

**Village of Cazenovia Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
October 9, 2017**

5 Present: Rich Huftalen, Chair; Adam Walburger; Anne McDowell; Stephen McEntee; Don Raleigh.

Others Present: James Stokes, Village Attorney; Kurt Wendler; Greg Widrick; Duncan Sproule; Brian Enders; Roger DeMuth; Brenna Hughes; Will Huftalen; Todd Harrington; David Muraco; Louis Muraco; and Steven Riedl.

10

\* \* \* \* \*

R. Huftalen called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and introduced the Board.

15

\* \* \* \* \*

R. Huftalen asked for any changes to the minutes of September 11, 2017. S. McEntee noted that the name Matso should be Matzo. R. Huftalen made the motion to approve the minutes as submitted. A. McDowell seconded. The motion carried with 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

20

\* \* \* \* \*

**Roger & Naomi DeMuth, 59 Chenango St., Addition, Architectural Review**

25

Roger DeMuth and Todd Harrington came forward to explain. Mr. DeMuth presented a model of the proposed addition. An existing addition will be removed and replaced with a slightly larger addition on the backside of the main house. A larger entryway is proposed. The studio will be extended 10 feet back. Everything will be kind of the same as it is, but will be a little deeper. The net increase is about 240 square feet.

30

R. Huftalen reminded the Board that because this is not in the Historic District, it is the Planning Board’s role to provide architectural review for reasonable compatibility, consistency and harmony of the height, scale, proportions, nature and quality of materials, colors and related architectural design characteristics of proposed new or altered buildings and other structures and related site development with the dominant and traditional architectural design characteristics of surrounding existing buildings and site features. R. Huftalen stated that he finds it to be so. In his opinion this is a nice plan. No variances are required and it looks like a straight forward proposal. R. Huftalen declared this a Type II action under SEQR (State Environmental Quality Review) under 617.5(c) construction or expansion of single family residences. This is not subject to review under SEQR, so this project is exempt.

40

R. Huftalen made the motion to grant architectural approval for the application as presented. A. Walburger seconded. The motion carried with 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

\* \* \* \* \*

45

**Duncan Sproule, 7 Fenner St., Porch, Architectural Review**

Mr. Sproule came forward with Steven Riedl to explain. There is no difference in the footprints of the old porch and the proposed porch. The old one has a concrete deck and the new one will have a wood deck. The columns will be different. The old ones are round. The new ones will taper from the bottom to the top. They will be painted to match. The porch will have 6 x 6 treated foundation-grade posts put into the ground below the frost line. The brick columns on the left and the right will stay.

R. Huftalen questioned if all four columns will be similar. Mr. Sproule answered yes, the posts are round now and the new ones will be squared off with a slight taper. The new ones will be pressure treated with a box around it for the shape.

R. Huftalen noted that this falls under the Planning Board’s purview because it is not in the Historic District and it is the Planning Board’s role to provide architectural review for reasonable compatibility, consistency and harmony of the height, scale, proportions, nature and quality of materials, colors and related architectural design characteristics of proposed new or altered buildings and other structures and related site development with the dominant and traditional architectural design characteristics of surrounding existing buildings and site features.

A. Walburger commented that it is hard to be against adding another wood porch in the Village and it looks good to him.

R. Huftalen declared this a Type II action under SEQR (State Environmental Quality Review) under 617.5(c)(9).

A. Walburger made the motion to grant architectural approval as presented. A. McDowell seconded. The motion carried with 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Aldi, New Plaza Identification Sign**

Greg Widrick handed out a drawing of the sign proposal.

Mr. Widrick: This falls under Zoning Code 180-117F(4):

*For buildings, or a group of buildings under common management containing more than two businesses, offices or other commercial enterprises, one shopping/business center ground sign, not exceeding 60 square feet in sign area, nor more than 10 feet in width and nine feet in height. No lettering shall exceed 24 inches in height, and no portion of the sign identifying an individual business or tenant shall exceed 24 inches in height.*

Mr. Widrick: It is for a multi-tenant identification sign. I double checked. Everything seems to match the criteria required under it, not exceeding 60 square feet in sign area. We are not even close to that. No more than 10 feet in width, 9 feet in height. No letters shall exceed 24 inches in height, and no portion of the sign identifying an individual or tenant shall exceed 24 inches in height. So the letters all conform to that. Again, this is a front-lit sign, so it is basically just a board.

R. Huftalen: Is it going to be ground lit? Will there be lighting from the ground up?

95 Mr. Widrick: Yes.

R. Huftalen: As Mr. Widrick said and Mr. Stokes can confirm, on the site plan, we got a monument sign identified as to where it is going to go. It's in that main entrance. It is not just an Aldi monument sign, but it's for a building or group of buildings under common management containing more than two businesses, offices, or other commercial enterprises. A couple of questions I had, 100 Greg, if you have more than one . . . It will say Cazenovia Market on the top, you think, and then if you have another alternate . . . For instance, there are three parcels that front the road. Would you want to be able to identify more than just two businesses?

105 Mr. Widrick: We would be open to that, but we are just trying to stay within those constraints. This is placed more at that one common entry, if you remember the site plan, it's before the Village Street, directing people that this is the driveway.

D. Raleigh: For those two. On the scale, I know it looks like the brick is not to scale.

110 Mr. Widrick: It's just a red standard brick. The sign guys just sometimes use a template.

R. Huftalen: Would you be proposing the same color brick as Aldi?

115 Mr. Widrick: Yes. It has to match. Dave (Muraco) is required to use the same materials we are using so it will be a common color.

R. Huftalen: My only point of concern going forward is if the other partner up there wants a sign for a group of buildings at this entrance. I would want to get that clear before we make this approval.

120 Mr. Widrick: Dave (Muraco) has reviewed this and approved it. We have an email that says he approves it. I thought he was going to be here tonight. He approved this. He is the one who recommended that we have Cazenovia Market at the top. He would be fine with that.

125 R. Huftalen: I think this also requires County approval, Jim?

Mr. Stokes: Yes, it has to be reviewed by the County.

130 Mr. Widrick: Is that something you guys submit automatically, or do we have to do that?

Mr. Stokes: We submit it. I was hoping you would put together some kind of an application form to submit.

135 Mr. Widrick: I can work with you on that.

S. McEntee: Did you specify lighting? How you are going to do the lighting?

Mr. Widrick: An LED. An LED light that washes up.

140 S. McEntee: Is it actually attached as part of the base?

Mr. Widrick: It is in the base.

145 R. Huftalen: That became a point of discussion over at the brewery about making sure it was compliant with the intent of our dark skies law so it is not shining upward unduly.

R. Huftalen: What other things were we thinking of among the Board members?

150 A. Walburger: You hit on the biggest point, which is to prevent the road front from being excessively demarked with other signs. As long as we can accommodate the other properties up there adequately, then it seems fine by me.

155 R. Huftalen: I would say the next steps would be to get an application filled out specifically for this. Then we will get a description of the project to the County and get their referral back. Then we will be able to take action.

S. McEntee: I'm trying to understand. What is the width of that grassy area between the parking lot and the road? This looks like it is going to be about 12 feet long.

160 R. Huftalen: It is 60 feet to the front of the store.

S. McEntee: From the edge of road, basically?

165 Kurt Wendler: From the property line. So to the road will be wider because there is an easement that is green space. There are a bunch of plantings around it, low level plantings that are not shown on this, but would be installed based on the approved site plan.

R. Huftalen: Any other questions? Anybody from the public?

170 D. Raleigh: Proportionally . . . The Hampton sign that is out there . . .

R. Huftalen: That is a directional sign. This is not a directional sign. It is a plaza identification sign.

175 D. Raleigh: This will be bigger than that. The McDonald's . . .

Mr. Widrick: They are in a different zone so they have a full-on monument sign.

180 R. Huftalen: Village Edge North has a different set of rules. This is defined in our Code as a shopping/business center sign. A ground sign identifying any building or group of buildings containing more than two retail stores or other businesses on commercial property.

Mr. Widrick: We will follow up with Jim tomorrow.

185 Mr. Stokes: What are the materials?

Mr. Widrick: The sign itself is some sort of polymer plastic, but it looks like wood. It is not a box sign, so it's going to be flat.

190

\* \* \* \* \*

**Johnson, 77 Forman St., New Garage, Architectural Review**

Brian Enders came forward to explain. This is a garage addition on the south end of the property being added to the existing house. It will be two stories with a bonus room above. The owner wants to do something with the front entry façade and embellish the house a bit. It is within the sideline setbacks. The old blacktop driveway will get torn out and be planted to grass. The garage will come out 31 feet, 10 inches from the existing building. The roof will stay basically the same.

195

200

R. Huftalen declared this a Type II action under SEQR (State Environmental Quality Review) 617.5(c).

R. Huftalen commented that he finds it reasonably compatible with other properties in the neighborhood.

205

A. McDowell made the motion to grant architectural approval as submitted. D. Raleigh seconded. The motion carried with 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

\* \* \* \* \*

210

**Vet’s Field, 26 Chenango St., New Sign**

Mr. Stokes explained. There was a proposal last month for a new sign. Mr. Stokes handed out copies of a proposed amendment to help with the Board’s recollection. There was a discussion at the Village Board meeting last week about this essentially being a governmental or quasi-public use sign and the provisions of Section 180-117 relate to this. The Village Board is going ahead with a local law to modify that section that would make a sign for Vet’s Field exempt by making the amendment that you see. One of the exempt categories would be government signs established by government authority or for the identification of buildings or facilities owned by governmental entities or utilized for governmental/public uses such as, but not necessarily limited to, polling sites and public athletic fields, etc. He had discussed this with R. Huftalen a little before the meeting. One potential downside to that is that it does not necessarily put any parameters on a sign such as this in terms of size or design. Once it is exempt, it is exempt and it really would not come before the Board. One of the things briefly discussed by R. Huftalen and Mr. Stokes is how the Planning Board might feel about establishing some parameters. Mr. Stokes did a review of existing provisions that exist in other districts. A business identification ground sign, which is allowed in certain business districts, cannot be more than 5 feet in height, no more than 24 square feet per sign face. According to his calculations, the proposed sign is 10-1/2 square feet per sign face. The height is shown as 7 feet with the roof. Maybe if the roof were removed or another type of roof or cover could be used to bring it within the 5 feet. Quasi-identification signs are much larger; not more than 60 square feet of sign area, not more than 10 feet in width, not more than 9 feet in height. It is certainly well below those parameters. He wondered if the Board would want to establish some parameters and say the sign is exempt as long as it does not exceed certain dimensions. Those are a couple of examples in the Code.

215

220

225

230

235

R. Huftalen commented that if it is made exempt, it is exempt and there is no review.

Mr. Stokes observed that this sign looks great, but somebody else might come along with something that is not so great.

240 S. McEntee noted that the Planning Board is not changing the law here. It is the Village Board that will do that.

Mr. Stokes said he is looking for suggestions from the Planning Board to incorporate into the amendment.

245 S. McEntee stated he would like to make reference to the same Code that defines the limits of a business identification ground sign.

250 R. Huftalen questioned whether it would be more appropriate for a business identification sign or a business center sign because of the multiple uses; polling place, grange, and the fields.

S. McEntee said that for the future, if some place is exempt and they are exempt from all Code, we may be asking for trouble.

255 R. Huftalen stated he was thinking about a business owned by a government entity or utilized for governmental/public purposes, such as a park or a cemetery.

260 Mr. Stokes stated that he can easily make a distinction between buildings that are owned by a municipality and those that are used for governmental purposes so that this limitation would only apply to those used for governmental purposes, but not necessarily owned by a municipality. That would deal with the Planning Board's concerns.

265 A. Walburger questioned if the intent is to put the constraint on the outside entity who is operating under this exemption, not the Village itself. He said he is fine with that. Given that constraint, he is still fine with it complying with the 24 square foot limit just to further the constraints of the exemption.

S. McEntee commented that the Village does not want a gigantic sign just because they can get away with it. Then it's out of bounds of a normal sign.

270 R. Huftalen wondered if the Board should consider the sign face itself or the entire structure. Mr. Stokes answered that the entire structure should be considered. That way, the Board can tie it back to another standard.

275 S. McEntee believes this sign is modeled after the Rotary sign on Burton Street. R. Huftalen asked if Rotary owns that property or if the Village owns it. Mr. Stokes responded that the Village owns it, but the sign there is grandfathered.

280 R. Huftalen said he likes the idea of referring back to a shopping/business center sign. That allows a little bit bigger sign. It is 180-117F(4) in the Code:

*For buildings, or a group of buildings under common management containing more than two businesses, offices or other commercial enterprises, one shopping/business center ground sign, not exceeding 60 square feet in sign area, nor more than 10 feet in width and nine feet in height. No lettering shall exceed 24 inches in height, and no portion of the sign identifying an individual business or tenant shall exceed 24 inches in height.*

285

Mr. Stokes commented that is quite a bit bigger. It is 60 square feet instead of 24. It is 9 feet high instead of 5. It is 10 feet wide. That is a lot of sign.

R. Huftalen stated that ultimately it is the Village Board that decides.

290

A. Walburger pointed out that for the current Vet’s Field proposal, the entire structure is roughly 22 square feet including the roof. It fits inside the 24 square feet. It seems to be the right size total area for this type of sign. Given that this Code is already well established and has been around for many years, he thinks it is more prudent to point back to the identification sign.

295

R. Huftalen stated that A. Walburger convinced him. He agrees with that.

The total consensus of the Board was for the 24 square foot business identification sign.

300

\* \* \* \* \*

**New Venture, Village Edge South Mixed Use Development Preliminary Discussion**

Dave Muraco and Louis Muraco were present.

305

R. Huftalen noted that Mr. Widrick and Mr. Wendler were before the Board earlier tonight talking about the Aldi plaza identification sign and how they wanted one sign for the whole development. He urged Mr. Muraco to discuss the sign with them to make sure there is enough room to identify all of the businesses in the development. Mr. Muraco said he had already made a decision to have only one sign with just Aldi and the drugstore on it.

310

Copies of the plans were handed out to Board members. Mr. Muraco explained there would be no change to the Aldi or the drugstore. He cannot reveal the drugstore design yet. What was previously referred to as the bank building was 5,000 square feet with a drive-through. The tenant has backed out for the 5,000 square foot building. He is now proposing a 7,000 square foot building. That portion of the property was never subdivided, but if it was subdivided, it would be about 1-1/2 acres—about 60,000+ square feet. He is also proposing a three-story building. There would be 12 apartments total on the second and third floors and some retail downstairs. Part of the retail space is labeled for elevator and stairs in the center of the building. People would be entering from the parking lot. 2,000 feet of that will be used for residential development in the back—to be used for a club room, office, administration, fitness, coffee/vending, whatever. He does this at one of his buildings in Manlius and it works out really well and it is used by everybody. People who live in Carriage Gardens right now, go work out at Suburban Park at the club house and they can pay their rent right there as well. Parking for this development has been increased by about 16 spaces. This is a small increase in square footage. His engineer, Napierala Consulting, will put together revised drawings. He wants to leave the drive-through for financial or retail use. The building design is probably what everybody would be excited about. It goes back to the Comprehensive Plan—the McLaughlin Building—that everyone used as an example of what they would like to see. There were 32 units previously approved. He is now proposing 48 units and going three stories high. The footprint would be changed by about 7 or 8%. He has the layout of the apartments. The foundation plan is in process. Going from 32 to 48 apartments, parking needs to be increased. He is working on getting that accomplished without having a huge impact. He is trying to keep the footprint the same. He is choosing to go with the larger footprint of 1,210 square feet for every quad of four units. The first site plan was based on 1,100-square foot units, but they are now going to be

315

320

325

330

335 1,210 square feet. One-bedroom units will be 960 square feet because they work well, especially for  
seniors. Then there will be three units of 1,210 square feet. These will not have elevators. He wants  
to get an opinion from the Board about parking along the right side of Village Street C on the west  
side. He might possibly want parking all the way up and push the sidewalk a little to the right. He  
does not believe there will be a lot of traffic for a couple of decades or more. He does not see a  
connection happening. He said he sees it as a dead end street, so putting parking on the street is not  
340 a bad idea.

R. Huftalen wondered why Mr. Muraco chose the west side versus the east side. Mr. Muraco  
explained it would pull them across the street where there is no traffic and to keep cars away from  
buildings.

345 R. Huftalen recommended getting Mr. Carr's (Codes/Zoning Enforcement Officer) input on that  
regarding snowplowing. There would be no overnight parking since it will be a Village Street.  
Mr. Muraco said he could not do that, so that is eliminated immediately.

350 S. McEntee inquired if entrances to the apartments would only be on one side of the building.  
Mr. Muraco answered, "Yes, right out to the parking lot."

Mr. Muraco stated that he wanted to make sure the Planning Board is receptive to these ideas before  
getting into a lot of engineering. He wanted to let the Board know where he is headed with his  
355 plans. He is looking to spend more money and build bigger and nicer places to handle some bigger  
furniture and bigger appliances.

R. Huftalen asked why the other buildings would not have elevators. Mr. Muraco replied that  
elevators cost about \$100,000 per building. The whole front building, every apartment, will be ADA  
360 (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliant and that building will have an elevator. That is  
12 apartments with an elevator. All of the first floor apartments will be ADA compliant.

R. Huftalen commented that he likes the elevations and the number of ADA compliant units. This is  
a vast improvement over just the bank building. He likes the density it brings to the area. It is  
365 starting to achieve a mixed use feel.

A. Walburger wanted to verify the number of apartments: 48 in back and 12 up front for a total of  
60. Mr. Muraco confirmed those numbers. A. Walburger noted that this is approaching some actual  
density numbers. This is starting to achieve the gateway look. This is a substantial improvement  
370 over the bank building. This configuration is vastly improved. A. McDowell agreed as well as  
S. McEntee and D. Raleigh.

A. Walburger noted that these are changes to the initial site plan. There are a lot of details to figure  
out. Where does this go next?

375 R. Huftalen replied that this will fall under a modification to the site plan. Mr. Stokes continued that  
it does not reopen the initial approval. It would be limited to the amendment.

R. Huftalen stated that the site plan has been approved and these modifications are relatively minor.  
380 And the sentiment of the Board is that this is an improvement over what was originally approved.

385 D. Raleigh observed that there is a sign on the plans. Mr. Muraco said it is a directory just like Aldi. Mr. Stokes added that the problem is that only one plaza identification sign is allowed and Aldi and the drugstore are sharing it. A ground sign is allowed, but then it takes the place of a building-mounted sign. That would be the smaller parameters, i.e., 24 square feet. There can be multiple tenants on the building.

390 R. Huftalen said that the HPC (Historic Preservation/Architectural Advisory Review Committee) looked at the Aldi building. There is an application for a variance based on what the HPC recommended. They asked Aldi to go from an angled front to a square front. Because of that, Aldi wants two signs. That recommendation is part of their grounds for seeking a variance. He believes that the sign on the elevations of the building in front would get a lot of support from the HPC. S. McEntee commented that it is like a decoration. Mr. Muraco said it is like the McLaughlin Building. Mr. Stokes added that it is like an architectural feature.

395 Louis Muraco said they shrunk that sign from the original one. It was originally bigger. It was broken up in the middle for the recreation center. There is 5,000 feet of available space split up between those tenants, based on frontage percentage, are linear feet.

400 R. Huftalen pointed out that is multiple tenants in a single building, which he believes is different from a plaza identification sign. He cited the example of the Atwell Mill where the signs are on the side of the building facing Albany Street. Mr. Stokes said it would be a directory sign on the building, but it is small.

405 Mr. Stokes stated that Village Edge North (VEN) and Village Edge South Mixed Use (VES MU) can get a directory sign near the entrance, but that is not what is being proposed.

Mr. D. Muraco said he would like a 2-foot by 8-foot sign at the entry door.

410 R. Huftalen looked at 180-117F(1)(e):

415 *If a building contains more than one business, office or other commercial enterprise, in lieu of individual business identification signs located on the individual portions of the exterior building faced owned or leased by the business operator, business identification signs may be grouped together in a single central location visible from the street, in which case each individual business identification sign shall be not more than two feet in height, and the entire grouping of such signs shall not exceed 8% of the area of the building face upon which the grouping of signs is affixed, or 75 square feet, whichever is less.*

420 Mr. Muraco asked if that is per tenant. Mr. Stokes answered yes, per tenant. Each tenant gets their own sign mounted to the building.

425 Mr. Muraco asked if it could be split front and back. Mr. Stokes replied, only one sign per business. He continued that in Code Section 180-117F(1)(e) says: . . . *grouped together in a single central location visible from the street* . . . Theoretically, they could be put on the gable end that faces Route 20. If they are all grouped together, then the whole thing is subject to the 75 square feet.

Mr. Muraco inquired if graphics in the windows are allowed. Mr. Stokes said that window signs are different. Mr. Muraco wondered whether he could have double sided signs on brackets like there are

430 downtown. He thinks that would be the best way to do it. He wants to avoid coming in for a variance.

R. Huftalen recommended discussing the options in Code Section 180-117F with his engineer to determine the best fit. The Code in Section F is quote detailed.

435 R. Huftalen commented that this makes a nice addition to the hard edge of the Village.  
A. McDowell said it is a real trendsetter. A. Walburger added that this is beautiful progress.

440 Mr. Muraco said he would like to get things going with his engineer and get things put together so the Village Engineer is happy with the changes. There are some changes to the storm management areas.

445 R. Huftalen informed Mr. Muraco that an official application needs to be filed, a legal notice needs to be published, and a public hearing needs to be held. A site plan and architectural elevations are also needed.

Mr. Stokes suggested that Mr. Muraco’s engineer submit a letter summarizing the changes.

450 R. Huftalen asked for any further business to be brought before the Board. Hearing none, he made the motion to adjourn the meeting. S. McEntee seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 8:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

455 Marlene A. Westcott  
Recording Secretary