

TOWN OF LYSANDER  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
8220 Loop Road  
Thursday, July 8, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Town of Lysander Planning Board was held Thursday, July 8, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. at the Lysander Town Building, 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Corey, Chairman; Hugh Kimball; Steve Darcangelo and Doug Beachel

MEMBERS ABSENT: William Lester

OTHERS PRESENT: Al Yager, Town Engineer; Tim Frateschi, Attorney to the Planning Board; Cindy Clarke; John Langey; Jim Siddall; Cindy VanDeValk; Tom Karle; Mike Alexander; Annette Alexander; Mary Parrish; Frank Costanzo, ZBA; Ken Landon Carrie Saylor; Dee Hurd; Chris Hurd; Richard Lotano; Denise Lotano; Spencer Tooly; Maya Tooly; Susan Hopper; William Hopper; Connie Russell; Mike Russell; Wayne Weiss; Jill Swayze; Marge Dunham; Richard Dunham; Joseph Nanna; Christina Nanna; Anna Vogel; Pamela Fortino; P Zebrowski; Glen Silver; Brian Bouchard; Gene Dinsmore; Rob Helfrich; Kevin Rode; John Farneth; Robert Barr; Jason Killgrove; Tina Killgrove; Will Stone; Dan Pollock; Dana Himmel; Alan Castle; Carol Levy; Tim Swan; Matt Hunt; Mike Oemcke; Bob Snyder; Marsha Snyder; Len Keshishian; Ed Fisher; Dan Doerger; Richard Castellini; Jen A Schmidt; Bill Massaro, Belgium Cold Springs Fire Department; Karen Rice, Clerk and several who did not sign in.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

I. NEW BUSINESS

1. Establish Rules for Decorum at Planning Board Public Meetings/Hearings

Tim Frateschi, Esq., read the rules for decorum into the record; which will be made part of the resolution.

RESOLUTION #1 Motion by Kimball, Second by Darcangelo

RESOLVED, that in an effort to help the Town of Lysander Planning Board conduct efficient and productive meetings, the Planning Board, on July 8, 2021, adopt the following policy on Rules of Decorum at Public Meetings:

PUBLIC MEETING/HEARING RULES:

1. Any individual who desires to speak at a public hearing shall sign-in on the sign-in sheet provided at the meeting.
2. Only those signed-in shall be allowed to speak.
3. Speakers shall be allotted 3-5 minutes to present their comments, the time to be kept by the Chairman or his/her designee.
4. Speakers may supplement their oral comments with written comments before the public hearing is closed.
5. Speakers shall direct their comments only to the Planning Board.
6. The purpose of a public hearing is to gather information from the public, not to answer questions or address comments from the public on the night of the public hearing.
7. The Chairman of the Planning Board, at his/her discretion, may determine if a speaker's question or comment can be readily addressed by the Applicant at the public hearing.
8. Speakers shall state his or her name and address and limit their comments to the subject of the public hearing.
9. Speakers shall be limited to one opportunity to present their comments during the public hearing.
10. Speakers may not address the Board until recognized by the Chairman.
11. Discussion between Speakers and attendees of the public meeting or hearing is prohibited.
12. Members of the audience shall courteously listen and not interrupt a Speaker while the public hearing is being conducted.
13. Speakers should present their remarks in a courteous manner.

14. A person who disregards the directives of the Chairman in enforcing the rules, disturbs the peace at the meeting, makes impertinent or slanderous remarks or generally conducts himself in a boisterous or inappropriate manner while addressing the Planning Board, could be barred from further participation and forfeit any balance of time remaining for his comments.
15. If after a final warning, the speaker refuses to step down, the Planning Board Chairman may request that law enforcement remove the individual from the meeting room. §240.20 of the Penal Law.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

John Corey, Chairman, stated that these are rules not just for tonight's Public Hearing, but rules for all public hearings now and in the future for the Planning Board.

II. PUBLIC HEARING -- 7:00 p.m. (Continuation from June 10, 2021)

- |                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Controlled Site Use | Ranalli ALA, LLC         |
| Case No. 2021—0002     | Hencle Blvd/NYS Route 48 |

The Public Hearing reopened at 7:05 p.m.

Brian Bouchard, CHA Consulting Project Engineer representing the applicant, Ranalli ALA, LLC, standing in place for James Trasher who was here at the previous meetings but wasn't able to make it this evening. This is for the proposed warehouse at the northeast corner of Oswego Road and Hencle Boulevard. We want to provide an update in what has transpired since the last meeting. Previously you all understand that we proposed a warehouse that totaled over a course of multiple phases just over 1 million square feet; which would have been phased in three different phases. Based on comments that we received both at the meeting and in discussions internally the owner has made the decision to significantly reduce the scale and scope of the project. The project will not be what is shown on the map here (indicating on plan), which is a single phase. It will be a single project with just 360,000 square feet. His intention is to accommodate the future expansion elsewhere on within other properties that he owns within the County. With this we have submitted the revised site plan to the Town, we've also updated the traffic study. The traffic study was originally designed to document the full traffic impacts of all three phases and not just the first phase. We do intend to submit a fully updated application set for the Board that would include all of the site plan documents, not just the site plan, as well as the Stormwater report and that traffic study. What this is going to do is significantly reduce the impacts associated with this development that we've discussed over the past couple months. Specifically, it will still be compliant within the Industrial District Regulations, but it will also further reduce the bulk regulations, the lot coverage will be significantly reduced, the parking areas will be reduced in terms of the earthwork that's needed to perform the development, you have much less impervious surfaces that are needed for stormwater management, obviously it comes with less noise and less traffic impacts in terms of the number of cars and vehicles and trucks that are coming to and from the site. With respect to specifically traffic, because this was one of the concerns, we did update the traffic study and we did submit that to the Onondaga County DOT as well as the NYS DOT. Onondaga County DOT controls the Hencle Boulevard right-of-way for access and NYS controls the Oswego Road points of access. We have received an approval letter from the Onondaga DOT with respect to Hencle Boulevard. There is a restriction on the Hencle Boulevard right-of-way; there will be no vehicular access permitted on Hencle Boulevard. We are speaking with the County DOT to still allow for an emergency access point that will be a locked and gated access point, specific for emergency vehicles and more specifically for fire access to still provide two ways to enter and exit the site should there be an emergency. The only driveway for the site for vehicles, trucks and passenger cars entering would be on Oswego Road, which we've shown in the previous plans as well. We are still awaiting response from the DOT, so we haven't gotten their response, but this singular phase project is very similar to what was contemplate in the Phase 1 which did not require any mitigation measures, so the traffic study does document that there is no mitigation measures that would otherwise have been required for the future build-out of multiple phases which we've talked about in being necessary signal timing changes and roadway expansions to accommodate those turn lanes. So none of that mitigation will be required for this project, but we are still waiting for the response from the DOT with respect to that so, with that, the summary is we've taken this project and consolidated it down into that single phase that will be only 360,000 square feet built at once which we believe addresses many of the concerns and obviously significantly reduces the impacts associated with what would have been the future build-out of the bigger parcel and we look forward to getting the rest of the application materials that memorialize this to the Town for their review.

Mr. Corey stated that as you can see a great deal has changed. We are going to reopen the floor to questions with a one-hour limit time period for the remainder of the Public Hearing. I would think that once you absorb the information that was just presented to you, you should be able to see that many of the concerns that have been expressed over the last few months by citizens clearly the developer was listening to you. From a Planning Board standpoint, it's gone a long way towards making it less impactful as we analyze it and at the further point next month complete our Part 2 of the SEQR. With that, I would ask you, if you wish to speak, if you would raise your hand, I will recognize you, you come to the microphone, speak directly to us, and give your name and address.

Good evening Planning Board members, my name is Glen Silver, I reside at 2240 Mott Road, Lysander. I am here tonight to speak on the United Auto Supply application. Since this project, which was subject to Local Law #1, has completely changed literally in the past 24 hours, the point I wish to make that no one, especially myself as I'm speaking here right now, has had a chance to review these changes. Members of the public should be given the chance to review the new proposal and any new studies that this new proposal may require, including new State Environmental Quality Review documents which I believe are required by a new application. So, I am here tonight to simply ask you to hold a new Public Hearing on this new proposal, whether you are legally required to or not; or at the minimum keep the current Public Hearing opened until people have been given ample time to review the new proposal. To hold the Public Hearing on a previous proposal that has been rescinded and a new proposal that no one has had a chance to review with supporting documents that don't apply is otherwise a denial of due process and a waste of everyone's time. I have considerable other comments but I will hold them until I've had a chance to review the new proposal, which I'm hoping you give us time to review and comment on. Thank you for your consideration.

John Farneth stated that he lives on Connell Terrace and is a lifetime resident.

Mr. Frateschi asked if Mr. Farneth spoke at the last meeting.

Mr. Farneth stated that he did but was interrupted by the 'man over there' and was cut off. I didn't finish and was not given the chance to finish.

Mr. Corey stated that Mr. Farneth has an additional three minutes to speak.

Mr. Farneth stated that everything has changed in the last twenty-four hours; but I would like to get this in, in regard to the diesel trucks, the number of diesel trucks that would have to service a 360,000 square foot warehouse. Hencle Boulevard is way out in the northwest part of the County, as we know. Let's assume that the square footage multiplied by the height to get cubic footage, because that's how you calculate how much a diesel, 18-wheeler, can hold. Lets just...as an example take 16' is how high their storage is going to be, probably going to be higher. An average 18-wheeler diesel truck will hold 2,500 cubic feet of cargo, freight, auto parts. So, assuming the warehouse is built to fill up, that's the purpose of a warehouse, you're going to get between...you're going to need between three, at the new proposal, the old proposal would have given you eight-thousand trucks to fill up that warehouse, assuming they're going to use a warehouse, that's what it's going to take. The new proposal is going to take between three and four-thousand truckloads just to fill it. Now if you take Amazon, they try to turn their warehouses over like once every two weeks. At most, once every month. So, we are talking about an almost unlimited number of trucks coming down 690. There are only two accesses to this proposed warehouse; you've got 690 and then you've got 481, down 31 to Hencle Boulevard. I'm stating this fact because everyone uses 690. It's a dangerous intersection to begin with. If you go to the next one, everybody from 370, from westbound people of this County and Cayuga County are merging onto a very dangerous merge. Diesel trucks are accelerating up that half-mile hill, coming down the other side and there's a very tight merge there. Extremely dangerous. There's going to be accidents there the way it's configured. The river limits the merge lane. The next point I wanted to make is how much pollution these diesel trucks are going to cause. A diesel truck is as opposed to a gasoline engine...it makes a lot more CO2 and the particulate from a diesel engine because it's a high compression engine, is much smaller and it penetrates the brain. It's common knowledge among pollution people. So, you have three thousand trucks, who get an average by the way of only three to five miles per gallon, coming down 690 the whole time they're going to be here in the Baldwinsville area...they're going to burn two, three, four gallons because when they're loading and unloading, which could take hours, they have to run their engines to keep the pressure up because that's how the levitate their load in most cases. So, you're talking about, going back to twenty-two pounds, each gallon that they burn, each gallon that they burn is twenty-two pounds of carbon. You're talking about hundred pounds of carbon emitted just northwest of B'ville, B'ville High School, Eldan Elementary...every day, thousands of trucks. In order to make that place profitable you need thousands of trucks moving that type of

merchandise. So again, I haven't seen the new traffic study, but those are facts about the diesel engines. In conclusion, because I only have one minute, the purpose of my thinking on this project is, when I first heard about it the absurdity of locating a warehouse way out here. Why was Syracuse even settled...because of the convenient cross roads of north and south. We're fifteen, twenty miles way out here. If this guy is going to do ecommerce, the airport is, you take 481 to the airport. It's absurd. The location makes no planning sense that's all I would like to say. Thank you!

Robert Barr, Connell Terrace, stated that he would just like to know what advantage does the Town of Lysander gain from allowing this to be here. What benefits are the taxpayer's going to get? Are we going to get a reduced tax because this business is going to make up the difference or are they getting all kinds of exemptions and they're going to be moved in and our taxes are still going to continue to go up? What advantage, why does the Town want this business. Thank you!

Paula Zebrowski, 2260 Lamson Road, stated that this is a new project and we really haven't had the chance to review it and make our comments most relevant today; but when I moved out to Lysander I moved out to Lysander to be away from this type of industrial movement. I moved out to be away from the City and I moved on to an agricultural piece of property in order to enjoy that agricultural piece of property in the middle of a whole bunch of other agricultural pieces of property. Certainly, I drive down Route 48 every single day. I go to work in the City and I commute with people so that I'm able to decrease my carbon footprint while going in to the City. I carpool every time that I have the opportunity and I live on a piece that's intermingled with the wildlife refuge so that that development could be minimized around my particular piece of property. I suppose it was poor planning on my part not to recognize an Industrial piece of property on the way in and out of my Town that I thought to be agricultural. Then again, maybe it wasn't because there are a lot of people here I think having the same concerns. I think people arrived in Lysander with that plan. I think most of us came to an agricultural Town.

Robert Helfrich, 349 Hourglass Lane, stated that he saw the revised traffic study and appreciates some of the things that I have said and some of the comments that were made were (incorporated).

Mr. Helfrich read from a prepared statement dated July 8, 2021 that will be made part of the public record:

It is my understanding from a conversation yesterday, July 7, with Planning Board Chairman John Corey, the applicant does not plan to submit a new proposal for the warehouse, rather to revise the existing application. Furthermore, the EAF Part 1 will not be revised. The EAF Part 2 will be reviewed as early as August, should all revised and outstanding information requirements be satisfied.

I suggest the applicant withdraw the existing application in its entirety and submit a new proposal for the 360,000 SF warehouse given the significant and material change in the original plan. This will ensure all the SEQR documents relate to the correct proposal. Furthermore, should the applicant in the future decide to expand the facility to resemble subsequent phases of the original 1 million SF warehouse proposal, this would be prohibited as "segmentation".

During the April 8 Planning Board meeting where by the board first reviewed the EAF Part 2, Planning Board Attorney Tim Frateschi explained the process of an EAF Part 2 review. "When we go through Part 2 it relates back to Part 1. Every question that is in Part 2 should have an answer in Part 1: The existing Part 1 no longer applies to the newly proposed 360,000 SF warehouse. I reviewed the existing EAF Part 1 and found the following items no longer apply to the revised project. The list is not intended to be in its entirety, simply my personal review of the documents:

1. Part 1 - A The description no longer applies to a 1 million SF warehouse
2. Part 1 - D.1(b) The acreage to be physically disturbed is not correct.
3. Part 1 - D.1(e) the proposed action is not going to be multiple phases.
4. Part 1 - D.1(g)(ii)(iii) The dimensions are not correct.
5. Part 1 - d.2(i) The anticipated water usage/demand per day is likely not correct.
6. Part 1 - D.2(d)(i) Total anticipated liquid waste generation per day is likely not correct.
7. Part 1 - D.2(i) Impervious surface is not correct.
8. Part 1 - D.2(j)(ii) The traffic study no longer applies given it is based entirely on a 1 million SF high-cube fulfillment center and the ingress and egress has materially changed.
9. Part 1 - D.2(j)(iii) Parking spaces are not correct
10. Part 1 - D.2(k)(i) The estimated annual electricity demand is likely not correct
11. Part 1 - D.2(i) Solid waste generated during construction is likely not correct

12. Part 1 – E.1(b) Land uses are not correct
13. The EAF Mapper no longer applies given it relates to the 1 million SF warehouse

The EAF Part 1 is signed by James Trasher who states that he hereby certifies that the information provided is true to the best of his knowledge.

In addition to the Traffic Study needing to be resubmitted, the wetland delineation study should be revised to align with the new proposal. Other documents such as the photometric studies need to be revised or withdrawn and resubmitted. The Planning Board needs to take a “hard look” at every aspect of documents received and whether they are true and correct. When finalizing the Part 2, the Planning Board will need to explain why each impact may or will not be significant.

Given the significant material change in the scope of this project, I propose that the applicant withdraw their revised application and start the process over again with the new SRQR as if this is a new project. Thank you!

Mr. Frateschi stated that he received a statement from a resident, Wayne Weiss, 8833 Smokey Hollow Road, who asked that it be read into the public record:

To all interested persons:

The proposed construction of a warehouse at the intersection of Hencle Blvd and Route 48 creates a severe problem for residents north of the site that rely on ground water wells for a water supply.

This is the MAJOR supply of water available to all the residents north of the construction site. The problem is simply ‘explained’ when we realize that the aquifer that supplies that round water runs directly under the proposed construction site. The flow of the ground water is south to north. The actual aquifer is just under the surface and is limited to under 80 feet deep of useable potable water.

Since the Town of Lysander has decided to install a pipeline to supply water to the homes north of the village of Baldwinsville, this situation leaves all these homes and businesses without a water supply if the ground water supply is contaminated or restricted any more than it is at present.

A solution could be: Install a pipeline that supplies water to every residence and business north of the proposed construction site, BEFORE construction of the Warehouse can be started.

Otherwise, such a construction would be a probably hazard to the drinking water of the TAX PAYING HOME AND BUSINESS owners and residents north of the construction site.

Richard Lotano, 121 Coachman’s Whip, stated that he spoke at the May meeting, could I ask this young man (indicating to Brian Bouchard) to state one thing again so that I make sure that I understand it. Did this young man essentially state that Mr. Ranalli that Mr. Ranalli not be building beyond this 360,000 square feet and that he would be taking his opportunities there to other areas of Onondaga County? Did this young man say that, is that what I heard?

Mr. Bouchard stated that the current project that has been submitted with the revised site, which will be supplemented with more documents with a full site plan, stormwater report and traffic study will be for 360,000 square feet of warehouse.

Mr. Lotano continued...is there anything to be built in the future. Simple question.

Steve Darcangelo stated that as a Board member the concern for segmentation will be taken into account in reviewing this project.

Mr. Frateschi added that the Board understands the concept of segmentation and it will definitely be something that we will be considering as we move for a decision on SEQR.

Mr. Corey stated that despite, Rob, some of your comments, these people up here, we actually know what we’re doing.

Mr. Corey posed a question to the Planning Board Attorney: Given the comments of the one gentleman and Rob about the desire to continue the Public Hearing or to have a new Public Hearing regarding the new material and the change; it was my intention at this time to close the Public Hearing and the reason for that would be that there is nothing that has been submitted or

will be submitted, new documentation, that hasn't already been looked at and reviewed. If anything basically all areas have either been eliminated as a concern, like there's no longer a wetland concern, it no longer touches the 100 year line, traffic is down, all of those things from a Planning Board standpoint...from a million square foot project; if through our process we find that it meets with necessary and appropriate mitigations, all the State, County and Town Codes pertaining to this type of application, then under the new one that is submitted, which is substantially smaller in scale and size and impact, clearly there wouldn't be a need to start over. I'm speaking for myself, I'm not speaking for other members of the Board...that would have been my intention. We still have documents to receive, as noted. We don't have all of the updated documents. The only thing we know at this time is what we will be getting will be less egregious and impactful than what we've already been studying and working on. So, I'm welcoming any other comments from the Board members with regard to this.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that if there were a resolution on the table to either close the meeting or continue the meeting, I'd like to have discussion in that regard. Do we need a resolution to have a discussion?

Mr. Frateschi stated that you do not. The issue is, as I understand it, I (unclear) was the intention to close the Public Hearing tonight. As I have said from the May meeting and I think I said it at the April meeting...under State Law and under the Town Code, on a site plan review there is no requirement at all to hold a Public Hearing. We have not held three (3) Public Hearings over the course of three (3) months. So, it is purely under the discretion of the Planning Board to determine whether or not additional Public Hearings would be necessary to gather the type of information that is necessary to...and the way I've been looking at this Public Hearing frankly is that it is an opportunity for the public to provide us with information, especially as it relates to the SEQR analysis. That is the purpose of the Public Hearing that has been held. It's to provide us with that kind of information. We did do a review of Part 2 in April and at that time there was some sense of where the Planning Board thought it wanted to go, but they wanted to get more information, even after that meeting, which frankly there's still some more information that is missing and that's why a SEQR analysis has not been completed at this point. It's entirely at the discretion of this Board whether or not it wants to hold additional Public Hearings on a revised plan. I will speak to the issue of Part 1. Clearly there is information in the existing Part 1 that has to be updated because it's different, so that will be done. That doesn't mean we need a complete new Part 1. We need it updated to reflect the new Site Plan. That seems to be a logical and rational and reasonable way to handle that issue. When we look at Part 2, we're already reviewed Part 2. The Planning Board will review Part 2 again but only to the extent that this project has changed. So, issues that we have dealt with, like is the property for this project, we won't have to deal with anymore because it is the proper zoning for this type of project; or issues about wetlands or traffic is still being updated...those are all kinds of issues that we still need to make decisions on. But, whether you want to close the Public Hearing tonight is completely under your discretion.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned what the intention was to hold a Public Hearing for a project that did not require it?

Mr. Corey stated that the intention was that I felt that the scope and magnitude of this project was such that it would be important for the public to be made aware of it and have an opportunity to comment on it; even though we were not required to by Code or Law/

Mr. Darcangelo stated that he would think that was a very good decision; now I would ask fellow Board members, do we feel as though the scope and magnitude of this project, as it stands in front of us now, warrants the need for a Public Hearing?

Mr. Corey stated that if the project as it stands before us now was just submitted and the other project wasn't submitted I would say yes, but since the other project has been here, which is exactly the same project except on a larger scale that we have discussed over three months; I would say at this point, no, that's my position.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that that brings up another questions; can we as a Board anticipate that this smaller scale project would raise any public concerns that would be different from those that were raised on a larger project?

Mr. Corey stated that there's none he can think of.

Mr. Darcangelo concurred stating that he thinks issues have been raised, many of them have been good and I can't see how something...they've all been listened to and we have had the opportunity to review the project...I can't envision something different as a result in this project from the larger project. As I'm talking I'm trying to take into consideration myself as to how I

would express my concerns to the Board as well as try to let the public understand the thought process in making that decision. So, I do not see a reason to continue a public discussion. It's a different project, without a doubt, has a different impact, but I don't see any issues that would be different than what has been raised and I think we have a good representation of the public. The question was asked, does anyone else have a comment, it appears as though everyone's comments have either been spoken or have been represented by someone else; I would assume that, and my thought would be that there is no need to continue a Public Hearing for this, as for what we're looking at right now. That's my thought.

Mr. Corey stated that your thoughts are the same as mine. I would say this to the public...if we do close the hearing, our next meeting on this topic will be in August, you will have time to review the new documentation and during that time you can send us letters or emails that would update your thoughts based on the review of the updated documents. I totally agree with what Steve said, that was basically the logic I was using when I made my decision with regard to not need a further Public Hearing on this.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that's not to say that I don't think the public should not have their say.

Mr. Corey stated that they can still comment. Every letter, every email that has been sent to us by the citizens have been read. We have received, read and it's on the record. So, if you have any other comments or concerns you still have the opportunity.

Hugh Kimball encouraged anyone that wants to make those comments in writing to do so; because this is what happened in the last 24, 28, 48 hours...whatever timeframe you pick. It's new to us too as far as the changes, so you certainly are encouraged, what Rob said, he obviously did some homework in a very short period of time and raised some very good points about what needs to be changed in the Part 1 of the EAF. I'm glad he gave that to us. I certainly hope I will get a copy of it in the very near future and I would hope that all of you will take a good look at what is changing, some of it might not even be done changing as of the August meeting because we're still waiting on the State of New York DOT. We don't know what they're going to say; we don't know what they may ask for in terms of changes to the intersection, to how trucks are going to enter the road, etc... We don't know that and as for the one thing that is the reason we've been continuing the hearings is because we're no farther along with that than we were three months ago.

Dough Beachel stated that we've heard multiple comments on the site plan. We have to look at the criteria that it meets all of our rules and regulations, setback, height, zoning...that's our job as the Planning Board. I feel the scope, size and impacts of the project has been reduced. I don't see any site plan related differences that are going to change of the comments that we've already heard. I would agree to close the Public Hearing.

Motion by Corey, Second by Darcangelo to close the United Auto Supply Warehouse Project Public Hearing at 7:43 p.m.

Mr. Corey thanked everyone for their input and time.

### III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Review and approval of the minutes of the May 13, 2021 and June 10, 2021 regular Planning Board meeting.

#### RESOLUTION #2 -- Motion by

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the May 13, 2021 and June 10, 2021 Town of Lysander Planning Board be approved as submitted.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

### IV. OLD BUSINESS

- |                        |                          |
|------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Controlled Site Use | Ranalli ALA, LLC         |
| Case No. 2021—0002     | Hencle Blvd/NYS Route 48 |

There was some discussion as to whether or not the application should be resubmitted to the Onondaga County Planning Board for their review and recommendation. It was determined that the application will be sent and will be heard on August 4, 2021.

V. NEW BUSINESS

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Minor Subdivision<br>Case No. 2021—007 | Loop Road Development<br>8245 Loop Road |
|---|---|

Brian Bouchard, CHA Consulting, represented the Loop Road Development in their application for subdivision. The storage units, leasing office and associated access and parking have already been installed. What this application will do is subdivide the existing parcel into three (3) new lots. The storage complex will be Lot 1, each of the two commercial/office building parcels will be on their separate lot for the purposes of the new bank financing; so that the bank financing will be separate for the different parcels. There are no changes to the plans that were approved previously. It's purely a subdivision to divide the storage units from each one of the office building parcels.

Hugh Kimball questioned if there would be any impacts or anything that we've already reviewed and approved.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that there are no changes to the Site Plan; it's our understanding at this time, it's simply so he can build one of the buildings and get financing on it that is separate from the financing that he has for the existing facility there.

Mr. Bouchard concurred.

Steve Darcangelo questioned if what's shown in a very light shade is existing?

Mr. Bouchard stated that what's shown is the background of the Site Plan so it does include where the office buildings are. You can orient yourself to the property line, which is between the two (2) office buildings and the property line that forms the boundary of the storage units. It's not fully complete, but it the approved generic line work from the site plan to give you special orientation to where those lot lines were created.

Mr. Darcangelo reiterated that all of those buildings don't exist.

Mr. Bouchard concurred. The intent will be to complete the project that was approved.

There was some discussion with regard to access, more particularly for Lot 2. It was determined that all three parcels will access through the common driveway.

It was determined that this application will be forwarded to the Onondaga County Planning Board for their review and recommendation as the property is within 500' of NYS Route 31.

RESOLUTION #3 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, That the Planning Board having followed the prescribed SEQR procedures and having received no comments to the contrary, hereby designates itself as Lead Agency for the Alberici Excavation & Development, 8245 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York Minor Subdivision application.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

The applicant has completed Part I, Project Information; John Corey, Chairman, reviewed Part Two—Environmental Assessment, with the board.

1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations? No
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land? No
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community? No
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)? N/A
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway? No
6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities? No



7. Will the proposed action impact existing:
  - a. public / private water supplies? No
  - b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities? No
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources? No
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, water bodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)? No
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems? No
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health? No

**RESOLUTION #4** -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that having reviewed the SEQR regulations, determined this is an UNLISTED ACTION, and having reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment form, and finding no significant or adverse impacts resulting from the Alberici Excavation & Development, 8245 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York, Minor Subdivision application, the Planning Board issues a NEGATIVE DECLARATION.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

**RESOLUTION #5** -- Motion by Corey, Second by Darcangelo

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing be held at a date and time designated by the secretary, on the application of Alberici Excavation & Development, for a subdivision of property located at 8245 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York, Tax Map No. 0257.-02-33.0, for a development of three (3) lots from a parcel of approximately 11.44 acres.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Bouchard thanked the Board for their time.

- |                     |                |
|---------------------|----------------|
| 2. Site Plan Review | Gypsum Express |
| Case No. 2021—008   | 8265 Loop Road |

Brian Bouchard, CHA Consulting, represented the applicant, stated that if I'm not mistaken you had a discussion with the concept plan so you're generally familiar with the anticipated application. We've submitted the application and SEQR documents for a proposed parking lot expansion at the rear of this property. You may understand that there's been some activity over the years that has gone on back there but this is to formalize the new parking lot area that would be behind the existing building for the storage of his vehicles and parking of the trucks as well as a small two-bay drive-through truck wash bay that will be in the rear of the property. It includes access from the existing driveway along with a new access point to Loop Road just to the north so that there is circulation enough for the vehicles. We've included the comments from the engineering office with respect to some utility updates that were requested to show water and sewer from that truck wash bay. We've also provided previously the Stormwater Management Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Report for the new impervious surface for this project.

Hugh Kimball questioned where that water would go.

Mr. Bouchard stated that the water will go to a trench drain that is in the building itself and would pass through presumably an oil/water separator, which is a Plumbing Control requirement. The sewer lateral has been shown on the updated drawing.

There is a letter on file prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, dated July 8, 2021 that will be made part of the public record, in part:

I have completed my review of the Site Plan for the proposed Gypsum Express Expansion project located at 8265 Loop Road. At this time the site plan drawings with a final revision date of July 8, 2021 and SWPPP dated June 2021 appear to meet all applicable local and state code requirements. At this time, I would not be opposed to the Planning Board passing a resolution of the site plan approval for the project.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that we have not received a letter from ESDC (Empire State Development Corporation). There was some confusion as to wetland delineation. They did not receive the initial plan which showed and called out the wetland boundary points and the wetland delineation line. I have forwarded ESDC the complete package with the existing conditions plan, wetland boundary and wetland points called out. We have not received a letter, but that was their only concern referenced in the email from Quinn Hubbard.

Karen Rice, Clerk, stated that we can condition any approval.

Steve Darcangelo questioned the finished floor elevation.

Details were discussed and Mr. Bouchard stated that it was added to the amended site plan.

**RESOLUTION #6** -- Motion by Darcangelo, Second by Beachel

RESOLVED, That the Planning Board having followed the prescribed SEQR procedures and having received no comments to the contrary, hereby designates itself as Lead Agency for the Gypsum Express, 8265 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York Site Plan application.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

The applicant has completed Part I, Project Information; John Corey, Chairman, reviewed Part Two—Environmental Assessment, with the board.

1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations? No
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land? No
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community? No
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)? N/A
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway? No
6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities? No
7. Will the proposed action impact existing:
  - c. public / private water supplies? No
  - d. public / private wastewater treatment utilities? No
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources? No
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, water bodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)? No
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems? No
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health? No

**RESOLUTION #7** -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that having reviewed the SEQR regulations, determined this is an UNLISTED ACTION, and having reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment form, and finding no significant or adverse impacts resulting from the Gypsum Express, 8265 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York, Minor Subdivision application, the Planning Board issues a NEGATIVE DECLARATION.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes



2. Waive Hearing/Sign Plat      River Pointe at Radisson  
Carmellas Circle/Salvatore Avenue  
Phase 6, (5 Lots)

There is a letter on file prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, dated July 8, 2021, that will be made part of the public record, in part:

I have completed my review of the final plat for the River Pointe Phase 6 Major Subdivision as prepared by Applied Earth Technologies, dated June 16, 2021. The final plat does not reflect any changes to the dimensions of the lots included in Phase 6 when compared to the preliminary plat for the subdivision that was previously approved by the board. This map includes all of the remaining lots in the subdivision. At this time, I would not be opposed to the Board waiving the final Public Hearing and authorizing the Chairman to sign the final plat.

RESOLUTION #10 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that the Planning board authorizes the Chairperson to review the Final Plat, for the John Rao, River Pointe Subdivision application for property located at River Pointe, Phase 6, Lots 5, 6, 11, 12 Carmellas Circle and Lot 22 Salvatore Way, Baldwinsville New York, Part of Tax Map No. 082.-03-2.1, and finding that all modifications and conditions have been met; the Board authorizes the Chairperson to waive the Final Plat Public Hearing and sign the Final Plat.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

VII. ADJOURN

RESOLUTION #11 -- Motion by Beachel, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that the July 8, 2021 regular meeting of the Town of Lysander Planning Board adjourn at 8:24 p.m.

4 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Rice, Clerk