

**Village of Cazenovia Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
July 14, 2014**

5

Present: Richard Huftalen, Chair; Adam Walburger; Anne McDowell; and Diane Webb.

Absent: Jennifer Gavilondo.

10

Others Present: James Stokes, Village Attorney; Don Ferlow; Jim Hagan; Matthew Vredenburgh; Thomas Lewis; Robbie Lewis; David Muraco; Chris Heberle; Ian Madom; Bob Lucas; Susan Morgan; Judith Warburton; Peter Warburton; Janet Goris; and Mark Goris.

* * * * *

15

R. Huftalen called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. and introduced the Board. R. Huftalen asked for any changes to the June 9, 2014, minutes. A. McDowell made the motion to approve the minutes as drafted. A. Walburger seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

* * * * *

20

Mark and Janet Goris, 78 Lincklaen Street, New Fence.

25

Mark and Janet Goris were present to explain. They are proposing a 4-foot high scalloped picket fence with a gate on Lincklaen Street. The fence will extend out from about 10 feet or so from the front corner. It will run west to east along the property line about 90 feet or so and connect to another fence parallel to Lincklaen Street. The fence will run back to a point 2 feet before the neighbor's garage. The posts will be 4 feet tall with Gothic points on top of the posts. The fence along Lincklaen Street will be all cedar and painted to match the house. The fence running perpendicular to Lincklaen Street will be natural cedar and be 6 feet high. At a later date, an additional fence will be added to go around the rear of the property starting at the rear of the garage. That will be the second phase.

30

R. Huftalen stated that this has been before the Historic Preservation Committee (HPC) and they recommended, with some conditions, issuance of a Certificate of Compatibility.

35

A. Walburger asked if there was going to be a 6-foot high section of fence. Mr. Goris said they had decided to make the fence only 4 feet high along the neighbor's house where the windows are so they do not look at a solid 6-foot wall of fence. Mrs. Goris added that they will plant trees along that 4-foot high section.

40

R. Huftalen clarified that the fence goes south 16 feet and then it runs along the south property line 2 feet in and that is another 90 feet to the back of the garage, but some subset of that is going to be 4 feet high. The section along the south property border that runs from the front fence to opposite the neighbor's windows will be a 4-foot high section.

45

Susan Morgan spoke to say that she has lived at 76 Lincklaen Street for 14 years. This fence is replacing some old cedar trees that were taken down, so this is a substantial change in the boundary. Her property line is only 11.1 foot from her foundation. Her driveway is very narrow. She voiced her appreciation for the lowered fence so she is not looking at a solid fence 11 feet away. She

50 mentioned that Atlas Fence has put in the marker stakes for the fence. She now realizes just how close 2 feet from the property line is. She said that it is common in other towns and villages to have a 3-foot setback to maintain both sides of the fence. Ms. Morgan requested a more reasonable 3-foot setback instead of just 2 feet. Since the driveway is so narrow, she is concerned that snowplows and other vehicles might hit the new fence.

55 Mr. Stokes stated that the Planning Board does not have jurisdiction on site plan review of a fence or the setbacks. The fence is in accordance with the regulations. It is before the Board for a Certificate of Compatibility.

60 D. Webb questioned the color of the fence. Mr. Goris said that the portion facing the street will be white.

R. Huftalen declared this a Type II action under State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) 617.5(c)10. There is no other agency involved. The approval of this application will not have any significant or adverse effect on the environment. No further SEQR action is required.

R. Huftalen made the motion to approve and issue a Certificate of Compatibility for the project with the conditions recommended by the HPC, clarifying that one section of the fence will be 4 feet high rather than 6 feet high. A. McDowell seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

* * * * *

Cazenovia College, 15 Sullivan Street, New Windows.

75 Chris Heberle came forward to represent Cazenovia College. The proposal is to replace 8 windows.

R. Huftalen noted that the Board has the Historic Preservation Committee (HPC) minutes where they recommend issuance of a Certificate of Compatibility.

80 Mr. Heberle stated that the new windows will be more energy efficient. HPC recommended internal grids to replicate the existing 6 over 6 design. The new Edgemont windows will have the recommended internally installed grids in a 6 over 6 design between the two panes of glass.

85 R. Huftalen declared this a Type II action under State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) 617.5(c)8. There is no other agency involved. The approval of this application will not have any significant or adverse effect on the environment. No further SEQR action is required.

D. Webb made the motion to approve and issue a Certificate of Compatibility for the windows with a 6 over 6 design. R. Huftalen seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

90 * * * * *

Thompson Park Apts, 43 Albany Street, Special Use Permit.

David Muraco came forward.

95 R. Huftalen summarized that this is for apartments to be used as supervised student housing, which is allowed by the Code with a special use permit. This is the Masonic building. He advised the applicant, Mr. Muraco that a public hearing is needed because it is a special use permit.

100 D. Webb asked if the student housing would be on the second and third floors. Mr. Muraco answered yes. D. Webb inquired if there is a separate entrance for the students to get upstairs and if there is a fire escape. Mr. Muraco answered yes, there is a separate entrance, there is a fire escape, and the building is equipped with sprinklers.

105 R. Huftalen proposed that the public hearing be held at 7:30 p.m., August 11, 2014, at the regularly scheduled Planning Board meeting.

* * * * *

Ian and Lindsay Madom, 33 Chenango St., Driveway Paving.

110 Ian Madom came forward.

R. Huftalen explained that this request is something that is not typically under the purview of the Planning Board, but there is some history with the property.

115 Mr. Madom stated that he has lived at this address for 3 years and he has four children. It is a gravel driveway. He would like to pave the driveway so the snowplow will not push gravel off of the driveway that needs replacing every year and so the children can ride their bikes in the driveway. He presented additional pictures after yesterday's substantial rain. The gravel that currently is in the swale has been building up over the past three years because the plow keeps pushing it off of the driveway. The paving company graded the driveway in preparation for paving. They left some additional on the side that needs to be pushed back up against the driveway once it is completed. The intention is to leave the swale because the neighbors need it. He understands the purpose of the swale and has no intention of disrupting it. It still functions as it should.

125 R. Huftalen requested guidance from Mr. Stokes because a paving project is not typical for Planning Board review. There was a reference to Planning Board approval in 2004 that talked about initial construction of the swale. At that time, the application was approved on the condition that the swale area would be as prescribed at the time.

130 Mr. Stokes stated that the Planning Board does not do site plan approval for paving projects. In 2004, it was an application for architectural approval. There not being a condition against paving, there is no formal issue to be determined by the Board at this time. Keeping the swale intact was a condition of prior approval and that will remain in effect. A formal resolution may not be necessary, but the Board may want to acknowledge in the minutes that it was viewed in light of the prior action and determined that this would be in accordance with that prior approval as long as the swale is maintained per the prior condition and approval.

140 Robbie Lewis, a resident of 31 Chenango Street, spoke. She indicated that she lives in the house just below Madom's. She is concerned about more runoff down onto her property. Runoff already comes down the sidewalk. There have been additional drainage problems since the road was redone. When there is a substantial amount of rain, there is a lake where Gillette Lane and Chenango Street come together. The water comes up and floods the sidewalks. She is worried about her basement flooding.

145 Thomas Lewis said it was his understanding that the driveway at 33 Chenango Street was not supposed to be paved. He is concerned that water will come down to his property at 31 Chenango

Street. D. Webb stated that after reading the minutes from the 2004 meeting, it was never stipulated that paving was prohibited.

150 Mr. Madom is hoping that a paved driveway will provide an avenue to route the water off of the driveway into the road away from all of the properties.

155 A. Walburger commented that this is a bigger problem and not what the Board is here to address tonight. R. Huftalen added that the Planning Board has no jurisdiction over stormwater on residential properties and Mr. Madom is within his rights to pave his driveway. In 2004, it was clear that the Planning Board did condition approval on the swale. It would be prudent for this Planning Board to reiterate the importance of maintaining that swale.

160 R. Huftalen made the following motion: The Planning Board has determined that this paving project is in accordance with the 2004 Planning Board's approval with the condition that the drainage swale is to be maintained. D. Webb seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

165 Ms. Lewis asked who she should approach about maintaining the drains so water is not collecting. R. Huftalen replied that she could contact Bill Carr, the Public Works Administrator.

* * * * *

Dan Kuper, Cazenovia Hospitality, LLC, Public Hearing, Route 20 East, 2 Lot Subdivision.

170 R. Huftalen stated this project has been before the Planning Board for a number of months. It has been before the Historic Preservation Committee (HPC) who gave approval of the architectural rendering. Quite a bit of documentation has been received from various organizations, such as: Madison County Planning Department; New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation; Department of Transportation. A traffic study has been done.

175 Jim Hagan, the architect on the project, came forward and gave a presentation: The plan presented tonight is similar to the previous plans presented to the Board, but more detail has been added. Some of the technical issues have been worked out with regard to the site plan. An up-to-date topographic survey has been obtained. It shows the actual grade across the property and the back of the property is higher than previously thought. Details along Route 20 have been added; utilities, 180 pavement, and adjacent driveways. It also picked up topography farther to the west, which was needed in order to plan connection of the sanitary sewer. One of the primary concerns was access to Route 20 opposite of McDonald's.

185 Mr. Hagan said that GTS Consulting prepared a traffic impact assessment. They took field measurements of the traffic. A lengthy analysis was done. To summarize the traffic study, the addition of the hotel would not generate traffic that would result in any significant impact on Route 20 in this area. The general level of service would remain at a level B (out of A-F). The gaps that occurred between vehicles both eastbound and westbound were studied. It was determined that there were adequate gaps for turning movements into and out of the site. The study mentioned that 190 at times there may be slightly higher levels of traffic being generated because of what is occurring at the conference center, but those traffic levels would be sporadic and would have no significant impact.

195 Mr. Hagan continued that he and Mr. Stansbury of GTS Consulting met with the New York State Department of Transportation (DOT) in Utica and presented the traffic assessment. Issues were

discussed. One of DOT's concerns was the possibility of collisions in the median turning lane. For that reason, they suggested aligning the hotel entrance road with McDonald's driveway across Route 20. In an earlier plan, there was a 10-foot strip of land on the eastern boundary adjacent to the CAVAC property, which was going to be part of the hotel parcel with the idea there would be a sign located on that parcel. After looking at the topographic map, the 10-foot strip could be flipped to the other side. In doing so, this would relocate the entrance drive 10-15 feet to the east. That would give a rough alignment with McDonald's driveway on the opposite side of Route 20. That would do a couple of things. It would move the proposed sign from the east side to the west side of the hotel entrance road. Given the topography and existing vegetation, this would improve the visibility of the sign coming from the east and would remain about the same visibility from the west. Originally, a sidewalk coming from the hotel out to Route 20 was shown on the east side of the road. That has now been moved to the west side of the road. Besides providing access and tying into a bigger pedestrian system, it allows the ability to use the sidewalk to access future surrounding property development. DOT suggested extending the sidewalk and tying it to the existing sidewalk that runs on the north side of Route 20. The plan currently incorporates that. Technical details need to be worked out in terms of signage and illumination so people recognize there is a crossing at that point. That ties pedestrian movement from the existing sidewalk directly to the hotel. McDonald's driveway is 24 feet wide. DOT suggested that a portion of the hotel road that is in the State right-of-way be widened another 6 feet, to about 30 feet, which would help with the alignment. That will be pursued. After the revisions were made, the plans were submitted to DOT. The Planning Board should have a copy of an email from Ken Andela stating that DOT concurs with the design concepts for the entrance driveway.

R. Huftalen confirmed receipt of the email from Ken Andela saying that DOT concurs with the revised concept plans.

Mr. Hagan said there is an existing concrete gutter on the south side of Route 20 that runs from the CAVAC driveway down across the proposed driveway. It then veers off the edge of the road and just ends about 50-70 feet west of the entrance driveway and discharges into the field at that point. The drainage DOT is talking about is a concrete gutter across the entrance driveway to maintain the water flow. The alternative would be to have a drainage structure and pipe it under the road. That will be handled as part of the highway work permit process. On the other side of Route 20, there is also a similar gutter drainage system that may require some minor modifications if the McDonald's driveway gets widened.

Mr. Hagan continued: Over the last month, analysis of each level of the building was done to ensure the right mix and right size rooms in the hotel. There is a mix of various size rooms; individual rooms to suites. As a result of reworking that, the length of the building has shrunk by about 8 feet, which was taken off of the south end of the building. The configuration of the conference center was revised. It is generally about the same size. A basic plan for the kitchen service area has been done and how service will be flowing from the kitchen across into the meeting rooms and corridor on the south side that will give access to the courtyard area. As a result of those changes, the plan now has 82 guest rooms, which is a combination of rooms and suites. There are now 122 parking spaces on site with 8 spaces reserved. The 122 spaces will provide parking for guests of the hotel, hotel staff, and the conference center. The sidewalk will come in, run along the entrance road, tie into the entrance to the conference center to the end of the building and around to the front entrance of the building, and all around the parking area, with the idea that the sidewalk could be extended to the east or the west as future development occurs. The site plan has the basic framework for pedestrian movement. Also added is a small service shed to the side of the site to be used primarily

245 for lawn maintenance and snow maintenance equipment to be used on the property. In the submitted package, there is a letter from The New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), which is a bureau of the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation. The applicant is required, as part of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and obtaining a State Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (SPDES) permit, to get a response from SHPO that there
250 are no cultural resources present on the site. They publish a map of the state that shows large gray areas of archeo sensitive concerns. That map shows an area that skirts the eastern portion of the site, so a package was submitted to them. Their letter says they have looked at it and the project will have no impact on cultural resources.

255 R. Huftalen confirmed receipt of the SHPO letter dated June 30, 2014.

Mr. Hagan described the topographic maps and grading lines: The entrance road is at 3% across the front of the building. It goes to 5% heading to the west. The road is stopped just past the secondary entrance to the hotel, leaving about 70 feet to the property line. That grade can be altered so it can
260 be close to the existing grade at the property line. It will probably require a slight cut. This has been discussed with the Village Engineer. This plan shows the finished grade of the building at 1292.5. At the entrance road, it is at 1304, making the building sit 11-12 feet lower than the grade of the entrance road on Route 20.

265 R. Huftalen commented that the floor at CAVAC is 1308.

Mr. Hagan went on with his presentation: Conceptually, everything slopes from northeast to southwest. It is proposed to grade it in that general direction. Drainage from the entrance road will be picked up with a series of catch basins and a piping system to a stormwater management basin.
270 The front portion of the site will run around the north and west sides of the building. The east side will run around the east and south sides, going to the stormwater basin. He introduced Matthew Vredenburgh, the landscape architect on the project.

Mr. Vredenburgh described the stormwater management system: Stormwater is going to collect in
275 two pipes. There will be a series of rock-lined tiny basins to take the energy out of the runoff before it is allowed to move into the infiltration trench.

D. Webb questioned the size of a tiny basin. To indicate the size, Mr. Vredenburgh made a circle with his arms.
280

Mr. Vredenburgh continued: Once the infiltration basin fills up, the water will move on down to the detention basin, which collects the run off from the large storms. The majority of the storms will be managed adequately within the infiltration trench.

285 Mr. Hagan: A fairly extensive drainage report has been prepared and submitted to the Village Engineer. There are still some technical details to be resolved. Once those details are worked out, Mr. Vredenburgh will do a full SWPPP, which will allow for the SPDES permit.

290 R. Huftalen noted that approval will be required from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) and from the Village Engineer for the SWPPP.

Mr. Hagan: The plan currently shows an existing 12-inch water main coming from the reservoir on the south side of Route 20. That line would be tapped with a new service line coming into the site.

295 It would then branch and run along the east-west entrance road. Off of that, fire and domestic water
service would be provided to the hotel. There may be some pressure issues. A fire pump situation
may be needed to serve the upper levels of the hotel. Those are building details, not safety details.
The water line could be extended to the east or to the west. Two hydrants are shown on the plan.
One was relocated just east of the hotel entrance. The other hydrant was at the rear entrance on the
300 other end. Hydrant details will be worked out with Bill Carr, Public Works Administrator. The plan
shows a sanitary sewer line that would start in front of the building and run westerly. Right now, it
just goes off the edge of the map. There have been discussions with the Village Engineer and
Madison County relative to the sanitary sewer. The Village Engineer provided a map, on which has
been delineated various options to provide sanitary sewer to this property and other properties along
the way. The mechanics of how that will happen needs to be worked out. It is known that the sewer
305 is available and can be done with a gravity sewer situation as opposed to needing a pump station as
previously thought. The sewer would run down to an open field and come out to Route 20 adjacent
to Fauth's building with the existing sanitary sewer. The other option is to continue farther to the
west into the Village.

310 R. Huftalen said that he understands those details are being worked out with the Madison County
Sewer District and the Village Engineer. All sewers must meet Madison County's requirements and
the applicant's requirements.

315 Mr. Hagan commented that it is certainly possible to connect the sewer to this building, but the
question is: What are the financial ramifications? Electric service will be picked up from an
existing power pole that is located off the east corner of the entrance drive. It will be brought in
underground to the building. Similarly, it is hoped to have gas and telephone service coming in
underground as well. One of the questions raised was fire truck access. The traffic engineer
prepared a diagram utilizing a single unit 30 fire truck. The diagram shows there is adequate room
320 for the truck to maneuver in and around the building area. Subsequently, a question was raised if
that was the largest truck available. So a second diagram was done using a single unit 40, which he
claims is the largest truck that would be available, and it is still possible for the largest truck to
maneuver comfortably.

325 R. Huftalen said that Bill Carr needs to review the plan and truck movements.

330 Mr. Hagan stated that for the record, the intention is to have the building fully equipped with
sprinklers. Included in the package are: A light sheet with typical details, sidewalks, curbing,
handicapped access, light pole bases, and road profiles. Due to grades adjacent to CAVAC, two
cross sections through the entrance roads have been done. The upper one, Section A, occurs by the
entranceway where there is a fairly good grade going up to the CAVAC building. In doing that,
there will be a leveling area on the east side of the road, then a slope that will continue to the
CAVAC property. As a result, a grading easement is shown along CAVAC's property line. There
have been discussions with CAVAC and they have no objections to that.

335 Mr. Hagan: Included in the package is a photometric plan that shows lighting levels and proposed
lighting. A series of 25-foot pole fixtures on the two entrance roads are provided. The reason for
the height is that these entrance roads may become Village roads and it would be more appropriate
to have slightly taller poles in those locations. The spacing of the poles is a little farther apart. All
340 of the fixtures on the plan are LED fixtures, which is the current technology. The poles for lighting
the general parking areas around the building and driveways are 20-foot poles with a similar LED
design fixture. There are smaller light poles that are 10 feet tall with more of a decorative fixture on

345 them that would light the immediate sidewalk and landscape areas adjacent to the building. In the submitted package, there are cut sheets for the fixtures. All fixtures are full cutoff and all are Dark-Sky compliant. The fixtures are mounted so there are no drop lines and they shine straight down. The decorative fixtures on the sidewalks are different in that they are acorn style and more appropriate for those locations. Unlike HID or sodium-type fixtures where the lamp would be in the bottom, LEDs are in the top and shoot the light down. The Code calls for 75% maintenance factor. That may be incorrect terminology for the LEDs. They do not have the drop-off that occurs with the 350 HIDs or fluorescent-type fixtures. It is not really appropriate for this type of lighting. The lighting levels shown should stay fairly consistent throughout the life of the fixtures.

355 R. Huftalen explained that the 75% maintenance factor is anticipating that the lumens will degrade over time. When the legislation was written, it was more typical to have HID or other type fixtures where the lumens would degrade over time. LEDs were not widely used at that time.

360 Mr. Hagan: There is a tabulation on the bottom of the sheet that shows average foot-candle levels. Generally, the parking areas have 2.5 foot-candles, which is appropriate for adequate lighting and safety purposes, but not overly bright to create a nuisance factor. This complies with the intent of the ordinance.

365 Mr. Hagan: The package contains exterior design of the building. The plan shows wide clapboard siding for the main siding with brick on the bottom. There are fairly extensive overhang, fascia, and decorative bracket details. There are mansard, hip, and gable roof designs utilizing architectural shingles. The plan shows the proposed color scheme for the building. Mr. Hagan presented actual color samples for the paint, bricks, and shingles. These include: Benjamin Moore Sandy Hook Gray to be used for the siding. Wheeling Neutral to be used on the corner boards and fascia. A slightly lighter Sailcloth color to be used for the decorative brackets and around the windows. Certaineed Georgetown Gray to be used for the architectural shingles. The elevations are essentially the same 370 as previously presented. There are some minor differences due to roof layouts. Three of the towers are narrower than the main entrance tower. The canopy is reduced in height. There is a reverse gable on the end. The roof was extended higher over the conference center. Added to the package are the other two sides of the building. The swimming pool area projects out at the first floor level. Behind that is the 4-story main hotel where the treatment of the walls and rooflines is similar to the 375 opposite side of the building. The southern configuration of the building is similar to the front facing Route 20 with the pool addition next to that and the side of the conference center, which is in the background.

380 D. Webb inquired if Mr. Hagan had any photos of a building using that particular color of brick. Mr. Hagan answered that he does not. D. Webb expressed her concern in that the color of the brick does not look terribly attractive. A. Walburger commented that the fluorescent lights may make it appear different than outside natural light.

385 R. Huftalen asked if construction would be actual brick or veneer. Mr. Hagan confirmed that it would be full size brick, not veneer.

390 Mr. Hagan stated that he was not prepared to discuss signage yet because the hotel brand has not been decided. Originally proposed was a sign in the upper gable over the main entrance. Recognizing that faces southwest and away from the Route 20 corridor, it might be more appropriate for the signage to be located up high on the north end of the building to be visible from Route 20. The size would comply with the Village sign ordinance and would represent the actual brand of

hotel. In addition, there would be a ground-mounted sign on the west side of the entrance driveway, so people coming down the highway have a chance to identify the entrance. There will probably be some other incidental signage under the front entrance canopy. Franchise standards vary.

395 Mr. Hagan: Shown on the plan is a green area that looks like landscaping and Mr. Vredenburg has prepared a landscaping plan that has been submitted to the Board.

400 Mr. Vredenburg: The concept is for an attractive landscape with hardy and reliable plant materials, native species, plant masses, all-season, and interest. In the area of the stormwater facility, the idea is to have plants that prefer or can tolerate having wet feet and be native species. At the same time, struggling with the idea that this is in the Village and it should not be too natural. This will require refinement in relation to the adjacent parcels getting developed. The idea is to screen out some of the stormwater facilities. These areas should be as attractive as possible. Hotel guests should not
405 see a dry infiltration trench. There are trees throughout the site to provide shade for some parking spots and to reduce the heat island effect. Street trees will be 35 feet on center. Proposed street trees are honey locust, which are appropriate because they tend to be light, airy, and more open. They will not block the hotel from the street. Red maples are proposed for around the parking lot because they are reliable trees and are low maintenance.

410 D. Webb asked who is responsible for maintaining the plantings. Mr. Kuper responded that will be controlled by the franchise and is one of their checkpoints.

415 Mr. Kuper would like to get Stone Quarry Art Park involved with providing some sculptures and to help connect the art park with the Village.

R. Huftalen said the Village Edge South (VES) Design Guidelines talk about desires for connectivity and delineated trails. The Board will want to see these items in the site plan.

420 A. McDowell mentioned the appearance of the air conditioning units. Mr. Kuper responded that the air conditioning will be PTAC (packaged terminal air conditioning) units. There will be a grill that will blend in and the unit will not protrude from the building.

425 Mr. Hagan said that one point that was made early on and he wanted to reiterate and justify is that the property line actually goes out to the east and there will be a fairly wide swath that will remain forever green. The surveyor has provided a definitive line for the tree line so that damage can be avoided. The only exception to that is the discharge from the stormwater to the creek and whatever happens with the pedestrian connection in that area.

430 R. Huftalen stated that before a building permit is issued, the dedicated conservation area should be delineated on the plans and a deed restriction put on it.

435 Mr. Hagan stated that the majority of these documents were submitted to the Village Engineer. So far, the applicant has no problem with complying with any of the Village Engineer's concerns or providing the level of detail he is looking for.

440 Mr. Stokes asked if the roads would be built to Village standards and dedicated to the Village. Mr. Kuper answered that the roads would be built to Village specifications for future dedication. Mr. Stokes commented that it makes sense to build them to Village specifications and dedicate them to the Village because then the Village would maintain the roads.

R. Huftalen commented that the Planning Board will want to have the streets and sidewalks built to Village standards and approved by the Village Engineer.

445 Mr. Stokes added there should be an easement to get the drainage from the road to the stormwater management area.

450 R. Huftalen noted that the HPC reviewed the plan at their May meeting and these new drawings incorporate all the proposed HPC changes. The HPC made a positive recommendation to the Planning Board with the noted changes.

455 R. Huftalen observed that the Madison County Planning Department has submitted their response with many positive comments and has returned this for local determination. The County would recommend incorporating a provision that the parking lot is to be a shared use lot as a condition of the site plan. He asked Mr. Kuper if there would be any objection to allow parking for trail access. Mr. Kuper said not really, except for a possible liability issue.

460 D. Webb asked if having four stories would be a problem. R. Huftalen replied that is part of the reason for the special use permit application.

465 R. Huftalen summarized the County's comments: From a county level, we believe a hotel/conference center is a unique use for the county overall and one that has been missing in our area. We are aware of several missed opportunities in the past due our county's lack of a conference space and options for accommodations. We believe that this project can be a benefit to the Village and the county overall. The project will not have adverse county-wide impact and is returned for local determination.

470 R. Huftalen called for any questions, comments, or input from Board members, Counsel, or the public.

475 Don Ferlow came forward and gave a presentation: This is a very important plan. This is the first one in the new zone. I looked through the Design Guidelines and the zoning to get a better handle on where this project is. I am going to walk through bullets from the Economic Health and Heritage Committee (EHH) and reference the page in the Village Edge South Design Guidelines. Sites developed should be walkable and that relates to the whole 70 acres. They should be walkable, bikable, and connected to streets and trails. There will be repeats of different words in the Design Guidelines. Landscape should be integrated with stormwater management. There should be street trees and gardens. --Design Guidelines page 4. There should be required interconnectivity of streets, parking, pathways, and sidewalks. --Design Guidelines page 6. There should be pathways. --Design Guidelines page 7. Bio swales should be used in lieu of curb and gutter flow. --Design Guidelines page 8. Street trees should be at about 30 feet on center. --Design Guidelines page 8. Pedestrian opportunities should be optimized. There should be green space integrating public art. This is very interesting because the art park is on the trail that goes through the back of this site. --Design Guidelines page 10. Sense of place for the design. Comfortable human environment in private public space that may be between buildings and the sidewalks. --Design Guidelines page 11. Parking, landscaping, interconnecting sidewalks, shared with adjacent uses if feasible. There is potential feasibility in certain areas. Public spaces, pocket parks, common greens, green infrastructure, gardenlike features. --Design Guidelines page 16. Street trees, trees saved, public art. --Design Guidelines page 17. Use of bio swales, rain gardens, infiltration techniques. --Design

490 Guidelines page 23. Open space developed for each site, landscape with stormwater facilities,
groundwater protection, infiltration. --Design Guidelines page 23. Innovative stormwater
management. --Design Guidelines page 25.

Mr. Ferlow: Then we go to the zoning for the VES-MU District – Purpose and Intent. In 180-62 –
495 Interconnectivity and protection of natural resources. 180-63A – Plants to be retained. Detailed
landscape plan, number and species. Narrative drawing showing preservation of conservation areas
or a narrative alone without the drawing. 180-63D2 – Minimize parking to actual needs. 180-64A –
A required written report of compliance to the Design Guidelines. 180-64D – 50% of the lot shall be
in green space. It can include protected conservation areas that are integrated with the green space.
500 That would mean that the green space could down from 50% to 40%. Those are the visions and the
zoning elements. Where do we sit? I mentioned that this is the first project in the new zone. It is
also the first time we have seen the site topography and the grading plan. From day one, this plan
has progressed and gone a great distance. It has followed the original architectural concept that fits
this site and the basic zoning requirements, but not all, put forth in the Design Guidelines. As
505 mentioned by Mr. Hagan, the plan protects the south woods and the stream. The plan conforms to
the VES concept land use plan for future street layout. The plan has worked with a build-to line with
public space area in the front yard to the street. The building conference area now has a north
corridor with real windows in it. The doors will face the street into the public yard space. Some
parking has been deferred and that has been minimized as the Design Guidelines request.
510 Stormwater management has a strong infiltration focus. As depicted, the plan seems to retain a hotel
focus and not step out into the community. And that is not wrong. Having the hotel focus to date
really has allowed the hotel to be the dominant feature and allowed the plan to be refined to fit the
other needs without significant modifications or changes. I have some suggestions and
recommendations. The conservation area on the site is part of the open space and green
515 infrastructure. That needs to be defined on a drawing so it is in the record and will carry through.
Those numbers need to be set in conformance with the zoning. Stormwater basins need refinement
and plantings need to be established. Screening out the view of the stormwater management area, in
my mind, is the wrong thing to do because it provides the Village an opportunity to bring a
gardenlike element to it. (Mr. Ferlow passed around photos of different types of stormwater basins;
520 some were mowed, some were allowed to grow wild.) He continued: The stormwater management
area should be integrated with the landscape. Plants can be simple native signature plants in upstate
New York such as goldenrod and asters. The plantings should be established and simple. The
configuration, modified in the framework of functionality, should have a visual impact and have the
potential to display things like sculpture and be tied in and connect the two community areas (the
525 Village/hotel and the art park). Incorporate a trail system or walkway system that hotel guests can
walk out through and go down to the trail.

Mr. Ferlow continued: The planting plan needs finishing. The Design Guidelines compliance
narrative needs to be completed. Regarding the streetscape at the conference center and a
530 functioning pocket park, the benches need to be thought about in more detail so that people can sit
across from each other and talk. It is an idea for a pocket park that will enhance the Design
Guidelines elements. Establish a path system on the site with connectivity potential--not just for the
hotel. Right now, the sidewalks seem to function primarily for the hotel. They should potentially
connect to the trail to the art park and allow circulation through the stormwater management basins.
535 All are in relation to the intent of the Village space that is different from the average commercial
development. The conference center at the eastern side is 4 feet below the street at the floor
elevation. As such, it is down in a bit of a hole. A recommendation should be made that the
architect should study the conference center so it works better with the street grade. It is a separate

540 unit and could be raised 24-30 inches. It would work better with a pocket park, work better with a streetscape, require less excavation, and make the difference in roof heights between the main tower of the building and the conference center roof less intense separation. I discussed this with two of the HPC members and they said it is a preferable thing to make it fit better and have more sensitivity to the site. It needs to be considered and discussed. Everything I said tonight are items that will take this basic site plan, which is in place, add to it and not modify it significantly or alter the current plan
545 in any great detail, but refine it and bring it into greater compliance with the Design Guidelines.

Robbie Lewis commented that people in Cazenovia like to walk, walking paths, and access to everything. She likes the idea of a walking path. Many trail access points do have a place to park. It would be nice to have available parking for people who want to access the trails in the back. She
550 would also like to ask for bicycle access. She wondered if it would be possible to have bicycle racks at the hotel. She likes the idea of a water feature and places for people to walk and access the green area. Ms. Lewis noted that there are types of parking surfaces that are permeable and the Village should be thinking about that.

555 R. Huftalen said that stormwater management is a major consideration in the site plan and it has been in front of the Village Engineer. The applicant has to prove that runoff will be no greater than prior to construction.

560 Mr. Hagan turned the conversation back to grading and went through the numbers. The current grading plan was for the purpose of trying to hide the delivery area for the conference center kitchen.

Mr. Ferlow: I raised it as a question from the standpoint of the streetscape. As you enter the driveway, the building is up in the air. One suggestion is the pocket park and how it is configured. Drainage would work better if the building were higher. The building works now, but would it be
565 better if it were slightly higher? I am talking about visually with the difference in roof elevations and visually as you drive in.

Mr. Hagan answered that he understands Mr. Ferlow's point from the visual standpoint from the outside. The major focus was on how to get people back to the core of the hotel. Anticipating how
570 this will be used in the future, when steps or ramps are introduced, that increases liability with the risk of slips and falls. That leads to a lot of functional problems within the interior of the hotel. It would be easier to keep everything all on one level.

575 Mr. Ferlow mentioned the intentions of the VES zone and possible future connectivity with CAVAC, Cowherd, and Muraco. Mr. Hagan said that he had thought about the possibility of connecting CAVAC to the interior road.

R. Huftalen expressed appreciation to Mr. Ferlow for all of his hard work on this project and welcomed his ongoing input.
580

R. Huftalen solicited comments and questions from Board members.

A. Walburger observed that in looking at drawing 8, many of the second and third floor east elevation windows are already obscured to the southern view by the elevated roof lines. Another
585 two feet will obscure more windows. Mr. Hagan commented that will devalue the rooms. He also pointed out that the drawings are somewhat deceptive in that some will have flat roofs at a lower

elevation with mechanical equipment hidden. It will clearly have an impact on the rooms that face on the east side of the building.

590 R. Huftalen stated that the Board has the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) that has been filled out by the applicant. As the lead agency for this project, the Board is responsible for completing Part 2 of the EAF and making an impact assessment. He read aloud the instructions for filling out the form:

595 *Answer all of the following questions in Part 2 using the information contained in Part 1 and other materials submitted by the project sponsor or otherwise available to the reviewer. When answering the questions the reviewer should be guided by the concept “Have my responses been reasonable considering the scale and context of the proposed action?”*

600 R. Huftalen continued that there are two choices of boxes to checkmark on the form: No, or small impact may occur OR moderate to large impact may occur.

1. *Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?* Consensus of the Board: No, or small impact may occur.
- 605 2. *Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?* Consensus of the Board: Moderate to large impact may occur.
- 610 3. *Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?* Consensus of the Board: No, or small impact may occur.
- 615 4. *Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?* Consensus of the Board: No, or small impact may occur.
- 620 5. *Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?* Consensus of the Board: No, or small impact may occur.
- 625 6. *Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?* Consensus of the Board: No, or small impact may occur.
- 630 7. *Will the proposed action impact existing:*
 - a. *public / private water supplies?*
 - b. *public / private wastewater treatment utilities?*
 Consensus of the Board: No, or small impact may occur.
8. *Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?* Consensus of the Board: No, or small impact may occur.
- 635 9. *Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?* Consensus of the Board: No, or small impact may occur.

10. *Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?* Consensus of the Board: No, or small impact may occur.

640 11. *Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?*
Consensus of the Board: No, or small impact may occur.

645 R. Huftalen explained that, as the lead agency, this Board is responsible for filling out the EAF
Part 3, Determination of Significance. He read aloud the instructions for Part 3: *For every question
in Part 2 that was answered “moderate to large impact may occur”, or if there is a need to explain
why a particular element of the proposed action may or will not result in a significant adverse
environmental impact. Part 3 should, in sufficient detail, identify the impact, including any
measures or design elements that have been included by the project sponsor to avoid or reduce
impacts. Part 3 should also explain how the lead agency determined that the impact may or will not
650 be significant. Each potential impact should be assessed considering its setting, probability of
occurring, duration, irreversibility, geographic scope and magnitude. Also consider the potential
for short-term, long-term and cumulative impacts.*

655 To answer Part 3, R. Huftalen suggested the following: The entire procedural review has taken into
account the impact that this will have on the use or intensity of the land, traffic and activity from an
agricultural use to a commercial use, and the Board has found it to be consistent with the
Comprehensive Plan and desirable for the community. The project is in compliance with the zoning
and Village Edge South Design Guidelines and fits the desires of the community. The Planning
Board has determined that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse
environmental impacts.

660 Mr. Kuper wondered if he would need to come before the Board again if he found that raising up the
level of the conference center floor by a couple of feet would be better. R. Huftalen answered that
the floor elevation seems to be adequate as it is now according to Board members, but the Board
would view it as a positive development if the floor elevation changes so that it is higher.

665 D. Webb asked how many parking spaces were originally proposed and how it was minimized.
Mr. Hagan answered that there are 82 rooms and the ordinance requires one space per room. Also
recognized is the fact that if there is an event at the conference center, there could be a need for
additional parking above that. The conference center has a maximum capacity of 300 people. To
670 have that many parking spaces would overwhelm the whole area. An educated judgment is being
made that 122 parking spaces with 8 reserved spaces will meet the needs of the facility. Therefore, a
significant reduction has been made over what could be required. The 8 spaces are a safety valve.
There is no intention to pave those right now. If there is a problem in the future, they will be paved
and used as parking spaces.

675 Mr. Stokes offered a resolution to the Board:

**RESOLUTION
OF THE PLANNING BOARD
OF THE VILLAGE OF CAZENOVIA**

680 **RESOLUTION APPROVING APPLICATIONS FOR SUBDIVISION, SITE PLAN,
ARCHITECTURAL APPROVAL AND SPECIAL PERMIT**

685 **WHEREAS**, Cazenovia Hospitality, LLC (“Applicant”), submitted an application for site plan approval, special use permit and architectural review approval to the Village of Cazenovia Planning Board for the construction of a new 82 room hotel and conference center (“Application”), and

690 **WHEREAS**, the Application concerns the premises located on Nelson Street (Route 20 East), being a portion of lands owned by Rodor, LLC, tax map no. 95.3-1-1.111 (“Premises”), which are located in a Village Edge South (VES) Zoning District as defined under the Village of Cazenovia Zoning Code, within which a four story hotel and conference center is a permitted use upon the issuance of a special use permit, and

695 **WHEREAS**, a public hearing was duly scheduled, noticed and held, and subsequently reconvened on several adjourned dates, during the course of which all those wishing to be heard on this matter were duly heard by the Planning Board, and

WHEREAS, the public hearing has been, or hereby is closed, and

700 **WHEREAS**, the Cazenovia Area Conservation Commission and the Village Engineer have both reviewed this application, and their comments have been taken into consideration by this Planning Board, and

WHEREAS, the matter was duly referred to the Madison County Planning Agency pursuant to the provisions of Section 239-m of the General Municipal Law, and the Madison County Planning Agency recommended that this application be returned for local determination, and

705 **WHEREAS**, the Applicant has requested approval of the Application based upon the following plans and drawings by J.S. Hagan Architect, P.C. (unless otherwise indicated) all, unless otherwise indicated, last revised July 10, 2014: (1) Site Plan; (2) Grading & Utility Plan; (3) Sections and Site Details; (4) First Floor Plan; (5) Upper Level Floor Plans; (6) Roof Plan; (7) West and North Elevations; (8) East and South Elevations; (9) Light Spec Photometric Plan dated 7/2/14; (10) Planting and Landscape Plan prepared by Matthew Vredenburgh Landscape Architecture, sheet no. L-106, dated July 14; (11) Existing and Proposed Watershed Map prepared by Matthew Vredenburgh Landscape Architecture; (12) Topographic Survey Map prepared by David A. Vredenburgh, L.L.S., dated May 30, 2014 and last revised June 26, 2014; (13) Final Subdivision Map prepared by David A. Vredenburgh, L.L.S., dated March 27, 2014 and last revised May 30, 2014; (14) Traffic Impact Assessment Report by GTS Consulting dated June 16, 2014; (15) Site Location Map, sheet no. SU-40, dated 5/30/14; (16) Light Fixture cut sheets; (17) Stormwater Management Plans, Fig. 6 and Fig. 7 prepared by Matthew Vredenburgh Landscape Architecture, dated 7/14/14; (18) Hotel Paint and Roof Shingle Selections Board (collectively the “Plans and Drawings”), and

720 **WHEREAS**, the Planning Board has reviewed the short environmental assessment form submitted by the Applicant.

725 **NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED**, that this is an unlisted action as defined by the regulations implementing the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQR”), that this Planning Board is the only involved agency under SEQR, and that the approval of this action will not have any significant adverse effects upon the environment, and therefore a negative declaration shall be prepared and filed for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development is in accordance with the design standards applicable within the VES zoning district. The planned on-site stormwater management facilities are designed to maintain the current quantity of stormwater leaving the site, with no increase in the volume of stormwater or rate of off-site discharge.

730

2. The hotel building is located approximately 300 feet from Route 20 and is situated on the site at an angle to Route 20 in order to mitigate the visual impact of a four story building post development;
735
3. New utility service extensions for sanitary sewer and water will be constructed in accordance with Village standards;
- 740 4. All lighting fixtures will be compliant with the Village’s dark sky lighting regulations, thereby negating off-site light spillover;
5. Route 20 and the proposed new streets are adequate to handle anticipated vehicular traffic flows without adversely impacting traffic conditions on Route 20;
- 745 6. The New York State Historic Preservation Office has issued a “No Impacts” letter dated June 30, 2014 relative to the project;
- 750 7. The proposed development is otherwise consistent with the VES zoning, the neighborhood and the Village Comprehensive Plan.

and it is hereby further,

RESOLVED, that the Application for subdivision approval, site plan approval, architectural approval and special use permit is hereby granted subject to the following conditions:
755

- 760 1. Final engineering review and approval of the site, grading, drainage, landscaping, lighting and utility plans; all light fixtures, poles and mounting bases are subject to specific approval of the Village Engineer as to type, manufacturer and model(s) and conformance to Village Code requirements;
- 765 2. Preparation by the applicant and review and approval by the Village Engineer of a full SWPPP, including erosion and sedimentation control; all stormwater management facilities shall be designed in accordance with Village Edge South design guidelines and shall also incorporate CACC design recommendations as depicted in Figure 7, stormwater management details (Vredenburgh drawing);
- 770 3. The Applicant shall obtain and submit to the Village, through the Village Engineer, a NYSDOT Highway work permit for the proposed intersection with Route 20; new streets will be constructed to village standards and subject to approval by village engineer.
- 775 4. Completion of the design of sewer and water facilities, including hydrant locations, and other utilities, and approval thereof by the Village Public Works Administrator and Village Engineer;
- 780 5. Establishment of a maintenance agreement with the Village for future maintenance of approved stormwater management facilities;
6. Final detail of planting schedule and tree species to be prepared in consultation with CACC and the Village Tree Commission and approved by Village Engineer;

- 785 7. The conservation area shall include provisions for future public access to public trails that may be connected to the site. The conservation area shall be delineated on the final site plan. A written legal description of the area shall also be submitted, and permanent easement or other document containing the permanent restriction on use shall be approved by the Village Attorney and then recorded in the County Clerk’s office;
- 790 8. All utility easements and requests for dedication of streets and utilities shall be subject to approval by the Village Attorney;
9. Applicant shall submit a written narrative report documenting compliance with VES design guidelines.

795 AND IT IS HEREBY FURTHER RESOLVED, that no approval of any signs is included in this resolution. All requests for sign approvals shall be the subject of a future submission to this Board.

Dated: July 14, 2014

800 A. Walburger observed that the applicant has met an overwhelming percentage of bullet points previously indicated in the Board’s past meetings and the project should be allowed to move forward.

805 R. Huftalen commented that no building permits will be issued until all conditions are satisfied. Given how far this project has come and the willingness of the applicant to work with all the various parties concerned, he made a motion to adopt the Resolution with the conditions stated.

A. McDowell seconded. The motion carried and the Resolution was adopted with a vote of 4 in favor and 0 opposed.

* * * * *

810 A. Walburger made the motion to adjourn the meeting. A. McDowell seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 4 in favor, 0 opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

815 Respectfully submitted,

Marlene A. Westcott
Recording Secretary