

TOWN OF LYSANDER
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
8220 LOOP ROAD
Thursday, February 13, 2020 @ 7:00 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Town of Lysander Planning Board was held Thursday, February 13, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. at the Lysander Town Building, 8220 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York.

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Keith Ewald

OTHERS PRESENT: Al Yager, Town Engineer; Tim Frateschi, Esq.; Scott Merle; Bryan Bayer, Dunn & Sgromo; Greg Rossetti, OYA Solar; Eric Kenna, Dunn & Sgromo; Frank Costanzo, ZBA; Jason Brown, Dunn & Sgromo; Jeff Dack; Steve Sehnert, Applied Earth Technologies; Doug Reith, CNY Land Surveying; Frank O'Donnell, ZBA; Jim Stirushnik; Karen Rice, Clerk to Planning Board and several others

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

I. PUBLIC HEARING -- None Scheduled

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Review and approval of the minutes of the December 12, 2019 regular Planning Board meetings.

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

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the December 12, 2019 regular Planning Board meeting be approved as submitted.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

The minutes of the January 9, 2020 Planning Board meeting will be tabled until the March 12, 2020 Planning Board meeting.

III. OLD BUSINESS

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Controlled Site Use—Solar Farm | SSC Lysander, LLC |
| Case No. 2019—014 | 8971 River Road |

No representation required this evening. The Board has determined that they would like to hold a Public Hearing for comments, questions and concerns on the application of SSC Lysander, LLC to give the public an opportunity to see what is proposed with regard to a solar farm on property located at 8971 River Road, Baldwinsville, New York.

RESOLUTION #2 -- Motion Corey, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing be held at a date and time designated by the secretary, on the application of SSC Lysander, LLC, for property located at 8071 River Road, Tax Map No. 073.-01-24.1, Baldwinsville, New York, for a Controlled Site Use to allow the construction of a Solar Power Plant.

6 Ayes - 0 Noes

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| 2. Site Plan Apartments | B & F Development |
| Case No. 2020--001 | 3285 Belgium Road |

Jason Brown, Dunn & Sgromo, represented the applicant in their proposal for the Drakes Landing Apartments, at the corner of Drakes Landing and Belgium Roads. The apartment project consists of seven (7) buildings. Each building housing 26 units with 182 units total. There will be fourteen (14) garages as well as a Community Center. The property is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD). The units will sit on a twenty-two (22) acre site and will be

serviced by public utilities. The development will cover approximately 6 ½ acres of that. Mr. Brown opened the floor to any questions from the Board.

Hugh Kimball questioned how much of the rest of the land is wetlands.

Mr. Brown stated that there are 4.8 acres of wetlands.

Mr. Kimball questioned if the wetlands have been delineated.

Mr. Brown stated that they were delineated more than five (5) years ago as part of a prior project. We will have to re-delineate, but there have not been any changes to the site so we don't anticipate any additional wetlands.

John Corey, Chairman, stated that they developer and/or his representatives have met with the Radisson Community Association and asked to be briefed as to how that went.

Mr. Brown stated that he was not in attendance of the meeting, the client met with them. From what he said they were favorable for the project and didn't have any major concerns regarding the project moving forward. I thought they made a call to you...

Karen Rice, Clerk, stated that she received an email from Lynn Tanner, Radisson Community Association (RCA), in response to my asking how that meeting went.

Mr. Corey read the email, dated February 13, 2020, that will be made part of the public record:

Hi Karen....I gave Al a quick verbal update on this, as well. There were many Q's & A's on a range of topics (traffic, lighting, trees, etc). The meeting ended with the RCA Board asking them to tie their sidewalk/path into our community pathway system and they are going to research the options and get back to us. We also discussed agreeing to a specific Architectural Vocabulary (i.e. building materials) to ensure the product would be similar to their existing 3-story apartment building. All in all...it went very well! Lynn

Mr. Corey stated that at some point we'll still be looking for a formal letter from them. Basically all they are asking you to do is tie in to the pathway.

Mr. Brown concurred stating that they can put in crosswalks to cross Drakes Landing Drive and tie in across the street with the path.

William Lester questioned if there was any discussion with trying to tie into the Kerri Hornaday Park?

Mr. Brown stated not to his knowledge, my knowledge of the matter is that they do not want any additional paths.

Dough Beachel stated that he is on the Board of the Community Association. We had asked for a pathway along the west side of Drakes Landing to connect to the existing pathway. We still want the apartment users across 31 to be able to come up and walk up that side of the road. Ultimately that was our one request.

Mr. Brown stating that without being in attendance they never passed that information along to me.

It is certainly something we can accomplish.

Steve Darcangelo asked for clarification of the pathway.

Mr. Beachel stated that we asked for a pathway from the crosswalk at the northwest corner of Route 31 and Drakes Landing to connect to the existing pathway on the west side of Drakes Landing that leads to Kerri Hornaday Park. That pathway is to the north of the northern Oak Brook Road/Drakes Landing intersection.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if they would be crossing Drakes Landing to get to the trails on the other side.

Mr. Brown stated that if that is something the Town would like to see we're happy to provide that; but I think with the connection that they are now asking for makes that a moot issue.

Mr. Darcangelo concurred, stating that without a traffic control you would have an uncontrolled cross walk.

Mr. Brown concurred stating that the prior discussion seems like a better idea.

Mr. Lester concurred stating that that's 45 mph through there.

Mr. Kimball stated that it's like 2 miles from the last STOP sign to the red light and there are no houses along that stretch of the road so people tend to go faster and faster until they see that light at the end of the road; so there are concerns.

Mr. Brown stated that since the last meeting we did complete a traffic study. We submitted some perspective plans and things like that to you for your review. With the traffic we didn't see any real significant impact. We saw a two-second delay at the light.

Mr. Kimball questioned if you looked at it 7:30/8:30 in the morning.

Mr. Brown concurred stating that they did traffic counts at peak time/peak hours. 7:45, 8:45 is the peak time in the morning.

Mr. Yager concurred adding 4:45 to 5:45 in the afternoon; further I have reviewed the traffic study. There was no degradation level of service predicted, slight delays but not enough to lower the current level of service in any direction at the signalized intersection.

Mr. Kimball stated that he looked at this nine (9) years ago when the Y proposal was in there and I noticed times during the peak period where the upper part of Oak Brook were not able to get out. That was with nothing on that lot and there are a lot more houses in Radisson now than there were then. They couldn't get out so they were going all the way around.

Mr. Brown stated that the traffic study does predict, even in the existing condition of around 5% chance of backup past that road; but...(several talking at once) I think the max it got past that intersection was 30' at any time.

Mr. Yager...with that being said, in hindsight, we really should have shifted that entrance to Oak Brook 100' further to the north

Joanne Daprano stated that she has to dispute all of those facts. I know people that over on Oak Brook and they can't get out now.

Mr. Brown stated that they're using a traffic model...

Ms. Daprano stated that she realizes it's not going to improve, but it's obviously going to get worse. I live it every day.

Mr. Brown reiterated that it's a two (2) second increase at the light.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if there would be a need to restrict exit times from the southern exit?

Mr. Brown stated that at this time they don't have anything planned. We're open to hear the Board's comments on the matter.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that he hates to do it as there's no way of enforcing it so...if they do queue up from the lights back to this intersection it might be good, I'd hate to push all of your traffic up to the north, but...

Mr. Brown stated that more than likely if it's queued up past that intersection people are just going to ultimately defer to that second entrance anyway. They're not going to sit and try to get out while that is backed up.

Mr. Yager stated that we're creatures of habit, most of us leave for work at the same time every day and they know that every morning they're going to pull out from the southern exit of the development and if there's a backup your tendency is to just go to the northern exit from the development onto Drakes Landing. Just like I'm sure the people from Oak Brook are just going around the loop, across Twin Flowers...

Mr. Darcangelo stated that you think people parked in front of Unit 1 are going to drive up to the north exit to exit?

Mr. Brown concurred stating if they know that that is always backed up; if it is always backed up...when we did our counts we didn't see it backed up past that intersection. Of course that was one time out of 365 days a year.

Mr. Kimball asked if there is a backup could that be alleviated by making a right-turn onto the main road (NYS Route 31) so that you don't get a whole line of cars of people wanting to go right.

Mr. Yager stated that the lowest, during peak hours...that is the smallest percentage of turning movements at the southbound lanes. The actual relief that that would provide would be minimal. The left-hand turn lane...

Mr. Kimball stated that he noticed that when he did, but two or three cars could make a difference as far as blocking that entrance.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that the study shows that there is only a five percent (5%) incident of backup. It would be interesting to know if you could predict from your model what that 5% would increase to with this development.

Mr. Brown stated that that is with that development.

Mr. Yager concurred...5% of the time period at the peak hour...not over the day but over the peak hour.

Mr. Kimball stated that one of the things we learned ten (10) years ago was that there was a water table less than three (3) feet from the surface. Does that create any problems for you.

Mr. Brown stated that they have to adhere to New York State Standards to keep separation from ground water on certain practices of stormwater; other practices we can put into the ground water. It presents a problem but nothing that can't be solved through engineering.

Mr. Kimball questioned if the construction can be done without blasting or pile driving.

Mr. Brown stated that as far as he knows it can. Like I said...as part of the engineering we will probably perform test holes. That is a normal process of the SWPPP (Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan)...to dig test holes to determine the depth of bedrock. Right now the EAF says the depth of bedrock is an average of 2 ½ feet; but it's probably limestone bedrock which is 'diggable'. That's an estimate from the soil survey, it's hit or miss, that's why we back these things up with test holes. We don't anticipate blasting or pile driving.

Mr. Kimball stated that his concern there are neighbors right up behind the property on Sabin and there are other neighbors just across the road on Oak Brook.

Mr. Yager stated that he's not aware of any of the home foundations on Oak Brook requiring blasting or any form of rock excavation when they were put in. I don't anticipate that on this site.

Mr. Kimball stated that that does make sense.

Mr. Brown stated that that's something his client would want us to do anyway. I know it's scheduled but it's dictated by the weather.

Mr. Kimball questioned if a visual simulation will be provided to show how this is going to look from NYS Route 31, Drakes Landing...put a balloon in the air.

Mr. Yager...view shed renderings.

Mr. Brown stated that they can certainly give you something like that. We submitted cross sections of the site trying to give you a picture of what it's going to look like. Right now there's some young vegetation; so a lot of the low lying limbs are blocking everything you're going to see right now. Us doing a balloon fifty (50) feet back; we're not going to see very much. That's why we went with the cross sections we did; but we can certainly make an effort to try to do that if that is something the Board would like to see.

Mr. Yager stated that a rendering would probably be more appropriate in this situation rather than trying to put a balloon up and look at it.

Mr. Kimball stated that it looks like you're going to have to take out all of the trees and undergrowth that's there.

Mr. Brown stated that they're going to do the best that they can to leave some stuff in the front and along 31 as well...along the perimeter. We'll do everything we can to leave as much of that as possible. A lot of it isn't the greatest stuff anyway. It's young...but we show some additional trees to screen the front of that. Right now you're not losing anything that's very large; it's young forest.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if the Army Corp of Engineers wanted to save some trees with the previous proposal.

Mr. Yager stated that it was the Indiana bat thing...no cutting of trees from April 1st through October.

Mr. Brown recalled that the trees were too young at that time to even house the Indiana bat. We did list it as a species.

Mr. Kimball stated that Radisson has rules with regard to finishes, colors, etc... in residential areas. Basically you're in the middle of a residential area, so are you going to be compatible for the area.

Mr. Brown stated that their client will comply with what Radisson wants.

Photos of B&F's existing building that was constructed off of Willett Parkway shown, with Mr. Brown stating that it's the same building that they are proposing for this site.

Mr. Beachel stated that the RCA determined that the buildings need to be an approved "architectural vocabulary" per the Architectural Standards Community. We asked that that be contingent to these approvals that that's in place and in writing so that they can't get the site plan approved and build something else. It ties them to that architectural vocabulary and gives some latitude to change colors and stone with different buildings. They would come back in and have that amended. That was one of the stipulations that we wanted to have along with the pathway.

Mr. Kimball questioned where the parking lots drain and where will the snow be plowed.

Mr. Brown stated that the parking lot drains in two directions...as shown on your site plan, second page. The parking lots will be drained back to the stormwater management areas that discharge to the wetlands. With regard to plowing, the final site plan will show locations for plowing. I anticipate that they are just going to plow out the back and sides.

Mr. Kimball...as long as it doesn't get plowed into the wetlands.

Mr. Brown concurred stating that they can be plowed near the stormwater management areas because that's kind of what they're designed for, collect that type of run-off. They cannot push it into the wetlands. Moving forward we can show you locations for snow storage.

Mr. Kimball asked if you're aware that there are screening requirements for outside garbage storage or dumpsters, etc...

Mr. Brown stated that they are aware and have shown screened dumpsters...they're fenced in and landscaped.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that he's not sure how many parking spaces you can afford to lose in the Winter months, but my guess would be south of Structures 3 and 7.

Mr. Brown stated that it just so happens that AI notified us today that our parking spaces are actually too large.

Mr. Yager stated that they used the old standard which was 10' x 20'. Our new Zoning Code Standard is 9' x 18'; so that will free up a little bit of space for snow storage.

Mr. Brown stated that currently we have 360 spaces; two per apartment. With the reduction we can probably fit a few extra spaces and find places for snow.

Mr. Kimball asked if they're aware that outdoor lighting has to stay within the boundaries of the property.

Mr. Brown concurred stating that a lighting plan will be provided as part of the final plan. Mr. Kimball questioned if you've coordinated with the fire department.

Mr. Brown stated that they have not yet, but absolutely we would love for them to look at it and give us their opinion. Right now the drive aisles are 30' wide. They should have no problem getting their trucks around. We can meet with them and drive a truck ultimately drive a fire truck around the site.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if the utilities are public or private.

Mr. Yager stated that there are options on that. If they want to create an easement they can ask the Town Board to take dedication of the sanitary sewer mains to the manholes. They would have to go through the standard procedure of posting maintenance and punch list securities for a period of three (3) years; but they could request that the sanitary sewers be Town owned. Water to the site is typically OCWA and typically from the meter pit into site is privately owned.

Mr. Darcangelo...reiterated that distribution of water will be private but owned by the developer. Sewer may or may not.

Mr. Brown stated that that is something they can discuss with their client. I'm sure they're favorable of the Town to have them.

Mr. Yager stated that the storm sewer would be privately owned by the developer and there would be a requirement to do an annual maintenance inspection of the stormwater management facilities through a stormwater management agreement.

There was additional discussion with regard to the SWPPP.

Mr. Brown stated that that would be part of the next submittal. We just wanted to show you that we're progressing.

Jeff Dack, Twin Flowers, questioned how you can put a commercial property in a residential area.

Mr. Kimball stated that it's zoned as a PUD (Planned Unit Development). Both individual houses and apartments are permitted and there are already apartments in other parts of Radisson.

Mr. Dack stated that that piece of property is zoned for single-family, multi-family only...and you can go back to the prior lawsuit that was filed on that property.

Mr. Kimball stated that he has looked at that. When the original guy bought it, before he sold it to the Y, it had both. He wasn't intending to do that originally but it was in there.

Mr. Yager stated that multi-family has always been allowed in the residential areas of the Radisson General Project Plan.

Mr. Dack...multi-family, yes; but that is a place that is collecting monies so that is a commercial property and its NYS Tax Code is graded as a commercial property.

Mr. Yager stated that we have many other commercial properties in Radisson under the Residential Development Controls that are commercial properties. This is nothing new.

Mr. Kimball added that it is residential; not like a hotel.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if a hotel would be permitted on that property.

Karen Rice, Clerk, stated no...not in that zone.

Kevin Rode questioned why the north entrance of the sight not lined up with the north entrance of Oak Brook.

Mr. Brown stated that there is a wetland there.

Mr. Rode questioned why you can't mitigate the wetland.

Mr. Yager stated that you typically avoid mitigation if at all possible.

Mr. Rode stated that, being a resident, he sees issues with the way traffic's going to come in and out there. I think the entrance closest one to 31 should be a right-turn only. Someone trying to turn left there is going to back traffic up. It's going to be tough with that.

Jim Stirushnik, Dinglehole Road, questioned if there would be a Public Hearing on this application, as he has some questions also.

Mr. Corey stated that that is what the Public Hearing is going to be about.

RESOLUTION #3 -- Motion by Corey, Second by

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 B&F Development , 3285 Belgium Road, Baldwinsville, New York, Site Plan application for the Drakes Landing Apartment Complex .

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

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

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing be held at a date and time designated by the secretary, on the application of B&F Development, 3285 Belgium Road, Baldwinsville, New York, for a Site Plan Approval to allow the construction of the Drakes Landing Apartment Complex.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Brown thanked the Board for their time.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Minor Subdivision | Merle, Scott |
| Case No. 2020—002 | 8245 Emerick Road |

Steve Sehnert, Applied Earth Technologies, represented the applicant stating that the property is on the west side of Emerick Road, north of Whispering Oaks, Section 4, Phase II with the rest of Whispering Oaks being southwest of the parcel. It is a 55 ½ acre parcel; zoned AR-40. It is not in an Ag Taxing District; there are no NYS Freshwater Wetlands, nor the 100 Year Flood Hazard. At one time this parcel was part of the Incentive Zoning District, but it is our understanding that the Town has removed that from this parcel. The applicant would like to subdivide the property into three (3) single-family detached lots. Lot 1, as shown, was previously subdivided out and contained the original farmhouse and outbuildings of the Harkins Property on Emerick Road. Lot 2 will have 16.6 acres with 550' of frontage; Lot 3 18.6 acres with 517' of frontage and Lot 3 18.6 acres with 353.5' of frontage. Utilities will be private. The original plan when this parcel was part of the Incentive Zoning Overlay a connection from Whispering Oaks, Section 4, Phase II was proposed with a stub street provided; but that has subsequently been removed from the plans. The plan is to develop this property as an AR-40 subdivision.

William Lester questioned who owns Emerick Road.

Karen Rice, Clerk, stated that Emerick Road is a Town Road.

RESOLUTION #5 -- 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 Scott Merle, 8245 Emerick Road, Baldwinsville, New York Minor Subdivision application.

6 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?
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 #6 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Lester

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 Scott Merle, 8245 Emerick Road, Baldwinsville, New York, Minor Subdivision application, the Planning Board issues a NEGATIVE DECLARATION.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

RESOLUTION #7 -- 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 Scott Merle, for a subdivision of property located at 8245 Emerick Road, Baldwinsville, New York, Tax Map No. 049.-02-02.1, for a development of four (4) lots from a parcel of approximately 55 acres.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Sehnert thanked the Board for their time.

2. Minor Subdivision
Case No. 2020—004

Village of Baldwinsville
1963 West Genesee Road

Doug Reith, CNY Land Surveying, represented the Village of Baldwinsville who is looking to do a three (3) lot subdivision for property located at NYS Route 370 and Emerick Road. It is currently the Village of Baldwinsville's Department of Public Works and was formerly the NYS Power Authority's building. The property is zoned AR-40. At this time they do not need the property along Emerick Road. There is approximately seventeen (17) acres. There is existing water and sewer along 370. There is existing water up a little ways on Emerick Road, on the Byrne Dairy side of the road so the lots will have access for that.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, they would be in both a sewer and water district.

Steve Darcangelo, speaking on behalf of the Baldwinsville DPW, stated that the property is currently in a sewer district and there is a request in right now to have the water district include those two lots.

William Lester questioned if the Village would retain the remnant piece.

Mr. Reith concurred.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that Lots 2 and 3 would return to the tax roll because currently the entire parcel is owned by the Village and is exempt.

Mr. Yager stated that the Village has mentioned the possibility of a zone change once this subdivision is approved to allow a business/residential type of zoning to match what is on the southside of 370 and the eastside of Emerick Road.

Mr. Darcangelo added that they're not sure if they would do that or just offer it for sale under the current zoning and have any interested party approach the Town.

John Corey questioned if there was any thought on the use of the property.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that they just want to offer it for sale for whoever might see a potential for development, that's all. We don't use it. We put a pile of mulch there that is free to the public, we like it because it gives us an opportunity to get rid of our mulch but we'll find another spot. We just mow it and have for the entire time we've been there. It's not a green space that anyone uses. It's mowed for no purpose other than aesthetics.

This application will be forwarded to the Onondaga County Planning Board for their review and recommendation as the property abuts a State highway.

RESOLUTION #8 -- Motion by Corey, 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 Village of Baldwinsville, 1963 West Genesee Road, Baldwinsville, New York Minor Subdivision application.

6 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?
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 #9 -- 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 Village of Baldwinsville, 1963 West Genesee Road, Baldwinsville, New York, Minor Subdivision application, the Planning Board issues a NEGATIVE DECLARATION.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

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

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing be held at a date and time designated by the secretary, on the application of the Village of Baldwinsville, for a subdivision of property located at 1963 West Genesee Road, Baldwinsville, New York, Tax Map No. 049.-02-08.1, for a development of three (3) lots from a parcel of approximately 15 acres.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Reith thanked the Board for their time.

3. Minor Subdivision Case No. 2020—005	Hafner, Wendy 1671 Church Road (A)
---	---------------------------------------

This item will be tabled.

4. Controlled Site Use Case No. 2020—006	OYA Solar NY/Hafner, Wendy 1671 Church Road (A)
---	--

Controlled Site Use Case No. 2020—007	OYA Solar/Hafner, Wendy 1680 Church Road
--	---

Greg Rossetti, OYA Solar; Bryan Bayer and Eric Kenna, C&S Companies represented Gary and Wendy, Landowners, for the proposed Community Solar Farm; which requires a Site Plan approval (Controlled Site Use). There are two components with the submission.

Introduction: OYA Solar proposes a Community Solar farm on property located on Church Road, Sites A & B, in the Town of Lysander, Onondaga County, New York. Solar photovoltaic (PV) systems are proposed for both sites. Each project will generate up to 5-megawatt AC. The interconnection wiring will be pole mounted, overhead wiring. The Area of Interest (AOI) for delineation totals 85.4 acres. Wetland delineations have been provided and are consistent with the United States Army Corps of engineers (USACE) and New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) guidelines.

Mr. Rossetti stated that Community Solar is very in-depth of various incentive programs that are available. The idea is you've got Utility Companies and the State putting money into these various incentive programs. If you were to drive down any given road you'll find that residential homes and even businesses as well, 25% of those homes could accommodate solar on their roofs but could sometimes be challenging due to their designs. These Community Solar projects allow us through laws that have been passed in this State, allows us to remote meter. We sell subscriptions to homeowners and businesses. Through that program those homeowners and businesses receive a 10% discount on their power bill. That's the nature of both of these projects that have been submitted into National Grid as Community Solar.

Mr. Kenna stated that he is a Civil Engineer with C&S Companies. The proposal is at 1670 Church Road; which shows a subdivision associated with it. The plan is to subdivide the parcel with possibly a 30 +/- acre parcel on the west half, which will accommodate a 1 megawatt facility; with the remaining 60 +/- acres that also goes across the road, which will have a 5 megawatt facility. The reason for the subdivision is driven by how many megawatts you can have per facility. Also, you can't have more than one facility on one piece of land or tax parcel per NYCERDA and the grants. In order to get two facilities on this land we have to subdivide it so that they have their own tax parcel associated with it. We will be performing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan as we proceed. There won't be a lot of impervious areas created but it will be over an acre of land disturbance.

William Lester stated that it appears that the panels are either facing east or west, not south as I'm used to seeing them.

Mr. Kenna stated that you're probably referring to fixed tilt panels where the panels are placed on a rack and face a southern ski the whole time. This system is a little different. These lay sideways on a rack and actually tilt to the east in the morning and rotate across as the sun goes across. They're laid out to flip east to west as the sun moves throughout the day.

Solar panel locations, interconnections and access on the plans with setbacks and screening, both landscaped and fencing, were discussed.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if fencing would be a permanent screening or if you're planning any vegetation.

Mr. Rossetti stated that at the moment we're proposing a chained link/green slotted fence. Sometimes we've done native vegetative plantings along the fence but a fence is a cleaner option. The panels are only chest high. The fence itself will screen the majority.

Mr. Corey asked if view sheds could be provided.

Mr. Rossetti stated that they have already been provided as part of the submittal.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that he assumes the life of this project is 20 to 25 years. Your fence isn't going to last that long. You're green slats are going to wear out, crack, be broken...you're not going to be replacing them.

Mr. Rossetti stated that they're happy with either type of landscaping. I know exactly what you're talking about. The slotting that they have these days are actually pretty impressive. Again from an aesthetic view point we can get rid of the slats and do fencing. Fencing is actually cheaper to do than natural plantings I just feel that fields that are open like this you have a slightly cleaner look.

Mr. Darcangelo asked if they have a site locally with that fencing.

Mr. Rossetti stated that they do not in this area, there will be one in Jefferson County. New York State is just getting out of the block from a construction standpoint.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that you have to have the fence anyway for security anyway and that he'll review the plan to see what is being proposed.

Bryan Bayer stated that he is an Environmental Specialist with C&S Companies. What we've prepared is a formal final wetland delineation throughout the entire parcel. The boundaries of the wetlands are provided on the plan. We've developed both plans in such a way that permanent surface wetlands are avoided. We've also received clearance from the State Historic Preservation Office for both projects. We've provided the NYS Environmental Quality Review Act, Full EAF Part I for the Board's review and use.

Mr. Kenna stated that they are before the Board tonight just to present the application and get feedback and see what other materials, if any, are required to establish Lead Agency and start the SEQR process for both projects?

Mr. Corey questioned where we stand as far as material we need to formally start the process.

Mr. Yager stated that we have two site plan packages. We have not received the SWPPP, nor has a wetland report.

Mr. Bayer stated that it was not submitted as part of the application but if you'd like to see it we will send that in.

Mr. Yager concurred stating that other than that just a plat map for the formal subdivision. The Board is in a possession this evening to appoint themselves Lead Agency and start the coordinated review process.

There was some discussion with regard to whether this was an application for a Site Plan approval or Controlled Site Use. The Solar Law refers to it as a Site Plan, however the Zoning Ordinance refers to it as a Controlled Site Use. It was determined that they're one in the same in this situation. The Board is controlling the use of the site.

Mr. Kenna concurred stating that we're also fine with running the subdivision parallel too because obviously we don't want to subdivide Mr. Hafner's land until we know the site is going to be approved.

There was some discussion as to the process. Karen Rice, Clerk, stated that we have three applications. One for the Minor Subdivision; one for a Controlled Site Use for property located at 1671 Church Road and one for a Controlled Site Use for property located at 1680 Church Road.

Mr. Yager stated that from a SEQR standpoint, because the subdivision is part of the overall site plan approval for both parcels; I assuming we can do one SEQR for the subdivision and the Controlled Site Use all in one shot.

Tim Frateschi, Esq. concurred stating that the subdivision component on this we can work into the SEQR resolution...I will prepare a SEQR resolution that include all three of the applications.

RESOLUTION #11 -- 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 OYA Solar NY, 1671 Church Road and 1680 Church Road, Baldwinsville, New York Minor Subdivision.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

RESOLUTION #12 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Darcangelo

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 OYA Solar NY, 1671 Church Road and 1680 Church Road, Baldwinsville, New York Controlled Site Use application for a Solar Power Plant.

6 Ayes -- 0 Noes

RESOLUTION #13 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Beachel

RESOLVED, that a Public Hearing be held at a date and time designated by the secretary, on the application of OYA Solar NY, for a subdivision of property located at 1671 Church Road, Baldwinsville, New York, Tax Map No. 030-01-09.0, for a development of two (2) lots from a parcel of approximately 64 acres and a Controlled Site use to allow the construction of a Solar Power Plant.

6 ayes -- 0 Noes

OYA Solar representatives thanked the Board for their time.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

- | | |
|------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Major Subdivision | White Tail Woods |
| Amend Preliminary Plat | River Road |

Steve Sehnert, Applied Earth Technologies, represented John Smolen, Developer of White Tail Woods.

Mr. Sehnert stated that this subdivision has been going on for a while, back to 1990. The survey work was done ahead of that time. What we have before the Board this evening is the original preliminary plat approval with a few hand-written notes endorsed by David Alessio, who was the developer at the time. As you may recall, along the top of the ridge of the subdivision there is a National Grid easement for their power transmission line. A right-of-way was proposed basically following the power line easement for a walking trail (indicating on plan of the existing walking trail path easement that was discussed decades ago). One problem with the development of the walkway is there is nowhere for it to go beyond our property line. Areas left years ago to get to Doyle Road have since been sold. Additionally, in the process of developing Section C National Grid has asked that they move the walkway as they don't want them under their lines. The second item we'd like to discuss this evening that doesn't really pertain to this Board; but National Grid wants assurance that every lot that is being conveyed, that they are mentioned. That's taken care of by the way the lots are being conveyed. In trying to move this along so that the developer can finish up his development of the first part of Section C this Spring and start building houses in here...we'd like to get the Board to moving this walkway to the east of these proposed lots. Some lot lines may have to be adjusted in doing so.

Mr. Sehnert discussed the elevation of the property as it slopes down towards the Seneca River and how the proposed full build-out of White Tail Woods was supposed to tie into the adjacent property; however that too is under different ownership and won't be happening due to the placement of the home that was built on that property.

Al Yager, Town Engineer, stated that we actually contradicted ourselves in the preliminary plat approval. One of the conditions of the approval was that that all of the comments of the Barton & Loguidice letter dated September 5, 2005 be addressed. One of those comments was with regard to the two 60' wide right-of-ways that were left to get to Doyle Road be conveyed to the adjacent property owners. In doing that we cut off what would have been the access out to Doyle Road. Those lots were conveyed but by doing that we have given up what would have been a potential connection for the trail construction. Other notes in that preliminary plat approval was we had to address the initial notes on the actual preliminary plat that included the developer constructing some sort of walking trail. Nothing was defined, not where, not how long, how it was to be constructed, etc... nothing else. We kind of left a big open ended question mark there with what was going to be built, how it would be serviced, maintained and who was going to pay for that long-term maintenance as there is no homeowner's association. Further, it would only be accessible by the residents of the subdivision because we don't have a connection point out to Doyle Road or any connection point out onto Patchett Road. At this point in time I don't know that it's prudent to having the developer construct a trail like that. I think it would be prudent to maintain the right for the Town to construct a trail there in the future if an access point to either Patchett Road or Doyle Road can be obtained if the Town Board is willing to fund long-term maintenance of such a trail. Right now quite honestly we don't have funding to maintain the pieces of trail that we have through Timber Banks current trail. We don't have any connection points adjacent to this site; we would have had we not told the developer to convey those two strips to the adjacent property owners.

Hugh Kimball added that Doyle Road is pretty busy now compared to what it was when that was first conceived. There are a lot more homes back there.

Mr. Yager stated that there's really not that many more homes. The Landing's was already built out. It would have been a nice amenity but by telling the developer to convey those strips of land we've lost that connection.

John Corey, Chairman, stated that there's really no practical reason at this point in time to build the trail.

Mr. Yager concurred and suggested keeping the easement though.

Steve Darcangelo questioned the intention of the trail...was there at one time a plan or a discussion to build a town-wide trail.

Mr. Yager concurred stating that there was a proposal for the Seneca River Trail; however there were wetland and right-of-way issues early in the process. It has since fallen to the wayside.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned if the plan has been abandoned.

Mr. Yager stated that at this point in time he believes so.

Mr. Darcangelo reiterated that it was not necessarily intended for internal use of that neighborhood.

Karen Rice, Clerk concurred, stating that it was supposed to tie into the whole peninsula. Land was left in some areas but issues arose in securing land in other areas.

Mr. Yager stated that we don't have good access points across private properties for a trail project and we don't really have a funding mechanism to maintain any infrastructure. We're struggling just to adequately fund road maintenance much less try to fund trails that go to nowhere.

Future development of the remaining lands of White Tail Woods was discussed as well as how a walking trail could possibly tie into Patchett Road to tie into the trail behind the Timber Banks development along the Seneca River.

Mr. Kimball reiterated that we accept an easement but let it sit until whenever.

Mr. Yager concurred stating that if we ever find funding or an opportunity to construct it...and access to existing roads, maybe that will be what we can look at some granting funding for, but

right now we don't have the means to allow access for anybody but the people that actually live in the subdivision.

Mr. Corey stated that basically all you need to do is bring us an amended preliminary plat.

Mr. Yager stated that we can do this one of two ways...pass a new preliminary plat resolution or we can just address this when they come in for final plat which is in the relatively near future.

Mr. Frateschi stated that the only problem with that is you might have to hold a Public Hearing if you think it's materially different; it probably won't be; but...

Mr. Yager stated that the note on the preliminary plat says: **6' wide walkway, asphalt/concrete surface built to typical standard.** They don't specify where it's going to go. It's pretty vague.

Karen added that six foot isn't ADA compliant.

Mr. Yager concurred adding that it has to be a minimum of 8'.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that you mentioned a transfer of property to the Town associated with this...

Mr. Yager concurred stating that that's what the long-term plan has always been. Any remnant parcel after the development was done would be, especially the stormwater management area, conveyed to the Town.

Mr. Darcangelo questioned what would our interest be in owning it?

Mr. Yager stated that he has no interest in owning it but that is what was specified in the preliminary plat resolution.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that there may have been an interest during the time that this was done, but as things that have changed I don't know that there's an opportunity to include that change as well...that we're not looking to take any property. I just don't know what the intended purpose was back then and I certainly don't see any reason now to take land out of private ownership and put it in public ownership with no intended use.

Mr. Lester questioned the allowable life of a preliminary plan approval.

Mr. Frateschi stated that there is no sunset.

Mr. Kimball questioned if we can put sunsets on in the future

Mr. Frateschi stated that you can, but the point is you can make whatever changes it wants to.

Karen added that some of the other conditions in that resolution have not been met yet either.

Mr. Frateschi suggested that the surveyor come in with a map that you and the developer want for the Board's review.

Mr. Sehnert stated that that's what they wanted this evening, some direction...and thanked the Board for their time.

VI. ADJOURN

RESOLUTION #13 -- Motion by Kimball, Second by Lester

RESOLVED, that the February 13, 2020 regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting adjourn at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Rice, Clerk to Planning Board