

The Town of Cicero Planning Board held a meeting on **Wednesday, March 4, 2009** at **7:00 p.m.**, in the Cicero Town Hall at 8236 South Main Street, Cicero, New York 13039.

Agenda:

- Approval of the minutes from February 4, 2009 (**deterred until the next meeting**)
- Site Plan, Airport Business Park, 5801 East Taft Road, Proposed modification of original design, Benderson Development (**approved**)
- Final Subdivision Plan, and public hearing, Airport Business Park, 5801 East Taft Road, Benderson Development (**to return**)
- Preliminary Subdivision Plan Sketch Review, Mirob Estates, Southeast corner of Sneller Road at Mudmill Road, 7 lots, Ianuzi & Romans (**to return**)
- Site Plan, SAI Hotels, Routes 31 and 11, Proposed restaurant and hotel, Clough Harbour & Associates, LLP (**approved**)
- Site Plan, Marble International, 8141 & 8145 Brewerton Road, Proposed retail store and storage facility, Martin Merola (**deferred until the next meeting**)

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Patrick Leone (Chairman), William Purdy, Scott Harris and Robert Smith

ABSENT BOARD MEMBERS: Richard Cushman, Christopher Rowe, Jason Mott and Sharon May

OTHERS PRESENT: Wayne Dean, Director of Planning and Development, Heather Cole, Esquire, Wladis Law Firm, Mark Parrish, P.E., O'Brien & Gere, Chief Carvel, Cicero Fire Department and Tonia Mosley, Clerk

The meeting was opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Leone noted the locations of the three fire exits and that there was one formal public hearing tonight. This Board recognizes the importance of public input and encourages those in attendance who would like to speak about an agenda item to do so. Please first raise your hand to be addressed by the chairman. Use the microphone in the front of the room. Let us know if you can not hear the proceedings.

**APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
FROM FEBRUARY 4, 2009**

Approval will be deferred until the next meeting.

Mr. Leone mentioned that Mrs. May might be attending the meeting late. If she does not attend this meeting the Board will not be able to act upon any motion that requires a super majority. We will also not be able to hear MARBLE INTERNATIONAL's site plan.

Ms. Cole agreed.

**SITE PLAN, AIRPORT BUSINESS PARK, 5801 EAST TAFT ROAD
PROPOSED MODIFICATION OF AN ORIGINAL DESIGN
BENDERSON DEVELOPMENT**

Representative: Matthew Oates

Mr. Oates introduced himself. We are here for site plan approval for modifications to the parking lot at Airport Business Park. We have resubmitted a site plan with a couple of changes. The plan shows the driveway onto Kreischer Road being modified to a right-in right-out driveway per the Board's comments. We have re-looked at the curbing. Most of the curbing on the site is granite except for the curbing around the existing Wynit building and the curbing for the Church Street entrance. That also includes the entrance off Taft Road to our site but the front portion is not our property. We would like to ask the Board to re-consider using concrete for a portion of the new site. We propose to re-use the existing granite curb around the Wynit facility and provide granite curbing around the new sidewalk parking area. For Church Street we are proposing to modify the entrance and re-use the granite for that portion as well. For the islands within the parking lot and the new curbing coming in off Kreischer Road we are proposing concrete. This would keep the overall cost of the project down. This is also consistent with the other curbing within the island.

Mr. Leone noted some of the curbing was in disrepair. Would you repair some of the existing concrete curbing?

Mr. Oates: Yes.

Mr. Smith asked if the green space area at the Kreischer entrance would be curbed.

Mr. Oates responded yes with concrete.

Mr. Parrish added what they are proposing seems reasonable. They are maintaining consistency

where they can. It is consistent with the other areas that are concrete.

Mr. Oates: There would be a raised pork chop island out to Kreischer. We are showing concrete there.

Mr. Parrish: If the Board does approve the plan tonight I would suggest that it to be conditioned upon the Highway Supervisor reviewing and being satisfied with the layout, since it does come out onto a Town road. I would also have the approval contingent upon the County's plans to re-construct the road in that area. That's so we don't have to rip it out in a year or so when the County gets to those improvements.

I do not think that the concrete is a problem in that area. If it is a mountable type curbing similar to what we used on East Circle Drive that is concrete, it is okay. That curbing gets a lot of abuse from plows, etc.

Mr. Dean noted we received the revised plan showing the right-in right-out today. As such it was just re-submitted to the County today.

Mr. Parrish: We realize that you want a right-in, right-out. The geometrics of it have to be worked out with the County and the Highway Supervisor. But, for planning purposes, it meets your intent.

Mr. Smith: If the County does not approve this, will it come back here for discussion?

Mr. Leone: Other than the radial kind of information which is more engineering than layout and design, I don't have a problem with it. If they expand the size of the entrance for wider driveways or they increase the magnitude of the island for whatever reason, I think that it should come back. I am suggesting if Mark is comfortable with it and it meets the Town's needs and the County's needs, I would be okay with that.

I have the County's referral dated 12/16/2008. They recommended showing the proposed drive on Kreischer Road as a restricted right-in and right-out only per the OCDOT's request. The applicant must revise a previously submitted traffic study to meet OCDOT's requirements. They applicant must also complete any mitigation as required by this Department. The site plan must show storm water runoff and how it will be managed.

Mr. Parrish: That is addressed. There are no changes to the grading.

Mr. Leone continued. A lighting plan must be developed to assure that there is no spillover or glaring. We have addressed the issues as far as I can see.

Ms. Cole agreed that the Board was not acting contrary to those modifications.

Mr. Leone made a motion regarding SEQR. He read: Be it resolved that the Planning Board of the Town of Cicero hereby determines that the proposed action with 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. Harris seconded the motion.** The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Harris:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Leone:	Yes

Mr. Leone made a motion to approve the site plan for Airport Business Park for the proposed modification of an original design of the parking area and curbing at the Wynit building with the following contingencies: we allow the applicant to pursue the use of concrete curbing in new areas. Any reused curbing will be required to make granite curbing around the Wynit building and the entrance drive off of Church Street. This approval will be conditioned upon our Planning Board engineer's discussion, the formal acceptance by the Highway Department and the Onondaga County Department of Transportation relative to the Kreisler Road right-in and right-out only entrance.

Mr. Harris seconded the motion. The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Harris:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Leone:	Yes

**FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAN, PUBLIC HEARING
AIRPORT BUSINESS PARK, 5801 EAST TAFT ROAD
BENDERSON DEVELOPMENT**

Representative: Matthew Oates

Mr. Oates: We are proposing a two lot subdivision for Airport Business Park. We are proposing breaking off the westerly portion the parking field just to the west of the existing Chase Morgan Building. This would create a new lot and allow us to develop this portion of the land at some time in the future. We realize that we have to file for and receive a variance from the bulk regulations. We will be doing that. We know you can not act upon the subdivision until we have the ZBA's approval.

The other comment was in regards to a sanitary sewer easement which we will provide to the Town for the existing sanitary sewer that comes up the entrance from Kreischer Road. We will provide a draft of that to the Town for review. We provided a draft copy of the REA to the Town.

Ms. Cole: I have reviewed it. I do have some questions and comments. Would it be best to address them to you or to the attorney whose name is on the top of this?

Mr. Oates: You can address them to me.

Ms. Cole: As long as we are not going to act tonight, I will address my comments and questions with Mr. Oates and then update the Board.

Mr. Dean: They will need a variance. The depth is okay. It is the width or the building line, building frontage. It is supposed to be 400 and it is 286.9. I wrote Mr. Oates a letter. I stipulated that if the lot is created, they will be bound by the setbacks. He should take that into account. He could need to alter the building or preclude any building that he might want to put on the site.

Mr. Leone: Parking will affect the size of your building also. You may have to lease parking from the other buildings.

Mr. Oates: I understand. Even if the variance was granted, everything else needs to fully comply with all other codes. The last item from Mark's comments was in regards to having contours shown at one foot intervals on the subdivision plan. We request that be waved for now. We are not proposing any buildings now. We can/will conform to that as part of the site plan.

Mr. Parrish noted that was typical for a subdivision of this type. I don't see an issue with it.

Mr. Leone agreed that was an issue that the Board would see during site plan. *Mr. Leone opened the public hearing at 7:24 p.m.* Is there anyone here who would like to speak in opposition to this project? (There was no response.) Is there anyone here who would like to speak in support of the project? (There was no response.) *I will not close the public hearing.* We will continue the public hearing until your next Planning Board meeting date.

PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN, SKETCH REVIEW
MIROB ESTATES, SE CORNER OF SNELLER ROAD AT MUDMILL ROAD
7 LOTS, IANUZI & ROMANS

Representative: Hal Romans, Surveyor and Planner, Ianuzi & Romans

Mr. Romans introduced himself. This is approximately a 20.4 acre vacant parcel at the southeast corner of Mudmill Road and Sneller Road. It is zoned AG. The intent is to subdivide it into 7 lots. The applicant would retain Lot 7 as their home site. It has frontage onto Sneller Road. They are planning on building their own home there. Due to the economy, they will phase the project. We are not sure that we would be able to sell off all of the lots at once. The first section would probably be these 3-4 lots along Mudmill Road.

The plan has been submitted to the OCDOT. The driveways are in the dark areas. Jim Stelter said they would like to have the driveways co-located, but not combined. He told me to put the plan together as shown and that he would review it.

Mr. Leone: Can you include any opposing driveways on the other side of the road?

Mr. Romans: This plan does show that. The homes here would be on a private septic system. The existing water line on Mudmill Road would be extended down for these lots along here, so that it would be public water.

Mr. Leone: I see the mapped wetland. You need to identify any additional wetlands on those lots. The Code clearly states the lots have to be a buildable size without wetlands included in the calculations. We will also want to see the locations of the perk and the size of the leech field. Give the basic location of where the house might be.

Mr. Romans: We understand that. I have already talked to the engineer about where we would

like to see the houses placed. That will also be determined by the septic systems, etc. I know that any lot smaller than 5 acres has to have an approved septic design for the final plan. All of the lots have at least a building line width of at least 146'. So, we are well above the minimum width of the lot.

Mr. Leone questioned the need for phasing.

Mr. Romans explained that the only reason we would want to file the final map in two sections is if the lots don't sell quickly you are paying taxes on individual lots. It is strictly an economic reason.

Ms. Cole: If we take it in the traditional steps that we normally do, we are dealing with preliminary approval now. If they want to do phases for the final subdivision plan stage that is their prerogative.

Mr. Parrish used the Gulf Stream subdivision as an example. There was a preliminary plan approved for that project for 200-300 lots. You had a preliminary plan approved for that number of lots. But, when the final subdivision plan was presented it came in sections of 40-50 lots at a time. The Board only approved the final plan for those 40-50 lots. This is the same type of situation.

Mr. Leone: What happens if they elected not to do the one acre size and they erased a lot line? What about the public hearing?

Mr. Parrish: They could do that through the simple subdivision procedure, which would not necessarily come to the Board. The Town has that procedure in place.

Ms. Cole: If you felt that there was a significant change, you could call for another public hearing.

Mr. Smith: I know you won't do it, but we do not want to see seven separate sections.

Mr. Romans: I think that your code stipulates that it has to be a certain percentage of lots. I want to say 25%. I will show Lots 1-4 as the first phase. You will see two phases. What is required for stormwater?

Mr. Parrish: We will need a grading plan or a something that shows the areas that will be disturbed. We need to determine what area will be disturbed. If it is more than 5 acres for this type of project, you will need to provide quality and quantity control—detention or some sort of pond. If it is between 1 and 5 acres you only need to do sediment and erosion control called a minor SWIPP. If it is less than one acre, which I doubt that it will be, you would not necessarily have to do anything.

Ms. Cole clarified and read from the code book.

Mr. Romans: Can the plan be sent to the County? Geometrically it is not going to change.

The Board agreed to send the plan to the county. A public hearing date would be set as the application gets further along.

**SITE PLAN, SAI HOTELS, ROUTES 31 & 11
PROPOSED HOTEL AND RESTAURANT
CHA Inc.**

Representative: Amy Franco, CHA Inc.

Mrs. Franco: We took your last set of comments and added them to include a restaurant's actual footprint. We have added sidewalks and landscaping. We created more buffer space between the southern and eastern portion of the site. We did cross sections of the ponding. We raised the fence around the pond by a foot—up to 5'. I show where the fence lies with the sidewalk and the parking.

Mr. Smith asked about Dr. Black's property. It says asphalt drive. That should be gone. He is not supposed to have access along Route 31. How much of that asphalt will be removed? Will that become green space?

Mrs. Franco: It would be the same pattern we have with the curbing and the sidewalk, whether there is brick or grass in that section. We would remove the whole driveway.

Mr. Smith: It is paved all the way to his building. It is paved right out to the road.

Mrs. Franco: Our plan is to continue the sidewalk all the way through, across.

Mr. Smith: If you are closing his driveway, that section of the driveway should be removed between the sidewalk and the corner of his building. In theory that would become a front lawn.

Mrs. Franco: Right. We would remove that whole section.

Mr. Smith: Has he agreed to that? Do we have any documentation of that because you do not own that property? I want to be assured that the curb cut will get removed along with the asphalt to the corner of the house.

Mrs. Franco: We will make sure that is within the easement agreement language. His parking field would remain along the side of the house.

Mr. Smith asked that it be documented.

Mr. Leone asked if there was enough room to put a walk on the other side of the pond.

Mrs. Franco responded no. We are trying to create pedestrian designations and pathways without spreading it out across the whole site. We have a walkable connection.

Mr. Leone: They have provided sidewalks all the way around.

Mr. Smith: So you could walk from Route 11 through your complex and out to 11 and 31.

Mr. Leone: How did you make out with your easements?

Ms. Cole: Part of this is going to be dictated by what the Board wants to see happen. The way that the preservation of easement agreement is worded, the site plan would show access points for each adjacent property. Access would be preserved, or a cross connection would be preserved at those access points only. If the Board would rather see it more flexible, that would need to be modified in the agreement. I could work with their attorney to accomplish that.

Mr. Leone: I am not sure it is in the best interests of the applicant for us to say show us where these connections would be exactly. Then you would have to have an agreement with the present owner to accept it exactly. Or, we could say that the easement would be in a general area. I don't want the applicant to be held hostage by some property owner who is not ready to say where that driveway or access point should be.

Ms. Cole: So, you would like each adjacent property to show a general location that is probably more than 24', something that is more of a spectrum, within which a 24' drive isle could exist. I got an email from the developer's attorney. Apparently the Kesel's attorney had been in contact with him requesting some proposed changes to the agreement. I will look at them. I am sure that it will not affect this Board's decision.

I will suggest that for the way the agreement is set up now that the site plan approved by the Board be attached and incorporated with it. You will be able to see where the easements are located. If we could show that on the plan Amy, I think everyone will be satisfied.

Mr. Leone: The next time an applicant comes in and needs that easement there will be a reverse requirement.

Ms. Cole: That is already required the way that it is set up. There will be reciprocity. Amy, do you think that will be feasible to show on the site plan?

Mrs. Franco: Yes. We would basically do the same labels that we had before, but now it will be for all of the properties.

Mr. Leone: Based upon your parking field you have 175 seats. That is the maximum amount of seats that will be available in the restaurant. We are also suggesting that the size noted be the maximum size. Also, when the restaurant comes in we are going to see a full pallet for that. Mark, do you want to talk about the grading or any adjacent property issues?

Mr. Parrish: The grading plan shows some grading on the adjacent properties. They will need to get permission from those property owners to do that. If they are not able to get that permission, and they need to revise the grading plan I would suggest that they come back to this Board so that we know what is going on. I think that what they have done is reasonable, but whether or not it is going to meet the expectations of those property owners I can not say.

Mr. Smith: Have they posted the fees for the final inspection on this?

Mr. Parrish responded yes. They will need to execute a stormwater control, construction and maintenance agreement with the Town. That gives us the ability to inspect the facilities and to make sure that they are being maintained properly.

Ms. Cole added it gives the Town an easement to go in and fix any problems.

Mr. Leone: I can make that a condition of approval.

Mrs. Franco: Is that something that you provide to us?

Ms. Cole: Correct.

Mr. Parrish: There are a number of storm sewers on the site that are less than 12" in diameter. We feel that they should be the minimum size. They have indicated that they do not want to do that because of cover issues in some areas. However, we feel that this one pipe underneath the entrance to Route 11 should be at least 12" in diameter. If that is not functioning properly it is going to affect other properties.

Mrs. Franco: We don't have a problem with that.

Mr. Leone: The light fixtures on the house sides of the site should be shielded for glare.

Mr. Parrish: I think the lighting plan was modified to reduce the spill.

Mrs. Franco: We moved a couple of light poles away from the property to help that situation.

Mr. Smith: Do we have enough light at the driveways?

Mr. Parrish: Yes, both entrance ways are lit. They also have signs. We do not have architectural elevations for building signage on the restaurant. That should come back before the Board. They have shown a phasing plan to treat the empty space while they decide on a restaurant.

Mrs. Franco: Sidewalks are part of phase one.

Mr. Smith: Can we put an expiration date on our approval?

Ms. Cole: Site plans don't really have expiration dates.

More discussion occurred.

Ms. Cole: I think what Mr. Harris is suggesting is that if the site is not developed within x period of time they should be allowed to do that unless adjacent property owners have developed their properties in a manner that might be inconsistent or cause problems with the site plan, or, if there are regulatory changes that have been adopted during the interim that should be considered.

Mr. Dean: Or, could we say that if the project has not commenced within two years, it has to come back in for review.

Mr. Leone: I don't think that it has to come before the Planning Board for review, I think that it at least has to be reviewed by the Codes Office to determine whether or not it needs to come back in for site plan review.

Mrs. Franco: At least require a meeting maybe to sit down and go over the plan to see if anything has changed. That makes sense. Then it is less expensive.

Mr. Harris: I want to protect the Town. It is our major responsibility sitting in these seats. We also want to be a place where people want to do business. I am just looking for a balance. I thought that if the caveats were set right could take care of both parties.

Mr. Smith: We have gone through the stuff. If you don't build it within two years it is not unreasonable to ask the applicant to come back and at least review it with the Director of Codes.

Ms. Cole: Then if that person determines that in their discretion it should come back to the Board for review, that person can refer it to the Board.

The Board agreed.

Ms. Cole reviewed the County's response. I think you have addressed all of their concerns.

Mr. Leone: Have they shown the access easements that we were discussing for each area? Do we have that on the site plan?

Ms. Cole: I don't believe they are at this point. But, if you would like to do a contingency that it is clearly noted on the plan because the plan itself will need to be attached to their proposed agreement.

More discussion occurred regarding easements. Mrs. Franco agreed to move the light closer to where the pedestrians are at the Route 31 entrance.

Chief Carvel: The proposed hydrant locations are acceptable. At the last meeting we discussed if the turning radii would be okay. I submitted additional information. The applicant was going to do some sort of modeling.

Mrs. Franco: We did that and sent the CADD drawings to Mark. He was agreeable to that.

Chief Carvel: I would also ask that standpipes be a part of the approval.

Mr. Dean: That would be similar to what we did at the Holiday Inn.

Mrs. Franco asked for clarification of the two year deadline.

Ms. Cole noted the restaurant would be excluded. It would have its own site plan.

Mrs. Zambrano asked about the letter from the DOT which was noted at the last meeting and suggested that this project would have an impact on their plans for a ramp off/on to Route 81. Have there been any discussions with the NYSDOT about that? Will this project be impacted at all?

Mr. Leone: That was discussed at the last meeting. I commented that this whole plan had been down to County Planning Agency for eight months with both the County and State weighing in on the site plan. There was only one comment relative to any loop ramp extension. To suggest this be considered one hour before the meeting as a possible occurrence of a possible future event is unacceptable. As far as I know the State has no plan. I think that it is unacceptable for the developer to hold up what I feel is a reasonable built out of that space. I think that it is unnecessary for the Board to stop the action.

Mr. Leone made a motion regarding SEQR. He read: Be it 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. Harris: Yes
Mr. Smith: Yes
Mr. Leone: Yes

Mr. Leone asked council if the four Board members present had the right to move this plan forward with a majority action.

Ms. Cole: Given that it does not appear that you are acting contrary to the County Planning Board's recommendation by meeting all of their concerns, I think yes.

Mr. Leone made a motion to approve the SAI Hotel and restaurant pad site plan under plans with a latest revision date of February 6, 2009 and the following conditions:

1. The developer shall obtain a permit from the NYSDOT for the entrances to Routes 31 and 11.
2. The developer shall offer a cross access easement agreement to each property owner in a form as approved by the Planning Board's attorney and accepted by the Planning Board's engineer which shall be indicated on a revised site plan for their use. These easements shall run with the property and not be exclusive to a particular property owner. The easement agreement will be perpetual and irrevocable with the locations as discussed below:
 - a. For the Myers property a 24' drive isle will exist somewhere within the eastern most property boundary.
 - b. For Verizon as it exists on the plan
 - c. For Knittel 24' somewhere within a 60' area extending westerly from the northeastern corner
 - d. For Kesel within the designed location but instead of the 40', as indicated on the plan presented this evening, it shall be 60' wide. There shall be an additional 10' on either side of the easement area.
 - e. For Cicero Methodist Church extending 60' west from the garage that is shown at the northern most boundary of the developer's property
 - f. For the east side of Dr. Black's somewhere within the northern property boundary
 - g. For the west side of Dr. Black's parcel, the entrance road, someplace along the northerly property boundary
 - h. For Cicero Estates 60' extending westerly from the northeastern corner of the property. These will be approved by the attorney and engineer. Ms. Cole clarified for all of the easements the access area is the 60' or larger that has been proposed. The 24' will be within that 60' or larger designated area.

3. The number of seats in the restaurant shall not exceed 175 unless the Planning Board approves an amended site plan that provides for additional parking.
4. Permission shall be obtained to perform the grading on the adjacent properties. If permission can not be obtained this developer shall provide an amended site plan for the Planning Board to consider.
5. In accordance with the Town's local law regarding stormwater management and erosion settlement control a construction and maintenance agreement shall be executed with the Town for the stormwater management facility
6. The minimum size of the culvert under Route 11 shall be increased to 12"
7. House shields shall be provided for light fixtures that are adjacent to any residential properties
8. Prior to the construction of the restaurant the developer shall present a site plan and associated materials for review including architectural elevations and signage and other modifications that maybe required to accommodate the restaurant.
9. Dr. Black's current driveway needs to be removed, removal of the curb cut. That area must be green space to the corner of the house to establish a front lawn. We need to see acceptance of that removal from Dr. Black.
10. The hotel's stairwells shall be out fitted with Class I standpipes with a 2.5 inch valve. See the email from Chief Carvel to Amy Franco dated December 12, 2008 for clarification (ATTACHMENT A).
11. If the property is not developed in accordance with this site plan within two years of today's date the property owner will have to approach the Town's Director of Planning for a determination if it needs to go back for Planning Board approval
12. The light will be moved closer to the street at the Route 31 driveway entrance and sidewalk.

Mr. Smith seconded the motion. The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy:	Yes
Mr. Harris:	Yes
Mr. Smith:	Yes
Mr. Leone:	Yes

Mr. Smith made a motion to adjourn. **Mr. Purdy 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 8:50 P.M.

Date: March 16, 2009

Tonia Mosley, Clerk

ATTACHMENT A

Toni Mosley

From: Carvel, Richard J [richard.carvel@brookfieldpower.com]
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2008 5:46 PM
To: Franco, Amy
Subject: RE: SAI Hotel & Restaurant, Cicero

Amy, the following are my recommendations for the site revisions for the new SAI hotel & Resturant for Cicero, New York.

The existing hydrant at the southwestern corner of the retention pond should be moved to the Northeast corner of the retention pond in the island to the east of the sidewalk unless there is concern for the hydrants safety due to traffic or snow removal operations. If this is the case move it to the extreme southwest corner of the lawn in front of the hotel. An additional hydrant should be placed in the island at the northeast corner of the retention pond at the east or north side of the light pole. Again if snow removal threatens this location move it to the extreme sotheast corner of the lawn in front of the hotel.

A third hydrant should be placed in the lawn west of the restaurant in line with the fire protection piping entrance shown on the print. This will provide supply for the fire dept connection at this structure.

Under all but the most extreme fire emergency conditions these hydrants would preclude shutting down Rte 11 or Rte 31 to obtain water supplies. Given the existing traffic conditions on these routes I am sure the Planning board would be pleased to see this possibility mitigated.

You have been provided with the turning radius requirements for our largest apparatus and you have verified that there is adequate room to accomplish these these requirements.

I will also ask the Planning board to require as part of the site plan appoval that the hotel stairwells be outfitted with Class 1 standpipes with a 2.5" valave with "Syracuse" 3.141 (8 threads per inch) male threads.

I see that the developer's designer has started the design for the hotels' fire protection system and the standpipes were on the drawings I was provided.

With the above items satisfied, I am in agreement with the site plan.