

The Town of Cicero Planning Board held a meeting on Wednesday, February 3, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. in the Town Hall at 8236 South Main Street, Cicero, New York 13039.

Agenda:

- Pledge of Allegiance
- Approval of the 1/6/2010 Planning Board minutes (approved)
- Site plan, Northern Pines Golf Club, 6722 Route 31, Proposed expansion and pavilion, Joseph Mastroianni P.E. (approved)
- Site plan, C.J.'s Car America, 8665 Brewerton Road, Proposed used car dealership, Chris Stellakis (approved)
- Site plan/Sketch plan/SEQR determination, Loretto Health and Rehabilitation, Cicero Commons, Proposed long term care facilities, Pioneer Companies (to return)
- Preliminary subdivision/Sketch plan/SEQR determination, Cicero Commons, Route 11 & Meltzer Court, Pioneer Companies (to return)
- General discussions: Solvay Bank, Standards for Planning Board training and attendance

Board Members Present:

Mark Marzullo, Chairman
William Purdy
Jason Mott
Robert Smith
Christopher Rowe
Richard Cushman
Sharon May
Scott Harris, Ad-Hoc

Others Present:

Wayne Dean, Director Planning & Development
Neal Germain, Esq., Germain & Germain LLP
Mark Parrish, P.E., O'Brien & Gere
Jessica Zambrano, TB Liaison
Judy Boyke, Supervisor
Richard Carvel, Cicero Fire Department
Lynn Jennings, Town Board
Chief David Pangaro, Cicero Fire Department
Douglas Whitman, P.E., C&S Companies
Tonia Mosley, Clerk

The meeting was opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Marzullo requested that all cell phones be turned off. He noted the locations of the emergency exits and acknowledged the importance of public participation. He urged audience members who wanted to speak to do so, using the microphone in the front of the room.

APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES FROM 1/6/2010

Mrs. May made a motion to approve the Planning Board minutes from January 6, 2010. Mr. Cushman seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

SITE PLAN, NORTHERN PINES GOLF CLUB
6722 ROUTE 31, PROPOSED EXPANSION AND PAVILLION
JOSEPH MASTROIANNI

Representative: Joseph Mastroianni, P.E.

Mr. Mastroianni introduced himself giving a brief review. He noted the subdivision portion was done already. But, the Board required a letter by the owner regarding no development in the woodlands area that was not delineated—without going through the process. We worked with the attorneys to get that letter together. You have a signed copy of that letter.

For the site plan, we show a pavilion style building here. It will be stick built and used for golf outings, etc. Basically it is a building with a couple of bathrooms inside. It is not heated. It does not have any restaurant type facilities.

Mrs. May asked if catered food would be provided in the pavilion. How would you wash

dishes?

Mr. Mastroianni responded they would have to bring it in and remove it. There will not be anything cooked there. There are no real sinks or anything there. It would be similar to having a function at Long Branch Park where people have picnics or family gatherings.

The County with their review requested a traffic study/counts be provided to the DOT. We did a traffic study and dealt with Mike Washburn from the DOT and Catherine Cane. Mr. Mastroianni continued, describing which drives would be closed, entrance only, delivery only and entrance/exits. He showed where delivery only signs would be placed, no drive thru signs would be placed and where a wooden guard rail would be placed to block drivers from going through.

Mrs. May asked about the driveway that is currently blocked off by boulders.

Mr. Mastroianni noted that would be removed and grassed over with the ditch re-established through that area. The owners opted for a new septic system, which has gone to Jeff Till at the Health Department. There is no change to signage, with the exception of added directional signs. The pavilion will not have outside lighting. There are no lighting changes to the facility.

The original application showed three maintenance buildings in this area, where one building was going to be moved to this area. That was done in the interim. This other building will have a bump out—extending out to allow carts to be parked and to do some maintenance. It will not be heated.

We show all parking. We have approvals from the DOT. The former Planning Board chairman requested a letter from the DOT stating that they were aware of the driveways. Since this turned into a traffic study and highway work permit for the work being done, basically that request was taken care of. The Codes Department has a copy of that also.

Mr. Marzullo asked about the building that is getting the expansion. Currently the north side of that building has overhead doors. Will that remain?

Mr. Mastroianni: Yes, whatever is on that side will be mirrored out to that point.

Mr. Smith asked about the parking lot on the adjacent lot.

Mr. Mastroianni: Under the subdivision, all of these lots will become one. Originally the golf course was composed of three lots. That will become one lot and the three building lots will be removed. That has been filed, so technically there are 4 lots--- the large golf course and the three building lots. No cross easements, et cetera would be needed.

Mr. Mott asked about the entrance only drive. That is 25' wide. Will you mark that on the pavement as entrance only?

Mr. Mastroianni: There are two signs here, one on each side, that say one-way and point in. And if you are coming from the driveway on the inside, there are two signs that say no entrance or do not enter, similar to what you see on the on ramp to Route 81. The DOT was in agreement with those four signs being adequate for stopping someone from doing that. I believe there are arrows on the pavement there that indicate movement going both ways. Those will be removed.

Mr. Smith: The parking lot you are adding will be gravel?

Mr. Mastroianni responded yes adding details on which drives would be paved and what part of those drives would be paved.

Mrs. May noted the site plan shows 158 parking spaces.

More discussion occurred regarding the traffic study.

Mr. Parrish felt if the DOT has approved this, it is their highway, they will do what they feel is appropriate for the entrances. As long as the Board is happy with the traffic circulation internally, I don't think that there is really much more that we need to review.

Mr. Mastroianni noted that when you get a work permit signed by the DOT, the bottom states that the applicant must notify the DOT when said work is done. Then the DOT comes out to inspect it.

Mr. Mott: 40 x 80 is a rather large building. This is a question for the fire fighters here tonight. It looks like it is 150' from the parking spaces. In the event of a fire, does that give you enough access to the building?

Chief Pangaro responded noting this site was located in South Bay's fire district. But, in my opinion, 150' should be all right.

Mr. Smith: Are we all set with sanitary facilities with these numbers?

Mr. Mastroianni noted this area here is the raised bed. We used the numbers from traffic counts on Father's Day, the allowable numbers and increased it by 33%. After waste goes through the septic tank and everything else, there is a 3,000 gallon holding tank. There is a duplex system there. Every eight hours it will pump out a dose of about 140 gallons.

The building here will have a small fryer or something. There will be a grease trap. Everything will be inside. This is not an open building. We are getting away from using tents.

More discussion occurred.

Mrs. May made a motion regarding SEQR. She read: Be it further resolved that the Planning Board of the Town of Cicero hereby determines that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the environment and that this resolution shall constitute a negative declaration for the purposes of Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law of the State of New York. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

Mr. Marzullo made a motion to approve the site plan. Mrs. May seconded the motion.

The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

SITE PLAN, C.J.'S CAR AMERICA
8665 BREWERTON ROAD, PROPOSED USED CAR DEALERSHIP
CHRIS STELLAKIS

Representative: Chris Stellakis, applicant

Mr. Stellakis introduced himself. One of the details that had to be cleared up from the last time we were here was the County's response. We have that. Another detail was a question about sewers. If we go to Phase II we will have to hook-up to the public sewer system.

Mrs. May confirmed that Board members had received a copy of the DOT letter.

Mr. Smith noted the County's concerns about lighting. Is there anything we should be concerned about?

Mr. Marzullo: They recommended shields or something?

Mr. Parrish read from the County's response: approval should be contingent upon approval of a lighting plan by the Town Engineer to ensure no glare or spillover is allowed onto adjacent properties and state rights-of-way. They have submitted a lighting plan that shows at the property lines and the rights-of-way .1 foot candles---which is pretty much the level that we allow. They have also added glare shields on the back of the fixtures that back up to Route 11 to further reduce the impacts.

Mr. Smith: Phase 2 will be paved?

Mr. Stellakis responded yes. That was the requirement that we talked about at our last meeting. I agree to that.

Mr. Marzullo questioned the amount of customer parking. I think that there are only three spots.

Mr. Smith: For Phase 1, 3 spaces will probably be sufficient.

Mr. Stellakis: The surveyor made an adjustment updating the drawings. We will probably have 17-18 cars for sale on display. I don't think that we are going to have very many customers all at once.

Mr. Marzullo: What is the Board's intent? Are we going to approve the entire plan or the first Phase of the plan?

Mr. Smith: I thought we were going to approve the entire thing as long as Wayne was all set and as long as it was paved. The applicant understood that we required paving and that Wayne would be responsible so that Phases 1 and 2 can be approved. We delineated what Phase 2 would be and the applicant's obligations to proceed.

Mr. Cushman: You mentioned that there might be 3 phases.

Mr. Stellakis: Yes, we talked about if I deemed it unnecessary to buildout the entire parking lot that I would leave off the north section.

Mr. Smith: That would be done with Wayne's approval. If Wayne had issues with that, he would bring you back in front of the Planning Board.

Mr. Dean agreed.

Mr. Stellakis responded that is fine with me.

Mr. Dean requested that the Board include the date on a plan when a motion is made.

Mrs. May made a motion regarding SEQR. She read: Be it further resolved that the Planning Board of the Town of Cicero hereby determines that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the environment and that this resolution shall constitute a negative declaration for the purposes of Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law of the State of New York. Mr. Mott seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

Mr. Marzullo made a motion to approve the site plan dated January 20, 2010. Any additional phasing approved on the site plan would be done in paving and would be coordinated through the Zoning Office. The Zoning Office has the right to bring this back to the Planning Board if they deem it necessary. Mrs. May seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

SITE PLAN/SKETCH PLAN, SEQR, LORETTO HEALTH AND REHABILITATION
CICERO COMMONS, PROPOSED LONG TERM CARE FACILITIES
PIONEER COMPANIES
AND
MAJOR PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN/SKETCH PLAN, SEQR
CICERO COMMONS, ROUTE 11 AND MELTZER COURT
PIONEER COMPANIES

Representatives: David Norcross, Pioneer Companies
Alex Wisniewski, LJR Engineering

Mr. Norcross introduced himself as a representative for Loretto Health and Rehabilitation Center. I am here to do a brief review of their green house project proposed to be located in the Cicero Commons. Last week we made a presentation to the Town Board who referred this project back to the Planning Board for site plan review. The Town Board found that the project is consistent with the approved zoning of that area, Planned Unit Development (PUD).

Loretto is planning senior housing with this project. We have approximately 18 acres of land under control. The slide being shown represents an example of what a green house is. Green house is a new style of senior care that is being developed through out the country. Currently there are between 60-65 green home developments throughout the United States, for example, the St. John Homes up in the Rochester area. This would be the first one in Central New York.

The exterior of the homes are very residential in nature. They are designed to be clustered like a neighborhood or community. Each home is centered around a central hearth with a fire place and a high level of buildout. Inside the kitchens have granite counter tops and high-end trim details.

Each house is designed to have 12 individually occupied bedrooms. They are private rooms with bath and shower in each room. Loretto's plan is to have 13 of these green homes on the Cicero Commons site.

The thrust is to de-institutionalize health care and to get away from large institutional hospital like nursing home settings and to bring the care back down to the home level.

Mr. Smith asked if the exterior coverings would be vinyl.

Mr. Norcross noted the use of numerous types of exterior siding. I think we were thinking of something like hardy plank, something that is more durable than vinyl or aluminum siding. We really have not gotten to that level of detail yet. We want something high end that would maintain well and be long lasting. I think some stone accent work along the front would be strongly considered.

Mr. Cushman: Could you expand more on the green technology? We don't expect to see windmills or solar panels or things of that nature. Can you explain to those in attendance exactly what you mean by green development?

Mr. Norcross explained that the name green home is not necessarily attached to these because of the green technology for the energy saving element of the homes. The green is intended to be like...

Mr. Cushman: ...like a neighborhood.

Mr. Norcross continued....like a neighborhood. It is Loretto's intent to make these homes as sustainable and environmentally friendly as they possibly can. In other words, they will use energy star appliances, have heating and air conditioning systems that are the latest technology and things of that nature.

Mr. Rowe: What about garages and parking for people who come to visit?

Mr. Norcross: The intent is to have attached garages. They are not designed for vehicular use but for storage and ambulance access to the home. You have a covered portal in which patients could be taken in or out of the premises.

Mr. Rowe: Where would visitors and/or family members park?

Mr. Norcross: Alex Wisniewski is here to run you through some of the details of the site plan. But, we are suggesting a combination of street parking and some parking at each residence. There is room in each driveway for 2-4 cars.

Mrs. May: Do you know if there will be a bus route to this location to pick up seniors. Will there be a spot for the bus to utilize?

Mr. Norcross: Loretto is interested in exploring that for patients and employees. They do an outstanding job of utilizing their own vehicles and the different types of transportation vehicles that are available to them. I think the answer to that is absolutely yes.

Mr. Marzullo: If any of the Planning Board members are interested I have a video which shows the home in operation. It is well worth taking a look at.

Mr. Norcross: Alex can give you more details on the site plan itself. We are still in very preliminary stages with Loretto in developing the interior layout of this facility. We are in the range for each home of 7,000-8,000 sq. ft. That is being fine tuned over the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Wisniewski: I am sure you are all familiar with the Cicero Commons Campus. There were a number of uses that were approved as a part of that campus. Again, the Town Board did agree that this project is consistent with the original PUD approval. It is approximately 18 acres on the western perimeter of the site plan that you see. Due to the size and its nature it would be a Type I Action under SEQR. One of the objectives tonight, as you look at the recommendation from the Town Board, was their suggestion that the Planning Board be lead agency as it relates to SEQR. It would be a coordinated review. Hopefully, we would like you to declare your intent to be lead agency and setup the required notifications.

This is an aerial view of the Cicero Commons. You can see the current infrastructure. That includes the infrastructure to the front of the proposed project. All utilities that we need for a connection are readily available at that point.

Mr. Smith asked for the location of the pump station.

Mr. Wisniewski: This is the proposed site development area. The only infrastructure that is not constructed outside of the limits of our project is this road connection here. We have designed this loop road to work well with the original master plan to form an intersection at that point.

Pioneer has completed an updated survey of this area. They have also done current wetlands delineation on the property. It does pose some constraints with the site layout. The pump station would be located right about here. It is sized to accommodate the full buildout of the Cicero Campus.

Mr. Smith: So, it is large enough to accommodate future development?

Mr. Wisniewski: it will accommodate this, plus. The building here is labeled as the Commons Area. At this point we are still working through the programming with Loretto, so it is unsure if they need any additional support structures beyond the 13 green houses. We are still trying to determine if there is a need for a support staff area, common gathering area for church services and things of that nature.

There is the potential opportunity for walk-out basements in these two units. I have the drive coming down to serve what would be a lower space that could potentially serve as support space as well. We don't know exactly how large these footprints will be. But, we have another all day design session with Loretto on Monday. I hope to get a lot of these questions answered then.

Mr. Smith: All of the cooking and food deliveries would be to the units themselves?

Mr. Wisniewski: That is correct. As I understand it, the two full-time on-staff employees get 180 hours of additional training as nurses which include culinary skills. So, the nurses on staff are cooking for the elders.

The houses are really run by the elders. Residents can get up when they want to or cook up something on their own. There are people there to assist and/or help but it really tries to give residents a sense of independence and home. The concept with green houses is that they are individual entities that function independently from each another. The fenced area is intended to be outdoor courtyards. Each unit would have one.

Mr. Smith: For example, SYSCO Foods would deliver food for each house to each house. There would not be a tractor trailer going to one of these support buildings?

Mr. Wisniewski: Correct. The intention is to have the smaller bread truck sized deliveries, etc. That is why they feel that the garages shown are important to the design. Small trucks could pull right in and unload. You have available storage.

The architect has prepared a sketch of the preferred footprint selected by Loretto. This gets away from that institutional feel. The front entry is here with a garage offset for deliveries and storage on this side. Visitors and elders would use the front door. You come into a large open space. The kitchen is immediately there. There is a wall of windows that look out over the back courtyard and a great room with a hearth and fireplace that people can sit around and socialize. The intention is for each unit to have 12 single occupancy bedrooms. This barbell shape situates all of the bedrooms in close proximity to the center of home. The main thing to refine at this point is bedroom and bathroom sizes. Each room will have its own full bathroom with a European style shower.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Wisniewski addressed a question from Mr. Cushman. This line represents the limits between the Town of Cicero to the east and the Town of Clay to the west. A portion of the Cicero Commons' master plan falls within the Town of Clay. It is Loretto's intent to purchase a portion of that property as a part of this project. We are trying to contain the footprint of the buildout within the Town of Cicero property. We have had in house discussions about bringing in the Town of Clay as a part of the review. I do anticipate the need to locate a stormwater facility partially within the land that falls within the Town of Clay.

There is currently a gravel drive that extends south to the pump station area. Pioneer would build that out as a Town road in accordance with the standards set forth in the original PUD approval. We anticipate a 24' wide roadway with granite curbing. Again we have the simple loop connection to the existing intersection at Meltzer Court. And then this intersection would ultimately allow the future extension of the road in accordance with the original PUD plan here.

The site generally drains to the west. This road pitches to the south and drains to the west. I envision the need for two separate stormwater facilities. I envision this road will drop in elevation to a low point roughly in this location with a storm sewer discharge and flood route to the west of that facility.

There is a state jurisdictional wetland in this corner which has an associated 100' buffer shown in blue. Our intent is to not impact the wetlands, thereby not needing a wetlands permit. Just off of the plan here there is another portion of that wetland with its associated 100' buffer. That is solely within the Town of Clay property. Again, we will keep our development's footprint out of there. Ultimately, these stormwater facilities will treat and detain the stormwater with the SPEDES requirements and discharge into those wetlands.

We do have the proposal for some on street parking combined with individual drive accesses to each of the individual units. Parking would be available in the driveways with some flat shaped, 90 degree parking. That is another component that where we are working with Loretto to define their needs.

Mr. Mott: I believe the Town of Cicero has no on street parking within the code?

Mr. Dean: Not designated. You are allowed to park on the street.

Mr. Mott: How about clearing the roads in the winter?

Mr. Parrish: There is on street parking already in the Campus. It was discussed at length with previous approvals. We will have to address the same issue here.

Mr. Marzullo recommended talking to the Highway Supervisor. I spoke with him about it. The existing on street parking at the Campus is not currently plowed by the Town. The plows go by and then it is done privately. He was also concerned with the jigsaw puzzle effect that is there now.

Mr. Wisniewski: Mark voiced that in one of our earlier sessions. One consideration is having on street parking situated on one side of the street or the other. The maintenance and plowing of those facilities will have to be worked out with the Town and Chris. We are aware of the potential issues associated with that. There is precedence for it within the Cicero Commons. It was approved as part of the original PUD.

We are proposing sidewalks across the street frontage within the development. The concrete curbing that was laid out as a higher end development project is a part of the original Campus

development. Again, our intent is to have that road dedicated to the Town upon construction by Pioneer. There will be public utilities within the roadway, public sewer, storm sewer and OCWA water.

Mr. Smith noted that the Town ordinance says there will be no on street parking from October until April. You are prohibited over the winter. That covers these roads also. The Town Board is the one that has to solve that issue.

Mr. Parrish: This is a concept review and we should consider these types of things. If the individual parcels or buildings are not going to be subdivided, you basically have a campus. You could make that a private road. It does not have to be a Town road from the aspect that it is serving a number of different lots. If all of those were individual lots it would make sense for that to be a Town road. But essentially you have this parcel of land with one ownership, one entity controlling it. Realistically the roads and utilities on the site could be private facilities.

That is a potential avenue that you could go with for the project. That would preclude future subdivisions or changes to that area, if something happened in the future where they needed to begin to subdivide those up. But I don't think that is the intent. This is something that you might want to consider as you go forward with your review.

Mr. Cushman: I don't know if that is something that Loretto wants to get into---having snowplows and doing their own plowing.

Mr. Parrish: They will have to plow these little parking lots and those types of things. And, if there is a concern with on street parking and how to address it with the Town's laws; that would be one way to address it.

Mr. Wisniewski: That was discussed in house. I do know that Loretto would prefer that it be public, both the road and the utilities associated with it. With fire safety, emergency vehicles safety and things of that nature and given the type of residents they will have, Loretto feels from a reliability of maintenance standpoint that being a public facility was important. You are right in stating that the sidewalks and driveways will have to be shoveled and/or plowed.

Mr. Smith: I think that a public road is a good idea. But we do have someone here from the

Town Board as our liaison. Do you have any idea how the Town Board feels about this being a public road? Before we approve parking, do you think that is something that the Town Board could look at doing ordinances to cover this particular road?

Ms. Zambrano: We can certainly look at it.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Wisniewski clarified. It is not our intent to individually subdivide off parcels here. Ultimately this Board will make their recommendations back to the Town Board relative to the PUD site plan and subdivision. Hopefully you will recommend approval. Another step that Loretto may need to take is another subdivision that would allow the partition and separation of that property from the balance of the Commons. That is assuming that the final plat for this subdivision would not be approved and filed until such a time as that infrastructure is in the ground, as-built, reviewed and accepted by the Town Engineer and the Town Board.

Obviously, Loretto would have to have control of the 18 acres before they would start building this infrastructure. I think there is the need to do a minor subdivision to slice off the 18 acres from the balance of the property.

Ideally tonight we would like this Board to declare their intent to be lead agency and send out notifications as they relate to site plan and subdivision. We still need to figure out in house what the proper mechanism is related to contracts and being able to commence work in terms of the land ownership issue.

We are trying to achieve a neighborhood, new urbanism kind of feel here. You see that with the setbacks. We try to keep them at 15' from the right-of-way line. We promote pedestrian access with the interconnection of sidewalks through out the development.

Various Board members stated this was a great project, an excellent use of the land, and an asset to Cicero's seniors.

Mr. Wisniewski: We will work out the details in terms of Loretto's needs, progress our site

plan, re-submit with the intention to come back before the Board with a more detailed review and keep the project moving.

Mr. Germain: This matter has been referred to the Planning Board by the Town Board. It was also referred to the Planning Board in hopes that the Planning Board would declare itself to be lead agency for the purposes of performing the SEQR function. At this point if the Planning Board so chooses, they could make that resolution that the Planning Board would declare itself to be the lead agency for the purposes of performing SEQR. Mr. Smith made this motion as stated by Mr. Germain above. Mrs. May seconded the motion. The motion was approved with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Mott:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Rowe:	Yes
Mr. Cushman:	Yes
Mrs. May:	Yes
Mr. Marzullo:	Yes

Mr. Parrish explained about the project, the PUD and the process. The PUD for the Campus as a whole was originally approved with a local law in 2000. That local law essentially spelled out a process by which subsequent phases or particular sections of the project would be approved. It is really a four step process. The first step, which has already happened, is that the applicant has gone to the Town Board. They found it to be consistent with the concept plan and referred it to you for review.

The local law says that the Planning Board's review shall take the form of a site plan and/or subdivision as appropriate. This project has aspects of both site plan and subdivision, so the applications and reasons that it says site plan and subdivision is because of that fact. (They have submitted those applications.) When the Planning Board completes its review you will make a recommendation back to the Town Board relative to the project either stating that you agree with it as the developer proposes or with whatever modifications you think should be made to the plan.

At that point the Town Board needs to schedule and hold a public hearing and adopt a local law approving the project. At that time they will either take your recommendations, but ultimately

it is their decision. They can either take your recommendations or use their own to really do what they see fit. Ultimately, it is the Town Board's decision to approve the project with a local law after holding a public hearing.

That is the process that we are going to go through. The Planning Board's role is to review it as either a site plan or a subdivision.

Mr. Wisniewski noted one other procedure that would go through the Town Board. They would review any public infrastructure. We would prepare contract drawings and present those to the Town Board for approval.

Mr. Parrish added that would follow the PUD approval.

The Chairman stated that the applicant had asked if the Planning Board would be willing to meet at a special meeting because they are on a pretty tight time constraint. I offered that if it became necessary, we would offer to do that.

Mr. Wisniewski: We appreciate that. I believe that you have a regular scheduled meeting on March 3rd. If I have ample time to prepare the documents to give you and Mark the opportunity to review the project, it would be our intent to come before you at that meeting.

Mr. Smith: Have we met our obligation for notifying Clay to save time?

Mr. Dean responded not yet. I wanted to make sure that this was acceptable before we sent it out. We will take care of that.

Mr. Norcross: In regards to a time line, they would like to begin construction in the fall of 2010. This has an approximate 12 month construction cycle. They would open these homes in groups. The expectation would be at the end of that 12 month cycle, in September or October of 2011; all 13 of the green homes would be open.

I would also like to mention a note that Supervisor Boyke handed me. Centro Bus does have a run that services the Cicero Commons. I know that Loretto will be thrilled to hear that.

GENERAL DISCUSSIONS:

SOLVAY BANK

Mr. Cushman: I noticed that they were working on the Old Starbucks and that it was going to be a Solvay Bank. Is that something you will handle through your office Wayne or will that come before the Planning Board?

Mr. Dean: The Zoning Office will handle that. Basically, they are just changing the exterior of the building under a building permit with a minor traffic modification.

Mr. Smith: Will it change the counts that we approved much?

Mr. Dean: It was a drive-in. If anything they may go down.

MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR BOARD TRAINING AND ATTENDANCE

Mr. Marzullo: I gave the Board a draft of minimum standards for training and attendance. Over the next week or so please look that over. If you have any input, give it to me and I will forward that on to the Town Board.

Mr. Marzullo made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

IN AS MUCH AS THERE WAS NO FURTHER BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:15 P.M.

Dated: February 15, 2010

Tonia Mosley, clerk

