

**VILLAGE OF BALDWINSVILLE**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
Tuesday, August 28, 2012, 7:30 P.M.  
*Approved 9/25/12*

---

**PRESENT:** Carl Pelcher, Chairman  
Dave Arthur  
Mace Markham  
Jim Schanzenbach  
Bob Scherfling  
Nicole Schlater

**ALSO PRESENT:** Tim Baker, Village Engineer  
David Jones, Village Attorney  
Stephan D'Archangelo, Superintendent of Public Works  
Susan LaQuay, Board Secretary

**GUESTS:** Mr. Hal Romans, regarding Aspen Springs subdivision

The review of the minutes from July 24, 2012 and July 31, 2012 are postponed until the September meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Discussion/Action regarding Aspen Springs Subdivision – phase 2**

Mr. Hal Romans is present to address the Board. He stated Phase 2 will be adding lots 36 through 43 along the southeasterly side of Aspen Springs Drive. The infrastructure for both phases 1 and 2 were put in prior to phase 1. He noted the developer will possibly be looking to do a 3<sup>rd</sup> phase. The preliminary plan was approved several years ago and phase 1 was filed in 2008. Chairman Pelcher noted the original plan was accepted in 2005 as was the environmental assessment. He stated there is no need for a new site plan. B. Scherfling asked if the process of site plan review needs to be repeated because the approval was so long ago. Chairman Pelcher stated that is not legally necessary.

Mr. Romans stated the preliminary plan included 48 lots and included all 3 sections. Phasing of these 3 sections was shown for the development. For Phase 1, the developer was going to build the entire road section, but only filed section 1 at that time. The preliminary plan went through the entire review process and contract documents were prepared by the design engineer, reviewed by the Village Engineer and the infrastructure was accepted and done. Steve D'Archangelo stated it appears all the infrastructure was approved for full build out and the storm water retention basin was built considering full build out. The SEQR was approved for the entire build out. He noted there have been no major regulatory changes since then that would require future development to be reviewed and, therefore, it is not technically needed. Mr. Romans noted the lot lines match the preliminary plan and there have been no changes since that was approved. T. Baker stated there were some changes to the surface water pollution prevention plan, but since the storm water retention basin is already in then that is only required for these 8 lots and other future development. He noted the engineering was already approved and this just needs updating to meet that requirement. T. Baker noted that payment in lieu of parks money is potentially an issue. Mr. Romans stated that Mr. Alberici did a lot of work on Sergei Yevich Trail and thought that was to be

considered in place of payment in lieu of parks. He stated that James Trasher, PE will provide documentation for this. M. Markham noted that the developer did in fact do a lot of work on the trail. T. Baker asked if the work that was done was connected to the entire 96 lots or just the original Phase 1 lots and asked if Mr. Alberici did 96 lots worth of work. Mr. Romans stated that, according to James Trasher, Mr. Alberici provided \$70,000 worth of work. M. Markham stated he believes there is a record somewhere with a dollar amount on it as the work was all logged to keep track. It is just a matter of finding the paperwork.

D. Arthur stated there was a motion dated 4/24/07 when the road was constructed which addressed the two catch water basins on Route 31, stating that there was supposed to be a fence provided – a minimum of 6' galvanized steel chain link fence with a gate and access. He noted there were several discussions over months involving the Village Engineer, the Village Attorney, and the insurance company. Chairman Pelcher stated this Board needs to either amend that motion or make it a condition of this approval. D. Arthur noted the motion specified galvanized steel fence or more aesthetically pleasing wrought iron. Steve D'Archangelo noted that catch basins in general run the gamut of chain link fencing to no fencing at all. He noted the DOT does not fence their basins. B. Scherfling asked if there is another retention pond on the other side of the development. M. Markham stated there is one and it is fenced with vinyl-coated chain link. T. Baker noted that the state catch basin located adjacent to the one in question is not fenced.

Upon motion by Chairman Pelcher and second by D. Arthur to accept the final plan for Phase 2 of Aspen Springs dated 8/15/12 on the conditions as follows:

- All securities are paid.
- Payment in lieu of parks is satisfied.
- An appropriate fence is built around retention pond 2.

**Motion carried 6:0.**

**OTHER BUSINESS**

**4-Corners Overlay**

Chairman Pelcher emailed the Board Members a document regarding the characteristics of this overlay, which is included below:

**The Four Corners  
Overlay District**

**1. Purpose and Intent.**

The regulations set forth in this Article establish a specialized district for the area in Village located from the beginning of West Genesee Street to the municipal parking lot next to the Village Hall and River Street, from the beginning of Syracuse Street to Paper Mill Island and Marble Street, from the beginning Oswego Street to Elizabeth Street and 45 Oswego Street.

This historic downtown area has been the business hub of Baldwinsville for over one hundred years. It has been home to many types of commercial properties with residential properties located above the businesses. Some of the buildings date back to the nineteenth century.

The Four Corners Overlay provides standards to promote the preservation and rehabilitation of these historic commercial, civic and mixed-use buildings, and insure that new infill construction is consistent with the historic character of the District.

This area will make use of existing municipal parking and encourage pedestrian travel with sidewalks and street crossings. This will allow people to move easily from one area of the Village of Baldwinsville to another.

He asked for comments regarding this.

B. Scherfling noted the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> lines, “to the municipal parking lot next to the Village Hall and River Street,” and suggested removing “and River Street” and replacing it with “including across to Charlotte Street” to include the dental office. He asked about Marble Street. Chairman Pelcher noted that he had intended to exclude Marble Street as the EDR plan does. This district will stop at Marble Street and will include Lake Effect, but not the antique shop on Marble Street.

M. Markham suggested including 45 Oswego Street. He also noted that 47 (49?) Oswego Street is technically a business and is zoned B2 and should be included as well.

D. Arthur noted that Marble Street, Water Street, and Meadow Street are all similar and maybe should be addressed together.

Chairman Pelcher stated he will use street names and numbers in the description.

J. Schanzenbach had several points he wanted to include:

1. Buildings should be a maximum of 4 and a minimum of 2 stories. He noted that, for example, Keely’s looks out of place on the corner being only 1 story.
2. Buildings should be within 1-story of neighboring buildings.
3. A 15’ build-to line.
4. No side setback requirements. Buildings can have party walls.
5. No parking requirements to accommodate full build out of lots. He noted they may have to include some parking and municipal parking is available. Chairman Pelcher asked if a mixed-use building should be required to provide parking for tenants. D. Arthur noted that businesses will be sure to provide for themselves what is needed out of self-preservation. Steve D’Archangelo noted that some inner city municipalities are providing the opportunity for total build out while providing municipal parking in the vicinity. However, sometimes development exceeds what the municipality is able to provide for. At that point, they need to consider providing more municipal parking or consider implementing parking requirements.
6. The parking lot will need to be located behind the building.
7. The frontage will have a minimum of 75% build out.
8. Sidewalks and curbs will need to be provided for. There should be specifics. N. Schlater noted that there are existing sidewalks within this overlay already.
9. Landscaping specifics should be included.
10. Require all utilities are to come in underground.

Chairman Pelcher noted this sounds a lot like the Village Square overlay. He thinks patios should be included as well. M. Markham noted there has been some talk about patios needing licensing agreements to determine where tables/chairs can be placed as there has been some concern about blocking sidewalks. J. Schanzenbach noted they would be in the right-of-way. M. Markham suggested specifically addressing pedestrian safety. T. Baker noted there is also an issue of what the DOT will allow. J. Schanzenbach noted the Village Square Overlay stated this was contingent on the DOT. D. Arthur stated he would like to encourage the use of café-type seating.

Chairman Pelcher stated that sandwich board signs need to be addressed better in the code. T. Baker agreed and stated that sign size in the downtown area should also be addressed. The current size is 12 ft<sup>2</sup> per side.

N. Schlater noted there is barbed wire atop the fence at the substation and would like that addressed. B. Scherfling noted this is required for safety. M. Markham stated there was talk at some point about them moving the fence back away from the street. T. Baker noted it crosses village property and one proposal was that they move the fence downhill to get it out of sight. M. Markham noted that the decision of the federal authority involved in this will override the Village.

Chairman Pelcher stated that the overlay needs to address this area in the event there is, for example, a fire that destroys a building and it needs to be specific about what would replace that building. J. Schanzenbach noted they could come up with pages and pages of specifics. N. Schlater stated maybe they should focus on exclusions. J. Schanzenbach stated any new building should be reviewed by the ARB. T. Baker noted that the ARB in the past has been hesitant to dictate colors and materials for buildings. Chairman Pelcher suggested looking into other municipalities for ideas on how to address repair/restoration. J. Schanzenbach suggested looking at Dewitt's code. T. Baker noted that the ARB definitely has a certain style in mind, but has never really felt empowered to implement that vision. M. Markham suggested stating that a replacement building will have to maintain the character of the Village.

T. Baker noted that The Widewaters Group had developed a site in Camillus. Camillus required they use brick and The Widewaters Group complied. D. Arthur stated he is a recent addition to the ARB and it has not been very aggressive, although they are moving that way. N. Schlater used to be on the ARB and feels that their guidelines need to be more specific. T. Baker noted the ARB is effective when the developer is cooperative, but ultimately the ARB has not been able to convince developers to go along with them. M. Markham suggested encouraging the ARB to work with the Planning Board to give them a backup. D. Arthur noted that when a requirement is included in an overlay that it becomes law and they need to be sure to inform the ARB. The overlays need to give the ARB laws to fall back on. T. Baker noted that the ARB has been very forceful with signage.

J. Schanzenbach suggested requiring full-rendered elevations, which will enable the Board to check building heights. T. Baker further suggested that the rendering should include adjacent buildings to show where it fits in. D. Arthur stated he feels this should be the most stringent district and J. Schanzenbach agreed. B. Scherfling suggested including an appropriate percentage of glass/windows on the building face. T. Baker stated dual-façade buildings need to be addressed as well.

J. Schanzenbach suggested walking this area together as a Board. Chairman Pelcher set up a time to meet on Saturday, September 8, 2012 at 9 am at Shamballa.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 25, 2012.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Susan A. LaQuay*  
Planning Board Secretary