

**VILLAGE OF BALDWINSVILLE**  
**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**Tuesday, October 25, 2005, 7:30 P.M.**  
Approved 11/22/05

**PRESENT:** Chris Savacool, Chairman  
Russ Lucy  
John McFall  
David Arthur  
Edward Rock  
Evelyn Mercer  
Larry Barnett

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

**GUESTS:** James Trasher, P.E.  
Paul Curtin, Jr., Attorney  
Tom Scuiga, B.S. Enterprises  
Doug Shortslef  
Aaron Bradshaw  
Sarah Baker, Trustee  
Jack Baker  
Tony Saraceni, Trustee  
Joseph Saraceni, Trustee

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Upon motion by J. McFall and second by D. Arthur that the minutes of the September 27, 2005 Planning Board meeting be approved as submitted. Motion passed.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Golden Legacy Adult Living Facility - Meigs Road**

Chairman Savacool noted the Board started looking at this plan last month and D. Faldzinski has submitted new engineering comments dated October 20, 2005.

Mr. Paul Curtin, attorney for the Applicant, reviewed the plan for the Board. He noted the property is a 12-acre parcel contiguous to Meigs Road. The initial plan showed primary access to the property from Meigs Road. After discussion with the Board, they were directed to reorient their entrance further to the south and parallel to the property. There was also discussion regarding the dedication of 40' of their property and 40' of Syracuse Home's property to create a collector road. They were concerned about the dedication of this 40' due to the potential for variances being required. Mr. James Trasher, the engineer for the project, was able to revise the plan to eliminate the potential need for any side yard or front yard variances and accommodate appropriate lot coverage thresholds. Mr. Curtin stated he spoke with Mr. Mark Murphy of Syracuse Home on several occasions and suggested to him that Syracuse Home dedicate the entire 80', as this Applicant is doing the engineering, the infrastructure, etc. for this proposed collector road. Mr. Curtin stated Mr. Murphy took this suggestion to the Syracuse Home board and he is not sure of the outcome. However, they are prepared to proceed on the basis of the Applicant dedicating 40' of his property.

Mr. Curtin noted the plan is being proposed in two phases. The first phase will be contiguous to Meigs Road and will include three buildings of 24 units each (72 apartments total) and two garage units with 18 units each (36 total). Mr. Curtin stated he had reviewed the Village zoning ordinance and this site conforms to the minimum lot size for this type of project and in order to move forward in a phase fashion, they would like to get approval for the overall site so

that it can developed comprehensively. Due to financing and the financing requirements, Mr. Curtin asked that the site be subdivided for phase 1 and phase 2 as the lender does not wish to have any unimproved land subject to their lien. He also noted that they may not even be using the same lender for both phases and, therefore, they feel a subdivision would be appropriate. He stated they realize this is not typical, but thought it should be addressed at this time.

Mr. Curtin stated if the revised plan is acceptable, the Applicant would like to move forward with the engineering so they can begin addressing the engineering comments. Mr. Scuiga is anxious to begin developing the site. He noted they are aware that some of the Board members and the Village engineer had walked the site recently.

Chairman Savacool asked D. Faldzinski to review his comments dated October 20, 2005. D. Faldzinski noted he reviewed the new plan and provided comments and also identified some of the items that had changed from the previous comments dated September 27, 2005. He reviewed his comments as follows:

### **Site Plan**

- The building setbacks being provided by the current plan consist of the following:
  1. Front yard setback (facing Meigs Road) of approximately 48'. This is in excess of R-2 zoning requirement of 40'.
  2. Front yard setback (facing Oakcrest Road) of approximately 20'.
  3. Side yard setback (along north property line) of approximately 28'.
  4. Rear yard setback of approximately 197'.
  5. Distance from north to south between buildings at approximately 40'.

D. Faldzinski noted this plan did not include a lot of dimensions as it is in the preliminary stage. Mr. Trasher noted that typically the minimum separation between combustible buildings is 40' to avoid special fire hazard classifications etc. The proposed buildings have been spaced in accordance. Also they were aware that Meigs Road would become a corner lot situation so they considered Meigs Road as a front yard and still continued with the side yard going along the proposed Oakcrest Road and this is where they kept the 20'. He noted there was discussion at the previous meeting about there potentially being leeway regarding setbacks as this is in a PPD district. He stated the orientation of the buildings off of proposed Oakcrest Road is one of their issues. Mr. Curtin asked the Board to consider that there will be the 80' right of way for the collector road and when the road is centered, the edge of the building is 40' off the edge of the right of way. If the center line of the road were to be offset, they could pick up some more room. This depends on what they are able to achieve with Syracuse Home.

Chairman Savacool noted that, as this will now be a corner lot, both yards will be considered front yards. D. Faldzinski noted this is typically what is done. However, he reminded the Board that R2 zoning is being referenced as a guide for establishing requirements, but because this is in a PDD district, the Board has flexibility with the setback requirements. This is a unique situation.

Chairman Savacool noted that currently the distance between the building and the property line is 20' along Oakcrest Road. Mr. Trasher stated this is measured from the jut outs on the building so some parts of the building are in excess of 20'. D. Faldzinski noted if the Applicant is successful in obtaining the entire 80' of right-of-way from Syracuse Home, the distance would be greater. Mr. Trasher stated that this scenario is based on the Applicant providing 40' of right-of-way, which is the worst-case scenario.

- Fire access around the proposed buildings should conform to local and state guidelines. The applicant shall coordinate the site plan layout with the Baldwinsville Fire Department and Building/Code Office.

D. Faldzinski encouraged the Applicant to do this and feels this is important to the layout of the buildings. He noted the four buildings grouped together near the center of the property should have some type of fire lane for access. Mr. Trasher asked if the Board will refer this to the Fire Department. Chairman Savacool stated the Applicant should contact the Fire Department themselves and work this out with them. They should have the Fire Department provide a letter to the Planning Board.

- The plan should incorporate a direct walking path from all buildings to the community building.

D. Faldzinski noted that, due to the nature of the facility, it would be useful to have this path. Mr. Trasher asked if they have to be defined sidewalks. D. Faldzinski stated crosswalks across parking areas would be appropriate. Mr. Curtin noted there are sidewalks currently in the plan.

- The applicant should indicate whether vegetative screening along the north, south, and east property lines will exist. If little screening currently exists, some screening of the buildings and parking areas should be provided.

Chairman Savacool stated this is an important issue. He noted some of the Board members had gone to the site and saw that there was a buffer already at the northern end of the property near the apartment complex. The Board would like to make certain there is adequate screening between the properties involved. Mr. Curtin stated they will provide more a more detailed landscaping plan. Mr. Trasher noted this has been completed over the last month and will be included in the revised plans.

- The County sanitary sewer trunk-line shown on the plans may not be accurately depicted. The post-construction trunk-line alignment should be located as part of the topographical survey for the site.

Mr. Trasher agreed that this is not accurate in the plans. He noted they now have the correct information and will include this in the revised plans. Chairman Savacool asked how the sewer line is laid out. Mr. Trasher stated they have not determined this yet.

### Parking

- The proposed plans detail that 284 parking spaces will be provided for the facility and its 168 units. According to Village Code, approximately 252 parking spaces are required. This is based on providing 1 and ½ parking spaces per dwelling unit. Also, 12 handicap parking spaces are required per A.D.A. guidelines whereas 40 spaces are being provided.

D. Faldzinski noted at the previous meeting there was discussion regarding eliminating some parking spaces. Mr. Curtin agreed and noted the Board's comments were particularly focused on eliminating spaces on the ends of the buildings for green space. He noted they would be willing to do this to provide more green space. However, he felt providing more handicap spots than required is advisable for a project of this nature. Chairman Savacool feels adding more green space would be a good idea. D. Faldzinski noted they may have to eliminate some parking spaces to provide fire access as well.

The remaining comments are old comments from September 27, 2005. D. Faldzinski noted he reviewed these as well in regard to the revised plans. He noted the major issue is the floor area ratio in the PDD district regulations. He noted the requirement is for the site to be constructed at 0.4 to 1. He stated he had been talking with J. C. Engelbrecht about this particular requirement and he believes that the intent is to limit the developer as to the number of floors they can have for one particular site. J. C. Engelbrecht noted this requirement is for density control. D. Faldzinski stated that, based on his initial calculations, the plan is probably around 50 to 60%, which is a ration of 0.6 to 1. J. C. Engelbrecht stated they have to count up all floor space. Mr. Trasher asked if this would include garages and noted that typically they are not included in the calculation if it is a density issue. J. C. Engelbrecht stated the code does not state residential floor area, but floor area in general and, therefore, the garages would be included. Mr. Curtin stated that the garages will, therefore, be a factor. Mr. Trasher stated they had discussed that the calculation would be for living space only at the previous meeting. J. C. Engelbrecht stated this is not what the regulations say.

Chairman Savacool asked if there is a remedy for this issue. J. C. Engelbrecht noted that the PDD is a mechanism that is not addressed very often. The Board is allowed flexibility, but still must limit density in building and in people. Mr. Scuiaga asked if they were to change the garages to covered parking areas, would they still factor into the calculations? J. C. Engelbrecht stated that according to the definitions in the code, accessory buildings would still be included in this calculation.

Mr. Curtin stated he feels that within the context of PDD zoning classification, the Board may have some degree of flexibility and they feel that the garages are an amenity that will enhance the project. He suggested the Board may view them as a positive and waive the requirement or grant some form of a variance in its application. J. C. Engelbrecht stated he feels they need to do the calculations including the garages to see where they stand first. Chairman Savacool noted once these are done, they would have the opportunity to justify to the Board why using that ratio may not be appropriate.

D. Faldzinski stated he still believes that even if the garages are excluded, 7 buildings with 3 floors each will still be close to 0.5 to 1 rather than the 0.4 to 1. Mr. Trasher wanted to know what the 0.4 figure pertains to. J. C. Engelbrecht stated it may make more sense to talk about it starting with the percentage of lot coverage. 30% of the ground can be covered by buildings, accessory buildings, etc. This means 70% will not be covered. The code is saying they then take that 30% and as an overall cap (as a density control factor) take the whole 12 acres and add up the floor space and make sure this number does not exceed 40% of the total project. There are two different numbers. Mr. Curtin noted that he would like the Board to consider that they are losing 40' x times the length of the property to the right-of-way. J. C. Engelbrecht stated he is not considering this in his mind now as he views this application as including 12 acres.

Chairman Savacool noted again that some of the Board members had walked the site. He asked if there would be perceived any drainage issues with the proposed layout. J. C. Engelbrecht noted there is another problem with building in phases in a PDD. He noted this only qualifies for being a PDD as all the land is together and they need to figure out a way to provide phases due to financing issues. He noted that the property can be financed separately and developed separated, but the Board needs to make sure that it can never be physically divided and sold. Mr. Curtin agrees and noted it is not their intention. J. McFall noted that the proposed stormwater basin is in phase 2 and asked what would happen to the runoff in phase 1. J. McFall stated he is concerned about the stormwater basin not being constructed until phase 2. Mr. Trasher noted that the phases really just pertain to the buildings, not the infrastructure. J. C. Engelbrecht asked if the Applicant will commit to construct the infrastructure now. Mr. Curtin agreed.

Chairman Savacool noted they had talked about the wellhead protection district at the previous meeting. Mr. Trasher stated he had met with the County DOT as it relates to Meigs Road and Downer Street and the traffic study. Based on the impact of this development, they feel there is really no impact to that intersection between typical AM and PM peaks as they are different than what will happen for a senior living facility. He stated when they complete the site plan they will submit it to the DOT and they will offer back the comment that no mitigation is required and will provide a letter. D. Faldzinski stated he had spoken to Mr. Jim Stelter as well and agreed that this is the same conversation he had with him. He noted that anytime 100 or more trips are generated in during peak hours a traffic study acknowledging this is required. He asked if they intend to provide this. Mr. Trasher stated based on 168 units they will be under the 100 trips. He noted this is based on AM and PM peak hours for a typical apartment unit, but as this is a senior living facility, it will be less. D. Faldzinski asked that they provide the Board with a summary of their analysis for the record. Mr. Trasher agreed to do this and noted that Jim Stelter had requested this as well in the form of a letter. D. Faldzinski noted that the County will ask for this as well.

Chairman Savacool noted they had discussed covenants in terms of the types of tenants they will have. Mr. Curtin stated this will be prepared and submitted to J. C. Engelbrecht for his approval. Chairman Savacool noted that this will be important because otherwise the above mentioned traffic situation will no longer be relevant. Mr. Curtin noted this will be protected by the covenant. He stated the typical covenant will require that 80% of the units will be headed by an individual aged 55 years or older.

Chairman Savacool asked if there were any discussions with the DOT regarding site distances. Mr. Trasher stated they will provide this in the letter.

D. Arthur asked if the ingress and egress are one-way entry and exit. Mr. Trasher stated they are planned as two-way access. He noted there are, therefore, four points of ingress and egress. D. Faldzinski and Chairman Savacool noted this could create confusion with the two sets of ingress/egress so close together. Mr. Trasher stated if there were a single point of ingress, the narrow width of the lot would make the turn upon entry difficult. D. Faldzinski stated he will review this in more detail and noted they may want to consider striping or signage indicating one way, etc.

J. McFall stated he thinks this is a good project for this site and feels the Board should work with the developer to get it built. E. Mercer and E. Rock agreed.

L. Barnett stated he had stopped by the Applicant's facility in Geddes and thought that it was very nice.

R. Lucy stated that the Applicant's assessment of how retired people spend their days and their driving habits are accurate.

D. Arthur stated he feels the developer has been very accommodating of the discussions regarding the collector road and feels the Board can likely work through issues with this site being a PDD.

Chairman Savacool stated it looks like the site is developable. He noted there are some obstacles but those can be overcome. He feels the plan laid out is favorable. D. Faldzinski agreed with the understanding that he reserves the right to comment further as engineering comes further along, but he feels it is a good initial layout and does not anticipate it changing much from what is shown now.

Mr. Curtin asked if D. Faldzinski feels comfortable with starting work on the engineering at this time. D. Faldzinski stated he does.

Mr. Trasher stated that upon looking further at the plan, he feels they should get the ingress/egress down to one curb cut because there are additional parking spaces and they can maneuver the buildings to accommodate this.

E. Rock noted that there was discussion last month regarding eliminating parking spaces, but that green space would be reserved if additional parking were needed. Chairman Savacool stated that is not necessary at this time, as they are over the requirement. Mr. Curtin noted that the Board could say that of required spaces they will only require them to construct a certain number and show additional spaces as reserved based on projected need. Chairman Savacool stated they can consider this as it is being planned and if the Applicant feels there is an area in which it would make sense to do this then they can bring this to the Board's attention for their consideration at that time. He personally would like to increase the green space if possible.

D. Arthur noted that at the previous meeting Mr. Curtin had noted that the garages were used for storage by tenants often. He felt this should be considered when determining how much parking is needed as the cars that will not be parking in those garages will need parking spaces in the lot. Mr. Scuiiga clarified that the garages are deep enough to accommodate both storage and a vehicle. He noted that possibly 95% of the people at Snowbirds Landing have shelves built into their garages but are still parking there. They are 12' wide and there is room for storage along the sides as well.

Joe Saraceni, Village Trustee, asked if Oakcrest Road will have sidewalks along it and if the Applicant has considered alternative pedestrian solutions. Chairman Savacool noted that some pedestrian access is desirable even though not all of the tenants will be walkers. He noted the classification of the road may determine the sidewalk requirements.

Sarah Baker, Trustee and Chairperson of the Architectural Review Board, asked what the zoning designation of the property is. Chairman Savacool stated it is zoned PPD, or Planned Development District. Chairperson Baker asked if this property would be subject to ARB review. J. C. Engelbrecht stated this would come under ARB review and the ARB would have wide latitude in the review of this property. He noted the individual restrictions by district are not applicable. Mr. Scuiiga stated they have already submitted an application to the ARB on the advice of the Code Enforcement Officer.

Mr. Curtin stated he will be in contact with Mr. Murphy from Syracuse Home and will report back to the Board regarding this issue. Chairman Savacool noted they will address the subdivision issue at the same time as the site plan.

## NEW BUSINESS

### **Discussion regarding collector road from Meigs Road to Canton Street to Syracuse Street/Maple Street**

Chairman Savacool noted this idea of a collector road has been discussed for some time. The Van Buren Planning Board had a meeting recently, which Chairman Savacool attended to discuss this issue informally. He discussed with them what this Board had been talking about regarding this. He noted there is some question as to what type of road this would be and where it would be located. They really thought it would make sense to do some good master planning for this area so when developers come in, the Board will have direction.

Chairman Savacool talked about bringing the Van Buren Planning Board and the Baldwinsville Planning Board together and having a joint planning meeting to discuss this issue. He stated he would like to discuss this as the Village Planning Board first to get some input in terms of what would be desirable in this area.

D. Faldzinski had a map of the area per Chairman Savacool request. Chairman Savacool showed on the map the properties involved. He noted the properties owned by Mr. Scuiga, Syracuse Home, a 52-acre parcel owned by Barbara Johnson, and the Spencer property. He noted the Village is looking for a road alongside the proposed Golden Legacy Adult Living Facility. This could be either a collector road that will have driveways and individual roads onto it or an arterial road, which would be more like a bypass with limited access.

Chairman Savacool stated he spoke with Barb Johnson regarding possible locations of this road crossing through this area. Currently there is a 60' area set aside and the area the Village would need would be 80'. He stated there was a possibility of an 80' piece of property owned by Barb Johnson's son and it is possible the Village could take something through that property. Barb Johnson would also like to square off that property and include it back into larger parcel. D. Arthur stated he was pleased to see there are already property owners interested in this roadway. D. Faldzinski noted this roadway has been known for a long time now by the property owners in the area and the 60' on the Johnson property was left for this purpose.

Joe Saraceni asked what the current zoning of the land in question is currently. D. Faldzinski noted it is residentially zoned.

Chairman Savacool stated the idea is to have a plan to give to developers when they come to the Board. The Barb Johnson area is good because it would bisect that property.

J. McFall asked if there are any wetlands on the Johnson property. Mr. Shortleaf stated there are 5.5 acres. Tony Saraceni, Trustee, noted that the wetlands could require that road be curved. D. Faldzinski stated he would need to know ahead of time where the wetlands are located and what the buffers to those wetlands are.

Chairman Savacool asked if anyone had an opinion as to what type of road this should be. D. Arthur stated he had researched the type of roads. An arterial road is a roadway that will go some distance at a higher rate of speed and have less pedestrian traffic. He feels this proposed roadway is more of a collector road, as it will have local roads feeding into it.

Joe Saraceni stated he is concerned with pedestrian access on this road as there will be pockets of development with no sidewalks in between. He stated he would like to see sidewalks due to the type of developments being considered for the area. He also asked if they should consider the maximum number of curb cuts that would be desired. For example, would individual driveways be considered, or would cluster developments with one curb cut for multiple driveways be more desirable?

D. Faldzinski noted the idea for this road is to alleviate current traffic issues at Downer Street, which is near failure at Sorrell Hill Road. The development located in the town off of Sorrell Hill Road will eventually be looking for access onto Meigs Road. He noted that the traffic will be there to substantiate the development of this collector road and from a traffic standpoint, the fewest number of residential curb cuts would be best.

E. Mercer noted the potential for development between Canton Street and Route 48 is tremendous and the undeveloped land there will be developed sooner or later. L. Barnett agrees and feels that driveways along this road now will be problematic in the future.

J. McFall asked how much more development in that area Syracuse Home intends to do. D. Faldzinski stated that as of his latest discussion with them they did not feel they have anything planned for 5 to 10 years and it is a function of getting government support for expansion. E. Mercer noted that when Syracuse Home first came onto Meigs Road, they planned a three-stage development. They have two in place currently. Mr. Baker stated the third is an assisted living facility and this is their focus now. They recently obtained approval from the State for this and it will be located on the property towards Route 690.

Joe Saraceni asked what the extent of the meetings with Syracuse Home has been. D. Faldzinski stated he just had one brief meeting to discuss this roadway and the acquisition of the 40' right-of-way and briefly touched on what their development plans for the next 5 to 10 years would be and he did not feel they are planning anything soon. Chairman Savacool noted this is a potential problem in that if development is put off too long then the road may be developed everywhere but adjacent to Syracuse Home. J. McFall stated he feels they will have a difficult time having Syracuse Home build this road. D. Faldzinski noted the Village could require a right-of-way through the property and form a transportation district to allow the village to collect funds for the roadway. J. McFall asked if the Village could bond for a roadway. J. C. Engelbrecht noted they could bond for capital expenses.

Tony Saraceni stated he likes this proactive approach and feels all parties should get together to discuss this further. Chairman Savacool noted that Van Buren would like to have a discussion with the Village and their Chairman would like to see a collector with limited curb cuts, but he does not want it to be just a thoroughfare. Chairman Savacool stated he feels that limiting the curb cuts is important. The Village wants the Town on board because this roadway will extend into their area and it would be good to have consistency in development along the road.

Chairman Savacool stated that he feels that the idea of having the right of way will actually promote development in this area.

Mr. Jack Baker noted the planned 631 bypass across river will be close to this collector road.

Sarah Baker stated she feels this kind of planning sets the stage for the Village to have a degree of control over the kind of development that will take place.

Joe Saraceni stated he is pleased that the Village is having this type of proactive discussion. Tony Saraceni agreed and stated he feels this is very important, although it will not be an easy process. He feels it is very important to get all the interested parties together. Chairman Savacool stated he will work with the Chairman of the Van Buren Planning Board to set up a joint meeting for both Planning Boards to meet together.

Upon motion by J. McFall and second by D. Arthur, the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m. The next Planning Board meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 22, 2005.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan A. LaQuay  
Planning Board Secretary