

**VILLAGE OF BALDWINSVILLE  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, August 22, 2006, 7:30 P.M.  
Approved 9/26/06**

**PRESENT:** Chris Savacool, Chairman  
Russ Lucy  
Dave Arthur  
Larry Barnett

**NOT PRESENT:** John McFall  
Edward Rock

**ALSO PRESENT:** J. C. Engelbrecht, Village Attorney  
Dan Faldzinski, Village Engineer  
Susan LaQuay, Secretary

**GUESTS:** Mr. Mark Murphy, regarding Syracuse Home  
Mr. David Schlosser, Schopfer Architects, LLP, regarding Syracuse Home  
Mr. Doug Shortslef  
Mr. Chris Hurd

**REGULAR MEETING - 7:30 P.M.**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Upon motion by L. Barnett and second by R. Lucy that the minutes of the July 25, 2006 Planning Board meeting be approved as submitted. Motion passed.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Site Plan Review - Syracuse Home**

Mr. David Schlosser and Mr. Mark Murphy are present to address the Board.

Chairman Savacool stated the Board has received a letter from the Baldwinsville Volunteer Fire Company regarding emergency vehicle access, a resolution from SOCPA, and comments from D. Faldzinski. He stated the SOCPA resolution dated August 8, 2006 (Case #Z-06-247) recommended approval with modifications as follows:

1. The applicant must provide an engineering study to verify to the NYS DOT that the proposed development would not create additional stormwater runoff into the state's drainage system and provide a mitigation plan if it does.
2. A lighting plan must be developed to ensure that no glare or spillover is allowed onto adjacent properties and the state right-of-way and the plan must be approved by the Town Engineer and the NYS DOT.

D. Faldzinski stated he feels these modifications are customary and that the discharge pipe is directed towards the NYS right-of-way. New discharge to the state right-of-way requires a drainage report, which the DOT will review. Mr. Schlosser stated he is somewhat concerned about the DOT as they are not known for their timeliness. He noted that all the water in that area drains in that direction already and their plan will hold it back and slow it down. He thinks it may take three months to receive comment from the DOT and D. Faldzinski agreed it may take that long. Chairman Savacool asked D. Faldzinski to comment regarding this issue in terms of how he thinks they will review it. D. Faldzinski stated the mitigation measure is the detention basin and the mitigation plan is already being put together. This Board will review the drainage report to make sure they are not exceeding the rate and this is standard. J. C. Engelbrecht asked if the applicant submits the report to the DOT and it shows there is no need for mitigation if it

would still take three to four months to receive comment from them. D. Faldzinski stated the Planning Board can say that there is no need for mitigation, but the DOT will still take that amount of time to review it.

D. Faldzinski stated he does consider this a minor issue as it is not a difficult design to accomplish. He stated he can review the report as the DOT will and he can anticipate that they will have similar opinions on it.

Mr. Schlosser asked if they can submit to the DOT, but get approval prior to obtaining a CO. He feels the worst-case-scenario DOT comments would require them to dig deeper or move the discharge differently, which would not occur until late in the construction process anyway. He stated they can have preliminary calculations within two weeks. J. C. Engelbrecht stated this cannot be done, but noted that D. Faldzinski is considering this minor. D. Faldzinski noted that if the DOT requires significant changes to the plan, the plan would have to come before the Planning Board again with those modifications anyway. J. C. Engelbrecht stated he feels it would not benefit anyone to stop everything for three to four months. Mr. Schlosser again noted that all the water south of this drains that way anyway and he feels their plans should be viewed as an improvement by the DOT.

D. Arthur asked what stage the drainage plan would be implemented. Mr. Schlosser stated they will have to have erosion control prior to receiving the CO so it would probably be approximately eight months into the process.

Upon **motion** by D. Arthur and second by L. Barnett that the Planning Board accept SOCPA's resolution dated August 8, 2006 (OCPB Case # Z-06-247) regarding Syracuse Home. Motion passed.

D. Faldzinski reviewed his comments dated August 22, 2006 as follows:

### **Site Plan**

1. Required vs. proposed calculations for the floor area ratio should be included within the Site Plan summary table.

Mr. Schlosser stated this is already on the table. D. Faldzinski stated that it needs to address the floor area ratio as well.

2. The application of the proposed project action, which is within 500' of the Village limits, will need to be sent to both SOCPA and the Town of Van Buren for review.

D. Faldzinski noted that the SOCPA comments have already been received and accepted and nothing has been received from the Town of Van Buren as of yet.

### **Stormwater**

1. The site is located within the Canton Street Wellhead Protection Area. As a result, the project will be subject to the regulations as part of Article XIX Wellhead-Watershed Protection Overlay District within the Village Code.
2. An infiltration system in addition to a detention basin should be provided to recharge stormwater into the ground similar to pre-development site conditions. This will aid in minimizing impact to the well-field. The current stormwater facility design discharges water off-site in lieu of recharging a portion of the stormwater into the ground.

D. Faldzinski stated he had spoken to Mr. Schlosser about this and was told that a consultant is on board with this and a civil engineer will be in contact with him. D. Faldzinski stated he has no disagreement with this.

3. Stormwater runoff from new pavement areas and buildings will need to be captured and conveyed into a stormwater management facility. Currently, stormwater runoff from the new access drive and eastern parking area is not routed into the proposed stormwater management facility.

Mr. Schlosser stated this runoff will all be picked up and routed to the detention basin.

4. An adequate buffer area around the stormwater management facility should be provided especially in instances where building and pavement areas are directly adjacent. The buffer area should be fairly level and allow the passage of maintenance equipment.

D. Faldzinski noted this comment ties in with the letter from the Fire Department. The Fire Department is asking for more room between the detention basin and the southern side of the proposed expansion. Mr. Schlosser stated he will meet with the fire inspector and come to an agreement regarding this.

5. A detailed drainage report will be required to demonstrate that the proposed stormwater discharge meets water quantity and quality requirements. Modeling results from routing the onsite stormwater through the proposed stormwater management facility should be provided. Calculations and details relating to the sizing of forebays, pretreatment areas, the infiltration basins, weir, orifice, and outlet structure should also be provided.
6. The proposed drainage from the stormwater management facility is currently directed toward the NYS Route 690 right of way. As a result, the stormwater management report will need to be reviewed and approved by the NYS DOT. The applicant should provide the Village with documentation of this approval.

D. Faldzinski noted this was already discussed earlier in the meeting.

7. A NYS DEC State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) stormwater discharge permit for construction activity exceeding one acre of disturbance will be required for the proposed action. In addition, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan including erosion and sediment control components will be required.

## Utilities

1. The extension of the 10-inch diameter water main should be shown on the plans. If the extended main remains private, each fire hydrant will require a backflow prevention device according to the Onondaga County Health Department requirements. If the main is conveyed to the Village, a 20-foot wide easement must be provided to encompass the pipeline and fire hydrants.

D. Faldzinski stated he had spoken to Claude Sykes regarding this and currently the facility is serviced by a 10-inch water main that is publicly controlled and comes in on Meigs Road in front of the property line. The entire portion of that line is within the Village easement. Mr. Schlosser stated he was not aware of this prior to tonight, but they will create the appropriate easements. J. C. Engelbrecht stated he will make sure the Village Board is aware that they will be taking over the infrastructure. Chairman Savacool suggested they get this on the Village Board of Trustee's agenda ASAP.

3. The location of fire hydrants should be coordinated with the Village CEO and fire chief. An American Flow Control Waterous Pacer B-67 hydrant and Mueller gate valve should be used for each fire assembly.
4. Details regarding the connection of the proposed water main to the Village system should be provided. The proposed water main extension should be completed with AWWA Class 52 ductile iron pipe and C153 fittings.
5. Notes and specifications for the installation, inspection, and testing of water system components should be provided within the plans.
6. The location of the proposed lift station and details of the wet-well and pumps should be provided. Also, the layout and details of sanitary sewer and forcemain piping improvements should be provided.

## **Engineering**

1. Construction details for all the proposed improvements including, but not limited to, pavement, sidewalks, handicap ramps, drainage structures, light poles, etc. should be provided within the plans.

Mr. Schlosser stated these had all been included on previous submissions, but they did not duplicate them for each one. D. Faldzinski stated he would like to see everything included on one plan.

J. C. Engelbrecht stated for clarification regarding contingent approvals that it is possible if the engineer states an issue is minor. If anything is considered to be above minor, the Planning Board will not do a contingent approval. If the engineer states an issue is minor and the developer is willing to accept the risk, the Board can grant contingent approval.

Mr. Murphy stated that on August 9, 2006 they did an initial presentation to SIDA and SIDA requested that they be included as in interested party. The SEQR form has been resubmitted to reflect this. Mr. Schlosser stated they will copy the information provided to the Planning Board to SIDA on the Board's behalf.

Upon motion by D. Arthur and second by R. Lucy, the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 p.m. The next Planning Board meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 26, 2006.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan A. LaQuay  
Planning Board Secretary