

VILLAGE OF BALDWINSVILLE
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, July 28, 2009 at 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Carl Pelcher, Chairman
Don Cronk
Larry Barnett
Jim Schanzenbach
Nicole Schlater

ABSENT: Ed Rock
Dave Arthur

Also Present: Tim Baker, Village Engineer
Ron Carr, Village Attorney
Marie Giannone, Secretary

Minutes of June 23, 2009 were approved.
Carl Pelcher welcomed Nicole Schlater as a member of the Planning Board.

Item No. 1 – Cluster Type Zoning. Ron Carr submitted a work up that he did on Section 63-4 of Chapter 63 of the code of the village of Baldwinsville – Cluster Type Zoning. The members reviewed this and discussion followed.

Mr. Carr read 2A of this plan as follows:

2(a) The subdivider shall submit to the Planning Board a concept conventional, non cluster subdivision plan which would be approvable by the Planning Board under applicable Zoning Laws and other regulating considerations and which demonstrates the number of buildable lots which would comply with all requirements of the village zoning law.

Mr. Carr said the applicant would have to submit a concept plan and also a regular subdivision plan which has to be acceptable by the planning board. This would be done to make sure the comparable appropriate density between what the code would require under subdivision and what the density would be under the cluster zoning.

Chairman Pelcher said he had a note from the previous meeting on unusable land that would not be included in the density. Mr. Carr said this goes to the entire concept of clustering under village law. Mr. Carr said this law is the authorization to undergo the process that basically is amplified under the village law 7738.

Mr. Baker said he was concerned with detention ponds and where the requirements would be. Mr. Carr said in calculating true density, you have to back out obvious areas of the topography of the land that may not be developed. Discussed followed.

Mr. Baker said procedurally would the planning board make the determination in the procedure based on what has been submitted is a representative plan of what could be built and except by resolution of the planning board establish the density and number of units. Mr. Baker said the applicant has to come in formally and convince the planning board and the planning board will be the sole determining body to decide what is by resolution. Mr. Carr said that is in Section 63-4. Mr. Cronk said that would create a benchmark in the number of units and that would be compared to the cluster.

Discussion followed if the board should enact this cluster zoning into law. Mr. Barnett said the board did the work and should move forward on this law. The board unanimously decided to go forward with cluster zoning.

Mr. Barnett made the motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees consider a change to amendment Section 63-4 of Chapter 63 of the Code of the Village of Baldwinsville entitled "Subdivision of Land" outlining cluster development procedure. Seconded by Don Cronk. All voted yes.

Item No. 2 EDR Project

Chairman Pelcher said he had a meeting with the EDR representatives and went very well. Chairman Pelcher said he wanted to work on the write up that Chris Savacool prepared and nail down the build to line.

Chairman Pelcher said one issue is the paper street – Denio that does not exist right now and he said a set back or build to should be put there. Also, the lots facing the river with setback from the rivers need to be addressed.

Chairman Pelcher asked the board where the build to line should be on East Genesee. Should it be from the curb or center of the road. Mr. Barnett said there has been quite a lot of discussion on this.

Chairman Pelcher said he had discussion with Mr. Baker on this. Chairman Pelcher felt the curb would be the easiest but also that DOT could widen East Genesee. Mr. Baker said there is a jog in the DOT line which could create problems. Mr. Barnett said the curb line would be easier to visualize.

Mr. Schanzenbach said it is no different from measuring from the curb than the center of the street because a surveyor will lay this out and establish the lines. Mr. Schanzenbach said he preferred center of the road and felt it was easier, because if something happens or it gets widened and the DOT line jogs it eliminates confusion. Mr. Barnett said if we set a setback from the center of the line and the road is widened, that destroys everything, but if we set it from the curb and date it, it is locked in.

Chairman Pelcher asked Mr. Schanzenbach why he felt center of the road was better. Mr. Schanzenbach said the center of the street is established by DOT. Mr. Schanzenbach said you can go to DOT and get a map and find center of the street fairly easy. If you are going from DOT right of way that can change. Mr. Schanzenbach said you can go from DOT curb which is different from DOT right of way.

Mr. Barnett said the board's goal is to have consistency on East Genesee Street. Mr. Barnett said the board is concerned with how things look from the curb line to the building. Mr. Baker said by dating it, it locks it in as of that date.

Chairman Pelcher said the diner is approximately 13 feet. Discussion followed on whether it should be 12 or 15 ft setbacks, give or take 3 ft. Mrs. Schlater asked what happens to the 3 ft if the developer builds out 12 ft. Chairman Pelcher said 3d would not come into play. The developer would put in a sidewalk, greenery, etc. Mr. Barnett said it should be specific to setback and adding some language to provide reasonable accommodations for construction necessities. Mr. Barnett said the board is trying to get some uniformity and he said plantings scare him. He said they look good for the first five years then they are not kept up, get overgrown and become an eyesore. Mr. Baker used Oswego Street – Hills – as an example. Mr. Barnett agreed. Chairman Pelcher said “3d” needed to be changed where it talks about plantings. Mrs. Schlater said she did not know if maintenance should be considered in that it is a separate issue. She said the board should figure out what makes the most sense in terms of the guidance for the overlay district and then if something else is required in terms of proper maintenance. Mr. Barnett said plants right now are a problem. Mrs. Schlater said she was not sure that something should be done to address that factoring in an assumption that it will continue as part of the rationale. Mr. Barnett said he was making an assumption that this was a policing nightmare. Mr. Barnett gave an example that a couple of years ago a church was to put in plantings as part of the site plan, and to date no plantings have been put in. Mrs. Schlater said constraining the type of development would be a concern. Mr. Barnett said that was a good point. Chairman Pelcher said the 2 ft to 3 ft would give a developer that option.

Chairman Pelcher asked the board if they wanted a build to line 13 to 15 ft primary face of building. The board agreed on 3a to 13 to 15 ft primary face of building. Mr. Baker said the board could interpret it at site plan review. Chairman Pelcher asked if that is covered in 3d – build out requirements 75% minimum. Mr. Schanzenbach said that was referring to the length across.

The board moved on to 3d. Build out Requirements for Frontage. Discussion followed. Mr. Barnett said there is an opportunity when the developer comes into for site plan review. Discussion followed on the street wall, shrub hedge or ornamental fence. Mr. Baker asked if the board wanted to put in a clause stating this would be part of site plan review. Mr. Carr said this is divided into sections. Section 3 is Basic Standards and Section 4 is Standards for Site Design and Development. Mr. Carr said under Section 4, the Architectural Review Board will approve matters under Article XX. ARB may be jurisdictionally overseeing any walls but not sure of shrubbery. Mr. Carr said in addition to that matter of consideration relevant to site plan review as specified in Section 72-28(B) of the village code by the Village Planning Board, the following matters shall be considered. These are design characteristics that the board may consider under this section. Chairman Pelcher asked if the board should get rid of the shrubbery wording. The board agreed to take out in 3d “shrub hedge”.

Chairman Pelcher said a lot of villages will give some variance for any alley way through that allows pedestrians access. The board agreed that this could be added under “Standards for Design and Development”.

Chairman Pelcher said between 3a and 3b should be something for Denio Street. Should there be a setback for the paper street. It should be the same setback as 3a. Mr. Baker said that was a good way to deal with this now and you can always come back and make changes. Discussion followed on village square and Denio Street.

The board moved on to 3d Setbacks on the river. Mr. Barnett said this was previously discussed. Mr. Baker said Silver Fox building was used as closest to the trail and he thought the number was 10 ft. Chairman Pelcher asked Mr. Baker if there can be a setback and build to. Mr. Baker said the build to requires that you don't exceed the maximum. A setback of 10 ft. and a build to line between 10 ft and 20 ft are different. With setbacks only one dimension is honored. Mr. Barnett said the board does not want one person to be 10 ft off the trail and another 20 ft off the trail. Mr. Cronk asked if the wording allows for that as it states in 3b minimum and maximum. On 3b the minimum setback shall be 10 ft and the maximum setback from the said walking trail shall be 20 ft. Mr. Barnett said by putting in numbers for minimum and maximum the board is moving forward. Mr. Schanzenbach suggested that the build to line is made to be flexible as long as they bring something up to the property such as a patio, hedge, etc., and then you establish the line but give them some flexibility to put in what they want. Mr. Barnett said before we were talking about the primary face of the building but now Mr. Schanzenbach is saying that the 10 ft build to line off the trail has to be adhered to but not necessarily the face of the building. Chairman Pelcher agreed with that having a build to on both sides. Mr. Baker asked if this would be saying how big the building would have to be. Chairman Pelcher said not necessarily. Mr. Schanzenbach said the build to side on the river is flexible in that it can be any size – ex. 30 ft or 40 ft of patio but has to be defined as a structure. Mr. Schanzenbach said from what he has heard from the board, they all want some kind of defined line on the river side without trying to force someone into what they want to do. The board liked the idea.

Discussion followed on residential areas on the river. Mr. Barnett said the wording could say “a barrier along the 10 ft line will be established where the building is not up to that line”.

Chairman Pelcher said he would update this and get it out to the members.

Mr. Carr said the board may want to consider the nature of the barrier, i.e. height. Mr. Carr also said to consider height of shrubs.

Item No. 4 – Parking Issues

Mr. Schanzenbach handed out an “Off Street Parking Requirements Comparison” to the board members. Chairman Pelcher discussed his handout to the board.

Mr. Schanzenbach said he picked 12 municipalities at random but also picking a couple that was closest in size and style to the village. The comparison showed the village is close to other municipalities. The biggest difference was that other municipalities have more defined uses than the village has. He said that Town of Clay was more stringent. Seneca Falls was very similar to Baldwinsville. Mr. Schanzenbach said on the whole he did not feel a lot of changes needed to be made, only tweaked. He said to Mr. Carr's point that one place copies the other; it was actually hard going through a lot of these as people do it so differently, i.e. write things differently, and define uses differently. He used an example of Seneca Falls ice skating rink – sports arena. More discussion followed.

Chairman Pelcher asked if the board should be concerned about retail business as it relates to parking.

Mrs. Schlater asked what is the specific problem that the board is trying to address as it relates to parking:

- ✓ Make it easier for developers to comply with the codes
- ✓ Try to encourage development more in line with the EDR plan
- ✓ Try to encourage more density downtown
- ✓ Multiple goals or problems trying to address

Chairman Pelcher said all these need to be addressed. Mr. Cronk said the retail parking issue is the one that needs to be addressed – 1 per 100 sq ft.

Mrs. Schlater discussed the Harrington Fire House parking lot study that was done a couple of years ago and what they were trying to accomplish. She said there was a recommendation that parking codes were developed based on general planning guidelines and based on maximum use time versus average. She said the recommendation was that in trying to improve parking codes you go with your average use as opposed to maximum use in order to make more efficient use of the space. Mrs. Schlater asked if a formal study should be done.

Mr. Schanzenbach spoke on reserved parking where standards would be refined but you would require the developer to make some green space for future parking. Mr. Carr said this is done in Camillus. Chairman Pelcher asked the board if they agreed that the parking should be different for the overlays. Mr. Baker said he is concerned with future development and parking requirements. Mr. Carr said the code allows for offsite parking for onsite parking requirements if you own the lot within so many feet. Chairman Pelcher said more discussions needed to be done on the parking issues and this would be continued at the next meeting.

On the Getman/Curtis issue, Mr. Baker said Mr. Joe Ehle brought in another proposal to divide one lot off of Curtis Street where there is frontage already and only do two lots that would come off the street that was built off of Getman which is the furthest stub. Chairman Pelcher brought board members, Mrs. Schlater and Mr. Schanzenbach up to speed on this project. Discussion followed on runoff water, stormwater drainage, etc. Mr. Ehle has not yet purchased the land.

Chairman Pelcher said nothing has changed since Mr. Ehle came before the board a while ago. Mr. Baker said he told Mr. Ehle that the board wanted this to be developed without variances. That was the consensus of the board that this be developed without variances.

Meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Giannone
Secretary
Planning Board