

**Village of Cazenovia Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
July 9, 2018**

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

Absent: Adam Walburger; Zach Young, Alternate.

10 Others Present: James Stokes, Village Attorney; Susan Smith; Bob Lucas; Susie Lucas; Gabrielle Reagan; Matt Monroe; Greg Widrick; Matt Vredenburg; Todd Harrington; Tim Mahoney.

\* \* \* \* \*

15 R. Huftalen called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. and introduced the Board.

\* \* \* \* \*

20 R. Huftalen noted a comment made by Mayor, Kurt Wheeler, regarding the May 14, 2018, Planning Board minutes on page 2, line 60 when Dave Jahnsman said, “If South Meadow residents think it will be connected, they will come to the Planning Board in force.” The Recording Secretary checked the recording. The Board believes that Mr. Jahnsman misspoke and this should have read “. . . South Village residents . . .” R. Huftalen made a motion to revise the minutes and reissue them.

25 D. Raleigh seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed. The minutes will be revised and reissued.

R. Huftalen asked for any changes to the minutes of June 11, 2018. He mentioned an error on page 5, line 194: The application inquired . . . This should read: The applicant inquired . . .

30 R. Huftalen made a motion to approve the minutes with that correction. S. McEntee seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

S. McEntee commented that the minutes reflect that Zach Young was absent. He wondered if Zach was expected to attend. Mr. Stokes answered that the alternate is supposed to attend.

\* \* \* \* \*

35 **Gabrielle Chocolates, RODOR, LLC, Special Permit, Public Hearing**

R. Huftalen opened the public hearing and stated that the Planning Board is lacking some things for site plan review. This application has been sent to the Madison County Planning Department for review and no comments have been received. Due to those reasons, no action can be taken tonight.

40 R. Huftalen informed the applicant that the site plan needs to show the Board that there is compliance with all Codes. The following are needed:

1. Enough copies for each of the Board members.
- 45 2. Drawn with a minimum scale of 1 inch equals 100 feet.
3. A north arrow.
4. Location of dumpsters and trash facilities. If there are none, that needs to be stated.

5. A record of applications for permits from other public agencies.
6. A floor plan of the whole space showing different areas and dimensions with customer and employee access.
7. Lighting plans.
8. Parking spaces and driveway.
9. If something is not applicable, put N/A.

Ms. Reagan stated that there is a tremendous amount of space in the barn, but the way it is partitioned off already, it fits her purposes. The plumbing is already there from a previous creamery. The operation is pretty green and there is very little waste. She will not have a dumpster. She will use standard residential curbside trash.

Susan Smith, a member of the community, asked if there is going to be a retail operation there. Ms. Reagan answered that there will be no retail.

R. Huftalen recapped: The application is at the Madison County Planning Department now. The revised site plan will be submitted to them. The application will be amended by the applicant to include a more detailed site plan map. Once the new site plan is submitted and comments are received back from the County, the Board might be in a position to take action at the next meeting on August 13.

R. Huftalen asked for any other questions or comments from the public. Hearing none, he made a motion to close the public hearing. D. Raleigh seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Aldi, 120 Nelson St., Architectural Review and Utility Screening Plan**

R. Huftalen stated that he has been corresponding with the applicants regarding the need to come back before the Planning Board to finalize architectural review and the utility screening plan items left open. At the last meeting, the Board discussed the area where the second sign was intended to be located. The Board decided that the treatment used is appropriate and adequate. There needs to be discussion regarding the Board’s final approval resolution when the Board approved the site plan. The resolution stated: *All utilities shall be located underground to the extent practicable. Any utilities located above ground must have adequate screening.* We asked the applicant to provide that screening and they actually installed some of it last week. Greg Widrick is here to talk about what they did.

Mr. Widrick: We spoke with Rich to see what he had in mind and we were open to anything. We talked about arbor vitae. They grow fast. They work as a good screen cover. We took those photos to a landscaper and told him what we were looking for and how we wanted this done. And he came up with a plan of putting 12 arbor vitae around the transformer. This utility was not contemplated during our site plan approval. This is something new that National Grid dictated where it had to go. We had to alter the path a little bit and put these 12 arbor vitae around it. This landscaper said to leave an open space in the back so the transformer can be serviced. He recommended 3-4 feet high and spaced the same amount apart. He said they will grow rapidly. If they are too thick, they will die off and get brown spots. He said this is a very hardy size to go

95 through the seasons. He said that within 12-18 months they will be filled in. We went ahead and planted them.

A. McDowell: Who keeps them up when the deer come and eat them?

100 Mr. Stokes: I have to finish the maintenance agreement with their attorney.

R. Huftalen: There is a provision for a maintenance agreement with the developer for the landscaping. In fact, they have already replaced some of the stuff that didn't make it through the winter. It looks good to me. I wanted to make sure the rest of the Board is on board.

105 D. Raleigh: They used something similar to screen the utility at the new Manlius Fire Department.

Mr. Widrick: I'm not sure if those are arbor vitae or cedars. I think those might be cedars.

110 R. Huftalen: In our discussions, that is one of the things we didn't want to do was have a treatment of tall thin columns. I was assured these will fill in more completely.

Mr. Stokes: Is the plan to trim them as a hedge once they mature?

115 Mr. Widrick: Keep them short because we have the street that is right there.

Mr. Stokes: So maybe the Board wants to specify a height at which they are supposed to be maintained.

120 R. Huftalen: I think that would be important for public safety.

A. McDowell: Then there would be no obstruction of the view in making the left-hand turn out there. The height will be really important.

125 Mr. Widrick: It sure is.

R. Huftalen: Can we incorporate this in the maintenance agreement?

130 Mr. Stokes: Put it in the resolution tonight. The maintenance agreement is going to say to maintain it in accordance with the Board's approval.

Mr. Widrick: Those are anywhere between 3-4 feet tall. We had to alter the path closer to Route 20. It is tight to Route 20 definitely. I wouldn't go much higher than the height of the transformer. Then it is not creating additional visibility issues.

135 R. Huftalen: I would be in favor of incorporating that as part of a resolution that they be maintained.

A. McDowell: It is going to be very important.

140 Mr. Widrick: I agree. I shop there and I want to be able to see.

S. McEntee: Is it 6 feet?

145 Mr. Stokes: I would say pick a number whether it is going to be 6, 8, 12 inches higher than the transformer.

S. McEntee: The tallest electrical enclosure is taller than the bollards if that is the gauge. To me, it's back from the road. You are going to pull up. It shouldn't be an obstruction because it looks like it's at least 10 feet off the road. So 6 inches taller than the tallest enclosure.

150 R. Huftalen: The other issue raised was the generator whether it falls under utilities and screening.

S. McEntee: Yes because it is an electrical source.

155 Mr. Widrick: Two issues on that. First, it was identified on our site plan and even in the architectural plan that was approved. There was no vegetation around it at all. Second of all, there is precedent with the hotel's generator, which is twice the size of ours and has no screening around it, and neither does CAVAC.

160 R. Huftalen: The only thing I would say makes this a different case is that, 1) This fronts on a public street. 2) There is a provision for public art that is immediately in front of it.

Mr. Widrick: Which has been installed. Isn't Lakers Lane a public street also?

165 R. Huftalen: It is. But if I'm correct, this is actually facing the parking lot.

Mr. Widrick: You go up to Lakers Lane, where there is a T in the intersection, and it's right in front of you.

170 R. Huftalen: I would say they are two different cases, in my opinion. That's why we have a Board with different opinions.

Mr. Widrick: And the fact that the approved site plan didn't have it as a requirement. That's the main reason. We were told we couldn't have two signs because we couldn't set a precedent. We looked at precedents in the community. We looked at the hotel generator. They now have solar installed on the roof.

175 D. Raleigh: The utilities should not be crowded. They need to be accessible.

180 Mr. Stokes: Nothing says it has to hide it, just offset the impact.

Mr. Widrick: CAVAC has low vegetation.

185 R. Huftalen: I think putting two or three arbor vitae up there would not be an undue burden. There is a public art immediately adjacent to it. It fronts on a public street. It is going to get traffic. There will be residents back there driving up and down the street.

A. McDowell: It would be appreciated.

190 R. Huftalen: The resolution in 2017 said: *All utilities shall be located underground to the extent practicable.* Obviously, a generator is not going to be located underground. *Any utilities located above ground must have adequate screening.* Our Counsel would take the view that this is a utility.

195 Mr. Widrick: I haven't looked in the definitions of utilities, if they are even defined in the Code, whether a generator is actually a utility versus equipment.

Mr. Stokes: It is part of the electric and utility system for the building. I think the Chairman's position is easily defensible.

200 R. Huftalen: I didn't poll the Board beforehand, but I will poll them now.

D. Raleigh: I am in agreement with Rich.

205 Mr. Stokes: We don't have anything from the Madison County Planning Department on this. I didn't have anything to send them. This is an application for amendment.

210 R. Huftalen: I would propose three arbor vitae plants to screen the generator. The existing screening for the transformer in front of Aldi is adequate and shall be maintained at a minimum height of the bollards and a height no taller than 6 inches above the tallest electrical enclosure. The architectural treatment where the second sign was intended to be located meets with the Planning Board's approval.

215 Mr. Stokes: Everybody understands it takes time for these to grow. Next month we will put it into a formal resolution. Just so it is clear in the record, where are the three plants supposed to go?

R. Huftalen: There shall be three arbor vitae plants across the front, on the east side of the generator, between the generator and the stone dust path. I will mark it as such on the drawing.

220 Mr. Stokes: Again, do you want to specify a height?

S. McEntee: There should not be a height restriction for the generator screening because it will not be blocking any road visibility. It should be at least the height of the generator.

225 R. Huftalen: I'm in favor of that.

Mr. Widrick: Please let Bill Carr (Zoning/Codes Enforcement Officer) know we are trying to pin him down for those quick connects on the fire hydrant. We need specifications. In the other projects we have done, the fire department does them and we give them a donation.

230 R. Huftalen: I have this application marked up on sections of the site plan. I will give it to Mr. Stokes to send it to the County.

Mr. Stokes: Is there any plan to move the pole that really restricts turning movements?

235 Mr. Widrick: Yes. Again, it's National Grid that is holding it up. But, yes, absolutely. We want it out of there.

\* \* \* \* \*

240 **Mahoney Design & Build, Green Leaf Station, Emick Lane, Architectural Review, Several Home Plans**

Tim Mahoney came forward. He gave a booklet to each Board member. It is a book of house plans for Green Leaf Station, Emick Lane. He would like the Board to give a blanket approval on them to streamline his sales process. These plans are currently being offered for the remaining lots that are  
245 left. He went through the booklet plan by plan and pointed out the ones the Board has not yet seen. The Aspen has not yet been built. The Dogwood has not yet been built. The Lilac has been approved by the Board and is currently under construction. The Lilac has a couple of versions with front and side load garages. The Lilac under construction is a side load garage on Lot 17. The  
250 Cherry Blossom has been built several times and there are two- and three-bedroom versions, which do not change the elevation. There is a version of the Cherry Blossom that has a farmhouse type front elevation. The plan is very popular and he does not want to continue to build it without changing the front elevation, so he gave it a farmhouse look with a full porch across the front. There is a side load Cherry Blossom that has not been built. The Magnolia has been approved and built. There are different floor plan options for it, but they don't change the exterior. The Wisteria has  
255 been approved and is currently under construction.

Mr. Mahoney's ultimate goal is to get the Planning Board's approval on all of these designs so that he can go to Bill Carr (Zoning/Codes Enforcement Officer) with his site plan as opposed to  
260 appearing before the Planning Board for each individual house design. This will streamline his sales process. Anything that is different from the plans in the booklet will need to be seen by the Planning Board.

S. McEntee asked last time if certain lots could be excluded from certain pre-approved house plans. He would like the Planning Board to have the ability to review a plan for a lot where a side load  
265 garage is possible, such as a corner lot or where there could be two prominent faces of the house.

Mr. Mahoney said that Lot 3 fits that description. He has every intention to require a side load garage there. Lot 14 has a buyer and the garage will be facing the hammerhead as discussed at last month's meeting. Lot 18 has the width to do it and he would require it to have a side load garage.  
270

A. McDowell expressed being in favor of that idea.

R. Huftalen questioned whether those lots should be excluded from pre-approved plans or whether those lots should be required to have side load garages. Mr. Mahoney said that either way works for  
275 him.

S. McEntee prefers to exclude them from pre-approved plans so that Mr. Mahoney is not tied to a requirement of a side load garage. Lot 3 is an easy one to have a side load garage, so if  
280 Mr. Mahoney wants the Board to require that so he can move forward faster, the Board will do that.

Mr. Mahoney said that requirements are always scary. It is his intent to require buyers to have side load garages. But if somebody comes along and wants to build right away and have a front load garage, he does not want to be tied to that requirement. He would rather have the option to come  
285 before the Board. He has always intended that Lots 3, 14, and 18 have side load garages. He is currently dealing with topography issues on Lot 14.

290 R. Huftalen summarized: Lots 3, 14, and 18 will be excluded from pre-approved house plans. Mr. Mahoney will provide a sample board of siding and roofing colors and materials to be left at the Village Office. Mr. Mahoney added that every house is required to have carriage style garage doors and a detail element at the peak of the front gable.

295 Mr. Mahoney requested to get two booklets with each individual page initialed by the Planning Board Chair to act as the masters—one for the Codes/Zoning Enforcement Officer and one for Mahoney Design & Build. In the past, he has found this to be prudent. During the course of the meeting, R. Huftalen did initial each page of two booklets and gave them to Mr. Mahoney.

300 R. Huftalen declared this a Type II action under State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) 617.5(c)(9), construction or expansion of a single-family residence. It is not subject to any further SEQR review.

305 R. Huftalen made the motion to approve the booklet of six architectural renderings, with variations, dated 6/28/18 and initialed by the Planning Board Chair referred to in the minutes of the July 9, 2018, Planning Board meeting. These are approved for architectural review, but do not constitute issuance of a building permit. An architectural review application needs to be filed with a building permit application and the appropriate drawings attached to it. Samples of previously approved colors and materials on file shall be used with the booklet that is initialed. S. McEntee seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

310 Mr. Mahoney mentioned that Lot 5 has a buyer and they have chosen a 3-bedroom Cherry Blossom, the variation with no bump out for the bathtub. Siding and roofing have not been chosen, but will be from the approved palette. This will be the last Cherry Blossom like this, but other versions are still available, such as the front porch or side load garage versions, to make it different.

315 R. Huftalen commented that this will put the pre-approved house plan strategy to the test.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Willow Bank Yacht Club, Beach Area Renovations**

320 Todd Harrington and Matt Vredenburgh came forward. Mr. Vredenburgh explained that the Willow Bank Yacht Club is proposing to improve function, aesthetics, safety, erosion control, and drainage on the north side of the club. They would like to remove the asphalt driveway that goes to the beach and replace it with a walkway, which will be safer for people going to the beach. This will remove approximately 1,800 square feet of impervious surface, which is an improvement for lake water quality. The surface for the walkway has not yet been determined. It could be asphalt, stone dust, or pavers. Material will depend on the budget. The water pours down the existing asphalt driveway into the lake and takes the sand off of the beach and puts it into the water. The proposal will intercept the runoff at the top of the slope, midway down the slope, and possibly at the lower portion of the slope with a trench drain. Downspouts from the roof will be intercepted. Runoff will be piped over to a dry well in the lawn area to let it infiltrate into the soil before it finds its way to the lake. Grading of the lawn area will level off some sloped areas to allow for level picnic tables, etc. There will be steeper slopes between the level areas for people to lean up against to watch fireworks, etc. Aesthetics and function will be improved at the Owahgena Room entrance. There will be a more attractive level area with seating opportunities. The grass bank is eroding and falling into the

335 sand. The proposal is to install a timber seawall approximately 18 inches high to shore up the edge  
and people can sit on it and watch kids in the water. This project will not touch the water.  
Appropriate erosion control measures will be used. Stairs will be turned into ramps.

340 R. Huftalen stated that this application is subject to site plan review and a more detailed site plan is  
required. It is within 500 feet of a county highway, so the application must be reviewed by the  
Madison County Planning Department. Once the application and site plan are received by the  
Village Office, they will be submitted to the County by the Village Attorney.

345 Mr. Vredenburgh noted that a separate application has been submitted to the New York State  
Department of Conservation (DEC) for dredging the swimming area. Over the years, the sand has  
migrated into the water. DEC has approved it in the past, but that permit has expired. Therefore, a  
new application has been submitted.

\* \* \* \* \*

350 R. Huftalen asked for any other business to be brought before the Board. Hearing none, he made the  
motion to adjourn the meeting. S. McEntee seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor,  
0 opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

355 Respectfully submitted,

Marlene A. Westcott  
Recording Secretary