

**VILLAGE OF BALDWINSVILLE**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
Monday, August 23, 2011, 7:30 P.M.  
*Approved 9/27/11*

---

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

**ALSO PRESENT:** Tim Baker, Village Engineer  
Gregg Humphrey, CEO  
Susan LaQuay, Board Secretary

**GUESTS:** None

Upon motion by D. Arthur and second by T. King, the minutes of the July 26, 2011 Planning Board meeting are approved as submitted. Motion passed.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**3<sup>rd</sup> Overlay District**

Chairman Pelcher provided a summary of the (3) choices for this overlay (below) and the discussion at the July meeting.

1. Not do a 3<sup>rd</sup> overlay, but try to incorporate other requirements for the entire business district to address sidewalks and curb cuts.
2. Use what is on the map as this is what was agreed upon in June.
3. Use this map, but cut out the Jardine property.

He stated he spoke with D. Jones regarding modifying the boundaries of the approved overlay and was told this can be done.

T. King asked what zoning the Jardine property has currently. T. Baker stated the majority of it is Industrial and the remainder is Commercial. T. King stated she feels the development of this parcel is important. The access is narrow, but because Mr. Coholan owns the houses adjacent to the parcel, he can make it wider. She asked if the Board would like to see the parking close to the road for this property and noted that curb cuts and sidewalks are very important issues to consider. T. Baker noted the DOT will not allow a major development entrance so close to the RR tracks and this is why Mr. Coholan purchased the houses.

D. Arthur stated the purpose of an overlay is to identify unique areas that fall within the central business district. He wondered if that should include areas beyond the railroad tracks or is the Board trying to do too much and is concerned the Board is going outside the intent of overlays. He wondered if a zone

change to a PDD or B-1 would address the issues. Chairman Pelcher stated the inclusion of this property would just be a continuation of the central business district. D. Arthur stated he believes the central business district ends at the railroad tracks and that the vacant property can be addressed with zoning. Chairman Pelcher stated he disagrees, that the central business district extends beyond the tracks. T. King stated she feels the central business district has already been expanded and there are not "hard" lines. The boundary can be open to interpretation of the Board. D. Arthur stated he sees this as being different than EDR's intent.

T. King stated she is concerned that their speculation regarding the Coholan property is holding up this overlay.

G. Humphrey stated the overlay should address the frontage on East Genesee Street only and not deal with the interior property. D. Arthur referred to the tax maps and noted that the Jardine property is set back behind the residential and business plots. He would be more receptive to keeping the overlay to the roadway and address the interior with standard code. T. King agreed. J. Schanzenbach noted that most of what an overlay deals with is setbacks and sidewalks and keeping this overlay at the road accomplishes this. Chairman Pelcher agreed as well and noted that when the interior of this parcel is developed, they will push for sidewalks/setbacks for the interior development as well.

D. Arthur stated he would like to see both sides of Lock Street treated in a similar fashion. He thinks EDR considers Lock Street to be part of the Central Business District. J. Schanzenbach stated that Lock Street is so unique that it should be its own overlay. Chairman Pelcher stated if the PDD for the Coholan property does not come through, they will likely write a Lock Street PDD. He suggested putting both sides of Lock Street in this overlay and then a PDD would supersede the overlay when/if it comes through. However, the problem with this is the Board would be addressing completely different types of property in this one overlay, which would address sidewalks, build-to lines, curb cuts, etc.

N. Schlater suggested starting the overlay as if it includes all of Lock Street and see how it is working out and make adjustments if needed. D. Arthur, M. Markham, and t. King stated they feel Lock Street should be its own overlay.

Chairman Pelcher stated he is now leaning towards amending the 2<sup>nd</sup> overlay to shift the boundaries to include what was being discussed for the 3<sup>rd</sup> and then do a separate Lock Street overlay. He suggested everyone read the 2<sup>nd</sup> overlay and make sure they would want to extend it. T. King suggested marking it up both ways and sending it to Ms. Rice at EDR.

Chairman Pelcher noted as they move further from the center of town, the concerns mainly are build to lines and sidewalks. He believes the Village may be better off trying to change the code to address these issues rather than doing several overlays. D. Arthur agreed and noted that code changes can satisfy a lot of issues in these areas and he thinks we still need overlays in unique areas.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **Site Plan Triggers**

Site plan review triggers were discussed. Chairman Pelcher feels the code is confusing as to what proposals are referred to Planning and the reasons for the referral. He would like the Board members to think about this for further discussion.

### **Village Commons**

T. Baker notes site plan does not provide a lot of information. This site plan was reviewed by the Planning Board and approved in 2003. Much of the landscaping along the back has died. The approved plan shows cherry trees. T. Baker stated Nancy Lovelin requested that the landscaping be brought back up to what was approved. She is proposing roses. He noted that when an applicant submits a landscaping

plan, they are bound to keep it up forever, not just until it dies. It is the same with parking, an owner cannot just restripe differently than what was approved once the original stripes wear off. J. Schanzenbach suggested having D. Jones check if site plans must be upheld in perpetuity.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 27, 2011.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Susan A. LaQuay*  
Planning Board Secretary