

The Town of Cicero Planning Board held a meeting on **Wednesday, July 1, 2009 at 7:00 p.m.**, in the Town Hall at 8236 South Main Street, Cicero, New York 13039.

Agenda:

- Approval of the Planning Board minutes from June 3, 2009 (**approved**)
- Site Plan, Sketch Review, Greater Syracuse Association of Realtors, 5976 East Taft Road, Robert Abbott, Jr. (**to return**)
- Preliminary Subdivision Plan, Mirob Estates, SE corner of Sneller Road at Mudmill Rd., 7 lots, Ianuzi & Romans (**to return**)
- Site Plan, Sketch Review, All Custom Log Cabins, Inc., 5737 & 5745 Sneller Road, Ianuzi & Romans (**to return**)
- Site Plan, Sketch Review, SEFCU, 8086 Brewerton Road, Barton & Loguidice, P.C. (**to return**)
- Preliminary Subdivision Plan, Park Fees, SEQR Determination, Shiva Estates, Guy Young Road, 14 lots, Fisher Associates (**to return**)

Board Members Present: Patrick Leone (Chairman), Richard Cushman, William Purdy, Christopher Rowe, Sharon May, Jason Mott and Robert Smith

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

Absent: Scott Harris (AD HOC Board Member)

The meeting was opened with the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Leone noted the locations of the three fire exits noting that there were no formal public hearings tonight. He acknowledged the importance of public input and encouraged audience members to speak about agenda items by being addressed by the chairman and using the microphone in the front of the room.

APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES FROM JUNE 3, 2009

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the Planning Board minutes from the June 3, 2009 meeting. **Mrs. May seconded the motion.** The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

- | | |
|--------------|-----|
| Mr. Cushman: | Yes |
| Mr. Purdy: | Yes |
| Mr. Rowe: | Yes |
| Mrs. May: | Yes |
| Mr. Mott: | Yes |

Mr. Smith: Yes
Mr. Leone: Yes

**SITE PLAN, SKETCH REVIEW
GREATER SYRACUSE ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS
5976 EAST TAFT ROAD, ROBERT C. ABBOTT, JR.**

Representatives: Robert C. Abbott, Jr., Architect, Lynnore Fetyko, CEO, GSAR

Mr. Smith made it known that he was a member of the Association of Realtors but not a voting member.

Ms. Cole made it known that there was an employee of the Wladis Law Firm that was an active member of the Association of Realtors, a general member, not a decision making authority.

Mr. Leone asked Board members if they felt that Mr. Smith or Ms. Cole had a conflict of interest. The Board responded no.

Mr. Abbott introduced himself. The Association has purchased the approximately 8500 sq. ft. building at 5976 East Taft Road, the former Knights of Columbus building. It is a two acre site. Basically we are putting two small additions on in the form of vestibules in the front and back and a small classroom area. There would also be a 20 x 20 canopy coming off of the main entrance door on the side. The interior would be gutted for new handicap accessible offices, bathrooms, a couple of large meeting rooms for classes, computer lab and storage areas. The existing kitchen would be modernized.

Mr. Abbott's responses from Board questions included:

- The parking lot is all paved. If it is in the budget we would like to seal it all and re-stripe it.
- There are 92 parking spaces at this point.
- The classrooms would hold a maximum of 30-35 people at a training session.
- There are less than a dozen people who work here every day from 9 to 5, but more would come for a special function.

Mr. Leone thought the trip generation was between 80 and 90 at peak. You spoke about using a sheriff during those peak hours? The Board needs to be comfortable with traffic without you doing additional studies.

Ms. Fetyko noted we ask ex-fireman and ex-police officers. For a donation they would handle the traffic for any large venue that we might have.

Mr. Abbott added the existing 30' wide driveway is adequate.

Mr. Leone: Our basic requirement is for a 22' driveway. The County could require you to reduce it. They could say keep it, but make it one lane in and two lanes out for a stacking lane. Do you know if there is more than one parcel? If so are you moving towards a simple subdivision?

Ms. Cole: I have not heard from their attorney yet on that issue or about access to the cellular tower on the site. But, I anticipate that I will.

Mr. Leone: If you have adjoining lots or lots with odd property boundaries, your setbacks may not be correct for your building. Because of that this Board can not approve certain things, without a simple subdivision.

Mr. Abbott continued. We are adding a drop-off vestibule and a dumpster location behind the rear door of the building. The dumpster would be surrounded by evergreens.

Mrs. May: Our code calls for an enclosed dumpster with stockade fencing and gating.

Mr. Smith reminded the applicants of the importance of having a pdf to project onto the screen and the importance of having contact from their attorney. He asked for the clearance on the canopy to see if it would be good for an ambulance.

Mr. Abbott: 10'6". We have enough for a by-pass. Large fire vehicles could come in and go around.

Mrs. May: An ambulance is 10'6". You will need to raise it up somewhat.

Mr. Leone asked Mr. Parrish and Mr. Dean for a target height to pass on to Mr. Abbott. He does have a way for a fire truck to get around there but an emergency vehicle will want to pull under the canopy.

Mr. Cushman asked about the existing shed in the southeast corner.

Mr. Abbott: That is an open canopy where they can barbeque, etc. It is shelter on four wood columns.

Mr. Smith asked for the architectural colors and materials of the building to be added to the site plan for review.

Mr. Abbott agreed noting the colors would be earth tone. He discussed the building's and parking lot's lighting. He noted that he would provide photometric sheets.

Mr. Leone noted the amount of disturbance was minimal. It does not appear like there are any storm water management issues.

Mr. Parrish agreed. He is not changing any of the drainage patterns. I will look and see if there are any other issues.

Mr. Leone: You seem to have a parking need for about 50-60 cars and you do have some overflow area.

Mr. Dean: Based upon the code and the building's occupancy level, 70 people per room is allowed. That just includes the two meeting rooms. It does not include the office space or any ancillary spaces.

Mr. Leone: You can accept the number of parking spaces based upon the occupancy potential. I would be concerned about using that. You could generate a higher traffic volume that would require a traffic study. Mr. Parrish has explained to us once it gets over 100 you start to flex that. I have not heard that number and assume, based upon the count going in, we are comfortable with the 70-80 figure.

Mr. Smith asked if there were plans to rent the space out for weddings or social functions.

Mrs. May asked if there would be any type of dinners or fundraisers.

Ms. Fetyko: We provide food for our members during membership meetings. We wanted an area where, if a caterer brought in food there was a place for prep, clean-up, dish washer, etc.

The only time we would rent anything would be within our membership. For example, if one of the brokers wanted to have a holiday reception for their people they could do that here. It is primarily a benefit for our membership, not for the public. The vision is to provide a place for our congregation of 1300 members to be.

Mr. Abbott: The old kitchen was very commercial. The new kitchen will have a more residential feel.

Mr. Leone noted the application was sent to the County. Is that the best way to get their response regarding the driveway? Would it be better for the applicant to contact them directly?

Mr. Parrish: I don't think it would hurt.

Mr. Dean: Especially since the County is doing the Taft Road project.

Mr. Abbott agreed to speak with Mr. Stelter.

Mr. Leone asked if the Town had an issue with the 30' drive.

Mr. Parrish: I don't think so. It is a little wider than normal but it would allow for 3 wide vehicles there.

Mr. Leone: I would like to see it striped that way with a right turning lane, a stacking lane to turn left and an entrance way. Is 30' wide enough?

Mr. Parrish: 10' lanes are on the narrow side but they do work.

Mr. Abbott was concerned about trucks turns. We have plenty of space to work with and could make it wider if we had to. I think the Town's standard of 22' is too narrow. In my experience, I do a lot of the Dunkin Donut locations, 28' works.

Mr. Abbott reviewed the landscaping plan. The green areas are all mowed grass.

Mr. Smith asked if there was a opportunity to incorporate a rain garden. There is a considerable concern with storm water run off.

Mr. Abbott: We talked about it but have not designed anything. It is possible. The old pylon sign would be removed and replaced with a one that contains a reader board. Would we need a variance for that?

Mr. Leone: Do you meet the setbacks for the location with at least 20' off the right-of-way?

Mr. Abbott: Yes.

The Board felt a variance would not be needed.

Mr. Leone added the sign package should be approved as part of the site plan. We need to talk about your square footage and your reader board. For the reader board, we do not allow any flashing lights, no oscillating lights, and no moving images. You can have a script that changes every 15 seconds. I would like to hear that it includes some community service, for example an amber alert or tax breaks for homeowners.

Mr. Abbott: It would be a two-sided pylon sign. Here are the graphics. The reader board has two lines. The canopy would have GSAR 18" high and GSAR on the building. There would be plantings around the base of the sign.

Mr. Dean: The total square footage of signage is about 36.

Mr. Parrish: The total frontage is 69.

Mr. Leone asked the Board if they felt there was a problem with the reader board. They did not.

Mrs. May asked if the lettering on the building would be lit at night.

Mr. Abbott: That was not discussed but I assume that we might do lit channel lettering.

Mr. Leone: That is not necessarily a problem, but it needs to get into the site plan.

**PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN, PARK FEE DISCUSSION
MIROB ESTATES, SE CORNER OF SNELLER ROAD AT MUDMILL
7 LOTS, IANZUI & ROMANS**

Representative: Hal Romans, Surveyor, Ianuzi & Romans

Mr. Romans reminded the Board the application has already been before them. We had to get the wetlands delineated and we had them flagged. We are not impacting any wetlands. There is some standing water in this area. We have done some minor tweaking of the lot lines. Sheet 1 shows the subdivision plan. Sheet 2 shows the proposed septic system and house locations. The septic system for Lot 7 has been approved. It is the applicant's home. The other systems should be approved shortly.

Mr. Dean noted that Lot 7 was being treated as one parcel. A building permit was issued and that house is currently being built. The subdivision is zoned AG.

Mr. Romans: The lots all conform for area. All setbacks will be adhered to. Lot 7 is the large residual lot of 13 acres. It is encumbered by the wetlands which affects the building area. Both roads are County roads. I have talked with the County about driveway layouts, sending Jim Stelter the original plans. He had us move a couple of the driveways.

The Health Department requires an expansion area for each individual septic system. We show those on the plan. We made sure that each lot had room for ancillary structures. We did a grading plan and erosion control and sediment plan. The water line along Sneller Road is currently under construction.

Mr. Leone: Will all of the subdivision plot lots be done at one time? Is the applicant aware of the park fees?

Mr. Romans: Yes, all the sections. The applicant just needs clarification on what the fees are.

Ms. Cole: I think that it is \$475 per lot. The County's referral came back on March 21st.

Mr. Leone: That includes the lot you are building on.

Mr. Romans: We will have a letter from Jim Stelter regarding driveways for the next meeting.

Mr. Leone: We need to have a public hearing.

Ms. Cole: There is plenty of time to advertise a public hearing for the next meeting.

Mr. Parrish thought that he could be ready by the next meeting. A storm water pollution prevention plan has been prepared. This project is disturbing less than five acres total. As a residential project it does not necessarily have to do the storm water quality and quantity measures. It does not necessarily have to do retention. It is not required through DEC requirements if it is less than 5 acres for residential properties. Instead of erosion control a notice of intent needs to be submitted. I am in the process of reviewing those materials.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Leone made a motion to set a public hearing date for the next meeting, July 20, 2009.

Mrs. May seconded the motion. The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

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

SITE PLAN, SKETCH REVIEW
ALL CUSTOM LOG CABINS, INC., 5731 & 5745 SNELLER ROAD
IANUZI & ROMANS

Representative: Hal Romans, Ianuzi & Romans
David Beckwith, All Custom Log Cabins

Mr. Romans introduced himself and the applicant. The property is roughly 1.8 acres on the northerly bend of Sneller Road. It is currently two tax parcels. One of the parcels has an existing building on it. The existing septic system would be used. The other parcel is vacant. The intent is to use the existing building and existing curb cut. We have already sent a copy of the plan down to Jim Stelter. The vacant lot would have seven display log cabins. The existing building would be used for manufacturing and light assembly.

I show how we would utilize the existing driveway to provide for a truck turn-around. This lane opens up into a new proposed parking lot. We have 15 total parking spaces. The existing building would have few renovations, maybe some overhead doors. We are disturbing 0.3 acres. That would include the parking area and where we are extending the driveway here.

The display cabins typically sit on the ground or on blocks. The area is zoned Industrial.

Mr. Beckwith: Our business is currently located west of Binghamton.

Mr. Leone: Are your displays going to remain? Or are you going to be picking them up, selling them, and picking them up again.

Mr. Beckwith: No, that is not what they are there for.

Mr. Leone: Will they have landscaping around them?

Mr. Romans: I show landscaping and a grass area.

Mr. Beckwith: Our intent is to dress-up the entire property, especially around the log cabins themselves. It is to our benefit to make them look as best as they can. We bring in logs and cut them.

Mr. Leone: What do you do with your spoils—sawdust, end cuts, etc. Where is that stored?

Mr. Beckwith: There is a dump trailer on site that gets hauled off site. Basically, it is firewood. There is very little waste involved with the models. We order the packages in specific lengths.

Mr. Leone: I would like to understand that part of it in some kind of written form. I don't want to find stockpiles of this material that disappears at some unknown time. If it has value, I would want it stockpiled covered, or somehow treated like it does have value. It is a written SOP—standard operating procedure. I want to make sure that the trailers are out of the picture. In the original plan campers were mentioned.

Mr. Romans: No, trailers.

Mr. Beckwith: That is something we would be proposing in the future. For now it is gone.

Mr. Leone: Do you have enough room for the tractor trailers carrying your logs to turn around? Do you have good safety visuals on those turns? I don't know how often your trees come in.

Mr. Beckwith: The packages come in as cut logs—4 x 6 or 6 x 8. They are already milled logs, no bark. They are kiln dried products. There are no raw materials brought in. They are already done at our mill down in Owego. For example, someone wants a 14 x 18 cabin. We already have that in our computers. That chip is cut at the mill and kiln dried. Most of the time all materials are sent to the site where we build them. The fabricating done here will mainly be interior, railings, stairs, etc. We would not do any manufacturing here.

Mr. Leone: Wayne, do you look at this like a pre-fab building?

Mr. Dean: We would look at it like a house, not a modular. I don't believe it would be a modular house because it is not built to state specs or inspected by the Department of State while it is being constructed. We would treat it like any other house.

Mr. Beckwith: The largest model that we make is 1200 sq. ft. We also build 120, a 10 x 12 for a little bunk house for your camp. Our focus is up to 855 sq. ft. We try to stay away from the log homes. You can get up to 3000-4000 sq. ft. which ties up a half a million dollars for a log home, but that is not our focus. Our focus is hunting, fishing and vacation log cabins.

Mr. Leone: Will you do any signage along Route 81? Do you need to get State approval for that? They may have an issue with the lighting on it, etc.

Mr. Parrish, Mr. Romans and Ms. Cole were not sure.

More discussion occurred regarding signage and billboards. The Board noted that the applicant's sign is not a billboard.

Mr. Romans noted the building's frontage as 42' and signage as 24 sq. ft.

Mr. Romans: The display area will not be lit.

Mr. Beckwith: There will be a lamp on the outside of the models, which we normally put on the porches. There will not be any pole or in-direct lighting.

Mr. Smith: Will you have employees here on a regular basis?

Mr. Beckwith: On a part time basis for a while. I would not expect anymore than two employees at any give time until we get a railing system. We usually have 3-4 carpenters working on a railing system. Railings take a lot of time.

Mr. Leone: You need to show where your existing and proposed lighting would be including parking lot and drive areas. Include landscaping. Make sure you deal with the County regarding the driveway.

Mr. Romans agreed.

Mr. Beckwith: We do not use dumpsters.

Ms. Cole noted the subdivision needs to be addressed through Wayne's office. Will this go down to the County?

Mr. Leone: Is there an easement through your property to get to the billboard?

More discussion occurred.

SITE PLAN, SKETCH REVIEW
SEFCU, 8086 BREWERTON ROAD, BARTON & LOGUIDICE, P.C.

Representatives: Chuck White, Barton & Loguidice

Dan Clune, Director of Branch Operations Albany Office

Dan Keleher, Regional Director of Branch Administration

Pat Donegan, Rockland

Mr. White introduced himself and the application team. The property is the old Hanson property, located in front of the Wal-Mart. We have documentation from the property's current manager giving us permission to make this application.

We have a general representation of what the building will look like. The proposal is for a 2696 sq. ft. branch office. It would have two drive-thru teller lanes plus an ATM lane. SEFCU has a local branch on Midler Ave.

As you are looking at the front of the building which faces Route 11, the drive-thru would be on the left. The last partition is not a solid wall, not full height. The base is brick.

From Route 11, here is the northern entrance to the Wal-Mart site. The branch office would sit here in the center of the site. Our primary access to the site for full access would be internal to the Cicero Market road. We are also proposing a secondary right-in only access from Brewerton Road. The site would be paved with parking provided for up to 36 vehicles for visitors and employees. Other improvements include site lighting, drainage improvements and landscaping.

Mr. Leone: My concern is for the stacking of your vehicles on the north side. As they make the turn you have headlights hitting the corner. You need to show us what you are going to do to stop that from happening to drivers sitting at the light trying to make a turn. That is why I asked if the far wall on the drive thru was a full wall.

Mr. White: The parking on the northern side of the site, the angled parking, is intended to be for employees. Those would generally be occupied during business hours. We understand that people will visit the ATM in the middle of the night when the branch is closed. But for a good part of the day, there will be that visual buffer. We do have some landscaping going in. And there are some substantial existing trees that will remain.

Mr. Leone: Where will your property boundary be after you do your exchanges with the current surrounding property owner?

Mr. White: Under today's conditions the existing lot comes down the north side, comes across the front, follows along this diagonal up to the back corner, and comes back across again. Rockland has not purchased the property as of this date, but they would be the property owner. As part of their negotiations with the adjacent land owner SEAYCO, they have negotiated a land swap. That land swap would serve to carve off a portion of the Hanson property on the front, roughly the front edge of the proposed sidewalk. That would be transferred to SEAYCO as well as a narrow strip on this side of the parcel. In turn this triangular piece here would be conveyed back to this parcel.

Several things would happen by doing this. Most importantly the property along the west and north side of the site that would be conveyed to SEAYCO would provide them the physical real estate to build a new turning lane into the site as well as to continue the turning lane up and second lane up into the site on the entry road. When Wal-Mart came in 2003 that was one of the

items that was identified as likely to be required as part of their Phase II buildout.

Mr. Leone: For the record, I am not sure when that is required. I am not sure that it was to be a part of their Phase II. I do not believe that it is required as a part of your project. I think that we should get the right set of minutes to verify that. Does the Board see any reason why it should be tied to this development?

The Board responded no.

Mr. Dean: It was evident to me when I got the final approval for the site it was tied to when the land was available.

Mr. Leone: It is obvious the deal structure that has been cut allows property to be used for that. As a Planning Board why would we want to hold that up?

They do not show a proposed sidewalk along their northern boundary. There is a crosswalk there.

Mr. Smith: The location of the crosswalk takes people out to Route 11. It should cross the access street. There should also be a sidewalk to take people back. We don't want people cutting through the traffic patterns of the bank.

Mr. Leone: They do show a sidewalk going into their building. We can get people to the building, but they would still have to cross the parking lot to get over to Wal-Mart. Should that improvement be a part of this project or should it be a part of the next project?

Mr. Smith: It should be required as the building is built. While the road construction may not be a part of your project, the sidewalk should be there.

Mr. Leone: If we do not take an easement for that sidewalk today for the northern edge from this project, I am not saying that they should be required to build it, when the road is widened I don't want them to say there is not enough room for a sidewalk.

Mr. White: I can not speak for the future owner of the property, but it is my understanding that Rockland is more than willing to provide a strip easement along the northern side of the property exactly for that purpose.

Mr. Donegan: We can include that for final approval.

Mr. White: We are proposing another sidewalk. It would be across the entire front of the parcel. We have shown the last 30-40 feet as future sidewalk due to our concerns about this existing drainage easement. Under the conditions of this project that drainage will essentially remain a hole. We are concerned with building a sidewalk that dead ends right at a drop off. It is not a safe condition. We have shown building a sidewalk to the driveway and the curve ramp on the opposite side. SEFCU understands the Town's concern to have a sidewalk all the way across. The time to build that stretch would be when the next parcel to the south is developed.

More discussion occurred regarding sidewalks.

Mr. Cushman questioned the complexity of the traffic pattern.

Mr. White noted it was similar to the pattern at the Midler Avenue branch, which is very popular. The traffic flow is actually very smooth around the site. You are assuming that everyone goes through the drive-thru. We will take a look at the parking.

The intent for snow removal would be to utilize areas beyond the curb for snow storage. As necessary, SEFCU expects to remove snow from the site.

Mr. Leone: How many parking spaces are required versus the number that you have? How many do you need? The site is packed, so let us not overbuild it.

Mr. White: Based upon SEFCU's past experience with branches of similar size, 35-40 spaces are needed. There would be 10 employees.

Mr. Keleher: I believe there would be 5 teller windows inside. We are assuming that this will be similar to our Midler office, but that branch is bigger. This branch would not have safe deposit boxes. We have about 7000 transactions per month.

Mr. Leone: Where have you gotten with the DOT with your right-in?

Mr. White: That has not been approved. We have had informal discussions with them in regards to the right-in. The response has been favorable. We are prepared to submit the permit application to formalize the review process from the State. The turning lane would continue

a good way beyond. To my understanding it would extend beyond the property boundary to the south. I would have to verify that.

Mr. Dean: The State required the turn lane. They are aware of it.

Mr. White: We understand that it produces more vehicle conflicts within the site. It is viewed as a benefit to SEFCU. If we get it that is wonderful. We would like to request it and hopefully get approval for it.

Mr. Smith: I think that we should ensure that our engineer inspects this upon completion to make sure it is built according to the site plan. The applicant should be aware that there would be an additional fee for the engineer's inspection. The engineer would then send a letter to the Board.

Ms. Cole: I am looking at the letter from the property owner. It says that the property owner is Frank Hanson. On the application it says that the owner of the subject property is the Huntley Irrevocable Trust. I am not sure if the application is correct or if Mr. Hanson has the authority to act on the behalf of the Trust, but it should be clarified.

The other issue is the subdivision. When they do go for the new lot lines it will not meet the bulk regulations for General Commercial. I believe that it does not have enough lot frontage. They would probably need to go for a variance.

Mr. Ed Hanson: I am Frank Hanson's brother. I can state that he is the executor for the estate. I do not understand who is responsible for the road buildout. They are going to give it to SEAYCO for access. Who is responsible for doing all of the work?

Mr. Leone: SEAYCO.

Mr. Donegan: Yes they are. We have made a cash contribution.

Mr. Hanson: Without SEAYCO being here, how can you make decisions like that?

Mr. Leone: I want to make it very clear the decision is nothing more than what was approved as

a part of the conditions of the Wal-Mart site plan approval. When the property becomes available they are to build out the turn lane and what ever other road expansions where required. If through the property swap that property becomes available, the decision for them to do the work was made in 2003.

Mr. Hanson: You are having discussions about sidewalks and this and that. That might not be suitable for SEAYCO who might say that you can not have the back entrance.

Mr. Donegan: We have already negotiated a document with SEAYCO that spells out the terms. Part of us getting access out of the back was exchanging the property out front so that SEAYCO would have the ability to install that road improvement. He did not want us involved in the installation. Instead he asked us for a cash contribution which will be payable to him upon the property transfer. So we are giving him the cash to contribute towards his expenses to install this long road.

Mr. Leone: There is a sidewalk issue for that entrance. There is going to be an easement for it. We want it installed someday. We are not asking for it to be installed today. If that is an issue that has to be decided between two property owners which one is going to cover that debt service, so be it.

Mr. Smith: I think that the sidewalks should be constructed when they do the improvements to the turning lane. It should be one project.

Mr. White: We understand that variances will be required. It was our understanding that the dimension that was not met was lot depth.

Mr. Dean: It needs a 200' depth. It only has I believe 189'. It also needs 100' of frontage.

More discussion occurred about creating a non-conforming lot by doing the property swap, the subdivision. The Board discussed the value of what was being asked for and what was given.

Mr. White: The existing stockade fence is shown which was put up by SEAYCO for the benefit of the Hanson family when Wal-Mart was constructed. That fence will be removed. It is my understanding that SEAYCO will take that and use it elsewhere. We will save the trees that we can on the property. Anything in the central buildout area will not be saved. There will be no impact to the trees along the northern side which are off the property.

Mr. Leone asked about turning radii for fire apparatus, fire and ambulance service and the height of the canopy. Do you have a template which tells how your turning radii meet?

Mr. White: I have not provided a template, but can do that. I will have to confirm the height of the canopy.

Mr. Leone: You will have to watch out for scattered lighting. The lighting at the ATM needs to be reasonable. Mr. Parrish can help you sort through that.

Mr. White: We will meet the minimum standards for ATM requirements. There are some bright spots immediately under the canopy.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Hanson: Have you considered working with Wal-Mart for snow removal?

Mr. Leone: You are right but it is not our responsibility. I think our responsibility is to help design a plan that functions in the weather that we have.

Mr. Hanson asked about the sidewalk.

Mr. Dean responded a sidewalk is 5' concrete.

Tim Murphy: You are talking about a pretty intense use at this site with 35 parking spaces etc. The intersections south of there at Reis and Lincoln are failing. Would it behoove the Board to ask for a traffic study?

Mr. Leone: That goes without saying. It will be required.

Mr. Murphy: That right-hand turn off of Route 11 will be dangerous.

Mr. Leone: Mark do you think that the intersection took into consideration the proposed use on the property already?

Mr. Parrish: I believe that it did, but we can take a look at it.

Mr. Leone: I thought that the likelihood for an entrance off of Route 11 for that site would have been within that traffic study mix. I thought that none of those properties would have access off of Route 11.

Mr. Parrish: I believe that was a condition of the outparcels that were under the control of SEAYCO. That would not necessarily apply to this parcel.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. White: I would like to note that the traffic study done for Cicero Market did include the buildout of these three frontage lots which included for estimating and planning purposes this Hanson parcel. I believe they used restaurant uses for this parcel.

Mr. Murphy felt the Hanson property was not included in that traffic study.

Mr. Leone asked Mr. White to confirm that with Mr. Parrish.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Smith asked the applicant to come back and justify the amount of parking.

Mr. White: I don't know what your time table is for hearing us tonight. I have not had an opportunity to address drainage, landscaping, etc. Are those items that you need to see?

Mr. Leone: The storm water and drainage are an engineering issue. It is a primary function of that. You know that when you turn it over to the County they are going to say do not send anything to our road. Is the entrance road a private road?

Mr. Parrish: It is not a Town road.

Mr. Leone: Are you impacting more than an acre?

Mr. White: No.

Mr. Leone: We talked about lighting. You have a plan here for landscaping.

Mr. Leone discussed the signage package. Would the frontage calculation include the canopy?

Mr. Dean: Yes.

Mr. Smith: Will you have any monument signs or reader boards?

Mr. White: The package includes two sets of signs. This one would be over the door and on the west side of the building facing the highway. There is also one on the south side, the southwest corner where the main entrance is. We are proposing two monument signs, one to identify the front of the site and one on the rear side at the full access drive.

Mr. Leone: Aren't you sharing that entrance drive with the parcel next door? Why wouldn't we want that to be a layered sign? Does it have to be as big as the sign out front?

Mr. White: When the adjacent lot is developed next door, the drive would be shared. It would require some re-configurations.

Mr. Leone: We would want the sign to service both parcels. There would be a sign on each side of the entrance road.

Mr. Donegan questioned having advertising for another parcel on this sign. That would be off premises advertising. We went through this down the road when we did the mini plaza.

Mr. Dean: I would have to look into that.

Mr. Leone: It is like sign pollution. You are going to have a sign on every parcel. Would you want to see a sign on both sides of the driveway? You don't know what that other parcel will hold, but you would save space for it on the sign.

The next step is to get what we believe would be your final plan sent to the County. After today's discussion, you would modify any of parking fields, traffic flow, turn radii and lighting needed.

Mr. White asked for the deadline for County submittals and the variance application.

Mr. Carvel was interested in knowing how much room exists between the employee's parking on

the north side and the north edge of the overhang. Can a vehicle get by and/or under that? It would be outside of the overhang.

Mr. White: We are providing an escape lane with a 15' width. It would not be underneath the overhang.

Mr. Leone: Mr. White needs the turning radii for your trucks.

**PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN, PARK FEES, SEQ
SHIVA ESTATES, GUY YOUNG ROAD
14 LOTS, FISHER ASSOCIATES**

There were no representatives.

Mr. Leone wanted to make sure the Board had received all of the emails that went back and forth regarding the potential phasing issue. Does anyone have an opinion on the phasing itself that you were happy or unhappy with? I want to assure that we have a quorum at the next Board meeting. If we don't we could end up at a point of automatic approval for the subdivision.

Ms. Cole: I had an email from the developer. They intend to be here July 20th and intend to request in writing an extension of the 62 day time frame for you to act on the application before it would be subject to a default approval. If tonight you would be willing to adopt a resolution saying yes you consent to allowing an extension of that time frame subject to them requesting it of you in writing that would be helpful.

Mr. Purdy: The extension helps us right?

Ms. Cole: It helps both of you.

Mr. Smith made a motion to allow an extension of the time frame as stated by Ms. Cole above.

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

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

Mr. Smith: Yes
Mr. Leone: Yes

Mr. Leone asked if there was one phasing option out of the three sent by Mark that the Board approved of.

Mrs. May noted that she sent her response to Mark.

Mr. Purdy agreed with Mrs. May on Phase III.

Mr. Parrish: That would be starting out with the east side.

Mr. Leone: The issue is a hardship on the developer. I don't have a problem with that phase but I think that the developer might with the cost of bringing out the utilities. I do not have a huge problem doing Phase I. It may die in two or three years if it is not built out. I have no problem with taking securities for the Park. I don't know what we want to send to the developer.

Ms. Cole: I don't know that you need to give them direction because you have already agreed to extend the time frame.

Mr. Parrish: We have given them the list of alternatives. They are evaluating those. I think that they are going to come back with what they prefer to do. Then we can see if that works or not.

Mrs. May made a motion to adjourn the meeting. **Mr. Cushman 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 9:37 P.M.

Dated: July 15, 2009

Tonia Mosley, Clerk

