

The Town of Cicero Planning Board held a meeting on **Wednesday, January 9, 2008** at **7:00 p.m.**, in the Town Hall at 8236 South Main Street, Cicero, New York 13039.

Agenda:

- 2008 Organizational Meeting
- Site Plan, Tim Horton, 911 North Main Street, Proposed Restaurant, TDK Engineering
- Site Plan, Uncle Bob's Storage, 8239 Thompson Road, Proposed Site Expansion, James E. Fensken, Bryant Associates, P.C.
- Site Plan, Target Plaza Outbuilding, 8063 Brewerton Road, Proposed Multi-Tenant Retail Building, Cicero Associates
- Site Plan, Furniture Row, East Taft Road, Proposed Furniture Row Store, Furniture Row USA, LLC
- Zone Change, George and Barbara Jacobs, Northern Blvd. and Eastman Road, AG to General Commercial Plus, Authorize the Town Board to be Lead Agency

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
Vern Conway, TB Member, Liaison
Charlotte Tarwacki, Town Board Member
Gary Cannerelli, P.E., O'Brien & Gere
Mark Wladis, Esquire, Wladis Law Firm
Tonia Mosley, Clerk

ABSENT:

Scott Harris, Ad Hoc Board Member

The meeting was opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Leone welcomed two new members to the Planning Board: Jason Mott and William Purdy. He asked that everyone note the locations of the three fire exits. There are no formal public hearings tonight. This Board recognizes the importance of public input and encourages anyone who would like to speak to do so by raising your hand and being addressed by the Chair. Please use the microphone in the front of the room. It is our intent to be heard. If you can not hear us please raise your hand.

**APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES FROM
DECEMBER 17, 2007**

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the December 17, 2007 Planning Board minutes as presented. **Mrs. May** seconded the motion.

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

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

Mr. Leone made a motion at 7:05 p.m. that the Planning Board enters into executive session to discuss employment history and appointment of particular corporations to serve the Board. I would like our liaison Mr. Conway to attend along with the attorneys (Ms. Cole and Mr. Wladis), the engineers (Mr. Parrish and Mr. Cannerelli) and Mr. Dean. The attorneys can come in first and then the engineers. **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

Mr. Smith made a motion at 7:50 p.m. to close the executive session and return to the public session. **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

2008 ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING

2008 ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE PLANNING BOARD

Mr. Leone reviewed the appointments for legal and engineering services to the Planning Board and submitted the following letter:

December 27, 2007

Planning Board
Town of Cicero
P.O. Box 1517
Cicero, New York 13039-1517

Attention: Patrick Leone, Chairman

Re: Engineering Services File:101.25439

Dear Board Members:

Please accept this letter as O'Brien & Gere Engineers, Inc.'s request to be re-appointed as Engineer for the Town of Cicero Planning Board. If re-appointed it is our intent to perform the work in accordance with the current fee schedule or as may be set by the Town Board. It has been a pleasure to perform in this capacity and we look forward to providing continued service.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

O'BRIEN & GERE ENGINEERS, INC.

Mark C. Parrish, P.E.
Managing Engineer

Mr. Leone made a motion based upon the request of the O'Brien & Gere letter dated December 27, 2007 that O'Brien & Gere be re-appointed at the same fee schedule basis accepted by the Town Board. **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

Mr. Parrish thanked the Board.

2008 LEGAL SERVICES FOR THE PLANNING BOARD

Mr. Leone submitted the following letter:

THE WLADIS LAW FIRM, P.C.

Attorneys At Law

P.O. BOX 245
5795 WIDEWATERS PARKWAY
SYRACUSE, NEW YORK 13214

HEATHER M. COLE, **ESQ.**
HCOLE@WLADISLAWFIRM.COM

Telephone: (315) 445-1700
Facsimile: (315) 251-1073

(not for service of process)

December 10, 2007

Mr. Patrick A. Leone, Chairman
Town of Cicero Planning Board
Town of Cicero
PO Box 1517
8236 South Main Street
Cicero, New York 13039-1517

Re: 2008 Planning Board

Dear Pat:

Please take this letter as the formal request by The Wladis Law Firm, P.C. to be reappointed as counsel to the Town of Cicero Planning Board. We propose to continue under the same terms and conditions as we presently serve, with the current fee schedule remaining unchanged.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

THE WLADIS LAW FIRM, P.C.



Heather M. Cole

HMC/ke

cc: Chester A. Dudzinski, Jr., Supervisor
Cicero Planning Board

Mr. Leone: For 2008 legal services based upon a letter dated December 10, 2007 from the Wladis Law Firm asking to be re-appointed as counsel to the Planning Board, **I make a motion** that we re-appoint the Wladis Law Firm at the same fee schedule established by the Town Board some five years ago. **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

Ms. Cole thanked the Board.

2008 APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR

Mr. Leone made a motion that in my absence Sharon May serve as Vice-Chair. **Mr. Smith seconded the motion.**

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

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

2008 PLANNING BOARD ATTENDANCE REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Leone made a motion regarding organizational attendance requirements for the Planning Board. Ms. Cole read:

RESOLUTION Minimum Attendance Standards for 2008

WHEREAS, the Town of Cicero Planning Board desires to establish minimum attendance standards for its members in order to ensure to the extent reasonable that a quorum of members will be present for each regularly scheduled meeting date.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS RESOLVED as follows:

1. Each Board Member, in order to remain in good standing, shall attend at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the regularly scheduled meeting dates of the Planning Board.
2. Each Board Member shall take all reasonable efforts to inform the Chairman of the Planning Board or the Zoning Office of any meeting at which he or she will be unable to attend. Such notice will be provided as early as possible.
3. If a Board Member is unable to attend at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the meetings in any given calendar year, he or she is expected to tender a resignation letter to the Chairman.
4. Upon receipt of a resignation letter, the Planning Board shall, by majority vote, determine whether to accept or reject the resignation letter. In reaching its determination, the Planning Board shall consider the circumstances under which the resignation letter was tendered and any other circumstances germane to the issue.
5. In the event of extraordinary circumstances, a Board Member who contemplates being unable to attend at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the

meetings shall submit a written request for a leave of absence of up to six (6) months, along with an alternative resignation letter. The Planning Board shall either grant the leave of absence or accept the resignation letter depending upon the circumstances of the request.

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

**SITE PLAN, TIM HORTON, 911 NORTH MAIN STREET
PROPOSED RESTAURANT, TDK ENGINEERING**

Representatives: Aaron Falkenmeyer, P.E., TDK Engineering Associates, P.C.
Jack Krisanda, Tim Horton's

Mr. Krisanda gave a brief synopsis of Tim Horton's. Tim Horton's has been in existence for about 40 years. We are a coffee and pastry company out of Toronto, Canada. We have approximately 3,325 stores across the United States and Canada, the majority of which are in Canada. We hope to push into the Syracuse, Utica and the northern tier market.

This store would have a drive through. We look at it as a cross between Dunkin Donuts and Panera Bread. You will find a comfortable atmosphere while eating in the building. The tables have a honey-oak finish with non-attached chairs. You are served on china. However, the majority of our business is done via the drive through. We have a set time of 45 seconds at a drive through window. From the time you make your order and get to the window, you are only at the window for about 45 seconds. We do add an extra car or sometimes two cars to the length between the order board and the window to speed things up a little bit.

The site is appealing to us because of the morning traffic. We do 85% of our business between 6-10 a.m. We are a 24 hour operation. The rest of the day is hit or miss depending upon the traffic. We do have a lunch menu, a lite-fair menu similar to what

Wendy's has since we were part of Wendy's at one time. We have a soup and sandwich menu which includes chili.

The Town wanted an easement across the back in this area for a road. We have talked to our neighbor asking for an easement across. Unfortunately the funds they were looking for were in excess to what we could actually pay to make this profitable. However, we are willing to leave this area back here open for when the Town does gain access to that area. That area would remain free of anything that would inhibit a road from traveling across. We just could not make a deal with our neighbor but we will leave it for the Town. I assume that would be satisfactory to grant an easement without argument or cost. As far as we are concerned, it would help us out as well and we are more than happy to do so. I know that would eliminate some of the traffic that clogs up that area.

Mrs. May stated the traffic there is horrendous to get out and to make a left onto Route 11 heading north.

Mr. Krisanda: We are looking for the traffic that goes south, the traffic going to work.

Mr. Leone: To the south is the new Copper Top Tavern re-occupying the former Red Lobster. That restaurant never came in for site plan and I am not aware of a previous site plan. Had it come in you probably would have had the easement across the back. How is the easement from there out controlled to Route 11?

Mr. Dean: They own that themselves.

Mr. Leone: So, the Town does not have an easement across there?

Mrs. May noted the back entrance to the Copper Top from Bear Road.

Mr. Leone noted Bear Road is a county road. Only one public access is needed to a site. We would like to see an easement across the back of all of these lots. For the future if we have the ability to connect north and south the easement would already exist.

Mr. Krisanda agreed. It is in the plan and we will show that on the plan. When it goes into the official record it will be set. You will have access.

Mr. Leone asked the applicant to speak about the staging of the drive through. Give us an example of how the site will work. Have you talked to the DOT yet?

Mr. Falkenmeyer: We have not.

Mr. Leone: It is in your best interest to do so. As soon as you are comfortable with the site plan, we will get it to the County. The County will talk to us about the DOT's position.

Mr. Krisanda: It is my understanding that we do have that dialog open, but have not received a response.

Mr. Falkenmeyer introduced himself. The site, when compared to what we are proposing, has minor changes. We are proposing a 2400 sq. ft. restaurant with 29 parking spaces. Two of those parking spaces would be handicap accessible. We are proposing a drive through access along the southern edge of the property with a 16 car capacity.

Mr. Leone: Stacking for 16 cars?

Mr. Falkenmeyer: Correct.

Mr. Krisanda: There have been changes in Tim Horton's policy over the last few years. One of the reasons for change has been traffic getting out into the road. They look at stacking as many cars in the queue as possible. The current standard is 15. Here we have one extra car we can work with. Our goal is to keep any traffic impediment on our site and not in the road. To not interfere with traffic, our goal is to keep the stack on our property.

Mr. Leone: How does that work for customers getting into a normal parking space and doing a walk in? Do the cars encumber any of the access points?

Mr. Falkenmeyer: It basically follows the western perimeter of the property, leaving the interior of the site for pedestrian access.

Mr. Krisanda noted safety was an important factor. We do not like to have pedestrians crossing over traffic.

Mr. Smith asked about campers and trailers. We get a lot of Canadian visitors. The area looks tight.

Mr. Krisanda noted the area in the back that we are leaving for the easement will be open. Someone could easily turn around in there and get out. Someone getting stuck in there should not be an issue. There should be enough room for an RV to do a three point turn to get out. Also, the curbing here could be opened up to allow someone to get out if they had to. That is something we are looking at.

Mr. Leone: If you have a stack of 16 cars and someone does not want to wait, you have to open it up.

Mrs. May: You mentioned that you are going to have 29 parking spaces. How many spaces does the site have currently? Have you added or deleted any?

Mr. Falkenmeyer noted what was on the survey. It is hard to say.

Mr. Leone: You are not retrofitting the site. You're talking about demolishing and rebuilding. So, the site will be modified.

Mr. Krisanda: Retrofitting the building was too expensive. The current building did not fit our needs. You could not do a drive through.

Mr. Leone asked for the total number of seats in the restaurant.

Mr. Krisanda responded 36 seats.

Mr. Leone: Mark or Wayne, is it typically two-to-one for restaurant seating? If there are 36 seats should there be 18 spaces plus some handicap?

Mr. Dean: I am not sure what we have used but that sounds reasonable.

Mr. Krisanda stated Tim Horton usually designs for about 24 parking spaces for a restaurant that is 2400 sq. ft.

Mrs. May: What is your busiest time for sit down customers, noon?

Mr. Krisanda: The lunch menu is not as busy as we would like. We are working on that. Between 8:30 to 9:00 most people are on their way to work and have gotten their morning coffee. On the average you are looking at around 10-11 cars in the parking lot at any one time. You can add 6 cars to that for employees.

Mr. Leone asked about snow storage.

Mr. Krisanda: We have a snow removal program for what we can not stack in the area. Since the rear portion is an easement that is not being utilized, that area would be used for snow storage.

Mr. Leone asked if there were any issues with storm water.

Mr. Parrish responded possibly. We will have to look at the storm water. Currently there is no a point discharge from the site. It is essentially sheet flow. They show level spreaders which look like it is draining to a low area on the adjacent property. I do have some concerns about that since we do not have a defined outlet from that area. If we are increasing the volume of run-off ponding might frequently occur on the adjacent properties. We will take a close look at that to see what the effects are. I would like to see if we could find some way to get a positive drainage outlet to an existing storm sewer system from this area.

Mr. Falkenmeyer: It is essentially the same site plan. The impervious features such as asphalt paving, concrete, sidewalks and the building—the total of these will result in a net effect of a zero increase of impervious area. Therefore the total run-off from the site is essentially zero. So, we have not left any provisions for managing quantity. I think Mark and I would agree on that.

However, there is an existing drainage easement on the western property line that goes to the north. I have walked that. As Mark pointed out, there is a low area in the back. It is extremely choked off. It looks like up behind the Pizza Hut property there is a 36” diameter CMP culvert that does come back out to the east to Route 11. This might be a maintenance issue.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Leone: You have to address snow storage. We need to understand how someone would get out of this drive through line if, for example, there was an emergency. You have no room on either side. There is not a secondary drive aisle to squeeze someone through. What is the width of the drive aisle where you have two-way traffic? Can the building be moved to accommodate an extra lane or half of a lane? I can see someone getting into this line by mistake, thinking that it was an exit.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Smith: You don't show any sidewalks in front of your establishment, along Route 11. We have required sidewalks along Route 11 for the last year and a half.

Mr. Krisanda: That is not a problem.

Mr. Leone: You have lighting issues that have to be addressed. We will need to see a lighting plan and a detailed landscaping plan. You have the setbacks.

Mr. Parrish: I would like to get some direction. What type of green area would you like to see in front of the building from the road right-of-way to the beginning of the parking area?

Mr. Leone: It has been 20-25 feet. What do we have?

Mr. Parrish: I think this is only about 10. Also, the side setbacks seem to be close, probably in the range of 3-4 feet, 3 on the north and 4 on the south. Will that be acceptable?

Mr. Leone: We have been looking for 5 feet on each side. It's a design criterion to give us a little more grass space. You have no place to throw snow.

Mr. Krisanda: We do have the limits of the site itself. We are limited with the width of the site.

Mr. Leone understood. But, just because there are limits we can not allow you to overbuild the site. You still have to function within the parameters of the site. Some of this might require a little creativity to do everything that you want to do.

Mr. Falkenmeyer: If snow removal is an option that we want to pursue, what would you like to see?

Mr. Leone: I think that you have some space back there for some snow storage. Based upon your site design, I don't know how you would get it back there.

Mr. Krisanda: The curbing has to be addressed. It would also eliminate the inability to get in and out of the drive through. Striping may work in some cases where curbing does not.

Mr. Leone: I do want access, whether or not it can be used, to the north and south. That easement area needs to be left unencumbered. I understand if snow is to be stored there when it is not being used. You have a nice project here. I think that as you move and restructure your site, you are going to meet the needs of what this Board is suggesting and still have a well functioning restaurant. What is the width of the drive between your sidewalk and the parking area?

Mr. Dean: I believe drive aisles require 22 feet.

Mr. Falkenmeyer: 30 feet.

Mr. Leone: That could make your drive aisle on the southern boundary more usable for a car to get by.

Mr. Krisanda: That is not a problem.

Mr. Parrish: One other thing is signage. You will need to apply the 20' setback for your sign in the front. As far as the total square footage, you have 35 feet of building frontage. It looks like the pylon sign you are proposing is 50 square feet. It also looks like you have three wall mounted signs, at 54 square feet each for a total of 212 square feet. You are allowed 35 square feet.

Mr. Krisanda noted this was the standard sign package we put out.

Mr. Leone: You might be able to do that on each corner. You may decide one sign is more important to be of size, and can cut down the size of the others. We are not counting your menu boards or directional signs as signage.

Mr. Parrish: Typically this Board allows 200%, which would give them 70 square feet to work with.

Mr. Smith: Is there an overhang in the drive through?

Mr. Krisanda: There was an awning. The designers took that off and stopped doing that approximately 4 years ago.

Mr. Leone asked for landscaping around the sign up front.

Mr. Falkenmeyer: This landscaping in the front is not going to fly. After looking at some of the grading issues we will have, those plantings would probably not survive.

Mr. Leone: Landscaping as a package is important to this Board. You are trying to get a complete site application, one that this Board can send to the County. The County then has 30 days to respond. For us to get this going we need a complete application. To the best of your ability get your landscaping plan of what you believe will be there, your building if it is going to move, your drive through, the width of your drive where it impacts the street, your set backs, your traffic movement on site, sidewalks, lighting and your curbing all need to be addressed. I don't view what I have in front of me as a complete application.

I will ask the Board if the applicant gets a complete application in before the next time we meet, and I think that it is fairly complete; does the Board give me authorization to release it to the County?

The Board responded yes.

**SITE PLAN, UNCLE BOB'S STORAGE
8239 THOMPSON ROAD, PROPOSED SITE EXPNSION
JAMES E. FENSKEN, BRYANT ASSOCIATES, P.C.**

Representative: James E. Fensken, P.E., Bryant Associates, P.C.

Mr. Parrish submitted the following letter:

January 2, 2008

Planning Board
Town of Cicero
P.O. Box 1517
Cicero, New York 13039-1517

Atten: Patrick Leone, Chairman

Re: Uncle Bob's Self Storage Site Plan Review
File: 0101.25439.288

Dear Board Members:

We have reviewed the following materials in regard to the above referenced project for compliance with Town Code requirements relative to Site Plans and effect on Town utilities and roads:

1. Cover Sheet dated December 10, 2007
2. Existing Site Plan dated December 10, 2007
3. Grading Plan dated December 10, 2007
4. Proposed Site Plan dated December 10, 2007
5. Proposed Details dated December 10, 2007
6. Survey Plan dated December 10, 2007
7. Drainage Design Report dated April 2006
8. Lighting Plan dated October 5, 2007.

Bryant Associates prepared items 1 to 7 and Apex Consulting prepared item 8.

The 13.62-acre site is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of South Bay Road and Thompson Road. The site contains an existing self-storage business with associated site improvements. It is proposed to construct a new 15,525 square feet self-storage building and modifications to the site improvements. The site is zoned Industrial. Our comments are as follows:

1. Stormwater runoff from the project area is tributary to drainage facilities on the site and a culvert under Thompson Road. As the project disturbs less than 1-acre of land a NYSDEC SPDES Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities is not required for the project. Stormwater runoff from the site will be directed to the existing drainage facilities or a detention area located along Thompson Road. The project will not significantly affect stormwater runoff patterns but approval for the discharge to the drainage facilities along Thompson Road should be obtained from the Onondaga County Department of Transportation (OCDOT).
2. The Board should review the landscaping, lighting, signage and architectural elevations with the Developer. The following are comments regarding these issues:
 - a. The additional lighting consists of wall packs on the new building and appears reasonable. However, the TWH 175M light fixture should be replaced with a fixture that provides IES full cut off distribution similar to the TWAC 100M fixture that is also being utilized.
 - b. Vegetation and a block wall currently screens views of the site from the adjacent roads. The vegetation is to be removed to accommodate the site improvements. The Board should review the architectural elevations and screening with the Developer to confirm they are adequate.
3. The site is located within the Cicero Sewer District. A note has been placed on the Plan indicating no additional sanitary sewer facilities are necessary for the project.
4. The site is located within the Gillette Road Water District. A note has been placed on the Plan indicating no additional water facilities are necessary for the project.
5. The site has frontage on Thompson Road and South Bay Road, which are County highways under the jurisdiction of the OCDOT. Access to the site is provided from an existing curb cut onto Thompson Road. The Plan does not show any modifications to the site access.
6. The northern portion of the site contains a 100-year floodplain as identified on the 1994 FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps but the site improvements is outside the limits of this area.
7. The northern portion of the site contains a State Wetland as identified on the New York State Freshwater Wetland Map and a Federal Wetland as identified on the National Wetland Inventory Map but the site improvements are outside the limits of these areas.

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,

O'BRIEN & GERE ENGINEERS, INC.

Mark C. Parrish, P.E.
Managing Engineer

Mr. Fensken introduced himself handing out updated information. We were last here in May of 2007.

Mr. Leone asked what is the expansion total. What exists on the site now and what are you expanding on the site?

Mr. Fensken: What is out there now is an approximately 20,000 square foot self storage facility with open garage door lockers. They are proposing a 15,525 square foot climate controlled building. It would be several door entrances. You would enter the lockers from inside the building.

Mr. Leone: When you were in we talked about the aesthetics of the building in the corner.

Mr. Fensken: I don't think that the Board had a feeling for what the site would look like at the last meeting because we did not have any visuals. Screening and landscaping would be addressed at this meeting. We have not made any landscape changes at this point.

The materials I received for the May 2007 meeting did not match the buildings that are currently here. The plan is to make the building the same color as the buildings that are there now.

Mr. Leone: I could not tell you the color of the current buildings because I can not see it. I see your stone wall, which is acceptable. This is a premier corner in our Town. Unfortunately, traffic gets stopped there for a long time. They get to take in all of the aesthetic qualities. We will be looking for some reasonable architectural features. Is this the typical design for your sites?

Mr. Fensken: I personally can not be responsible for the design. I am more responsible for the site development. But, from my understanding, typically the type of building that Uncle Bob's puts out are the metal frame buildings with the metal roofs.

Mrs. May commented that this looks like an oversized shed. The style, shape, color, etc. is not aesthetically appealing. If I were parked at this light, I would have to think twice about going into the business because of what I am seeing visually from the outside.

Mr. Smith added that the current vegetation on the corner hides the vehicles, boats, etc., stored outside. We don't see much of them now because of the way the site is laid out. We would get a chance to see all of those things with this wrought iron fence design.

Mr. Fensken: I believe that was a concern the last time we were in, seeing the back part of the facility. With this simulation, yes you can see through the fence. But, the new structure will hide the back portion of the facility.

Since purchasing the site, the owner has upgraded it. They have repaved the lot and repainted all of the buildings. If I put up some type of screening or landscaping would that be feasible?

Mr. Leone: You are in an Industrial area. The zoning is appropriate for your storage facility. The facility is on a high traffic corner. It does not need to simply look like a shed or manufactured building. You could change the façade a little to make it look pleasing and welcoming. It could be something that has fake windows. You could add some berming, possibly a grassy knoll or pine trees, to break up the building's characteristics. Whether or not the wrought iron fence is the best way to go or the Board wants to see additional masonry area carried through---you might be able to leave the building's façade because it is masked.

My guess is that Uncle Bob's or the new corporation has some other designs. Again, the issue is not the functionality of the site. You have the right, and this Board will work with you to allow you to put the appropriate amount of storage on this site. But, it is also this Board's responsibility to make it as appealing to the general characteristics of that neighborhood or the people passing through there as much as possible. We would ask you to work on that feature.

Any additional lighting put on this building on the road side as well as the interior has to be addressed. I don't know if you are looking for any additional signage. You must assure that all of your setbacks are appropriate and still have room for snow storage.

Mr. Fensken agreed. We have no additional signage and have submitted a lighting plan. I believe we have satisfied all of the comments that have come across thus far. This is good input for me that I can relate to the owners.

More discussion occurred regarding visuals and the line-of-sight from various locations.

Mr. Parrish: We do have one lighting fixture that we would like them to change out.

Mr. Fensken: I believe we have switched that out and forwarded it to you.

Mr. Leone listed items the Board would be looking for. Make sure your setbacks are within reason. We have talked about 20-25' of greenspace beyond the state's right-of-way and what you can do to break up the building.

Mr. Fensken: I know that we will not be able to add another brick wall there because of drainage problems. We are limited to the amount of grading we can do without getting into an issue with the County's right-of-way.

Mr. Leone: You need to work with the site that you have. Your buildout maybe too large for the site if you are running into conflicts with drainage or other issues. Look at it and see how you can best address that. We are here to work with you.

More discussion occurred.

**SITE PLAN, TARGET PLAZA OUTBUILDING
8063 BREWERTON ROAD, PROPOSED MULTI-TENANT RETAIL BUILDING
CICERO ASSOCIATES**

Representatives: Andy Hunt, Cicero Associates
Bruce Letts, C&S Engineers

Mr. Hunt introduced himself. We are the developers of the brand new Target in Cicero. We are here tonight to look at the continued execution of the development plan we conceived with that approval. This building would be located on one of the outparcels in front of the Target, fronting on Route 11. It is the parcel directly north of the main entrance to the existing site. The building is relatively small, 10,800 square feet. We expect it will contain between three and four tenants. We have attempted to incorporate the comments from the pre-agenda meeting.

Mr. Letts noted one of the comments at the pre-agenda meeting was the addition of taller and more varied vegetation. This revised elevation shows the impact of the taller trees.

Mr. Leone: We had a pre-agenda conversation with the developer and the engineer. We felt that the back of the building, which faces Target, needed to be a little more architecturally pleasing so that it would not look like a shipping entrance. They have worked with the façade and vegetation there. We asked them about an entrance sidewalk coming off of Route 11. They were also going to sort out some information about a possible bus stop or bus route.

Mr. Smith had a question for Mr. Hunt. When you did the Target you put the sidewalk in. At that time you agreed to maintain the sidewalk. You have removed the snow from the parking lot but I can tell you that during the last snow storm nothing was touched on the sidewalk. We had your word on that and I know that your word is good.

Mr. Smith thanked Mr. Hunt.

Mr. Hunt: Okay. That has fallen through the cracks then because I know that we have been mowing and everything. It is one of those things that if you are not driving by the site every day, you would not notice. I am glad you brought it to my attention.

Mr. Letts: In response to the pre-agenda meeting we have added the sidewalk that connects from the existing sidewalk on Route 11 to the back of the parcel on the site plan. We now show a monument sign in the island and the front parking. Again, we added additional high area landscaping in the back as well as more varied landscaping in the front. We have widened the entrances here to facilitate traffic circulation.

When we did the Target parcel we also considered sewer, water, drainage, etc. for this parcel. Therefore, this project will just connect to the facilities that we left under the original construction. Storm water management has already been calculated so that should not be a problem. We will have sewer laterals and water taps for the parcel as well.

I talked with Richard Manatin from Centro. I sent him a letter back when we did Target and did not get a response. I called him explaining that we were going to develop this outparcel. He was familiar with the area. His response was that they do not have time in their schedule to service this parcel. I asked him about our indent on Route 11 for a bus pull off. His response was if buses pull off there sometimes they would not be able to get back out to Route 11. He would rather block the lane. I asked him if I should contact SMTC for their opinion. He said SMTC would just refer me back to him. We can do whatever you would like, but that is what he told me.

Mr. Leone: This is a major stop. You have Wal-Mart and Target across from one another. It should be a required bus stop. I would say that it should be the intent of this

Planning Board and the Town to suggest that this should be one of Centro's service stops. We need to, with some reasonableness, request that from them.

Mr. Hunt stated we stand ready to react to whatever we can generate from them.

Mr. Leone: Are you willing to give us that pull off area? I think that is what is needed there.

Mr. Hunt: We have a well engineered path for travel. A bus could turn in and make a stop inside. I understand that is the answer we got from them and maybe there is more going on. They did mention that they prefer, when they stop in front of a place, to block traffic so that they have a line to keep going. We are open to either way.

Mr. Leone: I think it needs to be addressed from this Board or the Zoning Office.

Mrs. May: Not only Centro but the Senior Centers that also have buses which take their residents around area stores like Price Chopper, Wal-Mart and Wegmans. If there is a spot there, they would probably utilize it as well.

Mr. Purdy suggested a lot of it is scheduling. If you have a pull over on the side you are still going to add ten minutes to that run for the day. People at the other end who used to get the bus at a quarter after would now have to wait until eighteen after. People would get irate and start calling. That is why Centro does not want to get out of a rhythm.

Mr. Leone asked if there were tenants for this space.

Mr. Hunt: We are not in a position to announce any tenancies there, but we do have a lot of interest. No restaurants currently, only retail. We continue to work on free standing restaurant users.

Mr. Letts: As Andy said, it is a 10,800 square foot building. The total parcel is about two acres. This will be a leased building so we would not have to subdivide.

Mr. Leone asked about pedestrian entrances.

Mr. Hunt: The detail is all on the front. Customer entrances are predominantly down in the front. The building is designed for flexibility. It has the flexibility to side load. This area is designed for one large user that would have a single entrance here. You can see that the parking is a little lighter on this side than it is on the north side.

Mr. Leone asked about the façade.

Mr. Letts: We added the brick pilasters and the band and really broke it up. We put the landscaping in. We show the brick enclosure for the dumpster.

Mr. Leone: Do you have the room for your turn movement by widening the driveways? Do you feel comfortable with that?

Mr. Letts: Yes.

Mr. Leone: You will have a pylon sign in front with individual signs for each space. Are you looking at those signs for approval as part of your original package? The tenant would then understand exactly how much sign space they have allotted to them.

Mr. Hunt: The monument sign is 6' tall. We are looking for approval for that. For the building's signage since we don't have any specific tenant package coming in yet, we are not looking for it. We anticipate being able to live within the guidelines.

Mr. Leone: I am suggesting if you look at the package overall and you key in some space up there, this Board can work with you. If not and you get your pylon sign, you will be back into the Zoning Office for each case. If your allotted signage is over the total square footage of the frontage of the building, including signs on the back, front, sides, etc, you will need to go to the ZBA for a variance. You would have to come back in for every single sign.

More discussion occurred regarding signs.

Mr. Hunt: We will take a hard count and come in with something more definitive.

Mr. Parrish had a question regarding buffering and setback issues. The setback for the property line of the parking lot is 2.5' along the property line that goes along the entrance. Along the south westerly side they are paving right up to the property line. Are we looking for a minimum of 5 feet there?

Mr. Leone: Five feet from property line to property line, but not for frontage.

Mr. Parrish: Twenty from the front.

Mr. Leone: That would change if you are going to put a pull off there. The pull off would use some of that right-of-way in that area. Once you and Mark are comfortable that you have a complete application, we can send it to the County. You must also look at snow storage.

Mr. Parrish: I don't think I have heard any substantial changes that the Board has requested. I think we can probably send in this particular plan. It is up to the Board.

Mr. Rowe: I think it should go to the County. The bus stop is going to be one place or the other.

Mr. Leone: Is the rest of the Board comfortable with this package going down to the County.

The Board agreed.

Mr. Leone: Wayne with that we are suggesting release of this to County Planning. That should get you moving faster.

Mr. Hunt thanked the Board. I will get on that sidewalk snow issue right away.

The Board thanked Mr. Hunt.

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

Representatives: Amy Damin, Clough Harbour
Larry Fore, Furniture Row

Ms. Damin introduced herself and Mr. Fore. He can answer your sign and architectural questions. The site has basically stayed the same. We have gone through some reviews with Mark as well as the County in doing traffic. We have realigned this intersection to make it the requested, traditional four-way intersection. We have done truck turning movements to make sure the site can be accommodated by the semi trucks that will make deliveries and fire trucks.

Mr. Leone reviewed the site plan thus far. This is a project that crosses the Town of Cicero and Village of North Syracuse boundaries. The Village has given us the authority to act on their behalf through the design criterion and buildout of the site plan. We were concerned about the overall buildout of the Air Park. These people have accommodated us with an overall traffic impact study of which a portion was assessed to Furniture Row. The traffic in the area and some of the intersections fail as they exist now because of the buildout of Wynnit, the DOT, Deluxe Checking, etc. We have made it clear and have approved the subdivision of this parcel that Pyramid has with an idea of some of those other projects that Pyramid wants to build. Benderson has come in with a possible buildout. These traffic impacts need to be mitigated.

The Board has come to a general agreement that the number of trips generated by Furniture Row, their traffic, is a non-issue. We allowed this project, under the scope of things, to continue. Clough has re-designed the intersection we were concerned with. It seems much better. The other issue we asked to be addressed is the façade. Our concern was that the back of the building look a little better than the standard back of a building.

Mr. Fore: The area you see, the down ramp of the dock, has now been covered with a roof. We have screened it with a wall all the across. We screened the dock, which was already enclosed. We have continued with the pilasters.

Furniture Row is a group of stores that are all open on the inside.

Mr. Leone: It is a multiple façade. But any of those entrances will get you to the same place.

Mr. Fore: Yes. You walk in and it is a wide open area. You can go wherever you need to go to satisfy your furniture needs.

Ms. Damin: The loading area is hard to visualize. We are trying to take these pilaster sections that are kind of popping out, and bringing them all the way around 360 degrees. We are also adding that stone to the exterior.

Mr. Fore: This is a 53,440 square foot building. 70%, the front portion, is retail. The other 30% is warehouse. Turning those wing walls out on the dock satisfies the snow and rain from going in on the truck ramp. Another thing that it does is when there is a truck sitting in the ramp; you only see the nose of the cab and a little bit of the trailer when coming in from Taft Road.

We have done a photometric study. The building looks super at night. We could take each one of the pilasters here and add a small wall sconce with up or down lighting. This would give it a shadow feature. We did add the stone, carrying it all the way around, keeping the feature in the front and back. Inside the building are 4 large 16' diameter fans to help air circulation in the summer and heat circulation in the winter.

We want all of our customers in the front of the building. That is why there is very little parking in the back. We could also add some trees, or a little lighting.

Mr. Parrish recommended down lighting.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Fore: We are going to modify or sign package a little bit. We tried to negotiate with the billboard people to use the on site billboard for advertising. We are having some difficulty. Now Legal is asking for a reader board to eliminate some of the other signs on the building.

Mr. Leone: We have used reader boards. We have control over the speed your message would change. In this instance it may be an issue because you are on a state highway and the NYSDOT would want some type of control. You might not get that reader board.

Mr. Fore: A number of years ago we commissioned a piece of art work, a chair sculpture, for our national image. It is a stack of four chairs located beside our monument. At night the monument looks as if those letters are hanging there. We have pictures of what it would look like in daylight hours and at night. The letters Furniture Row is all that you see lit at night. Again, the chair sculpture is art work. There is no way to define square footage to two inch square tubes on four sides. The sculpture is angled to the pylon sign to give it depth. We carry these two items through out the entire United States.

We would have four store fronts that are specific to those companies. They are all individual stores, all individual profit centers that share in the lease and costs of the new building. They all have their own identities.

Mr. Leone: 1290 square feet of sign. What is the frontage of the building?

Mr. Fore: I have 876. Your 1290 attributes 143.8 square feet for the chair sculpture. That is art.

Mr. Leone: You just explained to me that was part of your sign package, your image all over the country. To me that is part of your identity and therefore part of your sign package. Irregardless, you still have 1150 square feet of other signage. What are the address of the building and the frontage of that side?

Ms. Damin: Taft Road.

Mr. Leone: We are dealing with a site that has 150-200 square feet of frontage on Taft Road. To double your sign package we could move to 450 square feet. Currently, your sign package has 600% more than code allows.

Mr. Rowe: What if we asked them to make the back of the building, which faces the plaza, be a façade?

Mr. Leone: That has no varying issue on the sign package.

Mr. Rowe asked Ms. Cole for the parameters for signs. How much can we approve?

Ms. Cole: By your code you are allowed to approve one square foot per lineal frontage of building. This Board has been doing more than that because you have some leeway. There is nothing that tells you or gives you an upper limit. I think that you need to follow the precedent you have already set which has generally been, 1 to 2 or maybe 1 to 2.5.

Mr. Leone: They have the right to go to the ZBA for a variance.

Mr. Parrish: If you look at the way the building is orientated on the site, you could take either side and consider it to be the front. The larger side would be 334.

Mr. Leone: I don't have a problem using the larger side. Even if you use that we are up to 650-700 square feet of sign. That seems reasonable.

Mrs. May: Can you make your sign package work with that amount of space?

Mr. Fore: I will do my best.

More discussion occurred regarding signage and what is needed for the final plan.

**ZONE CHANGE: AUTHORIZE THE TOWN BOARD TO BE LEAD AGENCY
GEORGE AND BARBARA JACOBS
NORTHERN BLVD. AND EASTMAN ROAD
AG TO GENERAL COMMERCIAL PLUS**

Mr. Leone: We have one more thing on tonight's agenda, acceptance of the Town Board's request to be Lead Agent for a Type I action that involves a zone change from AG to General Commercial Plus for the George and Barbara Jacobs' property. The property is located on Northern Blvd. and Eastman Road.

Mr. Smith made the motion:

**RESOLUTION
Jacobs Zone Change — SEQRA**

WHEREAS, the zone change application submitted by George and Barbara Jacobs for the property at the northwest corner of Northern Boulevard and Eastman Road constitutes a Type I action under SEQRA; and

WHEREAS, the Cicero Town Board has declared its intent to act as Lead Agency for the Project and has requested that the Planning Board consent to the Town Board's acting as Lead Agency.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS RESOLVED as follows:

1. The Planning Board consents to the Town Board acting as Lead Agency for the Project; and
2. The Planning Board chairman is authorized to acknowledge this resolution in writing to the Town Board

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

Mrs. May made a motion to adjourn. **Mr. Smith seconded the motion.**

The motion was **approved** unanimously.

IN AS MUCH AS THERE WAS NO FURTHER BUSINESS BEFORE THE BOARD,
THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:45 P.M.

Date: January 18, 2008

Tonia Mosley, Clerk

