

**Village of Cazenovia Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes  
January 14, 2019**

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

Absent: Anne McDowell and Zach Young.

10 Others Present: James Stokes, Village Attorney; Mike Millson; Dennis Gregg; Bob Lucas; Andy Day; and Dave Mosher.

\* \* \* \* \*

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

\* \* \* \* \*

20 R. Huftalen asked for any changes to the minutes of December 10, 2018. R. Huftalen made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. A. Walburger seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Millson Residence, 127 Lincklaen St., Addition, Architectural Review**

25 Mike Millson came forward to explain. The left elevation is looking at the house from Lincklaen Street. It is an addition of 32 feet. It is also adding a two-car garage, which will add 12 more feet to the north side. It will be 1,447 square feet added. It is similar to the existing design in that it retains the original house with the front porch. It is the same style design. It is adding the garage to the side. It will have matching shingles. He reviewed the zoning regulation about changing the frontage with the Zoning/Codes Enforcement Officer, Bill Carr, and it passes. The front and rear setbacks are  
30 okay. The house has a large front setback and the addition will bring it in line with the other houses around it. The addition will not be a full two-story all the way to the front. It will be similar to the way it is now where there is a one-story part in the front and it comes to the ridge of the garage. The existing driveway and the proposed driveway are shown on the plans. It comes into the Town and he talked to Roger Cook, Town Zoning Enforcement Officer. Mr. Cook did not see anything worthy  
35 of going to the Town Planning Board. The porch is similar to what exists.

40 R. Huftalen commented that the Planning Board has architectural review for this application. It is the Board’s duty to make sure that it is generally compatible with the rest of the neighborhood. In his opinion, this addition looks compatible with the other homes in the neighborhood. Other Board members voiced their agreement.

45 R. Huftalen declared this a Type II action under State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR). Since no other agencies are involved, nor will approval have any significant adverse effect on the environment, no further SEQR action is required. It is recommended that a Negative Declaration be prepared and filed.

A. Walburger made the motion to grant architectural approval for this application. D. Raleigh seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

50

\* \* \* \* \*

**Caz Barns, LLC, Bob Lucas & Dennis Gregg, New Road and Apartments**

R. Huftalen commented that Mr. Gregg has been working on this over the past few months and they have met to discuss it. R. Huftalen asked Mr. Gregg to come before the Board and make a general presentation. This is a sketch plan and no action will be taken tonight.

Mr. Gregg introduced Andy Day, CEO of Caz Barns, LLC; and Dave Mosher, the architect. The land is under contract with Bob Lucas of RODOR. Mr. Gregg went over the sketch plan with the Board. The house and barn parcel was already subdivided and is separate from this project. Another piece is proposed for subdivision for some other use at some point. The intention is to build apartments in the section that is zoned Residential Multifamily (RM). They were thinking of putting a road between the house and the dentist's office (Dr. Fauth). It was identified as Road C in the Village Edge South (VES) Guidelines. But it is not physically practical to do that. They are proposing to build two apartment buildings with about 40 units per building. All of the details are not available at this point in time, but elevations and details the Planning Board expects will be available at the time of the public hearing. The intent is to follow all of the VES guidelines and the Comprehensive Plan. They hope to schedule a public hearing for the February meeting.

R. Huftalen asked if Mr. Gregg had spoken to Bill Carr, Zoning/Codes Enforcement Officer. Mr. Gregg said yes and that Bill wants to make sure that the amount of road going over top of the water and sewer lines is minimized. He continued that ductile iron was run through there when the other development was built. He will continue to work with Bill. There are 80 feet to work with and Mr. Gregg will try to minimize the impact. Water lines will run on the north side of the new road. Sewer lines will run on the south side of the new road. The road will be a horseshoe shape. Another road will drop down to the apartments. At some point in time, there will be plans to connect to a landing area and another station to get onto the hiking trail. But right now the only thing he wants to do is build the apartments. He questioned if this is in the VES district, but zoned RM.

After looking at the zoning map, R. Huftalen and Mr. Stokes said it is not in VES and that it stands alone as RM. Mr. Stokes commented that the road would go through the VES district and would need to adhere to any VES standards.

Mr. Gregg asked if that would be the same as South Meadow with 12-foot driving lanes with an 8-inch kick up. Mr. Stokes advised him to match the road to the Aldi road because they will connect at some point.

S. McEntee wondered about the extent of the wetlands. Mr. Gregg said they would be put on the map. It is pretty obvious where they are when you walk it.

R. Huftalen inquired if the landing mentioned would be part of this project or another phase. Mr. Gregg answered that would be in the future. There will be a delineation, but he might do something minimal at this point in time.

R. Huftalen mentioned that there are some agreements to figure out, such as with Dr. Fauth. Mr. Stokes added that there is a condition with Dr. Fauth that when the new road became available,

he would need to abandon his driveway from Route 20 and access his office from the new road. This is to minimize the number of curb cuts and for safety.

100 R. Huftalen inquired if other projects are contemplated in this area. In looking at the map, Mr. Gregg pointed out the wetlands and the area for the storm management system. He stated that he has no other plans to do anything else.

105 R. Huftalen remarked that the Planning Board needs to avoid segmentation and needs to look at the total project. Mr. Gregg stated that his only intention is to build the apartments. All construction will be kept inside the dotted line.

110 Bob Lucas commented that this project appeals to him because these developers know what they are doing. He admitted that he did not know what he was doing and was just chopping up the land and did not realize the grade was that low back there.

R. Huftalen asked if this is going to be the only access to Route 20. Mr. Gregg replied yes and there will be a conversation about sidewalks.

115 R. Huftalen noted that emergency access needs to be planned. A. Walburger added the new road would provide multiple avenues of exit to Route 20 for traffic pressure relief and emergency access. It establishes the actual configuration of a buildable lot and other things that are unknown for a future project.

120 S. McEntee mentioned screening for the properties along Nelson Street. The plan represents a lot of vegetation there now. Mr. Gregg said that you can look into those back yards because there are not very many trees and there is no defined hedgerow. Required setbacks will be in place.

125 S. McEntee inquired if there is any plan for screening of those properties. Mr. Gregg answered there would be discussion about this. A. Walburger advised Mr. Gregg to just plan for screening.

130 R. Huftalen looked at the buffer requirements in the Code, 180-110, which specifically refers to any non-residential land use where it adjoins one or more residential districts. These are two residential districts. R. Huftalen told Mr. Gregg to still plan for screening. Mr. Gregg said he would expect to do something. A. Walburger said that the Planning Board will give further guidance when a lot configuration with parking becomes available.

135 R. Huftalen questioned if there is going to be a private road to access the apartments or if it will be a dedicated Village street. Mr. Gregg replied that this will be discussed internally, but part of it might be a private road. Mr. Stokes commented that if nobody else is going to use the road besides the apartments, there is no reason to build it to dedicated Village standards. S. McEntee added that if the property is subdivided in the future and a parcel is sold off outside the RM area, then the road does need to be built to dedicated Village standards. Mr. Stokes said that the apartment driveway could come off of the road. Mr. Gregg indicated he would define that between now and February.

140 S. McEntee reiterated that if there is ever a desire to develop anything off of the south section of the road, the road needs to be built to Village standards. Mr. Gregg said that the road could be extended and there could potentially be something past the apartments and then the road would be built to

Village standards. Mr. Stokes noted that if any part of the road is dedicated, a turnaround is required.

145

R. Huftalen stated that the Board will be looking at RM zoning.

Mr. Gregg asked for a public hearing for February. Mr. Stokes said that is not possible because the Board does not have a site plan yet.

150

Mr. Gregg inquired whether a site plan needs to be presented. Mr. Stokes commented that there are too many unanswered questions, such as locations of buildings, parking lots, screening plans, and more. It is too early to open this to public debate. If it is going to be subdivided, then plans also need to be submitted. If it is not subdivided, lines need to be drawn to avoid setback problems. The Planning Board needs to know the plans before it is presented to the public.

155

R. Huftalen remarked that subsequent events might be called segmentation.

A. Walburger said he would like to see the proposed subdivision lines so that coverage checks can be conducted. Otherwise, the math works against 26.2 acres. If the intent is to build this as an RM zone, it should be carved out.

160

R. Huftalen said that if it is not subdivided, then conditions would need to be added that need to be enforced by a future attorney or board. Mr. Stokes said that should be avoided if possible.

165

Everything should be on paper so it is known what district regulations need to be applied. All questions need to be answered before a public hearing is scheduled.

Mr. Gregg wondered if a public hearing could be set up later in February instead of waiting for the March meeting.

170

S. McEntee inquired about the notice period for a public hearing. He was informed that plans need to be submitted two weeks ahead. Mr. Gregg indicated that time frame would be too difficult to achieve. He said he would develop a site plan between now and the next Planning Board meeting on February 11.

175

R. Huftalen recapped that Mr. Gregg needs to show the parking configuration, setbacks if the property is subdivided, road access details, screening details, site lighting, photometrics, dark sky compliance, fixture cuts, landscaping plan, grading plan, lot coverage or subdivision, and stormwater plan. The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is subject to Village approval.

180

Mr. Stokes mentioned that another reason to stay entirely within the RM is that VES has special conditions. R. Huftalen added that it is more clear cut in RM than VES.

S. McEntee sought confirmation that this request is for two 40-unit buildings. Mr. Gregg answered yes, a mixture of 1-2 bedrooms.

185

R. Huftalen cited the Code for multifamily dwellings that there must be at least 1.5 parking spaces for each dwelling. Mr. Stokes clarified it is per apartment regardless of number of bedrooms. He believes the size is defined and is 180 square feet, probably about 9 feet x 20 feet.

190

\* \* \* \* \*

R. Huftalen asked for any other items to be brought before the Board. There were none.

195 A. Walburger made the motion to adjourn the meeting. R. Huftalen seconded. The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

200

Marlene A. Westcott  
Recording Secretary