

VILLAGE OF BALDWINSVILLE
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, February 26, 2008, 7:30 P.M.
Approved April 22, 2008

PRESENT: Chris Savacool, Chairman
Dave Arthur
Larry Barnett
Donald Cronk
Carl Pelcher
Edward Rock

ABSENT: John McFall

ALSO PRESENT:
Joseph Saraceni, Village Mayor
Dave Jones, Village Attorney
John Camp, Village Attorney
Tim Baker, Village Engineer
Marie Giannone, Secretary

GUESTS:
John Nolan, Anderson Barney, R.E. Management Group
Paul Anderson, Anderson Barney, R.E. Management Group
Tom Elliott, TDK Engineering
James Nobles, NAPA
Dan Sidon, B'ville Sports Bowl
Tom Sciuga, Golden Legacy II Project
James Trasher, Golden Legacy II Project
Robert Germain, Golden Legacy II Project
Jason Kanak, TDK Engineering
Jessica Haas, Lake Architectural

REGULAR MEETING

Chairman Savacool opened the meeting with the introduction of Marie Giannone, secretary to the Planning Board, Zoning Board of Appeals and Architectural Review Board. Tim Baker was introduced as the new Village Engineer. Tim acknowledged that he was glad to be here and if anyone had any questions, please feel free to call him. Chairman Savacool said that Tim would be essentially replacing Claude Sykes, but doing much more as he will be at the planning board meetings. John Camp will continue to be our consulting engineer and will continue to call upon him on a regular basis.

Chairman Savacool updated the board on the Village Commons area as the ATM kiosk has gone up. A meeting was held with Chairman Savacool, Mayor Saraceni, Joe Hucko and Dan Warner with a discussion on the EDR Plan and how it envisions connecting Elizabeth Street to East Genesee St through the shopping area. Dan Warner was at this meeting to be sure public safety was considered with the new pathway for pedestrian access. Other issues that were brought up were the grading at the eastern ingress/egress, curbing that needs to be mounded, lighting near the ATM kiosk, and fencing around the dumpster. Chairman Savacool said this area is an important part of the EDR Plan and the Mayor wants to be sure we are still headed in the right direction. Chairman Savacool brought up previous discussions regarding the idea of the path going through this area. Chairman Savacool said at the time no one was willing to pay for it, and there was no agreement that this would have been utilized. He said now is the time for the board to think how to design it. The board would like the pathway to go close to the building where the health club is and extend the sidewalk so that pedestrians can walk and follow the walking paths down to the parking lot. Dan Warner was involved in this meeting as it related to public safety along the pathways, the straighter the path is the better to see from one side to the other.

Chairman Savacool brought up about training for board members and said the state requires municipalities deal with training for the Planning Board and Zoning Board. He said each person is required to take four hours of training per year and at the Village Board Meeting, a resolution was passed to give all members on the board an opportunity to satisfy the four-hour requirement by May 31, 2008. Chairman Savacool said we will have to coordinate a training session possibly in September. Mayor Saraceni said the planning board would receive a copy of the motion that was approved by the village board with the details.

Approval of the minutes of November 27, 2007 meeting was tabled until next meeting as this will give the board time to review these minutes. A copy of the November 27, 2007 minutes will be given to the board members.

OLD BUSINESS

Site Plan Review regarding The Shoppes at Baldwinsville

Mr. Paul Anderson, Mr. Jason Katak and Ms. Jessica Haas are present to address the Board. Chairman Savacool stated the Board has received new materials regarding this project.

Mr. Paul Anderson said they under took the engineering changes as requested by the board.

Chairman Savacool said the planning board needs a full set of plans before the next board meeting, which is March 25 with a submission date of March 11.

Chairman Savacool said this would give John Camp and Tim Baker enough time to review the plans so that this can move forward at the next planning board meeting, preparation of the SEQRA process and approval to go to county. Chairman Savacool

said the review date for the county is March 27 for their meeting on April 8. He said a special meeting could be held by the planning board in the middle of April if necessary.

Mr. Jason Kantak addressed the board and said since the last meeting they refined the site plan, particularly the entry drive. Mr. Kantak said they eliminated a screened island on the West side of B1 and B2 and have a three-way intersection. They have looked at utilities, which were substandard. They found most sanitary sewer pipes there are all clay tile which leak, the manholes are brick and mortar which are failing and the storms are 60 to 75% sediment filled. Mr. Kantak said they revised the location of the utilities coming through there in conjunction with what is there today, essentially so they do not have to reroute everything in a different pattern. Mr. Kantak said they laid out stormwater management areas to account for all the additional runoff from offsite to try to separate it into easements for future maintenance. He said they worked on the overall lighting layout. Grainger Construction has the demolition permit and have done the asbestos survey. Mr. Kantak said Phase I ESA has been completed. They have also evaluated the existing parking around B1 and B2 and found some of it is substandard and some can be reused until future buildings are built up. Mr. Kantak said that concluded his engineering presentation as not a lot of changes happened since the last meeting. Mr. Kantak said he was sure he could meet the dates. Chairman Savacool said that the members of the board would review this information according to their expertise in certain areas. Mr. Kantak also said they laid out on the project the zoning review of parking requirements, setback requirements that was discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Kantak introduced part of his design team: John Nolan of Anderson Barney, Tom Elliott of TDK Engineering and Jessica Haas of Lake Architectural. They are doing all the signage drawings for this project.

Chairman Savacool asked if they have started the process with the Architectural Review Board (ARB). Mr. Kantak said they met with them informally and were satisfied with what the ARB needed. Mr. Kantak said they were left with delivering lighting and are pretty much on board with what needs to be done.

Chairman Savacool asked if there were any plans for signage in the area. Jessica Haas passed out an illustration of signage at the entrance of the existing Tri County Mall. Ms. Haas said it would be at a 45-degree angle so that it can be seen from both sides of the road and that the materials would be similar to that of the buildings.

Chairman Savacool asked John Camp to state his comments on this project which were stated in his memo of February 25, 2008 to the Planning Board.

John Camp said he reviewed sheet SP-1 dated 02/12/08 for the above-referenced project and have the following comments:

1. Any proposed and any existing public utilities should be provided in an easement. These easements should be shown on this sheet. We recommend that any utility infrastructure that provides service to another lot be considered public and be designed and constructed in accordance with Village Standards.

John Camp said these comments are based on a conversation with Ron Carr, Village Attorney. The other comments are that the utilities are designed to standards and will adequately serve the adjacent lots. The applicant has made some progress toward that end, but a few items still need to be addressed.

2. Proposed building F is shown over the existing sanitary sewer lateral that serves the lot to the north. This lateral will need to be relocated.

John Camp said looking at Building F it shows a thin black line which runs through the middle. This is the sanitary sewer lateral that serves the Eckerd Store. The applicant is aware of this and they will have to show something on the plans to account for that.

3. Proposed building C does not have an identified use.

Dave Arthur asked if there was anything new on the use of this building. Paul Anderson said the drawing shows Building C may have a tower. Paul Anderson asked if this was a site approval issue as this was a great sales tool. Paul Anderson said they were not focused on the tower but the 25,000 sq ft with expansion.

4. The sheet contains a table of proposed PDD Zoning requirements in the lower right. It is assumed that the portion of the table labeled “required” is presented to establish the zoning parameters of the PDD.
 - a. The applicant appears to propose zoning code that would allow a maximum of 50% of the lot to be covered by structures. Under maximum coverage, the site could contain over 572,000 square feet of structures. The current plan shows just over 188,000 square feet of structures.

Chairman Savacool said for the PDD the structure requirements parking spaces are in the proposed sections. Chairman Savacool said the concern is that we don't want to get into a situation where in the PDD they can build out 50% which would be significantly larger than what appears here. John Camp said it is important to be clear as to what this information is going to be because this is new zoning, and he was interpreting this requirement to be proposed as new zoning. Proposed PDD Requirements will be changed to read on the site plan. John Camp said it does make sense to show two columns on this site plan – what we are setting the zoning to be, and an additional column showing what is being built at this point which gives some flexibility.

- b. The table should include a list of permitted uses.

Tim Baker and John Camp discussed commercial uses. They said if there is something to exclude, we may want to think about it, so as not to miss anything

- c. The proposed zoning would allow a 55-foot tall building to be located 20 feet from the side and rear lot lines.

- d. The proposed zoning requires 1 parking space for every 200 square feet of floor area.
5. We have received set of technical drawings dated 02/22/08. These drawings have not yet been reviewed.

Tim Baker said he needed a full set of plans. Tim Baker proposed to the planning board that the “required” be removed and the “proposed” is what is going to be required in No. 4. T. Baker said it finalizes it on what they can do and acceptable for this PDD which is in fact the zoning. T. Baker said they are talking about full build out at this time, specifying what they are going to have and could go ahead and give themselves a little bit of contingency but 55 ft is required. T. Baker said the PDD requires certain acreage. T. Baker asked the Planning Board if they are comfortable with this. An additional question had to do with wellhead protection overlay district. They are talking about maximum coverage of structure. Tim Baker is more concerned with maximum coverage of impervious area. Mr. Kantak said it only includes buildings. T. Baker said a number of total impervious areas, which exists at this time, compare it to what is being proposed, would help in the review process. Mr. Kantak said they are upward to 75-78% impervious area today, which is being reduced to a 60% range. Mr. Kantak will report back on this at next meeting. Mr. Kantak said through the use of landscaping it can be “greened up”.

Chairman Savacool said he wanted to look at the traffic signage and lighting. Other items discussed were fencing, fire department turnarounds, and traffic on Landrush Way. Tim Baker said he does not see any potential for Landrush Way not being a village street.

Chairman Savacool asked for comments. End of Discussion

Site Plan Review regarding 74 & 76 State Route 31, proposed NAPA Store – Jim Nobles

Chairman Savacool said this site plan was addressed previously. Dave Arthur and Chairman Savacool went over to look at the site. A couple of things that they addressed on this site was that there are two properties with no ingress/egress for that structure.

Jim Nobles said because everything is close, he decided to put lights on the building as shown on the plan.

John Camp reviewed sheet SP 1 dated 2/11/08 for the above-referenced project and have the following comments:

1. The plan shows an adjusted property line between two existing lots. Both existing lots were recently re-zoned “Business B-2”.

Chairman Savacool said both existing lots were industrial and re-zoned “Business B-2”.

2. The existing building does not meet the setback requirements of the Code. The proposed adjusted property line will increase the western side yard from 0.3 feet to approximately 4 feet. The minimum side yard required is 8 feet. Neither the eastern side yard nor the rear yard conforms to zoning requirements. These setbacks are not proposed to be changed.

John Camp said that the existing lot on the eastern side is already nonconforming for several reasons; one being the building is very close to the property line. The proposed adjustment to the property line between the two lots will make a nonconforming situation less nonconforming.

3. The following should be shown on the plan:
 - a. zoning of the project lots and all adjacent lots
 - b. proposed grading
 - c. the metes and bounds of the proposed lot lines

John Camp said he did not think there would be any issues, but it would be best to show the zoning of the lots in the plans.

4. The vegetative screening to the rear of the project should provide a substantial visual barrier between the site and the lots to the rear.

John Camp said the applicant should provide vegetative screening to the rear of the project. Jim Nobles said it was quite dense in that area and their lot was cleaned. Jim Nobles said they try to keep it cleaned out, but it comes back very fast. John Camp said this would be an opportunity for interpretation by the board as the intent is to provide vegetative screening between a residential and business use. John Camp said it is best to have it on the business property. Chairman Savacool asked the applicant to indicate this on the plan. Jim Nobles said he would indicate the vegetative screening on the plan.

5. A comment letter for this project dated October 23, 2007 was presented previously.

Chairman Savacool proposed a railing so that customers would not back up over the curb.

Tim Baker said the water now is collected on the lot and nothing is leaving the lot. Jim Nobles said the drains need to be cleaned out and the site will need to be regraded. Tim Baker said this has to be brought up about 18 inches level with the parking lot. The board will need more information on the grading.

Tim Baker addressed the dumpster on the backside of the residential area. Jim Noble said there is a fence where the dumpster sets in.

Tim Baker said the roof water run off needs to be addressed, likewise the entries under eaves running off also needs to be addressed.

NEW BUSINESS

Site Plan Review regarding Retail Sales (Advantage Accessories) 45 East Genesee St. B'ville Sports Bowl – Dan Sidon

Dan Sidon is present to address the board. He would like to add retail sales (seasonal) outdoor products – sheds, gazebos, wood swing-play sets, as well as some smaller items such as arbors, trellis, wishing wells, picnic tables etc. to the area at 45 East Genesee St – B'ville Sports Bowl.

Discussion by the board members regarding the parking impact. Dan Sidon said during the summer months when he would be selling these products, the B'ville Sports Bowl is empty. No bowling/luncheon business goes on during this time. Chairman Savacool said there has to be enough parking spaces allocated by the B'ville Sports Bowl so that customers do not affect the other businesses in the area. Dan Sidon said during the bowling season, these seasonal items will not be there.

Chairman Savacool said the board needs to see something that shows the square footage of the building, multiple uses of the building, the allocated parking spaces (striping) to be used during the summer months when this seasonal material is on site. Chairman Savacool said there has to be adequate parking during this seasonal selling not to impact parking of the other businesses. Chairman Savacool said we need some idea of how many customers come in during the peak season (bowling) and off season (summer months). Dan Sidon said this would be seasonal and all materials will be gone by Labor Day. Chairman Savacool said we need to see what the plan would look like with the seasonal material on it, which would show exactly how much parking is available. Chairman Savacool said this plan could be laid out based on past seasons and anticipation of off-season business.

Discussion followed on the parking spaces. Dan Sidon said he basically has no customers during the off-season right now, but he anticipates 5 to 10 customers.

John Camp reviewed the sheet dated 2001 for the above-referenced project and have the following comments:

1. The plan shows what appear to be several display locations for various outdoor products.
2. The location of these products has the potential to affect the sight distance of a vehicle leaving the property. The location of these products has the potential to affect the parking perpendicular to Albert Palmer Drive. The information shown on the plan is not adequate to assess either of these potential issues.

Dan Sidon said there is twenty feet from B'ville Sports Bowl parking lot before you reach Albert Palmer Dr. John Camp asked that this be noted on the plan.

3. The property is traversed by a substantial watercourse across its northwest corner. This watercourse has a contributing drainage area in excess of 1,500 acres. We recommend that an easement over this watercourse be obtained, if such an easement does not currently exist.

John Camp said we are looking for a maintenance and access easement to that creek in the event some maintenance work needs to be done. J. Camp said the village would have the legal right to have access to this area. J. Camp said this should be shown on the plan with some way to provide a real description of the easement to make it legal. Tim Baker said once the deed is pulled he could go out and measure and compare to show the general location of the headwall to make sure, based on what is found, to get the easement right location. Tim Baker said he would work with Dan Sidon on this.

Chairman Savacool told Dan Sidon that the Planning Board meets on March 25, 2008 and the deadline is March 11, 2008 for revised submission of plans. Chairman Savacool said the easement has to go before the village board for acceptance.

Chairman Savacool said Mr. Sidon should give a list of exactly what products will be displayed – the dimensions of the product, quantities of product.

Tim Baker will work with Dan Sidon on striping plans to meet the current standards.

Site Plan Review regarding Golden Legacy II Adult Living Facility – Meigs Rd.

Tom Sciuga, James Trasher and Robert Germain are present to address the board.

James Trasher said this site plan is very similar to Golden Legacy I. Mr. Trasher refers to the site plan during his presentation explaining the proposal is to extend the roadway into the site to construct two (2) twenty-four (24) units/buildings that are located off Legacy Drive, erect several garage units and parking spaces. Mr. Trasher refers to the site plan as he explains the location of the proposal. Mr. Trasher said they are here tonight to discuss the overall site plan. Mr. Trasher said they met with Tim Baker on February 25. They are looking to extend the roadway and are looking for a proper way of termination so village plow drivers can come in and turn around to plow the other side of the road. This is similar to what is being done right now, the plow comes down, plows snow off the end of the right-of-way, backing into a private parking lot, and then going down the road. They are looking to doing the same, basically extending the road and giving an easement which gives them a right to turn around and go out to continue plowing.

Mr. Trasher referred to the site plan and said because of the last project (Golden Legacy I) they understand the wellhead protection criteria and the basins when working with the former Village Engineer. Mr. Trasher said they are going to do whatever they need to do on the site to manage the stormwater similar to what was done (refers to site plan).

Mr. Trasher said the interconnection of having connectability between these developments is not something that is in the plan. They were not thinking of connecting roadways. They want to keep them separate from residential and commercial component. They do not want commercial people coming through our property as this community is a walkable community and residents in this area can walk to the shoppes and offices, personal type services. Mr. Trasher said they would like to work with Conifer Village and Tri County Mall on the cross access. Mr. Trasher said that they want to work on the walkable communities but want to limit the driveability of people through the property to a commercial property and a commercial property to a residence.

Mr. Trasher said this was a fast moving project and said more details of the site plan will be forthcoming as this project moves forward.

Chairman Savacool asked about the walkability at this site. Mr. Trasher pointed to several areas on the site plan where residents would be able to walk down to the Shoppes. Chairman Savacool said that is the one thing they look at is improving pedestrian access to the village. Mr. Trasher is referring to the site plan as he describes the walkability route.

Mr. Trasher said they would continue to fencing and he referred to the site plan to show where the fencing would be. Dave Arthur asked about screening on the western side. Other screening would be provided.

John Camp reviewed the following sheets dated 02/12/08 for the above-referenced project and have the following comments:

Sheet C-1

1. The name of the Mayor should be changed to Joseph Saraceni.

Sheet C-2

2. The zoning of each depicted lot should be shown on the plan.

Sheet C-4 (this was part of the above discussion)

3. The plan currently shows a rectangular terminus to the Landrush Way right-of-way. The final layout of the public road right-of-way should be coordinated with the Department of Public Works. We recommend that snowplows be provided a means of turning around that is completely contained in an easement or right-of-way.

Discussion between Tim Baker, James Trasher and Jason Kanak on what should be done for the snowplow turnaround of the public road right-of-way as right now there is no solution.

Chairman Savacool asked Tim Baker about this. Tim Baker said he had problems with the proposed plan as stated in No. 3. He said if the street is extended to his property line which is what is being proposed, it becomes their private drive. The snowplow still

needs a place to turn around and snow on the blades needs to be pushed off. Tim Baker said if we go on to his property, then there is the issue of plowing snow into his property, causing problems. Tim Baker said he felt we should find a solution where we are handling this on our property or we have an easement.

Mr. Trasher said the working relationship between the property owner, management and the village can come to an agreement on an easement, similar to what is done on Legacy Dr. Chairman Savacool said the attorneys are going to work this out to come up with an agreement, so this plan can move forward.

4. All sheets should be reorganized such that the site is represented more clearly.
5. The proposed objects on the eastern side of the parking lot should be identified. If these objects are dumpsters, screening should be considered.
6. The number of required and proposed parking spaces should be indicated on the plan.

James Trasher said there is ample space for more parking should it be warranted by the community.

Sheet C-5

7. The plans show several proposed utilities, some of which could be accepted by the Village for ownership and operation, and some of which could remain private. All proposed utilities constructed in the public roadway should be designed and constructed in accordance with Village standards. Profiles and details should be provided for all proposed elements of the project to be owned by the Village.

Mr. Trasher said the utilities that they would like to turn over is the storm line that is going to be constructed for the extension of Landrush Way. Mr. Trasher asked if the Village wants the water main turned over. Mr. Trasher said sanitary is all going to be private and they are going to work with Onondaga County Water and Environment Protection District to tap into their manhole that is located in this location (refers to site plan). He said water meters will be provided in the buildings, with outside readers.

8. An easement should be provided around the existing public sanitary sewer at the site.

The abstract of title has just been received.

9. Offsite drainage enters the property from both the south and the west. The applicant should provide means to safely convey the 100-year peak stormwater discharge through the site. An easement(s) should be provided around this 100-year storm water conveyance. An easement should be provided around the proposed storm water management basin.

Mr. Trasher asked if they are requesting a flood route in a sense from the outlet from Golden Legacy I to this location (referring to site plan). Mr. Baker said this would allow the Village to maintain that section.

John Camp said we need the entire stormwater management basin and the flood route, as this will drain the public road. He said currently there is no easement for the drainage of the public road. James Trasher illustrated on the site plan how this drainage will flow.

Sheet C-6

10. The rim of the existing sanitary sewer manhole to the east of the proposed parking lot will have to be raised.

11. Proposed contours should be labeled.

As the plans are revised, subsequent reviews may result in additional comments.

As part of their next submittal, the applicant should provide:

- drainage calculations to support the design of the stormwater management basin and public storm sewers
- profiles of any proposed public roadways, storm, and sanitary sewers, if applicable
- construction details for any proposed public infrastructure
- a photometric plan – if exterior lighting is proposed
- a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

James Trasher said the above items are ready for submission.

James Trasher said that they had no desire for an interconnection of the roadways because it is a residential area and the problems in controlling the investment that they are putting into this property. He said he believed some type of hammerhead or smaller cul de sac can be worked out which gives their team some type of comfort level to move on with the current property owner. Mr. Trasher said this now needs to be referred to County at this point. After more discussion, it was concluded that this does not have to go before County because they are not near the 500 ft. from the county/state mark.

Tim Baker said he was going to speak with Dave Jones and Ron Carr, the village attorneys.

Questions were asked about pedestrian access and fire department access to the Golden Legacy buildings.

Tim Baker said that anticipating all this can be worked out, he thinks we can move forward.

Tom Sciuga said the plans will show details of the subbase section for the parking lot and the access drive aisle is the same as what is used on village roads.

Zoning Ordinance Update Recommendations – EDR Project No. 08000

Chairman Savacool said they had discussed the idea of an overlay district, doing something in the business from the corner of East Genesee Street down to Cole's Muffler. He said a lot of previous discussions centered on build-to-line, different parking requirements, etc. Chairman Savacool sought out the Mayor's help to getting EDR involved for some direction. Chairman Savacool said we have contracted with them to look at and propose what steps we need to take, and what are our alternatives. Chairman Savacool said he met and spoke with Paul Fritz. A copy of a draft memo from Paul Fritz dated February 14, 2008 was passed out to the board for their review showing three alternatives that had been laid out. Chairman Savacool said he would like the board members to look it over and give him some feedback on what they think.

Alternative 1 – Creation of Overlay District for the CBD

In an overlay district the use and dimensional requirements are qualified and based on the objective performance of the underlying district. The majority of the CBD is in the existing B-2 district. The spatial characteristics of the desired build-out, based on the CBD Strategic Development Plan, need to be diagrammed in order to determine the optimal dimensional requirements. Consistent with the existing ordinance, borderline properties would conform to the dimensional requirements of the adjacent districts on the bordering side.

These requirements should be based on the desired landscape pattern (the whole of all of the structures on all the lots, rather than the sum of individual lots) thereby allowing for flexibility while adhering to a suite of goals that can be balanced during site plan review. These goals would be derived from Art. XII, chapter 72-28, Site plan review standards B.1-9.

Site Plan review – The inclusion of CBD overlay should be spelled out in section 72-28(A) of the Zoning Ordinance. 72-28(B) should be reviewed and revised to guarantee that the objective of the CBD Strategic Development Plan is reflected in the instances upon which site plan approval is based.

Alternative 2 – Development of Regulating Plan

This approach implies the development of formal and spatial objectives to which projects requiring site plan review must adhere. In the case of the Central Business District, the particular "sense of place" described for each Character Area in the CBD Strategic Development Plan would be translated into roadway widths, median plantings, pedestrian infrastructure, building heights and setbacks as well as typological features of buildings and street furnishings. The regulating plan essentially defines the location (streets, waterfront, park space, etc.) and character (building location, architecture, and signs) that impacts the public realm before development/redevelopment occurs.

Each character area would be defined in terms of formal goals that reflect their essence as perceived in the Village's vision, as suggested by the following concepts:

- East Genesee Street – “downtown”
- Marble Street – “island”
- Lock Street – “historic canal”
- Meadow Street – “residential”
- River Street – “pedestrian corridor”
- Water Street – “adaptive re-use”

This type of approach would be specifically useful for the East Genesee Street area since this is the area with the greatest potential for change. (EDR has examples of Regulating Plans that we can show you)

Chairman Savacool said in the regulating plan we decide where the building would be, height, architecture and signs, that impact the area before any development/redevelopment occurs. Chairman Savacool said we essentially would be creating an overlay district, laying out what they would have to do, and there may even be a visual component. Chairman Savacool said an example of this would be the Rite Aid Store where the proposal for that property in the regulating plan would show a building that fronts the river and a building that fronts East Genesee St. with a road access showing parking in that area. Chairman Savacool said for the other properties there would be a cut off of the ingress/egress and pushing everything in one direction with one road going through with everything feeding off of that. Chairman Savacool said this can be very detailed and also at the same time provide some latitude in it as we can lay out what we want with the ability to change some things.

Chairman Savacool said the Syracuse Lakefront Zoning Amendments that was also handed out to the board is very detailed with information on street right-of-way, street and bicycle network, location of street lights, lots and buildings, etc. (copy attached for the record).

Chairman Savacool said the overlay district could also have a visual plan for that area but would not have the same enforcements as a regulated plan. He said the difference is that the visual plan is what we want it to be, where the regulated plan would be much more specific in terms of what was required.

Chairman Savacool said we could not enforce anything against current property owners. Mayor Saraceni said he looked into this as there is some interest in properties in the downtown area. Mayor Saraceni said right now the village does not have a vehicle to adjust assessment, values or tax levies – there is no pilot program. Mayor Saraceni said there are grants that are available for private entities partnered with municipalities – “Restore New York” (which ties into Alternative 3).

Alternative 3 – Establishment of Model Project Status

As integrated, “vertical” approach can provide impetus to planning initiative by facilitating or promoting the implementation of a specific project that meets the suite of goals/design principles established by the CBD Strategic Development Plan and helps to establish a design and planning precedent. To obtain model project status, a profile of qualifications must be devised (based on Village goals) and an alternative permitting process facilitated (streamlining). Though intentional by way of the qualifications, the experimental nature of this approach allows for verification of goals/design principles and faster startup of “seed” development Site plan approval is done on an individual basis at a public hearing.

Discussion followed on taking a long term approach on the above alternatives. This in the long run will attract more business to the area when plans are in place.

Tim Baker discussed official street maps so that people going into it will know what is expected of them. He said a problem right down is access along East Genesee Street and how the village can minimize our access point, curb cuts, and possibly minimize the access between properties. He said if this is all planned out ahead of time, this will make it easier for developers coming into the village. Mayor Saraceni said he did not think we had the mechanism built into the code for official street maps. Tim Baker also said if we are trying to eliminate curb cuts, he did not think an official street map would work.

Chairman Savacool recapped this discussion:

- How are we going to proceed with this
- Board members like different aspects of each alternative
- Will ask EDR how much can be combined
- Regulated Plan gives more structure
- If the overlay plan was specific enough, it could follow the regulated plan

Chairman Savacool will talk with Paul Fritz to see if we can have a special meeting to discuss this further.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 P.M. The next scheduled meeting is on March 25, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Giannone
Planning Board Secretary