

The Town of Cicero Planning Board held a meeting on **Monday, May 18, 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 May 6, 2009 (**approved**)
- Final subdivision plan and public hearing, Hancock Airpark, West Taft & Thompson, MDA of Syracuse (**approved**)
- Site plan, Cicero Baptist Church, 6696 Lakeshore Road, Proposed community church (**approved**)
- Site plan/sketch review, Dr. Thomas Carroll, 9651 Brewerton Road, Proposed addition (**to return**)
- Site plan, South Bay Fire Department, 8819 Cicero Center Road, Proposed modification (**approved**)
- Site plan, Parks Storage, 8822 Brewerton Road, Proposed expanded self-storage (**to return**)

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

Absent Board Members: Richard Cushman and Scott Harris (Ad Hoc)

Others Present: Wayne Dean, Director of Planning & Development, Heather Cole, Esquire, Wladis Law Firm, Mark Parrish, P.E., O'Brien & Gere, Chief Purdy, SBFD and Tonia Mosley, clerk

The meeting was opened with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Leone noted the locations of the three fire exits and that there was one formal public hearing tonight. He acknowledged the importance of public input and encouraged audience members to speak about agenda items, using the microphone in the front.

APPROVAL OF THE PLANNING BOARD MINUTES FROM 5/6/09

Mr. Leone noted a correction on page 13 in paragraph 4. Defiantly should be definitely. **Mrs. May made a motion** to approve the 5/6/09 Planning Board minutes including the correction noted by Mr. Leone. **Mr. Smith seconded the motion.** The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

Mr. Purdy: Yes

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

**FINAL SUBDIVISION PLAN AND PUBLIC HEARING
HANCOCK AIRPARK, WEST TAFT & THOMPSON ROAD
PROPOSED SUBDIVISION OF EXISTING ROADWAYS
METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION OF SYRACUSE & CNY
IANUZI & ROMANS
(SEE ATTACHMENT A: O'BRIEN & GERE LETTER DATED 5/13/09)**

Representative: Lori A. Dietz, P.E., Hancock Field Development Corporation

Ms. Dietz explained that last fall we did road upgrades based upon Town of Cicero approved plans. I am here tonight to subdivide those roadways out of the overall park so that they can be transferred to the Town.

Mr. Parrish noted there was quite a bit of work done. It has been completed and looks very nice. You did a good job.

Ms. Dietz explained the roadwork that was done.

Mr. Parrish responded to the chairman's question about a needing County response. He noted it has gone to the County a number of times.

Ms. Cole was not sure that it needed to go again.

Mr. Leone noted this was a formal public hearing. Again they are subdividing the roads off so that the Town can take over the roads including the maintenance and plowing of those roads. He opened the public hearing at 7:06 p.m. Is there anyone here who would like to speak in favor of this project? (There was no response.) Is anyone opposed? (There was no response.) Mr. Leone closed the public hearing at 7:07p.m.

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

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

Mr. Leone: Mark you wrote a letter responding to the Board. Do you have anything else to add? The letter will go in the file.

Mr. Parrish responded no. We are recommending approval. Securities, etc. the normal things need to be posted.

Ms. Dietz stated I am hopeful that next year I will be doing all of the remaining infrastructure work.

Mr. Leone made a motion to approve the final subdivision plan as presented with a last revision date of 5/12/2009 for Hancock Airpark at the Taft and Thompson Roads' proposed subdivision extension of the roadways. **Mr. Mott seconded the motion.** The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

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

SITE PLAN, CICERO BAPTIST CHURCH
6696 LAKESHORE ROAD, PROPOSED COMMUNITY CHURCH
L.J.R. ENGINEERING, P.C.

(SEE ATTACHMENT B: O'BRIEN & GERE LETTER DATED 5/13/09)

Representatives: Alex Wisniewski, P.E., L.J.R. Engineering
Pastor Carl Novak, Cicero Baptist Church

Mr. Wisniewski noted the project was before the Board April 20th and was well received. We lacked the County's referral. Since then we have received that response. I have also revised the plan in accordance with Mr. Parrish's letter. The architect has also updated his plans. We have brought copies of that tonight. This includes an updated floor plan plus elevations. It identifies the new façade treatments including the new proposed entry on the front. The intent is to re-do the front of the building with new siding.

Mr. Dean noted that the entry element does not require a variance.

Mr. Wisniewski believed all of the technical issues were addressed. We are here tonight for a SEQR determination and site plan approval.

Mr. Leone asked for the total height with the steeple.

Mr. Dean responded 32 feet.

Mr. Wisniewski noted the landscaping plan including its phases. It notes that the proposed landscaping may not be installed as a part of the initial development; however it will be installed no later than 2010. There are budgetary concerns.

Pastor Novak explained we hope to do all of the work by the end of October, except for some of the planting.

Mr. Wisniewski: All of the hardscape that is proposed as a part of the plan: asphalt, curbing, sidewalks, etc. are part of the initial construction. It is solely the plantings themselves that might be delayed until the spring of next year.

Mr. Leone noted the County's concerns with runoff. He read portions of a letter from Mr.

Parrish.

Mr. Parrish explained that they are reducing the amount of impervious surface on the site so we should have less runoff. Very little of it goes directly into the County's system on Lakeshore Road.

There are two issues with the lighting plan. There is a little bit of light trespass off the east side of the site. I believe Alex pointed out that there is a pond back there. The level is fairly minimal.

Mr. Wisniewski agreed. Basically there is a pond on this portion of the site. That is where the light trespass that Mark is talking about occurs. The property is a residentially used commercially zoned parcel.

Mr. Parrish pointed out the flood lights used to light the monument sign out front. The plan includes a note which indicates that these flood lights would be mounted and directed in such a way that there should not be any glare issues. It is important that it gets done that way because it is in line with your line of travel.

There is an existing street lamp in the area that lights the road where the entrances are. Although the lighting on the site does not necessarily light those areas, there is some existing lighting along Lakeshore for that.

Mr. Wisniewski discussed signage. The free standing sign would be perpendicular to Lakeshore road. The square footage is well within the Town's allowances.

Mr. Parrish noted it was about 38 square feet. You have about 110' of frontage, plus or minus.

Mr. Wisniewski: We were able to create more than enough parking with this layout. We have 75 spaces and there is ample room to expand. There is an existing solid wood screen along the side with the residence. They also intend to keep the screen along the western property line.

Mr. Parrish: They are placing some fill along the west side of the building. There is quite a drop off in grade there, currently, where the driveway is. They show a swale between the edge of pavement along the westerly property line to take drainage back to the drainage course.

It is important that it get in there because we are filling it and we do not want to shed drainage off onto the neighboring property. If the swale is installed as shown on the plan, it should not be an issue. There is a grading plan.

Mr. Wisniewski: We would be responsible for the maintenance of the swale as a part of the facilities of the site's re-development. The color scheme is shown on the rendering. The other three façades will be painted also.

Mr. Mott noted the applicant's patience. Pastor Novak came in before with another site that did not work out. I think he has a great spot here. It will be a great project.

Mr. Leone agreed.

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

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

Mr. Leone made a motion to approve the site plan for the Cicero Baptist Church at 6696 Lakeshore Road and to be approved in compliance with the May 6, 2009 revised site plan drawing as presented by the rendering from today's meeting which will be filed. **Mr. Smith seconded the motion.** The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

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

SITE PLAN/SKETCH REVIEW
DR. THOMAS CARROLL, 9651 BREWERTON ROAD
PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE EXISTING BUILDING
L.J.R. ENGINEERING P.C.

Representatives: Alex Wisniewski, P.E., L.J.R. Engineering, P.C.
B. Dean Johnson, Architect
Dr. Thomas Carroll, Applicant

Mr. Wisniewski noted we were before the Board last January for this site plan. The proposal calls for a building addition to Dr. Carroll's current facility of approximately 1330 square feet to accommodate his dental practice. The discussion focused on the building's architecture and conformance with the Brewerton Form Based Code. The updated architectural drawings reflect the compromises we reached. The plan submitted also details materials and color schemes. We have included a detailed landscaping plan. Per Mr. Smith's suggestion we have incorporated some rain gardens. We have also prepared a detailed lighting plan. We have introduced fixture styles in keeping with the spirit of the Form Based Code. We have details of the proposed signage and elevations.

There is a storm sewer that bisects the property north to south. The red line indicates the re-located storm sewer. That will require approval from the Town Board. We have prepared construction drawings for that storm sewer and its associated easements.

We hope to put to rest any out standing issues there might be and to ask you to refer the application to the County. We would also like to identify any variances which might be necessary. I have identified that the front yard setback and sign setback does not meet the current code, again understanding that we are trying to meet the intent of the Form Based Code. Lot depth and side yard setback do not meet code. I am not clear if we need to obtain variances for those.

We recognize that we need to get a response from the County and to go before the ZBA before we come back in front of you for site plan approval. We would like to move forward with those processes.

Mr. Leone commented on the architectural style. I think that it fits what I was looking for relative to the Form Based Code. In some cases you give us a two-story feel. Unfortunately, you still have to get variances based upon current Town codes.

Ms. Cole: Wayne and I discussed that this morning. Between the two of us we would be happy to get back to Dr. Carroll and his professionals letting them know exactly which variances would be required.

Mr. Dean: I want to make sure that the dimensions here for setbacks, etc., meet the approval of the Board. I would like you to approve the setbacks and the layout for the building, so that when I go for the variances it matches what is here.

Mr. Leone: Some of the setbacks are in compliance with the Form Based Code. There needs to be a balance of issues here. If the Form Based Code was an approved code, they would be within the setback requirements. Unfortunately, you are in between two sets of regulations.

Mr. Smith thanked Ms. Cole for the copies of the Form Based Code. The applicant does meet most of those codes.

Mr. Leone asked about the proposed sidewalk.

Mr. Wisniewski responded there is a sidewalk proposed along Route 11. The entry point at Route 11 was one of the major points of contention, rendering some of Dr. Carroll's interior space not highly useable. As a concession on his part, he did agree to the porch feature at the front corner element to allow for a future conversion of the building into another use---if that did happen. He did not want to extend a sidewalk to that porch for fear that it might encourage foot traffic to a door that is not intended to be for public use.

Mr. Leone: How about the sidewalk going along Guy Young Road?

Mr. Wisniewski: That would be an additional cost and maintenance concern, along with the liability concerns associated with that. Given the lack of foot traffic along Guy Young Road, the applicant did not want to incorporate a sidewalk there.

Mr. Dean: From past discussions, the door on the front of the building is not usable by the public. You are forcing people to the back. I would expect that there would be a sidewalk along there for people to use to get to the rear entrance of the building.

Mr. Leone: I expect that there should be a side walk along there as well. I thought we would have a wrap sidewalk along that corner, at least to his drive. He does not have to extend it across

the drive but he should extend it to the drive.

Mr. Wisniewski: I am getting a nod from my client. He is agreeable to extending the sidewalk to his driveway along Guy Young Road.

Mr. Leone: You have to deal with the variance issues. We can not suggest or encourage the ZBA but they need to be aware of the Form Based Code and what it means to the buildout of the Brewerton area.

Ms. Cole offered to speak to the ZBA's attorney about it. She is aware of them. I would be happy to bring her up to date about this project and how it is connected. I will make sure she has a copy of the code.

Mr. Wisniewski: Can I assume that the variance application will also need to be referred to County Planning?

Ms. Cole suggested if this Board was okay with sending the site plan application, Wayne and I can make sure that both applications go simultaneously. Maybe they can be sent with a cover letter explaining the situation as to why both are being sent and as to why the variances are needed now as opposed to a few months from now.

Mr. Parrish noted the site is made up of two tax parcels. It has to be combined. Otherwise they will continually need variances. The proposed addition straddles the lot line. It is a simple subdivision procedure that should be done.

Ms. Cole added the simple subdivision procedure would not need to come before this Board.

Mr. Leone made a motion to send the site plan down to the County and to encourage them to use it for both applications. **Mr. Smith seconded the motion.** The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

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

Mr. Smith: Yes
Mr. Leone: Yes

**SITE PLAN, SOUTH BAY FIRE DEPARTMENT
8819 CICERO CENTER ROAD, PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO EXISTING
BUILDING, JOE CHIARIZIA
(SEE ATTACHMENT C: O'BRIEN & GERE LETTER DATED 5/15/09)**

Representatives: Scott Freeman, Landscape Architect
William Taylor, Architect

Mr. Freeman introduced himself and Mr. Taylor. We are here to re-submit the plans and drawings. We have responded to last month's comments supplied by O'Brien & Gere. We have also attempted to respond to today's comments. Those comments include the proximity of the building's footing to the existing sanitary pipe. Mr. Taylor has submitted a letter and drawings which state the footing depth would be increased to 8'.

Mr. Parrish noted it was still a concern. This is an accommodation by the applicant to try and address that concern. The sewer is 20' deep. It is anywhere from 5'-8' away from the foundation. In order to excavate/repair the sewer in the future if necessary, there will need to be special accommodations made to do the excavation safely. Sheeting or some other method would need to be used to make sure that there is no damage to the foundation.

Having said that, we only have a 20' wide easement. The sewer is located where it is. There was a variance granted that will allow this building to be as close to the road as is proposed. So, there is very little that we can do at this point to force the applicant to do something other than what they are doing.

They have the right to do what they are doing. They have made some accommodations to try and address the concerns. But, in the future they will need to be careful, very careful, if they need to excavate to repair and/or replace the sewer.

Mr. Leone asked whose burden is that.

Mr. Parrish stated it was a Town sewer. The County maintains it but the Town is responsible for the cost of the maintenance work and anything else that happens to the sewers. It is the Town's

burden.

Mr. Taylor noted that the South Bay Fire Department was there prior to when the sewer was put in place. To burden them with the expense of going down 20' with a foundation---they just can not afford it. They would not be able to put the addition there. It is the Town's sewer and it is the Town's responsibility. The cost of maintaining the sewer would be high, if it ever needed to be maintained. Bear in mind that this is a volunteer organization that protects the people of the Town.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Smith asked if the cost of maintaining the sewer would be paid by the people within that sewer district or would it be paid by people within the entire Town. That would be an awful burden on the homeowners within the sewer district.

Mr. Parrish responded it is a consolidated sewer district. So, generally the cost would be spread out Town wide.

Mr. Leone asked Mr. Taylor if he felt that the 8' foundation was adequate architecturally.

Mr. Taylor: It is adequately balanced with the responsibilities. You have increased the cost of their foundation. Now you would just be dealing with 12' of exposure instead of 14'.

Ms. Cole noted the Wladis Law Firm continues to do work for the South Bay Fire Department. I personally do not. When it came to my attention that that work had been started again, we erected what is commonly known as a Chinese wall within the Firm. That means I don't talk to that attorney about site plan work and he does not talk to me about the economic development work so that there is no conflict between the two of us. I wrote a letter to the Board about that in regards to this application. My representation is solely of the Planning Board and not of South Bay Fire Department.

Mr. Leone added we did sign off on something originally that was sent to us. The Wladis Law Firm sent us a letter dated April 27, 2009. It does not require another sign-on.

Ms. Cole: That letter was included in the minutes from the last meeting.

Mr. Parrish: The practice at the time the sewer was constructed was generally to take a 20' sewer easement within these cases and center your sewer within that area. The sewer got offset a little during construction. It is deep. If we were to do this now we would take a larger easement do to the reasons suggested here.

The accommodation has been made. That is something that is good. Again, I am not sure that we can legally require them to do something beyond what they have done.

Mr. Freeman discussed the next concern. I believe that we have addressed all of the storm water questions. We have revised our storm water pollution prevention plan.

Mr. Parrish: We need to make sure that they execute the storm water agreement with the Town.

Ms. Cole agreed and requested that a note be added to the file. Building permits, etc should not be issued until that agreement has been signed.

Mr. Parrish: The storm water quantity and quality facility is a dry swale to address the quality issue. We will not have standing water here for any length of time. It will pond temporarily. It also functions as a detention basin to mitigate the runoff rates.

Mr. Freeman explained we have addressed the entrances. We accommodated the recommended changes. We pulled them away from the intersection. We addressed the community concerns with the County obtaining the appropriate permits and approvals necessary for that.

The outstanding item is the last sentence requesting a basis for the number of parking spaces be provided on the plan.

Mr. Leone asked for the number of parking spaces and information about site circulation.

Mr. Freeman: I believe the concern was to provide one-way access around the building so that there would not be conflicts. You have the access off of Lakeshore which comes in here. That is two-way. You can come in and go out. These are oversized parking spaces.

There are two types of events that occur. There are emergency events where firemen come in or NAVAC people come in. You also have the banquet center in the back. These are the NAVAC

bays and here are the service bays. In a banquet facility event, you would come in one-way, park in the back and leave one-way. The side parking spaces would not be used for event parking. I have had discussions with Fire Department representatives. They have had this banquet facility since 1955 and have never had a parking problem.

More discussion occurred. Mrs. May asked for clarification on the location of the banquet hall entrance.

Mr. Mott asked for the number of volunteers that respond.

Chief Purdy: If we have all three trucks, 21-22 maximum seats.

Mr. Leone: So the parking field to the right is enough to handle that?

Mr. Freeman responded yes. We can define/designate 22 spaces.

Mr. Leone: It is no different than what is done for handicap spaces. You could label the ground emergency vehicles only. Will they come right out of the NAVAC side?

Mr. Freeman described the entrances and exits. The three chiefs will park here. It will be constructed as a drive-thru but it will be worked as a pull-in, back out. NAVAC will come in, back out and leave. The Fire Department will come in, back out and leave.

A cut sheet for lighting was provided 45 minutes ago.

Mr. Parrish stated they are fine. They are cut off fixtures so we do not have a lot of glare. They have some existing lighting. We have some fairly high light levels which do drop off quickly.

Mr. Leone: What is the purpose of having so much light in front of the bays?

Charles Hawks: We want a lot of light in front of the overhead doors. We want it bright in the front of the building so that we can see activity coming in and out at all times.

Mr. Parrish: They have some wall packs on the building's front facing Cicero Center Road. All they have is green area and landscaping in front, so I am not sure why it needs to be lit. That spills out into Cicero Center Road but it does not light the entrance. It just lights the area in front of the building.

Mr. Chiarizia: We can tone them down.

Mr. Hawks: We do a lot of work on the trucks in front when the trucks come back. They have to be washed. There are safety issues involved. We need to be able to see out there.

More discussion occurred.

Mr. Hawks: We can adjust the candle power. The lights will not be on all of the time. Maybe we only need one light to light the parking lot.

Mr. Leone: I realize that you need some workspace lighting. I am not sure that this is the best way to accommodate what you are trying to do. I think that the Board sees a serious problem with the foot candles.

Mr. Freeman suggested putting a lighting plan together and formally reviewing it with Mark after taking your concerns to our lighting consultant.

Mr. Leone agreed. I do not think that will keep this Board from making some type of action.

Mr. Freeman: There are no sign components in the package.

Mr. Leone: If the residential property to the west gets built out someday, they would have issues with headlight glare. That might be taken care of with some plantings by the Fire Department along the western parking lot edge. It could be something that gets done over a period of time.

Mr. Freeman: We can address that by putting in some smaller trees 3-4 feet tall.

Mr. Parrish: The note on the variance is not specific. It should state what they got.

Ms. Cole suggested referencing the meeting minutes where the variance was obtained for easy access in the future.

Mr. Freeman noted wetlands were not an issue and that the property was not located in a floodplain.

Mr. Dean: I have not done the square footage calculations for parking at the banquet hall.

I am not sure that the parking is adequate, but it seems close.

Mr. Chiarizia: The maximum is 120.

Mr. Leone: So for the record the occupancy is about 150, which probably works out with the square footage.

Ms. Cole noted the County's referral. Basically, they had no concerns.

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

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

Mr. Leone made a motion to approve the South Bay Fire Department site plan located on the corner of Lakeshore Road and Cicero Center Road with a revision date of May 1, 2009 and the following contingencies:

1. The lighting plan is reviewed again with the Town's Planning Board engineer to address the compliance issues in and around the garage doors.
2. The variance received is better defined on the plan.
3. The landscaping plan to the west will include some type of vegetation such as cedar trees, to block light scatter. That would be allowed to grow over time as we do not see residential areas to the west at this point immediately or contiguous.
4. The storm water management agreement is accepted by the Town

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

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

Mr. Mott: Yes
Mr. Smith: Yes
Mr. Leone: Yes

**SITE PLAN, PARKS STORAGE, 8822 ROUTE 11 LLC
8822 BREWERTON ROAD, PROPOSED EXPANDED SELF STORAGE
IANUZI & ROMANS**

Representatives: Hal Romans, Surveyor, Ianuzi & Romans
Dick Parks, Applicant

Mr. Romans showed the Board how the site exists today. We came in a few years ago with a site plan for two storage buildings with the intent to continue with the project if they were successful. Due to the zoning, we had to stop at the ZBA for a variance to allow a full buildout of the project. We were granted a use variance by the ZBA.

Mr. Parks is currently at about 85% capacity. In the storage business that is about full capacity. He has turned away a lot of potential clients because he does not have any more spaces and because he lacks a variety of space sizes. He would like to build out the entire site as shown on sheet 2.

There would be a new building where the house currently exists. The rest of the site would be built out with an additional five storage buildings. Two would match what exists now and two would be longer buildings. Building H would be a climate controlled storage building with a small office space. Everything is one storied.

Parking is along Building H. There would be a gate between that building and the existing buildings. There are eight parking spaces. Clients would be able to come into the office and rent a space.

We will have the Fire Department look at the plan for turning radii, etc, and address any concerns that they might have.

The existing storm water management area would be modified slightly, but this would become the stormwater management area in here. There is a swale that picks up overland drainage here, along with a swale here.

Mr. Leone: Do you have enough width to unload?

Mr. Parks responded there is enough space between the buildings for two cars to sit and pass each other. When you pull up, you pull up along the side of the garage door. There is 22' between buildings.

Mr. Leone: How does the traffic flow? If you had one person on one side and one person on the other side at the right spot, there is no pass through at all?

Mr. Romans: Right. Someone would have to go around the other way or wait. Storage places are not high traffic generators. Everyone does not show up at once.

Mr. Leone: Do you have any commercial traffic?

Mr. Parks responded no. It is not good for us. It is basically residential customers. Commercial would be a problem for us.

Mr. Leone asked for the building coverage.

Mr. Romans noted he would need to verify that, but from a building standpoint it should be fine.

Mr. Leone: Are you doing any outside storage?

Mr. Romans replied no. The site is not set up for trailers, vehicles or things like that. Whatever is not driving lane between the buildings will be green space.

Mr. Smith: Can we make that a condition of approval?

Mr. Romans: No outside vehicle storage? That is not a problem.

Mr. Smith: Does that cover you Wayne, if that condition was put in the site plan? Will that give you all that you need to work with it?

Mr. Dean asked if this was a fenced site at this time.

Mr. Romans: No, that is another reason to not get into outside storage.

Mr. Parks stated there would be set hours of operation. We want to put in an automatic gate. We do not want people in there late a night.

Mr. Smith asked if the gate would preclude entrance late a night.

Mr. Parks responded yes.

Mr. Romans discussed lighting. Lighting will include shielded wall packs on the ends of the buildings. There will be no spillover to adjacent properties. We will have a full lighting plan. Signage would remain the same.

Mr. Smith asked about the amount of office space. Mr. Romans stated he would make adjustments to the plan. Mr. Smith asked for a note from the attorney on the self-storage policy in commercial zones.

Ms. Cole: I think that the precedent you have set now is that self-storage is not going to be allowed in General Commercial zones and the only way it can be is if a use variance is obtained. That is what this applicant has done.

Mr. Romans: For the record I will note the variance on the site plan. It was a use variance. Use variances are traditionally hard to get.

Mrs. May noted that this was an existing site plan that was approved in February of 2004.

Mr. Leone made a motion to send the current plan to the County based upon the fact that the applicant does have a use variance for the property. **Mrs. May seconded the motion.** The motion was **approved** with the following vote:

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

Mr. Smith requested architectural.

Mr. Romans noted the plan includes landscaping in the front.

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 8:35 P.M.

Dated: May 29, 2009

Tonia Mosley, Clerk



May 13, 2009

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

Attention: Patrick Leone, Chairman

RE: Hancock Airpark Section A & B, 6th
Amended

FILE: 0101/25439.357

Dear Board Members:

We have reviewed the Final Plan (2 sheets) dated March 2, 2009 revised May 12, 2009 as prepared by Ianuzi & Romans, P.C. for the above referenced project. Hancock Airpark Section A & B 6th Amendment consists of improvements to General Irwin Boulevard and Stewart Drive in Hancock Airpark. The Final Plan is being submitted to show portions of Stewart Drive and General Irwin Boulevard that are to be conveyed to the Town of Cicero. The Plan is in general conformance with Town Code requirements for Final Plans.

The Developer has recently completed improvements to the road and utilities in the areas where the roads are to be dedicated. We will furnish a letter to the Town Board providing required security deposits for utilities and uncompleted work. Upon approval of the Final Plan by the Planning Board, we recommend the Chairman delay signing the Final Plan until the Town Attorney has verified the Developer has the necessary agreements and securities in place.

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

Very truly yours,

O'BRIEN & GERE ENGINEERS, INC.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'MCPARRISH'.

Mark C. Parrish, P.E.
Managing Engineer

cc: Town Board – Town of Cicero
Wayne Dean, Code Enforcement Officer – Town of Cicero
Toni Mosley, Code Enforcement Office – Town of Cicero
Heather Cole, Esq. – Wladis Law Firm, P.C.
Lori Dietz – Hancock Field Development Corporation
Hal Romans, L.S. – Ianuzi & Romans, P.C.
Gary D. Cannerelli, P.E. – O'Brien & Gere



May 13, 2009

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

Attn: Patrick Leone, Chairman

Re: Cicero Baptist Church Site Plan
Review

File: 0101.25439.358

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. Boundary and Topographic Survey map dated March 20, 2009
 2. Existing Conditions and Demolition Plan dated April 9, 2009 revised May 6, 2009
 3. Layout and Landscaping Plan dated April 9, 2009 revised May 6, 2009
 4. Grading and Utility Plan dated April 9, 2009
 5. Lighting Plan dated April 13, 2009.
- C.T. Male Associates, P.C. prepared Item 1, L.J.R. Engineering, P.C. prepared items 2 to 4, and Gardco Lighting prepared item 5.

The 4.134-acre site is located on the south side of Lakeshore Road just east of Ontario Avenue. The site contains an existing 9,324 square feet building along with associated site improvements. It is proposed to make minor modifications and additions the building for use as a church along with associated modifications to the parking, landscaping, lighting and other site improvements. The site is zoned General Commercial. Our comments are as follows:

1. The site is located within the Lakeshore Sewer District. Sanitary sewer service is provided by a lateral from an 8-inch Town sanitary sewer located along Lakeshore Road. No modifications to the sanitary sewer service are shown on the Plan.
2. The site has driveways onto Lakeshore Road, which is a County highway. The existing driveways are to be reduced in width and the westerly entrance is to be an entrance only. A letter has been provided from the Onondaga County Department of Transportation that indicates the driveways are acceptable. The Board should review the site circulation and basis for the number of parking spaces provided for the site with the Developer. Also, consideration may want to be given to providing a sidewalk from the easterly portion of the parking area to the entrance at the front of the building.
3. Stormwater runoff from the site is generally tributary to a swale and culvert that crosses the central portion of the site and flows westerly to adjacent properties. As the project disturbs less

Patrick Leone, Chairman
May 13, 2009
Page 2

than 1-acre of land a NYSDEC SPDES Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities is not required for the project. The project will result in a reduction of impervious surfaces on the site and therefore does not require stormwater mitigation. Approximately 2 to 3 feet of fill is to be placed on the west side of the building to accommodate a drop off area. It is critical that the swale shown along the westerly property line be installed to convey stormwater runoff from this area as shown on the Plan.

4. The Board should review the landscaping, lighting, signage, buffering and architectural elevations with the Developer. The following are comments regarding these issues:
 - a. The lighting appears reasonable for a site of this nature but the light trespass onto the property east of the site should be reviewed with the Developer. Also, the monument sign is to be lit by floodlights and it is important that these be directed so glare is not created along Lakeshore Road as noted on the Plan.
 - b. An approximately 38 square feet monument sign is proposed along Lakeshore Road. For the Board's information the building frontage is approximately 110 feet.
 - c. Per the discussion at the Planning Board meeting it is our understanding the addition to the front of the building does not require a variance.
 - d. The architectural elevations should include information on building materials and colors along with the height of the proposed addition.
5. The site is located within the Cicero Oneida Lake Water District. Water service is provided by a water service from an 8-inch water main located along Lakeshore Road. No modifications to the water service are shown on the Plan.
6. The site does not contain a State Wetland as identified on the New York State Freshwater Wetland Map or a Federal Wetland as identified on the National Wetland Inventory Map.
7. The site is not located within a 100-year floodplain as identified on the 1994 FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps.

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

cc: Town Board – Town of Cicero
Wayne Dean, Director of Planning and Development - Town of Cicero
Toni Mosley, Code Enforcement Office - Town of Cicero
Heather Cole, Esq. – Wladis Law Firm, P.C.
Alex Wisniewski, P.E. – L.J.R. Engineering, P.C.
Gary D. Cannerelli, P.E. – O'Brien & Gere Engineers, Inc.



May 15, 2009

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

Attention: Patrick Leone, Chairman

Re: South Bay Fire Department Site Plan
Review

File: 0101/25439.352

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. Existing Conditions & Site Demolition Plan dated March 17, 2009 last revised May 1, 2009
2. Grading, Drainage and Utilities Plan dated March 17, 2009 last revised May 1, 2009
3. Layout and Planting Plan dated March 17, 2009 last revised May 1, 2009
4. Erosion and Sediment Control Plan dated March 17, 2009 last revised May 1, 2009
5. Site Details dated March 17, 2009 last revised May 1, 2009
6. Wall Sections dated April 6, 2009
7. Draft Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) dated March 16, 2009 revised April 2, 2009
8. Lighting Plan dated March 27, 2009.

Keplinger Freeman Associates prepared items 1 to 6, R.Z. Engineering, PLC prepared item 7 and Visual prepared item 8.

The 5.9-acre site is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Lakeshore Road and Cicero Center Road. The site contains the South Bay Fire Department along with associated parking areas, utilities, and other site improvements. It is proposed to demolish a portion of the existing building and construct a 4,800 square feet addition onto the east side of the building along with associated modifications to the parking, landscaping, lighting and other site improvements. The site is zoned Neighborhood Commercial. Our comments are as follows:

1. The site is located within the Lakeshore Sewer District. An 8-inch Town sanitary sewer main located within an easement located along Cicero Center Road provides sanitary sewer service to the site. No modifications to the sanitary sewer service are proposed. The building addition is located at the edge of the sanitary easement and is 8 to 10 feet from the sanitary sewer main, which is approximately 20-feet deep. Our office has expressed concerns to the Developer's Consultants that the Town will incur additional costs to maintain or reconstruct the sanitary sewer due to the proximity of the proposed addition to the sanitary sewer. An April 6, 2009 letter from William Taylor Architects indicates that the building cannot be moved due to financial limitations and impacts on operation of the addition. The letter further indicates that the Fire Department is willing to increase the depth of the building footer to 8-feet to partially address our concerns. The 8-feet deep building footer is reflected on the Wall Sections.

I:\Cicero-T.101\25439.T-Cicero-Planni\352-S.Bay Rd Fire dept\SBFDsiteplan.doc

2. Stormwater runoff from the site is generally tributary to a wetland located south side of the site, the adjacent property west of the site and drainage facilities located along Cicero Center Road. As the project disturbs more than 1-acre of land a NYSDEC SPDES Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities is required for the project. The SPDES Permit requires stormwater quantity and quality and sediment and erosion control measures be provided. A majority of the site will be tributary to a stormwater management area consisting of a dry swale located along the south side of the site that provides the required stormwater quantity and quality mitigation. Approval for the storm sewer improvements for the portion of the site that discharges to the drainage facilities along Cicero Center Road has been obtained from the Onondaga County Department of Transportation (OCDOT). The SWPPP and plans provide details relative to sediment and erosion control and appears to generally be in accordance with the required standards. In accordance with the Town Local Law for Stormwater Management and Erosion & Sediment Control a Stormwater Control Construction and Maintenance Agreement should be executed with the Town for the stormwater management area.
3. Access to the site is proposed via entrances onto Lakeshore Road, which is a Town highway and Cicero Center Road, which is a County highways under the jurisdiction of the OCDOT. The proposed improvements to the entrances will remove the existing uncontrolled access onto the roads with a single curb cut onto Lakeshore Road and two curb cuts onto Cicero Center Road with appropriate widths and radii. It is our understanding the OCDOT has approved the location and configuration of the entrances but a work permit should be obtained from the OCDOT prior to the start of construction. The Board should review the site circulation and number of parking spaces provided with the Developer. A basis for the number of parking spaces required for the site should be provided an noted on the Plan.
4. The site is within the Cicero Oneida Lake Water District. Water service is provided by an 8-inch water main located along Cicero Center Road. The Plan does not show any modifications to the water service to the site.
5. The Board should review the landscaping, lighting, signage and architectural elevations with the Developer. The following are some comments for the Boards consideration regarding these issues:
 - a. The Plan shows a number of existing light poles on the site are to be maintained and wallpacks are to be provided on the addition. The following are additional comments on the Lighting Plan:
 - (1) A cut sheet for the wallpacks should be provided.
 - (2) The light levels shown on the Lighting Plan appear to be relatively high.
 - (3) The property line for the site is not shown on the Lighting Plan and as such it cannot be determined if light trespasses off of the site.
 - (4) The need for the wallpacks on the east side of the addition should be reviewed.
 - b. The Plan does not show any additional signage beyond the existing sign located at the corner of Lakeshore Road and Cicero Center Road. The proximity of the proposed flag pole to the right-of-way should be reviewed with the Developer.
 - c. The buffering along the property line adjacent to the residential property on the west side of the site should be reviewed with the Developer.
 - d. The note in the Zoning, Parking and Building Information on the variance that has been obtained for the setback along Cicero Center Road should provide specific information on the variance.

May 15, 2009
Page 3

6. The site does not contain a State Wetland as identified on the New York State Freshwater Wetland Map or a Federal Wetland as identified on the National Wetland Inventory Map.
7. The site is not located within a 100-year floodplain as identified on the 1994 FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps.

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

cc: Town Board – Town of Cicero
Wayne Dean, Director of Planning and Development- Town of Cicero
Toni Mosley, Code Enforcement Office - Town of Cicero
Heather Cole, Esq. – Wladis Law Firm, P.C.
Scott Freeman – Keplinger Freeman Associates
William F. Taylor, AIA – William Taylor Architects
Gary D. Cannerelli, P.E. – O'Brien & Gere