

The Town of Cicero Planning Board held a meeting on **Wednesday, February 6, 2008** at **7:00 p.m.**, in the Town Hall at 8236 South Main Street, Cicero, New York 13039.

Agenda:

- Approval of the January 23, 2008 Planning Board Meeting's Minutes
- Organizational Discussion, Establish Meeting Dates/Times
- Board Meeting Attendance for Student Credit
- Site Plan Revision/Zone Change Recommendation, Island Hollow
- Site Plan, Furniture Row, East Taft Road, Proposed Furniture Row Store, Furniture Row USA, LLC
- Site Plan/SEQR Determination, Lakeshore Road Apartments, South Bay & Lakeshore Road, O. Avraham, Walton Architectural Group
- Final Subdivision Plan, Park (277) Fees, Wallington Meadows Section 6, Wallington Meadows (Near Sections 4 & 5), Ianuzi & Romans

PRESENT:

Patrick Leone, Chairman
Richard Cushman, Board Member
William Purdy, Board Member
Christopher Rowe, Board Member
Sharon May, Board Member
Jason Mott, Board Member
Robert Smith, Board Member

OTHERS PRESENT:

Wayne Dean, Director, Planning & Dev.
Heather Cole, Esquire, Wladis Law Firm
Mark Parrish, P.E., O'Brien & Gere
Charlotte Tarwacki, Town Board Member
Assistant Chief Kevin Purdy, South Bay F.D
Chief Carvel, Cicero Fire Department

ABSENT:

Scott Harris, Ad Hoc Board Member

Mr. Leone noted the locations of the three fire exits and that there are no formal public hearings tonight. This Board recognizes the importance of public input and encourages anyone who would like to speak about an agenda item to do so by raising their hand and being addressed by the chairman. Please use the microphone in the front while doing so. It is our intent to be heard. If you can not hear us please raise your hand.

APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 23, 2008 PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

Mr. Smith made a motion to accept the January 23, 2008 Planning Board meeting's minutes. **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

ORGANIZATIONAL DISCUSSION, ESTABLISH MEETING DATES/TIMES

Mr. Leone made a motion that from this point forward in 2008 Planning Board meetings will be held on the first Wednesday and third Monday of each month unless otherwise noted because of a holiday or Town Hall closing. Pre-agenda meetings will be held on the Wednesday prior to the regularly scheduled meetings.

Mr. Smith asked that clarification of pre-agenda meeting dates and times be added to the motion.

Ms Cole clarified. I think the general intent is for those pre-agenda meetings to start at 3:30 on the Wednesday before the general meetings. Sometimes the pre-agenda meetings do get moved, do get cancelled or do start earlier or later. Any one interested in attending a pre-agenda meeting is encouraged to contact the Zoning & Planning office the day before or the day of the pre-agenda meeting to confirm the actual date and time.

Mr. Leone continued the motion. If any of the regular meetings or pre-agenda meetings get moved, the Zoning & Planning office will forward e-mails to Planning Board members and post notices within the Town Hall. **Mr. Mott 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

BOARD MEETING ATTENDANCE FOR STUDENT CREDIT

Mrs. May: We have a lot of students here tonight. We welcome you and are proud to have you here. In speaking to your teachers at school, you must have an original form. It must be filled out before it can be signed by anyone here on the Planning Board. We usually let you go between 8:15 and 8:30 p.m. Those rules and regulations have to be abided by according to your school.

**SITE PLAN REVISION, ZONE CHANGE RECOMMENDATION
ISLAND HOLLOW**

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

Mr. Leone noted this was a project on Island Road.

Mr. Romans introduced himself and the project. This is an approved preliminary plan for Island Hollow on the south side of Island Road. Joss Farm Way is the entrance into the Crossings on the north side of Island Hollow. Previously, we received a zone change for the whole project to be RM, intending to have the two public roads come out in here. The applicant has been negotiating with Raymond Joss Sr. who owns this parcel in order for us to take away this section of road and having this road come straight through as our second entrance.

Mr. Leone asked if the County DOT approved the site distances. I am assuming that this is a County road.

Mr. Romans: I talked to Jim Stelter at the County DOT.

Mr. Cushman asked for the reason for the change.

Mr. Romans responded this Board always favored coming out with an entrance here. At that time Mr. Joss had no interest in selling any portion of his property. The applicant has been going back and forth with him over time. It makes sense, allowing us to have a better entrance into this subdivision on this side and still have the entrance to the apartments.

Mr. Leone: Where are the power lines? Your entrances would be on either side of the power lines?

Mr. Romans: Yes. We had to be 300 feet from center line to center line. By picking up this .8 acre portion of Mr. Joss' property, we gain that 300' separation. It would be full access. Mr. Stelter said the 300' separation is what the County looks for.

We originally had 43 units, 96 individual lots. This would increase it to 50 units which will help pay for the re-design, etc.

Mr. Leone: The issue is that the bottom half of the property will need a zone change?

Mr. Romans: Yes, the portion that is under contract.

Mr. Leone: We changed the zoning from Industrial to RM on everything but that little section?

Mr. Romans: Yes, these three parcels here. They would not join in with the change.

Mr. Leone: We could have residential property which backs up to some kind of Industrial operation. If a contractor came in and bought it, they could use it as a lay down area in someone's backyard.

Mr. Romans: Yes after site plan approval. These parcels actually meet the requirements for Industrial zoning.

Mr. Leone: Aren't we better off suggesting that the area which is left be changed from Industrial to RM or at least from Industrial to residential? If it went to residential they could expand their house. Currently, those homes are non-conforming. They do not have a legal right to expand their houses.

Mr. Cushman: What is the feeling of the property owners of those three parcels that are still zoned Industrial? Are they willing to change?

Mr. Romans: No. I think Mike Bragman, who is the principal for the development company, can try one more time. He has repeatedly tried. The owners felt it might affect them tax wise and everything.

Mr. Leone: The Town Board does not have to take our direction but I think we have to look at it from a planning aspect.

Mr. Cushman: Could we legally re-zone?

Ms. Cole: The Town Board could do it on their own motion, on their own initiative without an applicant asking them to do that. If the Planning Board wanted to suggest that you could certainly do so. I could forward your recommendation to the Town Board in writing. They would also see it in your minutes.

When County Planning first reviewed this zone change, didn't they suggest that the area

be re-zoned too?

Mr. Leone: They did. I don't understand how the change was not given to the entire parcel.

Ms. Cole: I think it was because, at that time, the property owners were not interested in combining and the Town Board did not pursue it.

Mr. Parrish: I think the best use for that would be single family residential as opposed to multi-family. Unless you were to combine the parcels, they would have to have separate access out to Island Road. You are dealing with three separate tax parcels. Two of those do not have access to the internal road system. It would not make sense to make those multiple residential where you could have an apartment building or multi-family house with multiple driveways coming out onto Island Road. You would want to try to limit the number of curb cuts coming out to Island Road.

More discussion occurred regarding lot size, curb cuts and zoning options.

Mr. Leone: I think we need to do this in two steps. I think we need to make a motion to have the Town Board change the requested parcel to RM. It meets that. Secondly, we want the Town Board to consider changing the entire remaining three parcels that would be surrounded by RM to RM. They have to change the zone first. Then the site plan comes back in to us for approval of that road.

More discussion occurred.

Raymond T. Joss: No, absolutely not. I don't want it to be changed. I don't want to create problems with my uncle or my neighbors. I own a house there where my mother lives.

Mr. Leone: You don't care if the proposed section gets changed?

Mr. Joss: That's right. I don't care if that gets changed. I don't need a war with the rest of the people over there.

Mr. Leone: It could create a new war in the future if...

Mr. Joss: Which is not going to happen because they will never sell their houses.

Ms. Cole: The application before you is only for a portion of that lot. That is what you are going to make a recommendation to the Town Board on, one way or another. And then if you choose to make a second recommendation which would include the other

portion of that tax map parcel and the other non-industrial lots, you are free to do so.

Mr. Leone made a motion to recommend to the Town Board changing, as the applicant has requested, the portion of tax map 54-01-5.3 from Industrial to Multiple Residential. **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: I abstain. I represent a builder who has expressed verbally a possible interest in here.

Mr. Leone: Yes

Mrs. May: We could still make the other recommendation to the Town.

Mrs. Leone: To change the rest of this lot or stop?

Mr. Mott: I think we should honor Mr. Joss and leave it as is. If the property ever sells we can approach that bridge when we get there.

Mr. Leone: Okay. For the record I want to make it very clear that we have set this up to be a troublesome situation with residential home owners living next to an Industrial operation. That could happen tomorrow as a lay down area. By selling one of those lots a contractor could pull back in there and dump all of his crap in someone's backyard. I want this Board to be on record for that.

Your action has been taken. Apparently there will be no more action tonight by this Board.

Mr. Romans thanked the Board.

Mr. Leone: We will see you with your new sketch plan if the proposed zone change goes through.

Mr. Romans: Yes, thank you.

**SITE PLAN, FURNITURE ROW
EAST TAFT ROAD, PROPOSED FURNITURE ROW STORE
FURNITURE ROW USA, LLC**

(SEE ATTACHMENT A: O'BRIEN & GERE REVIEW LETTER DATED 2/1/08)

Representatives: Amy Damin, Clough Harbour Associates, LLP, Al Giannino, Pioneer Group

Ms. Damin introduced herself. Since our last meeting we have made some revisions to the plans. One is the additional landscaping on the back side of the building. We have also changed the storm water pond to outlet directly into the Interstate 81 drainage system. The DOT does have our plan. We are waiting for their comments.

Mr. Leone: It looks like you have raised the site 4-5 feet.

Ms. Damin: We have. There is a culvert at the end of the greenspace at the bottom left hand corner. The culvert goes under 81 at a certain elevation. It ends up being the same elevation that our site needs to outlet at. So, in order for us to be higher than that slope, we need to be at an elevation that causes water to go to the culvert.

Mr. Leone: Is it your culvert? Is there an issue along the 81 drainage that is very flat and was almost reversed? Is this going to drain?

Ms. Damin: Currently, it does not work properly. We are proposing to re-grade the bottom portion.

Mr. Leone: Will the bottom of the pipes make that work? Are you saying you are just going to remove blockage?

Ms. Damin: With the removal of soil to increase the slopes, it would be zero percent.

Mr. Leone: So it is stagnant.

Ms. Damin: Yes. We are improving the current situation but are not creating the greater slope due to the elevation of the pipe under 81.

Mr. Leone: Are you sending more water there, at a different rate than normal?

Ms. Damin: No.

Mr. Leone: Is your storm water detaining it enough so that your rate has not increased?

Ms. Damin: Correct.

Mr. Leone: If we send more water there and it is not working now, we could create a problem on the highway.

Ms. Damin: Right. That is the comment that may or may not come back from the DOT—if they would require one thing over the other.

Mr. Leone: Is there anything driving the original height of this piece causing it to have to go up 5 feet? Do you have to do something with height for a loading dock? Are there any physical features on this building which are causing you to have to raise the entire site 5 feet? Could they be handled in a different fashion?

Ms. Damin: Increasing the out-letting to the culvert causes our pond to be raised in order to meet the elevation. That causes the rest of the site to be raised by that certain elevation.

Mr. Leone: The way the loading dock is installed; does it create an issue for the original height you were working with?

Ms. Damin: As currently shown, they need to be 4 feet because of the slope. It could be. There are a couple of options that we could do in order to maybe work with the site. Currently, 5 feet works.

Mr. Leone: That is a lot of fill. We still have to address these issues. What does it do for the rest of the properties?

Mr. Parrish: This should not affect the rest of the properties. With the improvements it may benefit the existing storm water system. You can see the location of the existing 36" plus or minus diameter culvert that is the outlet of the storm sewer system from the existing plaza. That outlet elevation, for whatever reason, is about 2.5 feet below the invert of the culvert on 81. So, it sits in a hole. It is about half full of debris, the capacity has been reduced. It is in very poor condition. I have not heard of any flooding issues for the parking lot for the existing plaza. So, however that works, it works. It is not something that we would recommend be designed today or approved today. Which is why we are in this situation. Through out the review process we have been working with Clough Harbour to address this issue. This is the point we have reached. Their outlet elevation is the same as the culvert underneath Route 81. That is less than an optimal condition. It will work. But, it is obviously a maintenance issue for the owners of this site and for the DOT.

It is important to understand that this area is in the Village of North Syracuse. The

culvert belongs to the NYSDOT as part of the DOT drainage system. The DOT is going to have to approve the proposed improvements. If they don't and they want to see some sort of slope across the site, this site will continue to come up. The first floor elevation of this building is now about 4 feet, plus or minus, above the elevation of the existing parking lot. The two entrances drives have about a 5% grade which is acceptable. You have about a 3-4' grade change as you go up those drives to get to where the site is.

If they have to raise the culvert more to satisfy the DOT's concerns, the site continues to come up. You would have to consider the visual impacts, what the impacts are of the drives coming in and out, and how it affects the adjacent properties and its drainage. If this does not get approved by the DOT we could have an issue.

We have asked them to go back and look at what is driving the elevation relative to where the outlet is and the site's building.

Mr. Leone: To look at getting a higher elevation without continuing to fill the site?

Mr. Parrish: Yes. We asked them to look at whether or not they really need to.

Ms. Damin: The deepest part of the site would be the truck wells. If the DOT says we have to have additional height, we would like to keep the site at the current elevation and use the truck well in a different manner. Currently, the storm system has to be deep on the site because of the truck wells being so deep to connect. Two options that we have for the truck wells are...

Mr. Leone: Can't you sump those truck wells? Why wouldn't we look at that and get a better slope? Why do you need the DOT to come back and say that a zero percent slope in that drainage ditch is not going to work? It seems to me that you would sump your wells to the pond and be done with it. It does not seem to me that the best approach is to hope that the DOT just lets it go.

Ms. Damin: The client was a little opposed to doing the pumps.

Mr. Purdy: Are those truck wells heated, indoor places?

Ms. Damin: They are covered.

Mr. Purdy: Those pumps won't work. They will freeze up in the winter. I drove a truck for many years and that always happened. It is like a homeowner putting their sump pump outdoors.

Ms. Damin: That was the client's concern.

Mr. Leone: Does zero percent grade on that drainage ditch work? How long is that?

Mr. Parrish: 700 feet.

Mr. Leone: 700 feet with zero percent drainage slope. This that a good design? It is up to this Board to determine that.

Mrs. May and Mr. Smith did not think so.

Mr. Leone: If the DOT accepts this is this Board going to accept it?

Mr. Cushman: What other options do they have?

Mrs. May: What are your thoughts on heating the wells?

Ms. Damin: That could be an option. There is room next to the loading dock to do that.

Mr. Giannino: I am curious to know what the alternative is if nothing is done. We have another 20 acres to develop. How does it work if we don't build anything? If we just leave it as is, what is the current situation?

Mr. Leone: It is what it is. You would have to build up your site 5' before you could construct.

Mr. Giannino: Currently, the system is not functioning properly because it is not being maintained properly by the DOT?

Mr. Parrish: No. It is not a DOT issue per say. For whatever reason, when the storm sewer was constructed, the invert elevation is 2.5 feet below the invert elevation of the pipe that is down stream of it.

Mr. Leone: At this point if there are other engineering ways to do this better, the applicant has a responsibility to that. If they can not get it done, they have to at least show us that we tried and we can't do this.

Mr. Smith: Was that your only option or were there other options we should consider?

Ms. Damin: The other option we discussed was possibly bringing the pipes from the truck wells to that green island space which outlets to the pond.

Mr. Leone: Does that lower the height of your building? Does it cause you to raise the invert elevation?

Ms. Damin: As it currently is now, we would not have to do anything if we had to do anything with the pond.

Mr. Leone: If you bring the pipes from the sump out to the green grass area in the front, then what happens? You have changed nothing. But, can you raise the invert elevation of the discharge point there to get slope to here?

Ms. Damin: We have some leeway at that point, yes.

More discussion occurred.

Ms. Damin: The elevation that we have the property at right now, the building at right now—the approximately 5' of fill—is the minimum elevation we can be at for everything to work. Anything above and beyond that we can leave the building where it is right now. For example, if we do put a slope on the drainage swale, nothing on the building portion would change. Then, those two options: the pumps or relocating the truck wells, those two options would come if an additional slope was required.

The original grade has been raised two feet from what it was before. So, it was 3' of fill before.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Leone: You have some kind of easement for the sign people to get at their sign. Will that show up someplace?

Ms. Damin: Yes.

Mr. Leone: So, on your final plan you will have an easement for the billboard?

Ms. Damin: Yes.

Mr. Leone: The last thing we need to discuss is your overall sign package. I have in front of me what you believe is 806.5 square feet of sign. Our engineer calculated that differently.

Mr. Parrish: Yes, 958.5 square feet.

Mr. Leone: That is for the front of the building, along Route 81?

Mr. Parrish: It is the longer of the two dimensions.

Mr. Leone: That would be 334 feet of frontage. Under code they are allowed one square foot per linear foot of building. They are asking for almost 3 times the amount of allowable signage. That includes the monument which is an I.D. for Furniture Row. Typically, we have approved 2 times the amount.

More discussion occurred.

Ms. Damin: The client has taken off the two Furniture Row signs on both ends of the building. They are looking to do a total of 835, which would be 2.5 times the allowable signage. The signage scale to the proportion of the building does not seem out of place.

Mr. Leone: If you came in with around 700 feet, it would work.

Mr. Smith: I don't have a problem with the signs the way that they are. To the scale of the building and looking at it as an individual project, I don't have a problem with the sign package.

Mr. Leone: We could set a precedent where this Board is approving 3 times larger than allowed. That gets a little tough when you start denying other people the same thing.

Mr. Smith: It is based on individual buildings. The next one may not be this size. It is a large building. Proportionally, it is right. I think it is our job to look at things individually.

Mrs. May: I agree with Bob, according to the proportion of the building. I think the sign package is appropriate. I agree with the 835.

Mr. Leone: It is not 835. It is 958.

Ms. Damin: We would be able to minimize the sign somehow to get 835.

Mrs. May: I would agree to that.

Ms. Damin: So, shorten the monument or shorten one of the other building signs.

Mr. Leone: There are outlets. They have the ability to go to the ZBA.

Mr. Cushman: So 835 is 2.5 times?

Ms. Damin: Yes.

Mr. Leone: Bring your sign package back in that way for final approval and see if it flies.

Mr. Smith: Your biggest problem is the drainage issue.

Ms. Damin: My next question would be conditional approvals?

Mr. Leone: That will not happen until you address the drainage issues.

Mr. Smith: If the state came back and said they were fine with it, I don't think I would be fine with it.

Mr. Leone and Mr. Rowe agreed.

Mr. Smith: To be fair to you, I think you can hear some of the Board saying that even if the State agrees, it is not acceptable to us.

Mr. Cushman noted the Board does have to consider future development on the site.

Ms. Damin: Even if the State says one way or another, or chooses that we increase the slope, the finished elevation of the building won't change.

Mr. Leone: That is fine.

Mr. Giannino: Can I make a suggestion? Maybe we need to turn this into a work session. Maybe we need to re-group and get together with Mark and look at all of the options from that standpoint. Obviously, we have concerns going forward.

Mr. Leone: We agree. Mark, are you working on the contingencies and fee issues as you move forward?

Mr. Parrish: Yes. Because of all of the related issues we have posted a letter to the applicant requesting that they post additional fees for our review. When the Board considers approval I would like to have that in the motion to be addressed.

Mr. Leone noted the County's response. The Onondaga County DOT requests that the applicant remove the existing signal pole located at the intersection of Taft Road. Why is it the applicant's responsibility to take down those poles?

Ms. Damin clarified. That was a misunderstanding the County, the Planning Board and Jim Stelter had. That was clarified the day we received the letter.

Mr. Leone: I want to assure the way you are going to light your monument sign. It needs to be up lighted. I don't want to get glare or spill onto a major highway. That should show up in your lighting plan.

Ms. Damin agreed. The chairs are up lighted, the art piece.

**SITE PLAN/SEQR DETERMINATION
LAKESHORE ROAD APARTMENTS, SOUTH BAY
& LAKESHORE ROAD, O. AVRAHAM, WALTON ARCH. GROUP**

Representatives: William Walton, Mike Gridley and Bob Gamer of Walton Architectural Group, PC

Mr. Walton introduced himself. Our plan is sort of a u-shaped configuration. We have two wings for this building, one of which runs along South Bay Road and is a double loaded corridor apartment wing. It has apartments that look internally and towards the street. A corridor runs down the middle. The other wing is a single loaded corridor on the back side of the building with apartments facing toward the interior of the lot. We are a three story building. We are planning to build this out of concrete. It will be an ICF structure. We plan on 72 total units.

There is a pass through that happens through the building, here at the first floor. The second and third floor close over this. This area here is basically a drop box zone for residents, as an entry. The current height is 8'. We have the potential of adjusting that slightly once we get through the engineering of our building. We have left some structural height in here in order to accommodate that. Our hope is that we will be able to raise that an additional foot.

Mr. Leone: Will that accommodate an ambulance?

Mrs. May: How about a fire truck or rescue truck?

Mr. Walton: From this sheet you can see that it pretty much accommodates all vehicles up to a city bus. Those are around 9'. Ambulances vary. We met with the Fire Department. Do you have a height for your ambulances?

Assistant Chief Purdy: 9 feet, some are at 10 feet. Our rescue trucks are the same height as NAVAC's.

Mrs. May noted that was 9 feet. Two of our ambulances are almost 10 feet, the newer ones.

Mr. Leone: You stated that you do have the ability to raise that a bit. Is there a way to cut that area deeper to get more height?

Mr. Walton: Yes, we do have the ability to cut the fill in that area another possible foot.

Mr. Leone: The potential is to have emergency services, like an ambulance, which will almost want to do a pick-up there. It seems to me that a 10' height would make it work.

Mrs. May added there are antennas on top of these rescue vehicles which make them taller than 10 feet.

Mr. Leone: Is there living space over this?

Mr. Walton responded yes there is.

Mr. Leone: So there is going to be another condo?

Mr. Walton: Yes.

Mr. Leone: Is it possible that that unit could be built differently?

Mr. Walton: There is a possibility of making the first floor a little higher than what we have done. But that gets us into maybe some height limitations because of our overall building height. We did look at the possibility of taking that unit out to making that higher but the problem was that it cuts off that wing. You need to have that pass through that happens on the corridor side.

We met with the Cicero and South Bay Fire Departments reviewing the plans and emergency access to the site and building. They will have a plan for how this building is serviced by emergency vehicles. I think that they understand this road here will get them into the front of the building and that this road here gets them into the back of the building.

Our goal will be to try and raise that. At this point we are shooting for 8-9 feet. We have set up this drive in the middle to be a turn-around. A fire truck would be able to come in and exit out.

Mr. Leone: The mission here is to get as much as we can.

Mr. Walton: We have provided you with a color rendering of a section of the building to show you what the materials are. We are looking at a veneer masonry type product on the lower first floor and some higher sections to create some architectural articulation. The upper part of this project will be stucco because we are using an ICF type block which is a concrete form with foam. This is beige or light brown tone and this is a reddish brick.

Mr. Gamer: The roof would be tan or earth tone, something that compliments a natural pallet.

Mr. Leone: Will that block wall be exposed?

Mr. Gamer: That is just a deep foundation. As opposed to bringing structural fill in we intend to bring the foundation down.

Mr. Leone: Is this going to be elevation to grade that we would see from back there? We won't see that wall?

Mr. Gamer: Correct.

Mr. Walton: We also looked at the site's signage. We took the Board's suggestions about creating multiple signs on the property. We have added an additional sign at the entry point here in addition to the one that we had which was here. We have reduced the size of that sign to 10' instead of 12'. The signs are roughly 100 square feet each.

Mrs. May: You are not going to have anything at that point on the southerly end?

Mr. Walton: No.

Mr. Leone: So you have two signs, one at each entrance.

Mr. Walton: Correct. Two 10 x 10 signs. They will be internally lit with just the letters. Landscaping will be around the bottom. That is not illustrated on the plan, but we do intend to do some landscaping around the sign.

Mr. Leone: The height of your sign is 10' but the sign itself is only 4 x 10.

Mr. Walton: The signs will be made of the same materials as the apartments. Because we are making this a permanent entrance we added an additional light at the Board's recommendation. It is on the opposite side from where the sign is. We have the same pole light fixtures as mentioned last time. Basically, they throw light in one direction.

Mr. Gridley introduced himself. We met with the Fire Department to talk about issues of emergency access. We show a new emergency entrance on the eastern parking bay that we connect directly to Lakeshore Road. It would have a locked gate. The Fire Department would have keys to that. We looked at the grades and think we can accommodate an entrance that would be accessible to emergency vehicles. It would be a paved road. We would have to put an additional culvert in. We have discussed that with the County DOT. As long as it is a gated access point, they don't have any

problems with us. I'm showing the full width of the bay. I think that it helps the turning radius and getting people in there. This would be plowed. We show a single gate.

Mr. Leone: It is an emergency only access. I don't want to see trash trucks coming in and out through there. It is not going to be permitted as an active driveway by the County. It is a bad spot because of the way the corner is designed.

Mr. Gridley agreed. There will be a metal swing gate that we have shown in detail. We can have no parking signage on it; do not enter signage or whatever to make it clear that this is not an entry point. Some other issues related to emergency access were that we got the actual turning radius of the Fire Department's largest piece of equipment and tested that against the geometry of our plan. It worked out fine on our entrances. The only place where we made a modification was that we decided to open up this entire center island. We are proposing grass pavers which would have some grass growing but would allow vehicles to pass over it if needed. We are taking out these parking spaces. There will be no parking on the loop at all. I added them at this end so we have the same number of parking spaces. We will put signage there and stripe the circle as a fire lane or as a no parking area.

Mr. Leone: Will the back service road be wide enough to handle a fire truck if it needs to get back there?

Mr. Gridley: We had a lot of discussion about that with the Fire Department. They felt most of their equipment would approach from the front where the ingress/egress points are. As long as this was accessible to a small squad that could get back there, that would be sufficient. They do not expect to get a truck down there.

Assistant Chief Purdy agreed.

Mr. Leone: What would you like to see the height of the pass through to be?

Assistant Chief Purdy: I'd like it to be 10 feet. For the most part we don't see our rescue truck as having to go under there. We have the access from South Bay and the turn in from Lakeshore. We are comfortable with getting a rescue truck in.

Mr. Purdy: The back of this building is basically four stories high. I understand the 35' grade but that is to the front of the building. The back of the building is going to be 6-8 feet lower than the front. What does the Fire Department do if there is a fire through an exterior wall in the back of the building? My concern is accessibility to the back of the building for some kind of fire truck.

Mr. Leone: Will there be emergency exits along the backside of the building, other than

having to come out of the corridor and going out each end?

Mr. Walton: There is no exit on the backside of the building with one exception. You are exiting out the end of the building here—the stairs—and you are exiting out of the connection where the two come together.

Mr. Leone: I am guessing that the length of that and the height of that do not require by some State Code or other code some center enter/exit/emergency.

Mr. Walton: That is right. We are in our capacity for length of travel distance from one stair to the other. This is also a concrete building giving you a rated wall from the unit into the corridor and it is a sprinkled building. So, the potential for fire is really in the unit which is on the front side of the building, not the corridor side.

Mrs. May: If we have an MCI (Mass Casualty Incident), do you feel comfortable that you will be able to evacuate the tenants safely out both ends of the building?

Assistant Chief Purdy responded yes.

Mr. Leone: Would our code require anything different from the State's code?

Mr. Dean: No.

Mr. Gridley: The Board also requested fencing around the storm water pond, which we have added. The configuration basically comes right off the building, coming around and enclosing this entire area. It has a double swing gate at the point where the paved road ends and the access road begins.

We also show a 6' wood privacy fence along this side to provide some additional screening. The fence will sit on top of the berm. We are also increasing the size of the plantings from 8 to 10 feet. The mature Colorado blue spruce trees will provide the best screening.

Assistant Chief Purdy: At our meeting we asked for an additional hydrant to be added off of the South Bay Road side. That does not show on the plan.

Mr. Leone: Do you have a problem with providing that hydrant as part of your buildout?

Mr. Gridley: I don't think we have a problem with that. We thought we were going to incorporate that with...

Mr. Walton...one of the things that was discussed was the potential—depending upon what our sprinkler line requires—we could bring our sprinkler service through the building and provide a connection at the entrance to the building on that back side so that they could hook-up to that. If it is not an 8 inch, then we would look at doing a separate hydrant to give service on that side.

Chief Carvel: In all fairness to these gentlemen, if we don't ask for the hydrant in this process, we might not be guaranteed to get it.

Mr. Walton: It would be located in the south east corner of the building, closest to the entrance.

Mr. Leone: I am going to call it a hydrant whether it is on the building or not. Then you guys can work it out.

Mr. Walton: We intend to meet with the Fire Department after we move ahead with this project to talk about where our fire alarm panels are within the building, where their call centers will be located, what kind of fire alarm systems are in the building, etc, so that they are a part of that process because of the size of the property.

Mr. Leone: Mark, have the storm water issues been resolved for the most part?

Mr. Parrish: Yes. I have one other issue. I think they will need to re-locate a power pole to accommodate the entrance that was added onto Lakeshore. It is shown in the middle of the entrance and I assume it will be re-located. You also may want to again address where the fill is going.

Mr. Leone: The fill has got to be moved. It is a concern of this Board's. If it is not moved it has to be calculated into your storm water. It becomes part of the site's disturbance. I am assuming the entire extra fill is going to go when you are done and that we are going to see grass and flat area.

Mr. Gridley: The plan that we are showing is the finished project.

Mr. Parrish: We don't want fill to end up across the street.

More discussion occurred regarding spoils.

Mr. Leone: I would like to see the pass through at 10+'. A minimum of 10 feet.

Mrs. May made a motion regarding SEQR. 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. Rowe 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 made a motion to approve the site plan with a revision date of 1/31/08 and a received date of 2/1/08 along with the following contingencies: the minimal height acceptable to this Board for the pass through lane under the building will be 10 feet. A fire hydrant will be provided in the south east corner of the building that is satisfactory to the Fire Department and our Zoning officer. The removal of the light pole/power pole is completed which is currently located where the emergency driveway is shown. Any erroneous fill or left over fill from the project is removed from the site. The site is to be maintained in accordance with the site plan drawing dated 1/31/08. **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

**FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAN, PARK (277) FEES
WALLINGTON MEADOWS, SECTION 6, (NEAR SECTIONS 4 & 5)
IANUZI & ROMANS
(SEE ATTACHMENT B: O'BRIEN & GERE REVIEW LETTER DATED 1/30/08)**

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

Mr. Romans: This is Wallington Meadows Section 6. It is the 10 lots here between Wallington Meadows Section 4 and Section 5. We have a note on the plan that says there are 8 building lots. Two are reserved for when Lavender Lane gets extended to this portion here.

Going through Mark's review letter, he asked for stop signs. After speaking with Chris Woznica's office we added the one stop sign here.

Mr. Smith: What kind of traffic control do you have here for Brandy and Lavender? You are going to have traffic going back and forth through here. It was closed off.

More discussion occurred regarding possible locations for stop signs.

Mr. Romans: Mark's other comments explained that Lots 122, 123, 126-131 have sump connections. That is noted on the plan. This was built according to the preliminary plan. Nothing has changed except this small section of road that is connected in between Lots 4 and 5.

Mr. Leone asked if the erosion control was still in place.

Mr. Romans responded yes.

Mr. Leone: And you will maintain it as Mark's letter says through construction?

Mr. Romans: Yes. This developer has always worked well with the Town of Cicero.

Mr. Leone made a motion to approve the final plan for Wallington Meadows Section 6 with the following addition of two stop signs. One would be at the northeast corner of Brandy and Lavender and one at the southwest corner of Brandy and Whiting. Those contingencies will be added to the final plan. **Mr. Smith seconded the motion.**

The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

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

Mr. Leone: We have the approval of 10 lots. Relative to its location to parks which already exist in the area, I think that we should accept park fees for 10 lots instead of property. **I make a motion** that we accept 10 lots with park fees at \$ 475.00 per lot for a total of \$ 4,750.00 from the developer. **Mr. Smith 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 made a motion to adjourn. **Mr. Rowe 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 9:00 P.M.

Dated: February 14, 2008

Tonia Mosley, Clerk

