

TOWN OF LYSANDER
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
8220 LOOP ROAD
Thursday, July 9, 2020 @ 7:00 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Lysander Planning Board was held Thursday, July 9, 2020 at 7:30 p.m. at the 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Corey, Chairman; Joanne Daprano; Hugh Kimball;
Steve Darcangelo; William Lester and Doug Beachel

MEMBERS ABSENT: Keith Ewald

OTHERS PRESENT: Al Yager, Town Engineer; Eric Kenna, C & S Engineers;
Doug Reith, CNY Land Surveying; Frank Costanzo, ZBA;
Tim Coyer, Ianuzi & Romans; Stephanie Zieno and Karen
Rice, Clerk to the Planning Board

I. PUBLIC HEARING -- 7:00 p.m. (Continuation from June 15, 2020)

1. Minor Subdivision Case No. 2020—008	OYA Solar NY/Hafner, Wendy Church Road
---	---

The Public Hearing reopened at 7:00 p.m.

John Corey, Chairman, stated that the subdivision of land for the OYA Solar/Hafner Church Road Minor Subdivision is a simple two lot subdivision to accommodate a solar facility on each parcel.

Eric Kenna, C & S Engineers, stated that actually we will end up having three parcels, two that will have solar panels and the remnant piece across the street.

Karen Rice, Clerk, questioned if the road already 'subdivides' the property with the remnant piece being a stand-alone piece. We had a legal interpretation on Patchett Road to determine if a subdivision was a Major or Minor Subdivision and it was determined that the road subdivided the property and even though it was part of the same tax map number it was considered a stand-alone lot.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that maybe the difference was in how the deed reads. If the right-of-way is an easement rather than a deeded parcel to the Town...I'm assuming most of the roads on the western side of Town are easement right-of-way, rather than Town road parcels. The property line actually goes to the centerline of the road, in this instance. The only Town road that's not like that that is out that was is Wheaton Road. For some reason that happens to be an actual deeded right-of-way.

Steve Darcangelo reiterated that it's one tax parcel right now that happens to include property across the road.

Mr. Kenna concurred stating we will end up having three tax parcels.

There being no comments, questions or concerns the Public Hearing closed at 7:05 p.m.

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

PUBLIC HEARING -- 7:05 p.m.

2. Minor Subdivision Case No. 2020—003	Village of Baldwinsville 1963 West Genesee Road
---	--

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

Steve Darcangelo abstained as he is the Village of Baldwinsville's engineer and the property in question belongs to the Village.

Doug Reith, CNY Land Surveying, represented the applicant stating that this is 14.8 acres the Village owns at the corner of NYS Route 370 and Emerick Road. They want to cut two more lots

out of the parcel as they don't use this portion of the land; one 1.37 acres and the other 1.36 acres. Both lots will front on Emerick Road. The reason you have new maps this evening is because we put a note stating that there will be no access onto NYS Route 370. Public water and sewer is available.

John Corey, Chairman, reiterated that at this point in time it is a simple subdivision with no identified use.

Mr. Reith concurred.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that the intent is to sell the property under its current Code use. We have applied to the Town for an extension of the Emerick Road Water District to service these two lots. We don't actually don't know what the next step is.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that once the subdivision is finalized, the Map Plan & Report will reference this map, so once it's approved we'll put it on the next Town Board meeting to set a Public Hearing for the Special District extension.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that they also intend to run our sewer extension across NYS Route 370. The property is currently in the Sewer District because the parcel it's being cut out of is in the Sewer District. We have not done that yet and it's really been delayed because of COVID. I don't know if we have an obligation to do that or it just improves the value of the property if we do. I don't know if we're obligated to do that, if we are we would certainly do it, if not I'm not sure if we'd pursue it. If we're not obligated we may just sell the property with the understanding that it would be the property owner's responsibility.

Mr. Yager stated that by Town Code and County Plumbing Control Code if you are in the district you have to connect to the Sanitary Sewer. In this instance if the Village doesn't do the bore under Emerick Road, whoever buys the first lot and wants to build on it would need to pay for that improvement cost. With that being said, obviously the lots are considerably more valuable if that work is done. That's the Village's prerogative, however they want to proceed.

Mr. Corey stated that in any case, that's not an issue with the simple subdivision.

Mr. Yager concurred.

The Public Hearing closed at 7:10 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING -- 7:10 p.m.

3. Minor Subdivision
Case No. 2020—009

Zieno, Jonathan
2061 Rabbit Lane

The Public Hearing opened at 7:10 p.m.

Tim Coyer, Ianuzi-Romans, represented the applicant stating that the property is on the northside of Rabbit Lane. It consists of roughly 28 acres with a residential house and barn. The property owner wants to subdivide 4.7 acres with the house off and retain the remnant piece.

Hugh Kimball questioned if there were any proposals for any changes.

Mr. Coyer stated that he is buying the house across the street but wants to keep the remnant piece for recreational purposes. He wants to sell the house, keep the remnant piece and keep 'playing' on it.

The Public Hearing closed at 7:15 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Review and approval of the minutes of the May 14, 2020 and June 15, 2020 Planning Board meetings.

June 15, 2020, Page 4, Resolution #1: Change "Short" Environmental Assessment Form to "Long" Environmental Assessment Form.

RESOLUTION #1 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that the Minutes of the May 14, 2020 and June 15, 2020 Planning Board meetings be approved as amended.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

III. OLD BUSINESS

1. Minor Subdivision
Case No. 2020—008

OYA Solar NY/Hafner, Wendy
Church Road

There is a letter on file dated July 9, 2020, prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, that will be made part of the public record, in part:

I have completed my review of the plat for the Hafner Church Road Minor Subdivision application, prepared by Ianuzi & Romans Land Surveying, P.C., dated November 19, 2019. Overall it appears that the proposed subdivision conforms to all applicable Town Code requirements as presented. I would have no objections to the Planning Board approving this Minor Subdivision at this time.

Hugh Kimball questioned if the Fire Department ever looked at the plan.

Mr. Yager stated that they did; we received an email from the Chief stating he was ok with it. He will do on-site visits during the construction

Eric Kenna, C & S Engineers, concurred stating they will work together to get those inspections set up.

Steve Darcangelo questioned the reason for the subdivision.

Mr. Kenna stated that there are two reasons, NYSERDA (New York State Energy Research and Development Authority) wants only one community solar project per tax parcel and National Grid wants to bring one service to one address per parcel. National Grid wants each site to have its own tax map number.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that the reason he asked is because he thinks it's a shame that there are regulatory issues that are forcing the subdivision of large parcels. I think one of the reasons that people appreciate solar farms is because we see them as a way of providing economic opportunities for some of our agricultural landowners; without it going into forever non-agricultural use. This is going to have a definite end someday; personally I find that satisfying to know that we're transitioning land into another use with the idea that it may be agricultural land again in the future. If a warehouse were built there I doubt it would ever be used for agricultural purposes again; but unfortunately the regulations are requiring you subdivide the property; which I think is unfortunate. There is nothing we can do about it, but maybe tell the trustees what is happening and maybe the trustees can lobby try to see whether or not there would be a better way in Albany to get this taken care of because with all of this activity and the matter in which it is taking place. I think it's unfortunate that just to meet regulatory requirements, not the technical aspects of the project, not for any other reason but because there are some regulations out there that are forcing the subdivision of land. Unfortunately that increases the probability that this land that this land will not go back into some sort of agricultural or native land use in the future. The more we subdivide property, more likely that it's to be developed for, what I would call long-term use.

The application was forwarded to the Onondaga County Planning Board for their review and recommendation that will be made part of the public record, in part:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Onondaga County Planning Board has determined that said referral will have no significant adverse inter-community or county-wide implications. The Board has offered the following COMMENT in regards to said referral:

Any proposed or future access to Church Road to serve the new lots must be coordinated with the Onondaga County Department of Transportation and will require highway access and work permits and be subject to the availability of sight distance. Driveways serving the proposed solar farm use must meet the Department's commercial driveway standards.

FINDINGS:

An Environmental Assessment Form indicates that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

There is a letter on file from Al Yager, Town Engineer, dated July 9, 2020, that has been made part of the public record.

There is a letter on file from the Onondaga County Planning Board, dated July 1, 2020, that has been made part of the public record.

This action is consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

This action is consistent with the Town's current Zoning Ordinances.

This action will cause no adverse effects on the public health, safety and welfare in the neighborhood or district.

RESOLUTION #2 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that having reviewed the Minor Subdivision application, as defined on a map dated November 19, 2019, prepared by Ianuzi & Romans, Licensed Land Surveyor, associated with the application of OYA Solar NY, for property located at 1671 Church Road, Tax Map No. 030.-01-09.0, Baldwinsville, New York is hereby approved.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

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

RESOLVED, that in granting a subdivision to OYA Solar NY, for property located at 1671 Church Road, Baldwinsville, New York, the Planning Board invokes its right to impose a fee of \$250.00 per lot for three (3) lots in lieu of land for the development of parks, playgrounds, recreation or open land areas in the Town.

0 Ayes -- 6 Noes (Parcels contain Solar Farm with remnant piece to remain under agricultural)

All fees associated with this application are paid.

State law states that the applicant shall file the final plat in the Onondaga County Clerk's office within sixty-two (62) days from the date of final approval or such approval shall expire. The applicant shall also file one copy of the final plat in the Lysander Clerk's office.

2. Minor Subdivision	Village of Baldwinsville
Case No. 2020—003	1963 West Genesee Road

Steve Darcangelo abstained as he is the Village of Baldwinsville's engineer and the property in question belongs to the Village.

There is a letter on file dated July 9, 2020, prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, that will be made part of the public record, in part:

I have completed my review of the plat for the Village of Baldwinsville Minor Subdivision prepared by CNY Land Surveying, dated January 2, 2020. Overall it appears that the proposed subdivision conforms to all applicable Town Code Requirements as presented. I would however recommend that the Planning Board require that a note is added to the plat which restricts access on Lot 2 to Emerick Road as a result of Town Code Section 270-14.B.3 recommending the lot width be 1 ½ times the normal width, which would be 300' on an Arterial Highway in this instance per the Highway Overlay Controls. I would have no objections to the Planning Board approving this Minor Subdivision at this time contingent on the above referenced restriction being added to the plat map.

This application was forwarded to the Onondaga County Planning Board for their review and recommendation, that will be made part of the public record, in part:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Onondaga County Planning Board recommends the following MODIFICATIONS to the proposed action prior to local board approval of the proposed action:

The Town and applicant must coordinate with the Onondaga County Health Department to provide legal access for both lots to connect to the public portion of the sanitary sewer prior to Department endorsement of the subdivision plan.

The Board also offers the following comment:

The Town is encouraged to consider long-term land use and planning goals for this node, and in particular, opportunities for neighborhood-scale commercial uses that would be consistent with the nearby municipal highway department operations and gas station and may benefit from a zone change.

There was some discussion with regard to sanitary sewer.

Mr. Yager stated that previously the Village indicated that they were going to do the connection; now that there is a question mark on that the Board certainly could restrict approval if they so choose based on the County's recommendation that the means for sewer connection be provided prior to you being authorized to sign the final plat.

William Lester questioned why that wouldn't happen when there are plans to build something there. Why would that not be a restriction upon building; not subdividing.

Mr. Yager stated that the Board could do it that way... "no building permits will be issued until access to the proposed lots to the sanitary sewer system is provided."

Board members concurred; with Mr. Yager stating that it's up to the Board's discretion.

There was some discussion with regard to whether or not County Health's signature was required on Minor Subdivisions.

Karen Rice, Clerk stated that you need County Health's signature on all subdivisions.

Mr. Yager stated that the any approval would be conditioned upon the sewer connection being provided.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that if the Board is uncomfortable with this you can table it; it is our intention to get the sewer line extended, it's just we've been unable to under the circumstances right now. We won't be marketing the property until it has sewer. When it is constructed it will actually be dedicated to the Town so you will have notification.

John Corey, Chairman, stated that at this point if the rest of the Board agrees we will table this until the Village provides evidence of connection of the sewer to the Town Engineer's satisfaction.

Karen stated that since we closed the Public Hearing, action will have to be taken within sixty-two (62) days.

Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball to table the Village of Baldwinsville's West Genesee Road/Emerick Road, Minor Subdivision application to allow time for a public sewer connection.

DISCUSSION:

Mr. Yager questioned if 62 days is too short of a time frame?

Several talking at once.

Karen stated that you'd have to rescind the Action of closing the Public Hearing and keep it open or it will be a default approval within 62 days.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that he thinks that would be best because right now we're having trouble getting contractors. I can't assure you that it will be done.

Mr. Lester stated that we just make any approval contingent upon before anything can be built on those properties they have to be connected.

Mr. Yager stated that the map would have to be filed within a certain period of time.

Karen stated that you can override County with a majority plus one.

Mr. Yager concurred, however that doesn't mean the County Health Department will sign the map.

The Motion to table the application was not voted on and will be rescinded. The Board will also rescind the closing of the Public Hearing.

RESOLUTION #4 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board rescind the Action to close the Public Hearing on the Minor Subdivision application of the Village of Baldwinsville, 1963 West Genesee Road, Baldwinsville, New York; to allow time for the Village to explore public sewers to serve the property.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

3. Minor Subdivision Case No. 2020—009	Zieno, Jonathan 2061 Rabbit Lane
---	-------------------------------------

There is a letter on file dated July 9, 2020, prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, that will be made part of the public record, in part:

I have completed my review of the plat for the Zieno Rabbit Lane Minor Subdivision prepared by Ianuzi & Romans Land Surveying, P.C., dated April 30, 2020. Overall it appears that the proposed subdivision conforms to all applicable Town Code Requirements as presented.

FINDINGS:

An Environmental Assessment Form indicates that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

There is a letter on file from Al Yager, Town Engineer, dated July 9, 2020, that has been made part of the public record.

This application did not require referral to the Onondaga County Planning Board.

This action is consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

This action is consistent with the Town's current Zoning Ordinances.

This action will cause no adverse effects on the public health, safety and welfare in the neighborhood or district.

RESOLUTION #5 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that having reviewed the Minor Subdivision application Jonathan Zieno, as defined on a map dated April 30, 2020, prepared by Ianuzi & Romans, Land Surveying, Licensed Land Surveyor, for property located at 2061 Rabbit Lane, ax Map No. 017.-02-23, Phoenix, New York is hereby approved.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

RESOLUTION #6 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Kimball

RESOLVED, that in granting a subdivision to Jonathan Zieno, for property located at 2061 Rabbit Lane, Phoenix, New York, the Planning Board invokes its right to impose a fee of \$250.00 per lot for one (1) lots in lieu of land for the development of parks, playgrounds, recreation or open land areas in the Town.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

All fees associated with this application are paid.

State law states that the applicant shall file the final plat in the Onondaga County Clerk's office within sixty-two (62) days from the date of final approval or such approval shall expire. The applicant shall also file one copy of the final plat in the Lysander Clerk's office.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Major Subdivision: Highland Meadows/Lysander Preserve
Waive Final Public Hearing/Authorize Chairman to sign the Final Plat for two additional lots.

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

RESOLVED, that the Planning Board authorizes the Chairperson to review the Final Plat for the four (4) lot subdivision application of Highland Meadows Development, LLC, for property located at Highland Meadows, Phase 3C, Lots 30, 39, 43 & 44 Giddings Trail, Part of Farm Lots No. 78 & 79, Part of Tax Map Number 049.2-03-06.4 and finding that all modifications and conditions have been met; and that the Final Plat is consistent with the approved Preliminary Plat; and that any differences found are not significant; the Board authorizes the Chairperson to waive the Final Plat Public Hearing and sign the Final Plat.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

2. B & F Development: Drakes Landing Apartments
Update Planning Board. No Action to be taken. Public comments can be made during the Public Hearing at the August 13, 2020 Planning Board meeting.

John Corey, Chairman, stated that B & F Development has submitted a modified drawing based on comments made by Al Yager, Town Engineer. This evening's meeting is to update the Board. There will be a Public Hearing on August 13th and all discussion will take place then.

Greg Sgromo, Dunn & Sgromo Engineers, represented B & F Development. I would like to thank the Board for the opportunity to give you an update on some of the previous comments that were provided by the Board. Since the last meeting we have done some reevaluation of the site with the biggest change being the south driveway, which was directly across from Oak Brook South. We have moved it to the center of the site. That will be the main driveway to the site, between Oak Brook South and Oak Brook North. A traffic analysis has been provided. We have proceeded with some more details of the design; which we will present at the next meeting. The move improves traffic for Oak Brook South in particular. The traffic pattern will essentially be the same. This intersection is still operating at Levels of A, the same with the north driveway. In general, it does not change the traffic levels of service at Drakes Landing from what we've provided in the previous report. There is still the same amount of traffic going there as previously proposed. We did get a revised letter out to the Board, dated July 9, 2020, in response to the Town Engineer's comments.

William Lester questioned if the traffic study was done with the new location of the south entrance?

Mr. Sgromo concurred stating that that was the main revision. We also received some comments from Mr. Yager and we modified some turn movements counts; some signal timing things and offered some clarifications to driveway access. In the report that was sent out today, we've readjusted the timing at the signal. As the signal exists today it's very heavily weighed for NYS Route 31; that is one of the reasons you have back-ups on Drakes. By changing the time allotted to the straight through east/west movement on 31 by a five second reduction it put that 5 seconds onto Drakes Landing and you've actually improved the traffic dramatically, whether the project goes forward or not, but we definitely recommend providing that report to the State to make those changes in the near future.

Steve Darcangelo questioned if there is no change by the State does your current plan show the que at the light to come back to Oak Brook Road with your project in place?

Mr. Sgromo stated (unclear) traffic counts and with the current situation it's irrelevant. I can't go out there and watch traffic because traffic patterns change dramatically with COVID; but my guess is we'll probably back up to Oak Brook every once in a while, during peak hours; but that's because of Oak Brook's border line going close to 31, I'm not saying it's too close, but then again if you change those timings that would happen less frequently.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that he agrees with the change of the timing; I'm just not sure we'll get it from the State.

Mr. Sgromo stated that the State's pretty reasonable; we run into these things every once in a while, and do traffic studies and we find out they're not balanced; the State has actually gone out there and taken a look at it.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if we've ever requested a change.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that not since he has been with the Town but has heard of it happening in other municipalities. As you know this requires a Long Environmental Assessment Form (Long EAF) and coordinated review so the Department of Transportation will certainly get this traffic study as part of that and we'll discuss it at the coordinated review meeting.

Mr. Yager continued stating that he has not had a chance to review the data yet as it came in late this afternoon. I do agree that it's certainly a possibility to make an adjustment to the timing, the question is will the State accept that. If the State doesn't accept that we need to look at other options to mitigate a problem that already exists that will be exasperated further if the project is approved.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that he has raised this point before on other projects...my issue with something like this, when it happens, and I'm not saying it's avoidable (unclear) the result in growth...cars que up on Oak Brook Road and then what they do is get impatient and that's when driver's have a tendency to take greater risks. Now they're pulling out onto Drakes Landing when there's less of an opening in what is truly safe and accidents happen. If we can do something with talking to the State, particularly if a traffic study shows that it would reduce the possibility of ques going back as far as that road I think that would be terrific.

Mr. Sgromo stated that essentially that intersection operates at a Level Service B; which is phenomenal. The movements on that intersection are mostly A's the only B movement becomes the southbound Drakes. It's so off balance, that's the first thing we looked at and said this needs to be tweaked and optimized; but we don't normally do that on an intersection unless it's failing then we'd have to haggle with somebody to do that. Quite frankly if an intersection comes out as a B or C, it's typically not an issue, no justification really for modifying it. If that D exists there it still doesn't trigger that level of concern typically for an intersection to be modified. When you start getting into E's and F's you have to start looking at possibilities of what modifying options are out there. But in this case, it's the logical thing to balance the intersection...you know over the years or whatever it was designed originally, things have changed since that point which takes that balance out; and it could very well be that since that timing was put in place the apartments went in place, or more traffic got generated, something has changed, the patterns and such that now it doesn't work anymore. As a last resort we could take it and make it no left turn on Oak Brook South during peak hours or something...

Board Member: I don't know about that.

Mr. Sgromo stated that as a last resort if it is a big concern.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that one issue regarding the traffic on 31 is that the traffic on 31 varies so greatly from peak morning, peak afternoon, weekends...the traffic varies quite a bit coming from Drakes Landing, other cars moving onto Drakes Landing, of course the morning peak where they're moving off and the afternoon where they're moving on, on the weekends when there's heavy traffic going through the intersection...the light probably does need to be reevaluated and they could (unclear) to accommodate them varying peak situations. That would probably be very helpful.

Mr. Sgromo stated that it may just be as simple as it's not on their radar. They've got other areas that are more problematic and nothing is failing out here so it doesn't necessarily mean that they're get called out here to look at it to adjust them.

Mr. Sgromo stated that he wasn't here at the presentation of the proposal in February and would love any first-hand comments you might have that we should be aware of to evaluate further, etc...

Hugh Kimball stated that he would make the comment that the Board, as Board members have really not dealt with a lot of the things that you may be working with Al on since then, for example the SWPPP (Stormwater Pollution Plan), wetland delineation if it was redone.

Mr. Sgromo stated that he could give some updates on that....the wetland delineation is done.

Mr. Kimball continued... coordination with the fire department, that kind of thing and other items identified in the minutes...I have a list of eight items that I hope we will deal with at least hopefully before we start a hearing.

Mr. Kimball asked the Chairman if he was ready to get into the details today.

John Corey, Chairman, stated no, we still have to do the coordinated review.

Karen Rice, Clerk, stated the Board appointed themselves Lead Agency back in February, the coordinated review was scheduled for the end of March during the whole COVID-19. Involved agencies were notified and none of them responded with any issues during the 30 window of time they were given. That's already done. The same with OYA Solar and we didn't do another coordinated review.

Mr. Yager stated that we should do some follow-up letters maybe to DEC and DOT specifically. Due to the scope and scale of this project it may be warranted to reach out to those two agencies ahead of time.

Mr. Kimball stated that a lot of those places shut down.

Karen added that the Onondaga County Planning Board has heard the application as well with comments from those involved agencies...what do you want me to do?

Mr. Yager stated that he will draft a letter to the DOT and DEC discussing what's going on. There is some concern among Board members with regard to the wetland delineation. We'll ask for a determination from the Army Corp of Engineers with regard to the wetland delineation report.

...they're well about Flood Plain Elevation in this location.

Mr. Yager stated that the Chairman mentioned earlier today that it would be helpful from the Board to have some viewshed renderings from Drakes Landing.

Mr. Sgromo stated that they have provided some cross sections. I'm not sure what additional information the Board is looking for...3-D type renderings type of thing. What do you mean by viewsheds?

Mr. Yager...what it's going to look like from the intersection of Oak Brook looking across the street; from westbound and eastbound on 31 looking to the site.

Mr. Sgromo stated that they gave cross sections from here (indicating on plan). I can put those up again. The site is heavily treed, some are decent sized trees that we are looking to preserve. We have shown the boundary of disturbance area; we're going to leave a whole strand of trees along the perimeter. It is quite heavily treed to the west and trees will remain where the driveway is going with the exception of a 20' strip where we have to put a sewer line through. We're proposing that we'll go out there with whoever this Board designates and pick areas that need to be supplemented for future...where would you plant evergreens and more healthy deciduous trees, because there are some ash in there. The intent is, and we've done this before at Township 5 where the buildings were close to residences, we selectively cleared out trees and replanted and supplemented and it has done a tremendous job of filling out those think areas, but also when you put in evergreens you get that year-round type of cover. So, the intent is to take and preserve as many trees as we can and supplement wherever we need too. We're showing a couple dozen trees out there (indicating on plan), chances are there will be more than that by the time we're done and we're ok with that.

Mr. Kimball stated that various terms were used, visual simulations, viewshed drawings, even a balloon was mentioned, renderings...but the idea was, as a Board we'd like to see some kind of a picture/concept of what it would look like once the things are built.

Mr. Sgromo stated that maybe they can get over there and take some pictures and shadow in a building behind it.

Mr. Corey stated that they're just giving you an idea of what we're looking for. Obviously the two concerns that have come out is traffic and how this is going to fit in to the community. We're just trying to see how that's going to look. We're looking at a three-story apartment. There's nothing in that area that's three-story. There's two-story, not three-story...we want to work with you. We want to find a way that it makes sense, not only for you but for the people and the Town.

Mr. Sgromo concurred stating that they'll try to get you something together with the key spots being Oak Brook South...

Mr. Yager stated that that would be a great spot to do it.

Mr. Corey concurred adding...what are the people across the street going to see.

Joanne Daprano added both of the Oak Brook entrances.

Mr. Yager stated that we have to be cognizant that the people that back up to Drakes there all have a tree line. There's an existing tree line buffer behind those houses. From what they're going to see, I don't think they're going to see much because they already have a tree buffer behind their house.

Ms. Daprano asked about the people on Sabin, on the other side...

Mr. Yager stated that it appears that they have added a retaining wall so maybe something additionally can be added on top of that.

Mr. Sgromo stated that Sabin is almost 350' with the vast majority of it being treed at a significant grade. These homes are actually looking over the roofs, if anything, with the trees they may not see any of the roof. Their viewshed is much more protected or scattered. Along here (indicating on plan) will these be hidden from this, probably not, but again there are a significant amount of trees that we're going to be able to preserve there.

Mr. Sgromo identified the tree buffers along Drakes Landing and trees that are being preserved stating that these are three-story buildings but they're very residential in character. The exact same building at Center Pointe in Radisson. The latest building that was built in Center Pointe is the exact same building that is going to go here. We'll go out there and take pictures of that and try to use that as perspective before we return again.

Mr. Corey stated that he thinks that's good because now we've got your modifications to the entrances and you've got a better sense and continuing discussions with you and AI and working on the highway stuff, we'll get ourselves in a good position by the August 13th Public Hearing to start that process and we'll make sure that all of the Board members, once AI has tightened up what he's been working with and the drawings, we'll all have that and you're going to get to come in and do this whole show again right from scratch for us and for whoever from the public comes and I appreciate you making the effort.

William Lester stated that the Radisson Community Association will have to approve Architectural vocabulary and that kind of thing.

Mr. Sgromo stated that he noticed with on-going discussions, last I heard I'm not sure who is going to jump first type of thing as far as the approvals, but we'll get that worked out.

Mr. Lester stated that this Board has not approved anything in Radisson that the Radisson Community Association hasn't already approved before us, so keep that in mind.

Mr. Yager...or at least indicated that they weren't opposed to it. It's not necessarily an approval, they don't do their Architectural Standards review until we've approved it, but they've said that they're not opposed.

Mr. Lester stated that the RCA must give their blessing.

Mr. Yager concurred.

Mr. Corey stated that as far as he is concerned, we've always in the past gotten a letter of approval from the RCA prior to our approval; but for whatever reason this time they have not been willing to give us the definitive letter they used to give us. They've come up with this, 'well we're not opposed at this time, we want to see what you approve'. If we stand in that position when we get to our approval and this is just me speaking, there's going to be a condition on our approval and that condition is that the RCA has to approve it and give it to us in writing before any building permit can be issued. We're not going to turn that whole process around...that's just me speaking.

Mr. Kimball stated that he agrees with that and I think our Chairman makes that clear if you read the minutes from February and I'm suggesting you use those minutes as a template for what

we're going to be wanting to look at. One of the issues is compatibility within this community and I think that issue raised in that area is the density as well. You're talking a lot of people in a very small area compared to the amount of people in the same area across the street on Drakes Landing. That's a lot of people packed in there with not much recreation use, ability to throw a ball with a grandfather, whatever....it doesn't look like there's much room in there other than for buildings, parking lots, garages, pavements and roads. There's nothing there. I think you've got to think about that too.

Mr. Lester stated there was a question with regard to sewage which will involve WEP (Water Environment Protection) and the capacity of the River Road Pumping Station and will it be able to treat that volume of waste.

Mr. Yager stated that the volume won't be an issue. They have a couple options. They can tie directly to the Patchett Road trunk, the County Sewer Trunk Sewer that goes directly down 31...it is gravity in that location; or come across the road and tie into the 8" that comes from Oak Brook down to the Patchett Road Trunk Sewer. We'll have to take a look at that. We really haven't gotten that far yet.

Mr. Sgromo stated that they're just assuming they'll go across Drakes.

Mr. Yager stated that that's certainly a possibility we just have to make sure we look at the flow in that existing 8" sewer and make sure it can handle these additional...

Mr. Kimball questioned if there have not been recent problems in Radisson.

Mr. Yager stated that there have not been, no. There is some debris problems with people putting things down the drains that aren't supposed to go down the drains, but it's not a capacity issue.

Mr. Lester stated that he's concerned with the fire flow especially with three-story buildings.

Mr. Sgromo stated that they have had discussions with OCWA...

Mr. Kimball stated that that point should be looked at. That came up at least when did the Y.

Mr. Yager stated that from an elevation standpoint pressure shouldn't be an issue, fire flow may need to be looked at with that many units, but from a pressure standpoint at that elevation, more than adequate pressure.

Mr. Corey stated that we'll have plenty of time in August for a lot more questions.

Mr. Sgromo stated that between now and August we'll try to touch base with the Fire Department, look into the sewer and water issues and we'll have the wetland delineation by then...the preliminary report showed no significant change, just so you know; and the visual simulations.

Mr. Corey thanked Mr. Sgromo.

Mr. Sgromo thanked the Board for their time.

V. ADJOURN

John Corey, Chairman, stated that the next meeting is Thursday, August 13th at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a Motion to Adjourn.

RESOLUTION #8 -- Motion by Kimball, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that the July 9, 2020 regular Town of Lysander Planning Board meeting adjourn at 8:03 p.m.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Rice, Clerk

