

**Village of Cazenovia Planning Board
Joint Session with the
Historic Preservation/Architectural Review Committee (HPC)
Meeting Minutes
May 13, 2024**

5

Planning Board Members Present: Rich Huftalen, Chair; Adam Walburger; Steve McEntee; Anne McDowell; and Don Raleigh.

10

HPC Members Present: Ted Bartlett; Bill Paben; Gene Gissin; and Scott Shannon.

15

Others Present: James Stokes, Village Attorney; Marlene Westcott, Recording Secretary; Matt Vredenburgh; James (Jace) Brown; Caleb Sayers; Jim Dungey; Todd Enders; Thomas Tait; Bill Hall; Nancy Hall; Mark Ferguson; Jacqueline Silberberg; Michael Silberberg; Charlie Andrews; JoAnn Harrod; Dennis Harrod; Lauren Lines; Anne Ferguson; Bill Poglitsch; Mimi Weber; David Mehlbaum; Deb Alden; Mark Smith; Diane Webb; Barb Arnold; Jack Khalil; Marlene Burrell; Stefan Lutter; Amanda Bury; Steve Kent; Mark Goris; Kelly __ (illegible) __

20

30 people signed in.

* * * * *

25

R. Huftalen called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. He asked for any changes to the minutes of April 8, 2024. R. Huftalen made the motion to approve the minutes as presented. D. Raleigh seconded. The motion carried with 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

* * * * *

30

Russ Milana Residence, 9 Allen Street, Restoration

Todd Enders was present as the representative.

35

R. Huftalen: Mr. Enders presented this project to the Planning Board last month. We reviewed the details and forwarded them to the Historic Preservation/Architectural Review Committee (HPC). The HPC looked at his project and approved the project as presented. Mr. Enders had to come back to the Planning Board as per our Code. The property is a preexisting nonconforming structure. It involves the demolition of a garage. The project details are such that it is quite clear that the alterations and additions that Mr. Enders is proposing do not significantly increase the impact of the nonconformity on the adjoining lots. The Planning Board needs to ensure that is the case. The rest of the members of the Planning Board saw the project last month. Are there any questions for Mr. Enders? Todd, are there any comments you would like to add? There is a garage on Allen Street that is going to be demolished. And there are going to be some improvements made to the back of the main structure.

45

Todd Enders: The short of it is that with it being nonconforming, we are making it more conforming with the same square footage. We are not asking for more square footage than what's there. We

50 will take the buildings and structures and congregate it and bring it more into the center of the property in a manner that would be historically fitting to the building, which I think is what the review was about.

R. Huftalen: Any comments or questions from the Board? (None were heard.) As it pertains to State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR), it is well determined that this is a Type II action under 617.5(c)(9), construction or expansion of a single-family, two-family, or three-family residence. As 55 such, it requires no further action by this Board. I am going to make a motion to approve the modifications as presented.

A. Walburger: I second.

60 The motion carried with 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

* * * * *

Silberberg, Albany Street Holdings, LLC, 99-103 Albany Street, Site Plan & SEQR Review

65 R. Huftalen: This project has generated a lot of public interest. I appreciate Mr. Bartlett bringing his board along. We are holding a joint session here so that the two boards might inform each other. The HPC had an initial review. They entertained some public comments and shared those with the Planning Board.

70 Ted Bartlett: We are here tonight for the public hearing. I would like to say that since we are the guests, the special meeting of the Village of Cazenovia Historic Preservation/Architectural Review Committee (HPC) is called to order tonight, May 13, at 7:00 p.m. We are meeting at the same time as the Village of Cazenovia Planning Board. The purpose of the meeting is to hold a public hearing 75 regarding the application of Albany Street Holdings for their proposed project at 99-103 Albany Street, Cazenovia. We, HPC, will be receiving public comments on the project and will not be making any decisions. Review of the project will continue at the HPC's May meeting, Wednesday, May 29 at the Village Office Conference Room at 6:00 p.m. We welcome your comments and thoughts about the design and appearance of the project. We will also be staying to assist and 80 comment with the Planning Board on the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) review of the demolition permits.

R. Huftalen: As Ted noted, we are going to get an overview of the project. We are going to get questions and comments from the Planning Board. Our Board will continue with the SEQR review. 85 We have had a chance to take a look at the Full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) that has been provided by the applicant. There is a Part 2 that we will be working through and getting Mr. Stokes' help on. We will attempt to make a determination of environmental significance as required by the State Environmental Quality Review Act. This joint public hearing is to consider the application of Albany Street Holdings. We have special use and site plan review, re-subdivision 90 review, architectural review and certificate of compatibilities that we need to assess. You might wonder, why does it take two boards to get this taken care of? The HPC's purview is on the architectural features of the project. The Planning Board has declared lead agency status and we will be doing the SEQR determination. With that, you know what both boards are doing up here. We

95 have invited a lot of public comment. This is the first official public hearing we have had. The applicants have had a lot of feedback and they have responded to it. They have detailed changes to present tonight.

100 Matt Vredenburg: My name is Matt Vredenburg. I'm the landscape architect for this project. I'm here with Jace Brown and Caleb Sayers from Beardsley Architects and Engineers. They are the architects for the project. I will do a quick overview for those who aren't familiar with it. Our property is 99-103 Albany Street and 7 Center Street. We are proposing a mixed use residential/commercial building. There will be commercial on the first floor along Albany Street and residential on the upper floors. It is four floors with the fourth floor set back from the edge to make it less visible. (Pointing to overhead projection): This portion of the building is actually only going to be two stories so it is more in scale and more in keeping with the property next door, Amanda Bury's property. We are pulling back the building here, to create a little plaza space. There is a residential entrance right here, and a commercial entrance right here, and a commercial entrance right here. We have about 12 feet of elevation change across the property dropping down Albany Street. Currently, there is an old, defunct auto repair shop and old NAPA building that is L-shaped. And there is a residence at 7 Center Street. We are proposing approximately 31 units. We have parking on the first floor out of sight under the building. We have access to the parking off Center Street. That's the gist of it for the site. First, we met with the Planning Board in April. We met with the HPC April 22. We got a lot of good public comments. We appreciate those comments because it makes it easier for the public hearing. We have heard a lot of really good comments and we have been able to incorporate them into this latest iteration of drawings. The HPC heard all the comments from the public and they summarized it for us so we had a checklist. These guys have done a great job of reflecting them in the revised architecture. I'm going to go through the key points they brought up and these guys will demonstrate how we have addressed those. First, there was a comment about windows. The nature of the windows on Albany Street are more vertical than they are horizontal. The windows looked square, but they are better now. We have addressed that. Another comment that came up a lot was that this new building, especially from the Center Street elevation, looked more like East Genesee Street in downtown Syracuse. There is a lot of new residential architecture there for the students. It is somewhat homogenous and doesn't have any distinct character. The HPC wanted a better look at the façade details. We have addressed that. There was a comment about entryway fenestrations. There was a request to provide samples of materials that are being proposed. There was a request for a less rendered graphic to easier see some of those details. All of those things have been addressed. We were asked to get photos of the existing buildings before they got demolished and we are going to do that.

130 Jace Brown: Thank you for the opportunity to present the project to the community. We will not spend a tremendous amount of time because we have already had two public forums for this and going through the details of the project. We have all that information. We would be happy to go through it. We will be focusing more on the list that Matt presented in terms of salient changes and responses to the community's comments. This is a 3D version of the site plan that Matt presented. The overall mass and form of the building is identical to the last iteration. This is a bird's eye view and not something that anybody would apprehend from a car or the street. This view is slightly closer to the grade plane of the structure that's fully rendered. In response to some of the comments last time, we toned down the reflectivity of the glass. So now you can get a much better sense of what is actually being proposed in terms of the façade of the building and how it relates to the retail experience and transparency of a lot of the similar façades you see in the rest of the village. We also spent time, and you will see this in the details, looking at some of the cornice and window elements.

140

We will zoom in closer to see these elements and how they have changed since the last presentation. This is the lower level plan with the parking below the grade plane. This allows access to Center Street. The back of all of this is buried in the ground. There is commercial space that goes out to the sidewalk on the first floor. This is the plaza space a level above. There is another commercial tenant opportunity there, as well as another portion of that partial space fronting Albany Street. We then have the units in the back and some of the common amenities on the first floor. The upper floors are more or less identical to one another with the exception of this being a two-story structure and only has a second floor. Then we are looking at a roof on the third floor. Lastly, we have some of the rooftop units on the fourth level with some roof garden spaces overlooking the surrounding community. In response to the community's comments, we did spend some time going through what we would consider contextual fabric. What are other things that are happening in Cazenovia that make it feel like the town that we know? Caleb, do you want to comment on this?

Caleb Sayers: Sure. One of the comments we got was, if you were here previously, you would probably notice that on the Center Street elevation that we had a lot of triple gang windows. People were reading that as a horizontal element as opposed to a vertical element. One of the things I really liked on the building on the corner is these triple windows separated by brick. That is a detail that we changed in the façade to reflect more of what is happening in the community. This is a double gang window that is not in every building, but is common enough. Then a lot of single windows with a lintel and a sill. The comment that stood out to me was that the building looked too much like East Genesee Street. One of the reasons I think that is is because a lot of new residential buildings are lacking detail. They are very straight forward. They use blocks. They can be lacking in the small, rich details that make some of these older buildings really important and really loveable. You can see these stone lintels, the subtle brickwork that happens in a lot of these buildings. If you walk up and down the street, you will see buildings with rowlock courses or soldier courses at every level. That is something we tried to incorporate in this iteration. In this picture, you might recognize it as a brick detail from the old NAPA building, which is set to be demolished. When I got a close look at this, I really liked this detail. Ted mentioned in might be a good idea to try to incorporate a gesture toward that detailing in our building, so we have tried to do that. The pictures at the bottom show the general context. The thing that I wanted to pull out of this is the tone of brick we tend to be seeing in the area and some of the nice limestone base that is also pretty common as you walk down the street.

Jace Brown: Just some observations. Again; another request was a more black and white version of the drawings not rendered. These are part of the packet the boards have received. We wanted the public to see these as well in terms of how the proposed structure relates to the overall mass and form of what is next to it. You are starting to get some of the details that Caleb was just talking about. You are starting to see cornice elements. You are actually starting to see all of this, which has actually been part of our presentation. It is just more refined at this stage. There it is in black and white. There is the colorized version of it. Again, we have reduced the reflectivity of the glass so it doesn't read as black for you. You can see what is going on there. This is actually a pretty typical Victorian façade organization. We've got these larger, what would normally be cast iron, but in this case it's steel, elements. And then in-fill with smaller muntins as appropriate to the scale of the opening. And that's happening on a smaller scale on a smaller building and a larger scale on a larger building. We have also used a common preservation technique in the form of having a bit of glazing in the space between the structures. This is something that is often encouraged in preservation projects where we are trying to be able to unite buildings together, but not trying to block them together into large masses. This is what we call a glass hyphen between two larger

statements. This façade is a colorized version. One of the biggest changes, in terms of the actual architecture, is a proposed material change. Last time we were talking about this being a precast architectural façade panel. One of the limitations of that product was that we were limited to standard brick coursing. There is no variation possible with that product in terms of doing any kind of pattern or articulation. So after discussions with the owner, we have decided to change this to a thin brick. It is real brick, just thinner size and the way it is attached to the building. We have an example here. That has enabled us to start to introduce more articulation into the patterns. Here you are seeing some rowlock coursing. You are seeing larger stone lintels and heads on the windows. You are also seeing some articulation of the cornice as well as in the brick. There are corbels here. There are some nice sculpted architectural details to form up this cornice. Another thing I will point out is that we have spent quite a bit of time looking at coursing and where this is all lining up in terms of the façade panels. So that is one example of some of the articulations brought into the brick pattern of the building. Another area will be above the commercial entry. Here you can see much more clearly what is being proposed. This is an iron storefront, effectively. This will be all metalwork, which is painted. We have nice glass panels, nice articulation of all of the glazing in that space. We do have a generic label on here. We don't know what this tenant will be. They will certainly have some input into signage and that, of course, will be a subsequent review as appropriate in the future. We did want to get across the idea that there is quite a bit more going on here than the black mass that people were reacting to last time. An area on the front that we will zoom into. This is what Caleb was making reference to. Not only were we able to break away from the standard brick running bond coursing, we have now introduced some articulation at the bottom. We have pulled these pilasters forward slightly. We have actually repeated this mortar detail effectively from the NAPA building, which is a nice nod to the past. It is one of those things that a local history buff will be able to comment on walking down the street. There is a nod to that building and a repetition of something that people might remember from the past. We think it works really well with these other stone elements. Again, that articulation of the cornice is there on this building as well. You can see the repetition as well on the bottom of the storefront. Moving on to the east or Center Street elevation. Again, here is a clearer version of the rendering. There are a couple of things worth commenting on. Here you are also seeing the vertical lines. All of these windows are mulled together into vertical groups, giving us a little more up and down massing. Switching this to the thin brick product enables us to break these apart into separated window units, having a very Victorian aspect ratio of the 2 over 2. We have done that where we can. It was difficult for us to do that everywhere because of the layout of the apartments. We have a number of building codes we have to meet at the same time, in addition to meeting these façade requirements. We have done it where we can on the building and I think to good effect. We felt like this was welcome input from the community that I do think made the building better. You are seeing some of the articulation in some of the stonework in the base course below the façade. We spent a bit of time looking at the mass and scale of this façade and again the coursing. We will show you some of the materials we have selected. We have physical samples. We will zoom in on the garage entrance. We put together a rendered area here so you can see clearly the different materials being proposed. We have a mixture of sandstone blocks, architectural façade panel here, real thin brick here, sandstone here. We have the cast stone panels here. We will show you all of these materials. We have also made some changes in response to community input on these two sides of the building. This is the west elevation, which is a difficult view to actually apprehend in real life. There are other structures here getting in the way of being able to see this. This is the actual architectural elevation projection. This is the north side, which is the Hotel Lane façade. Last time, we had a lot of metal panels on this side of the building and we have reduced that significantly in this iteration. So the metal panel is no longer on the north elevation. This one here that I am highlighting is really what

240 presents to Hotel Lane. All of this is really in the background. It is actually quite a bit farther away
from Hotel Lane. That is wrapped all the way around to our circulation tower. There is quite a bit
less of that corrugated metal façade panel on the building, which we think added variety. I think the
difference in colors is also helping to break down the mass and scale of the building to what appears
to be a variety of smaller structures. This is another request from the last meeting. What does this
look like from Center Street? Caleb went out and got this photograph the other day. The blue line
245 represents the actual façade size of what this new structure is. One challenge this time of year is that
all of the leaves are down. This is a view with the appropriate scale of the building. We believe it is
accurate to what will appear in real life. We did drop in a tree with leaves just to give you a sense
that there is quite a bit of buffering there, that the separation that is naturally occurring here with the
house. This is about the maximum angle you can see it on the street. If you were walking on the
250 sidewalk, you would see even less of the structure on Center Street.

Caleb Sayers: This is a view from across the street from the Lincklaen House. As the street goes
downhill away from the center of the downtown area, the building is a lot less imposing as you
might guess. This is what this view is trying to get across. This is a view taken from across the
255 street from the Mexican restaurant. You can see the smaller two-story structure here and then the
three-story structure in the background and then the fourth floor, which is pushed back about 20 feet
from the edge. This is where our elevator and stairs live. This is a view of the commercial entrance
to the lower commercial area. This is obscured by a tree. This is the smaller, two-story building
with the plaza area that is pushed back from the street. This is a nice view that I feel gets across how
260 that top floor, while it doesn't totally disappear, but fades into the background when you view the
building in perspective. The goal of the project was to get residential units, and get units that are
nice and attractive. We also wanted to make the building less imposing and more fitting to the
context of the town. I think it really comes across in this image. This is the residential entrance,
which is nestled between the two-story commercial space and the larger building. You can see this
265 nice plaza area. I can imagine in the summer that would be a really nice place for the downtown
walk through Cazenovia away from lake to terminate. As I mentioned, the residential entrance is
right here, kind of forming a little hyphen between these two buildings.

Jace Brown: We will talk about materials with the lights on.
270

Caleb Sayers: Just a quick note on materials. I'm going to use the east elevation along Center Street
to talk about that really briefly. Along the back of the parking structure, we are seeing this as a
basement level or foundation. At the very base there will be a concrete water table and above that a
course of a concrete fabricated block which will go up to a line. Our main façade is going back and
275 forth between thin brick. The color we have selected for that is a rose blend velour. We thought it
worked well with the other brick colors that you find in the area. The sandstone architectural panel
façade pieces are a gray color. The metal siding at the roof level is a charcoal gray. The windows
themselves and storefront and paint will be closer to a true black. Those are the broad strokes of the
materials we are proposing for the façade.

Jace Brown: Just to mention, too, that all materials have variation within them. We are presenting
one example. There are going to be some that are slightly lighter or slightly darker. I personally feel
that lends a more natural tonality to it. It is not as homogenous as you would get with some
products. This also has a really nice facing on it. It has a fluted texture to it, which makes it feel like
285 work stone. There will be mortar joints between all of these products. It will be real mortar. There

will be real mortar between the brick joints. These façade pieces do have surface texture, so very similar to natural limestone. It is not just flat. If you look at it from the side, you can see there are waves on there. It does have a natural texture to it, the way sandstone or limestone would cleave.

290

Anne Ferguson: What are the lintels made of?

Caleb Sayers: The lintels will probably be a flat gray cast stone to match the brick.

295

Jace Brown: Similar to, but not exactly the same.

R. Huftalen: I am going to ask the Board to comment and then I will open it up to the public. Do the members of the Planning Board have any questions or comments? Anything you want to get across or get any clarification from the project presenters?

300

A. McDowell: I am very pleased with it. Very pleased. I see that you have tried to conform into Cazenovia, yet it still has a modern sleek look to it. I'm very pleased with it.

305

S. McEntee: Similar sentiments. I compliment you on the attention to detail. A question: A rough construction schedule timeline?

R. Huftalen: Listed in the EAF there is a broad timeline.

310

Matt Vredenburg: As soon as we can get started, we will. It is all dependent on the approval process. Ideally, demolition would start within the next month if it is approved. I believe construction would follow straight after.

S. McEntee: What about duration?

315

R. Huftalen: On the EAF, it is potentially up to two years.

Matt Vredenburg: A lot of that would be on the interior.

320

D. Raleigh: Similar sentiments to my colleagues here. I love the added detail. I love the zooming in. I'm all visual and you did a great job with that. And incorporating what people are saying and listening. Kudos to everyone involved.

325

A. Walburger: Excellent brick details. A question on the lintels and the lower casement section. Are you saying it is going to be flat manufactured stone like that or will it have a hand worn look like some of the other lintels in town?

330

Jace Brown: This is available in a certain size, which wouldn't be appropriate to the lintels. We have not specified that product, but it would have to be a similar thickness. It would be a cast stone. We have to find something available in that size. The intention is to match this palette as closely as possible so that it all lines up nicely.

Caleb Sayers: If you go around and look at lintels and sills on a lot of buildings here, they are often a very flat, even color and texture. We will look for something that has a little bit of texture to it, but

335 not a lot of texture. Something that will match this in tone, but won't have these striations and chisel marks. It will be a flat cast product.

A. McDowell: I just want to say that I love the windows in the commercial areas. I'm thinking there are going to be big signs on all those big windows. I just hope we don't have to see that. I know there is nothing you can do about it.

340 Jace Brown: The tenants decide what happens on the inside. I think the applicant is looking for a good quality tenant for the village and something commensurate with what's around it. I think that's as far as we can comment.

345 A. Walburger: On the metal building details, the storefront is factory powder coat and comes finished so it has reasonable wearability? Can you speak to the wearability of the metal panels on the west side?

350 Jace Brown: Very similar actually. In both cases you are talking about powder coated factory finish on the metal work. None of this will be field finished. So very similar durability characteristics to other high quality architectural metal finishes.

R. Huftalen: I agree with all the sentiments.

355 Bill Paben: I have a list right here and it seems like they were covering stuff. I would like to say one thing. From where they started to where it is now, I'm really pleased with all the details, and I hope the public is too, and the things you listened to from changing the windows to three windows instead of one connected window. The north side on the backside, which was really a lot of metal, changing the façade and breaking that up so it doesn't look like a manufactured building—like a pole barn—that sort of feeling. It is more broken up. It is well done. I do like the lintels above the windows. The cornice and the corbels on the sandstone look very nice. I was pleased to see that you are going to have not as deep cornice along the brick, which I couldn't see, but I did notice when you did this presentation. I really like how you are playing with the brick and you have more details and are picking up similar kinds of elements that we see along Albany Street. Overall I'm pleased. I also like the recess and the breaking up because it appears that it is several individual buildings, even though it is one building. It doesn't look like the first time it was presented, which was one flat thing. So kudos. Very nice job and nice presentation. I would like to say to the public that I really appreciate the turnout, especially the last one. You gave a lot of details. I think it really helps both boards in making a good decision for our community.

370 Gene Gissin: You said it all. Looking at this, I would like to see, and it's hard to tell from a flat view, but the depth of the windows and setbacks so it isn't as flat. I know that's not the case. But I'm looking at this and saying, "I don't see shadows." If it becomes all that detail and it's all lined up together, we are back to where we started and I know we are not. So great job.

375 Scott Shannon: Some of the blown up sections of windows and a few other things alleviate a lot of my concerns. I'm still a little bit uncomfortable with the sills and lintels as they appear to be very close to being flush with the surface of the brick.

380 Caleb Sayers: I can speak to that a little bit right now. My intent at least design perspective wise is for the lintel to be flush with the brick, but I would like the sill to project at least an inch or two.

385 Scott Shannon: The sill should definitely project, partly just from a watershed prospective. As you
look at 98% of the other lintels around the village, they almost all project at least a ½ inch if not an
inch in many places. In true hoods, they are well out. I'm not saying you need to go there, but if
you had a simple limestone sill, and you can do that with cultured stone easily, you could get those
pretty much any size you want. If you are going to buy this many, they will custom mold them
without any real difficulty. Getting it just a little thicker so you can get some additional shadow
lines. I'm just beginning to see that in some of those other details where you are pulling it out at a
390 45-degree angle, then you can really begin to see it. Another little bit of concern is the use of the
ebony metal and so much of it. It's really a fad right now, I think. I'm a little bit worried about how
fast that is going to be dated. Yes, dark trim colors were very popular during the Victorian period.
But black was actually pretty rare. I'd love to see this in something like a deep red, a deep avocado
green, or forest green, or a deep burnt umber. All kinds of things that would work really well with
395 the rest of your color combination. Technically, we are not supposed to try to dictate color, but I still
think that would really contribute to this a lot. The final comment I would have is on the main, the
tallest piece of your structure, which is the elevator tower, it is really still visible as you are walking
down Albany Street. Having it be basically a blank wall on one side and then have an uneven
window treatment on the south façade seems very odd. It would be great to have something that
400 either suggests that there could be a blind window there. Or, one of the things suggested—not the
greatest building in the world—but we have a blank façade on the Aldi supermarket where they did
some wonderful work, where they detailed some of the thin brick that made it a lot less
objectionable. So you could suggest there were bays that might have been windows at one time,
something like that. You have an opportunity to break up that façade.

405 A. Walburger: Thanks, Scott, for bringing that up. I have been looking at the west elevation, and
some of the broad field limestone sections and other parts of the building that are closer to the street
front have some shadow lines in there. Then there is some pretty large broad field. Even just a
course of 1-inch setback to give you a shadow line in that would go a long way.

410 Jace Brown: Just to be clear, are you talking about where the building meets the grade on Hotel
Lane?

415 A. Walburger: On the west elevation, I think it is the circulation tower. That is what Scott is talking
about when you come down east on Albany Street. Just keeping in mind some of those broad field
areas.

420 Scott Shannon: Like everybody else, I would really like to commend how far you guys have come
and listened. I think you are 95% there.

425 Ted Bartlett: I would like to reiterate a thank you for taking such good consideration of the
comments from the last meeting. It has come a long way and it's looking very positive. I would like
to emphasize as well the articulation of setbacks and lintels. And shadow lines are going to be real
important, particularly on the stone. I didn't hear whether it's going to be incised to look like stone
blocks. Is it or not on the gray part? On the upper parts on the front, on the Albany Street façade.

Scott Shannon: Will you be able to read those as individual blocks?

Ted Bartlett: Is it going to be scored to look like stone blocks?

- 430 Jace Brown: Yes. It will look like stone blocks.
- Ted Bartlett: That will be very helpful. It doesn't come across. I'm concerned about Amanda's property. That little green strip, is that hers or yours?
- 435 Amanda Bury: Pretty much half and half.
- Ted Bartlett: I think a good neighbor needs to really make sure she is happy and somehow that green strip doesn't become a thoroughfare and it is blocked off nicely from Albany Street and she can enhance it. That is one concern I had.
- 440
- Matt Vredenburgh: I met with Amanda last week and we walked along the edge and talked about the project. Her foundation is a stone foundation and then there is a short segment of a bluestone wall that terminates at the NAPA building. What I was thinking was to just wrap that bluestone around the corner. Then we are going to have a small planting strip there between the plaza space and her property. She has a little white picket fence and perhaps we can extend that to 15 feet or whatever just so it keeps it all cohesive. Not only will it look good for her, but it will look good for the people using the space as well. There is a continuity and consistency to it.
- 445
- Ted Bartlett: It makes that a positive space for Amanda.
- 450
- Matt Vredenburgh: Yes, and for everybody.
- Jace Brown: There are fire separation distances here that we will be adhering to. I will just point out that this design and part of the reason we are banking and coaching this into the hill is that this is a shallow foundation here. We want to make sure we minimize impact to that building. This is not a full foundation at that location. We have to get all the way back to about here in the building before we start excavating farther down. Of course, at that point the grade is going with us.
- 455
- Amanda Bury: The conversation with Matt the other day was great and I actually feel so much better. So thank you. The distance that you are going to stick to the current footprint on my side and you are not going to be digging down, those make me feel much better about my old foundation. My foundation on the back wing is newer. I'm feeling much better. All these little details are great. I noticed them immediately when I saw the new drawings. I immediately saw that little square and I knew exactly where that came from. The wall I will be looking at mostly is going to be charcoal?
- 460
- 465
- Jace Brown: Yes.
- Amanda Bury: Is it like metal roof where there is something sticking out, that kind of look?
- 470
- Jace Brown: Yes. It has some surface texture ribbing to it so it's not just a flat panel. That is meant to prevent it from oil canning or moving. It will be securely fastened to the building.
- Amanda Bury: I do like Scott's suggestions about color. Just in getting through the dust and dirt and winter and rain and raindrops on really dark matte surfaces that leaves spots. There is just a lot of crap in the air after the winter. Dried water drops on a surface leave a ring. If you add a little color, I don't think it would be absorbing the dust and stuff. I'm just being practical. You said some
- 475

sections are going to be black. The dirt that accumulates on my windowsills on Route 20. I'm just throwing it out there for you to think about.

480

R. Huftalen: Are there any other comments from the Board members?

S. McEntee: There hasn't been much discussion of exterior lighting. I know there was a comment about minimizing and dark sky compliant. I am curious about the location of lighting. Is that in the plan already?

485

Caleb Sayers: We started getting there, but we don't have a comprehensive plan for lighting yet. We have some ideas of where we would like to put lights. I do have a light fixture that I picked out for along the Center Street façade adjacent to some of the doors there. It's kind of like a carriage light. It is dark sky compliant and that will be our goal for any sconce elements that go onto the building. I feel like we have a ways to go before we really dive into the details of where all of the lighting is going to go and how many lights we actually need for the building.

490

Matt Vredenburg: I think the goal is to light it minimally and only using as much light as we need to make it safe. I would assume we are going to focus our lighting on the doorways—the building mounted lighting. There are a couple of street lights along Albany Street. And I believe there is one on Center Street that is up on a pole. In terms of site lighting, I can't see us doing much more than that—other than lighting the stairs.

495

R. Huftalen: A couple of general things, procedurally, Steve is anticipating some of the questions that we will be addressing in our environmental review. There is a lot of focus on architectural details. Tom brought up the point about construction management and impact on neighbors. A lot of those things will be handled administratively by our team here. Fortunately, they don't have to go far to keep an eye on the construction site. One of the important elements of our SEQR review is adherence to community character and respecting some of the cultural resources we have here, consistency with community plans, consistency with community character. In part, at least, we have reached out to a number of involved agencies. Jim sent out letters and we have gotten some responses. We also have a representative from Cazenovia Preservation Foundation (CPF) here. Mr. Dungey asked if he might present something on behalf of CPF. I think now would be a good time to do that.

500

505

510

Jim Dungey: You might imagine that CPF has been tracking this for some time. Based on what we have seen, right up until this moment, we have come up with a statement, which I will read to you:

515

The board and staff of the Cazenovia Preservation Foundation (CPF) are writing to express our support for the proposed redevelopment at 99/103 Albany Street. As an organization committed to the protection of our community's agricultural, natural, and architectural character, CPF is pleased that this project will enhance our community consistent with our mission.

520

The site at 99/103 Albany Street has long awaited a project of this ambition and scope. The persistent vacancy and disrepair of this site has detracted from the beauty and cohesion of our downtown area and has been a detriment to our community for decades. This proposal not only resolves these longstanding issues but also promises to add vibrancy to the heart of our walkable downtown through mixed-use

525

functionality. This project is a commendable example of smart growth, strategically leveraging existing urban space for new housing and commercial uses rather than encroaching upon our cherished natural and agricultural lands that surround Cazenovia.

530

We find that the proposed building's design thoughtfully responds to the scale and character of the surrounding area. CPF appreciates the proactive efforts the developer has made to engage with the community, seeking feedback and support to ensure the project balances community needs and expectations with overall project feasibility. We appreciate that the building's adherence to modern building practices and codes will ensure that it is significantly more energy efficient than other Albany Street infrastructure, and as plans progress, we encourage the developer to consider other sustainability features to the extent that such measures are feasible.

535

540

This project is a critical step forward in responsible community planning for Cazenovia. We look forward to seeing this project come to fruition and appreciate the positive impact it will have on our community.

R. Huftalen: I would like to entertain any other public comments or questions.

545

Tom Tait: How is the masonry affixed to the building? Is it a wood backing? Is it adhesive? Is it buttered and put on?

Caleb Sayers: Are you talking about the brick?

550

Tom Tait: Brick and stone.

Caleb Sayers: There are different systems. The brick is pretty interesting. It is a metal panel with a bunch of little ledges in it. The thin brick has a little groove in the back of it that hooks onto it. But it also has the ability to do soldier courses or courses on end and quoin bricks that are a little bit thicker. You can kind of take that metal and bump it out like a wood buildout as well. It attaches with mechanical fasteners, like metal edge, and it is also glued on with a construction adhesive. Then all of the grout lines are filled with real grout. The sandstone panel is affixed with metal furring to the outside of the building. The base course that is like limestone looking concrete is mortar applied masonry.

555

560

Tom Tait: I just want to add that Matt and I have been conversing that there is a landscape plan that is involved and it has been given careful thought to be a nod to the history of Cazenovia where on Albany Street it is going to consist of hybrid elms and ginkgoes on Center Street. So all of the harshness of these buildings that we see are going to be softened with landscaping. So I applaud him and the team for their thoughtfulness with that. We will oversee it with the tree commission.

565

R. Huftalen: If you could stand and identify yourself so we can make sure we get the minutes correct.

570

Deb Alden: Thank you very much for the reduction in the corrugated metal. It is significant. Thank you. One thing for you to consider is the side that is facing Amanda's. That is the west, so it will just soak in the afternoon sun. Think about how hot that is going to get and what that may contribute

575 to the carbon footprint and how hot it is going to get on that side. I would love to understand where the ventilation towers and units are going to be. Where are they?

Jace Brown: There will be mechanical units on the roof. As you can see, there is a significant overhang on the upper roof. We do not have a parapet proposed for there because I think that would make the sight lines worse. The units are on the small side, but there will be many of them. It is the direction the engineering is going in. So rather than have a single large package unit with cooling towers on the building, they will be much smaller residential scale heating and cooling outdoor units that would be across this upper façade. Also, on the lower roof which does have a parapet, on the short building, on the two-story structure. A short wall with the mechanicals inside of that. The engineering is still being done on that, so I can't show you an exact unit. But that is the intent for those units. I do believe they will be less obvious than a lot of other large structures, especially a large academic building or large office building where they have large package units that are 8 feet high. These are going to be 3-4 feet.

590 Deb Alden: But they will pepper across the top?

Jace Brown: We will concentrate them toward the back so they are as far away from that roof edge as we can get them. So you would need to be farther and farther away to be able to apprehend them. Generally, at those distances you are focusing on not hitting cars around you.

595 Deb Alden: On a practical note, I asked about parking before. How many parking spaces are there right now? I think requirements are 2.5.

Matt Vredenburg: There are 27 spots.

600 Deb Alden: So where else will they park?

Matt Vredenburg: I understand that the parking requirement is 1.5.

605 R. Huftalen: There is discretion. The Planning Board does not want to encourage surface parking. That is not one of our goals to create more parking. I believe there are no parking requirements with this. The idea from the Planning Board's point of view is that having interior parking is such a tremendous amenity that we don't view it as a substantial obstacle.

610 Deb Alden: It is unusual for a unit of that size to have one car. And then circulation. Is it going to change on Center? Are people going to be cutting down Williams and then onto Center?

R. Huftalen: There are no contemplated changes to the circulation patterns.

615 Deb Alden: So it will be two-way directional to the entrance to the garage?

R. Huftalen: Correct. Thanks, Ms. Alden, I appreciate your comments. She carefully shared some photos with us in an email.

620 Anne Ferguson: I also appreciate the attention to the comments from the public. I just want to underscore what Scott was saying in that I really think for our next meeting if you could show the lintels and the sills projected out rather than flush. To his point also, in terms of having all of the

casings be black, I think it does not necessarily project separate buildings. It presents one building with different façades. If you could change some of the casing work around the windows, I think that would be very helpful, whether it is green or even white. The Lincklaen House is all white. I think you could do some variety here, maybe on the red brick structures that is different from the limestone.

625 Diane Webb: My question is on the parking too. I still don't understand why there are 31 apartments and 27 spaces.

630 R. Huftalen: There is available municipal parking. Part of our goal is not to provide parking for every resident there. It is a little bit inconsistent with what we are trying to do in terms of achieving density.

635 Diane Webb: I am just concerned. I have seen people trying to cross the street right about that spot. I'm thinking about a mother with two little kids and bringing in groceries. If they don't have a parking space, they have got to go behind the library.

640 R. Huftalen: There is parking adjacent to the building. I'm not sure how you would create more parking.

Matt Vredenburg: There is parking behind the building. We are looking at possibly getting some of that already existing surface parking. So making use of what is already there.

645 Diane Webb: I think for most people, unless you are old and not driving anymore, everybody is going to have a car. This was probably determined in the beginning, but I don't remember. No remediation is needed underneath those buildings?

650 Matt Vredenburg: That's correct.

Deb Alden: I'm just wondering. Maybe we could apply for grants or something because I know the number of parking spaces needed is also dependent on whether there is public transportation. And since we don't have it here, maybe this is a good way for us to work with Centro to get some real transportation to alleviate some of those parking needs and transportation needs and let the building do things for us here.

655 R. Huftalen: Any further comments?

660 David Mehlbaum: Mr. Dungey's letter said so much. It was so eloquently put by the CPF. I'm not going to try to outdo that. I want to thank the Planning Board and the HPC for volunteering and putting in as much time as you all do. But to see the work that has gone in clearly is the work of a lot of people putting in their time and listening. I want to commend the design team and the development team. I heard a couple of references to East Genesee Street. If anybody had been to East Genesee Street 15 years ago or so, it was a dump. I think there are a lot of people really happy about what is going on there. Unfortunately, Cazenovia has had a lot of places that didn't look very good either. And for someone to come and make an improvement here, is so good for our community. I'm so excited about it. We have a lot of parking. I hope we get to a point where people actually want to come to Cazenovia and fill up the lots we already have. There are a lot of people if they don't get the first spot in front of the pizzeria, they don't get pizza. If we can drive

670 people to come here, we will have a more vibrant community. I think this building is going to be really great for it.

R. Huftalen: Any other comments or questions?

675 Stefan Lutter: I want to put on record that I'm appreciative of the fact that there is less parking than number of units. I work on a statewide team of planners and I bragged to them that I'm living on a street with a development that is not adding surface parking and has less spaces than number of units. I'm appreciative of the architecture lesson tonight. I learned a lot. Again, as a planner, I think about it in a different sense. This is not quite related to the project itself and certainly not a reflection of the project at all. I think the traffic implications, and by traffic I mean small scale driving on Center, Lyman, and to some extent Hotel Lane, which is a dangerous issue and is asking for problems, will be exacerbated by this, which is fine. No problem there. I think it needs to elevate the urgency at which the Village addresses that problem as in the next several months when equipment starts coming. In my opinion, it is untenably unsafe for people who regularly use it. I would extend that topic to Hotel Lane, which I think is used for more than just parking access to some extent and will be more used with more folks living there. It can be more than just basically unsafe parking access. I would continue that all the way through to where it exits on Lincklaen Street. Right now it is typical of a parking lot. It is quite dangerous and there are a lot of blind corners. Pedestrian access could be elevated in response to this project. We sort of discovered that Victor's house is not actually entirely on his property so that might create some kind of opportunity there. My only other comment is that I'm curious whether consideration was given to the Center Street side and how it socially interacts with the street in terms of entrances and exits. It is an improvement, I think, but I know there is difficulty because of the space and the elevation to get access to something other than the parking lot. I'm curious if that is completely off the table.

695 Caleb Sayers: For us to use Center Street as an accessible entrance for the apartments isn't totally off the table. There is a man door next to the garage entrance that could be used as an entrance. There would have to be a painted lane through the parking garage, which I think is doable. I think the issue of creating more truly meaningful engagement along Center Street is . . . It is a basement. There are limitations in terms of what we can do. We have added grated openings to add some engagement. And there are plantings that go along with them. There is another door to a utility space. We are putting little awnings over both of these and we are adding carriage lights on both sides. So I think we are attempting to do everything we can conceivably do to create interest and engagement along that façade. There are hard limitations on how far we can push that.

700 Stefan Lutter: I appreciate the attention given to the north side. It is less of an afterthought and more of a prominent part of the building, which I think is really good.

710 R. Huftalen: Stefan, in response to some of your ideas, the mayor is working with the Village Board and trying to uncover some resources and address those pedestrian issues. We obviously want it to become more pedestrian friendly. So duly noted. Thanks.

715 Jim Stokes: Matt, you were ambiguous about it at the last meeting, the greenspace at the northwest corner of the lot. Will there be any pedestrian or vehicular access from Hotel Lane?

Matt Vredenburgh: There will be access, but it is potentially just a service access for the back of that commercial space. No more than a fire lane width. So it's not going to be for traditional traffic. It

720 will be used sparingly as needed. We are limited on the amount of space we have there. It is very narrow. Other than that, the back of the commercial space, at this point, is intended to be a grass courtyard.

Jim Stokes: Will there be a defined driveway for service vehicles?

725 Matt Vredenburg: I wouldn't call it a defined driveway. It's more like an enhanced sidewalk.

Jace Brown: Building egress primarily. Building access, maintenance, that type of thing. You may have some people exiting the building about here where the stair tower is. Although I think we all know, most people tend to use elevators. You might get a few people oddly opening that door. But I think Matt characterized it correctly. This is mostly going to be servicing the commercial space to some extent. Leaving some of the lot with permeable, vegetative space I think is a good thing. We are talking about heat island effects and things like that. We are not intending to pave every inch.

730 Jim Stokes: Those doorways would be for emergency egress only? They are not for entering the building?

735 Jace Brown: They are not ingress points. We haven't gone over in detail the alarm plan, but I would imagine you would be able to exit the building without . . . Just casually. But those details we would go over with the building owner and operator.

740 Deb Alden: Where would deliveries be made? Where would those commercial spaces get their deliveries?

Jace Brown: We don't know the nature of the tenants, so it is difficult to comment on that. It could be an office, in which case deliveries would be incidental. If it's a restaurant or something like that, we would have to establish a plan.

745 Matt Vredenburg: There will be additional parking spaces in front. Currently it's a driveway, so we are going to add four more spaces in front.

750 Deb Alden: I have guests and no room in my driveway and they are not allowed to park overnight in the other lot.

755 Tom Tait: Can you point out the greenspace behind Amanda and the two-story section. Will there be a fence that bisects that greenspace?

Matt Vredenburg: No fence there.

Tom Tait: So Amanda will have access to that?

760 Matt Vredenburg: She has a fence right now that runs along that edge.

Amanda Bury: I will probably have to do something different, I would think. I have dogs. The current building is in my backyard and that will be gone.

765 Matt Vredenburg: The building will probably continue to serve as the barrier on this side. Your fence ends right at that corner. We might have to connect something right there just to allow you to continue to use it the way you use it.

770 Tom Tait: Just as a point of clarification from the last meeting, there is no opportunity for vegetation on Jail Alley, the north end of the building. It's too tight.

Matt Vredenburg: I'd rather put a sidewalk there than vegetation.

775 Jace Brown: As you can see, the building is more or less within a margin, more or less on the property line. So the extent of this project ends there.

Tom Tait: Do you have a ball park of what the dimension is on Center Street from the building to the curb?

780 Matt Vredenburg: We have a 5-foot sidewalk. And I believe the strip to the curb is 4 feet and going the other way is probably 3 feet, so 12 feet.

785 Marlene Burrell: My concern, once again, the commercial trucks on Hotel Lane, how many of them there are. They are from the Lincklaen House and Pewter Spoon. The trucks are long trucks. The parking back there, cars can't even get through lots of times because of those trucks. That's my concern about that. It's almost impossible for me to get out of my driveway a lot. Even the police tell them to move and they don't.

790 R. Huftalen: Any further comments from the public? If there aren't any other comments, I would ask that the HPC hang in there with us. We have plenty of work to do with our questionnaire.

Jim Stokes: Do you want to announce that you are adjourning the public hearing? I think we want to keep it open for another meeting.

795 R. Huftalen: We would like to adjourn our public hearing and continue it. We are going to continue the joint public hearing to May 29 at 6:00 p.m. We will continue to hear comments right here. We will see you again then. Right now, the Planning Board is going to remain in session with the HPC and we are going to do a SEQR review with the guidance of Mr. Stokes. Thank you all for coming. We will let you clear the room, but hang around if you want to hear more. (Many people left, but quite a few stayed.)
800

805 R. Huftalen: If we could get the room back to order. Jim, I would just ask for your guidance. We have done this before. Our Board has been through the Full EAF in the past. If you guys would help me. There are notes, but you also have blank copies. There are references. I'm reminded how hard it is to pull the particular details off the application in support of the way we want to answer some of these questions. We have our SEQR workbook. Jim is going to provide better guidance than that. We will start off with the first question:

1. Impact on Land

810 *The proposed action may involve construction on or physical alteration of the land surface of the proposed site.*

815 R. Huftalen: If you are doing a comprehensive plan, you would answer “no.” This project, obviously, is disturbing land. Because we are going to answer “yes,” we would look at the next set of questions.

a. The proposed action may involve construction on land where depth to water table is less than 3 feet.

820 R. Huftalen: It is listed as an average of 7 feet deep on the site plan and in the EAF. My suggested answer would be “no, or small impact” may occur. [All Board members agreed.]

825 *b. The proposed action may involve construction on slopes of 15% or greater. 100% of the slopes are 0-2%, so the answer, I believe, is “no, or small impact” may occur. [All Board members agreed.]*

830 *c. The proposed action may involve construction on land where bedrock is exposed, or generally within 5 feet of the existing ground surface. The applicant lists “no.” [All Board members agreed.]*

d. The proposed action may involve the excavation and removal of more than 1,000 tons of natural material. That’s “no.” [All Board members agreed.]

835 *e. The proposed action may involve construction that continues for more than one year or in multiple phases.*

840 R. Huftalen: Jim will help me on this. I noted in the SEQR workbook that they have listed that this could be up to 24 months of construction. However, it is in one phase of construction. My interpretation of the workbook was if it’s one phase or multiple years, the one phase would lead to a “no or small impact.”

845 Jim Stokes: Either way, you heard the applicant say that a lot of that time is interior construction, which isn’t going to have an impact. So either way, I think you can classify it as “no or small impact.”

f. The proposed action may result in increased erosion, whether from physical disturbance or vegetation removal (including from treatment by herbicides). Standard construction management practices. That’s “no or small impact.” [All Board members agreed.]

850 *g. The proposed action is, or may be, located within a Coastal Erosion hazard area. That’s “no.” [All Board members agreed.]*

2. Impact on Geological Features

855 *The proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of, or inhibit access to, any unique or unusual land forms on the site (e.g., cliffs, dunes, minerals, fossils, caves). (See Part 1. E.2.g). The answer to that is “no.” [All Board members agreed.]*

3. Impacts on Surface Water

860 *The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies (e.g., streams, rivers, ponds or lakes. (See Part 1. D.2, E.2.h). Both are answered in the negative, so the answer is negative. [All Board members agreed.]*

4. Impact on Groundwater

865 *The proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer. (See Part 1. D.2.a, D.2.c, D.2.d, D.2.p, D.2.q, D.2.t). The answer appears to be “no.” This will not require construction of any new public water facilities. This will not require any new sewer capacity. [All Board members agreed.]*

870

5. Impact on Flooding

The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding. (See Part 1. E.2). It is not in the 100-year flood plain. It is not in the 500-year flood plain. The answer is “no.” [All Board members agreed.]

875

6. Impacts on Air

The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source. (See Part 1. D.2.f, D.2.h, D.2.g). No emissions, no methane, no permitting required. The answer is “no.” [All Board members agreed.]

880

7. Impact on Plants and Animals

The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna. (See Part 1. E.2.m-q). We received a New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) letter. The answer is “no.” [All Board members agreed.]

885

8. Impact on Agricultural Resources

The proposed action may impact agricultural resources. (See Part 1. E.3.a. and b.). The answer is “no.” [All Board members agreed.]

890

9. Impact on Aesthetic Resources

The land uses of the proposed action are obviously different from, or are in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource. (See Part 1. E.1.a., E.1.b., E.3.h.). We have the HPC’s deliberation to refer to. In reference to the questionnaire filled out by the applicant in reference to the Route 20 scenic byway, there is no sharp contrast. The answer is “no.” [All Board members agreed.]

895

10. Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources

The proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource. (Part 1. E.3.e., f. and g.). The answer to this is “yes.” [All Board members agreed.]

900

a. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, any buildings, archaeological site or district which is listed on the National or State Register of Historical Places, or that has been determined by the Commissioner of the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation to be eligible for listing on the State Register of Historic Places.

905

R. Huftalen: I think the whole purpose of having the HPC review is to make sure this is done in harmony with historic resources. I would suggest that “no or small impact may occur” is the appropriate response there. [All Board members agreed.]

- 910 **b.** *The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory. The answer is “no or small impact.”*
- 915 **c.** *The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an archaeological site not included on the NY SHPO inventory. The answer is “no or small impact.”*

11. Impact on Open Space and Recreation

- 920 *The proposed action may result in a loss of recreational opportunities or a reduction of an open space resource as designated in any adopted municipal open space plan. (Part 1. C.2.c., E.1.c., E.2.q.). The answer is “no.” [All Board members agreed.]*

12. Impact on Critical Environmental Area

- 925 *The proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental area (CEA). (See Part 1. E.3.d.). Per our letter from DEC, the answer is “no.” [All Board members agreed.]*

13. Impact on Transportation

- 930 *The proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems. (See Part 1. D.2.j.).*

R. Huftalen: There is no change to the transportation systems. But there is sensitivity to the concerns raised about pedestrian circulation and the traffic impacts. You will recall, we had a discussion with the applicant about the traffic study that was supplied on January 12. At that point they were proposing 40 units. They subsequently reduced the number of units to 31. They asked if they needed to redo the traffic study. I told them they did not need to redo the traffic study. The study was prepared on January 12. The ultimate conclusions were that the proposed mixed use development would have no notable or significant impact on traffic operations. When you look at the scope of this, it is talking about whether traffic increases exceed the capacity of the existing road network, etc. While there have been traffic concerns raised, clearly it doesn’t rise to the level contemplated by what’s dictated in the impact on transportation question. I suggest the answer is “no” and no further questions need to be addressed on that. [All Board members agreed.]

14. Impact on Energy

- 945 *The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy. (See Part 1. D.2.k.). The answer is “yes.” [All Board members agreed.]*

R. Huftalen: The scope of this is most important. There is obviously going to be more energy consumed there post-development than pre-development. However, when we look at it, there are no provisions and no need to upgrade to a substation. No additional utilities need to be brought in to the site.

- 950 **a.** *The proposed action will require a new, or an upgrade to an existing, substation. The answer is clearly “no.” [All Board members agreed.]*

955 *b. The proposed action will require the creation or extension of an energy transmission or supply system to serve more than 50 single or two-family residences or to serve a commercial or industrial use. The answer is “no.” [All Board members agreed.]*

960 *d. The proposed action may involve heating and/or cooling of more than 100,000 square feet of building area when completed. The answer is “no.” [All Board members agreed.]*

R. Huftalen: These are all beneath the numerical thresholds stated on the questionnaire.

965 **15. Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light**

The proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor lighting. (See Part I. D.2.m., n., and o.)

970 R. Huftalen: Steve anticipated this question. You could potentially say “yes.” Outdoor lighting is going to be added.

a. The proposed action may produce sound above noise levels established by local regulation. The answer is “no or small impact.” [All Board members agreed.]

975 *b. The proposed action may result in blasting within 1,500 feet of any residence, hospital, school, licensed day care center, or nursing home. The answer is “no or small impact.” [All Board members agreed.]*

980 *c. The proposed action may result in routine odors for more than one hour per day. The answer is “no or small impact.” [All Board members agreed.]*

d. The proposed action may result in light shining onto adjoining properties.

985 R. Huftalen: From Part I of the EAF and based on all of our prior precedent, every lighting fixture is going to need to be dark sky compliant and the minimal amount of area as per Matt’s description.

e. The proposed action may result in lighting creating sky-glow brighter than existing area conditions. The answer is “no or small impact.” [All Board members agreed.]

990 **16. Impact on Human Health**

The proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants. (See Part I. D.2.q., E.1.d., f., g., and h). The answer is “no.” [All Board members agreed.]

995 *a. The proposed action is located within 1500 feet of a school, hospital, licensed day care center, group home, nursing home or retirement community.*

1000 R. Huftalen: There was a note in Part I of the EAF where the applicant noted that they are within 1,500 feet of the library. I think we can safely say “no or small impact.” [All Board members agreed.]

R. Huftalen: Jim, should we answer that one “yes?”

1005 Jim Stokes: I think you can answer that one “no.” That’s an example. But the mere fact that it is within 1,500 feet of one of those does not mean there is an impact.

17. Consistency with Community Plans

The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans. (See Part 1. C.1., C.2 and C.3).

1010

Jim Stokes: It is consistent. It is a double negative. I would answer that one “no.”

18. Consistency with Community Character

The proposed action is inconsistent with existing community character. (See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3). The answer is “no.” [All Board members agreed.]

1015

R. Huftalen: Jim did provide the determination from the Madison County Planning Department. I just want to put a couple of their comments in the record:

1020

The proposed “99-103 Albany Street and 7 Center Street” redevelopment project is a transformational project for the downtown of Cazenovia . . .

R. Huftalen: They go on to conclude:

1025

. . . the importance of this aspect of the project seems crucial as it will be highly visible and the intent of the B-1 zone is to “encourage . . . modification . . . expansion . . . without adversely affecting the historic integrity and character of the area” (180-48). Overall, the project is an exciting opportunity to revitalize this corner and provide new infill development, and we return this for local determination.

1030

R. Huftalen: In terms of consistency with community character, I think we are very safe in answering #18 “no.” Jim has prepared a document for us. Jim, I would prefer to have you share the highlights of it, rather than read the whole thing. Do you mind doing that for us, Jim?

1035

Jim Stokes: Given the Board’s review of Part 2 of the EAF and answering those questions, which Part 2 of the EAF is generally designed to address substantially all of the issues that are required to be addressed under the Environmental Quality Review Act regulations. Given those answers, I think it is appropriate that the Board consider a negative declaration, which under the language of SEQR means a finding that the project as proposed will not have any significant adverse environmental impacts. Every project has impacts. The standard is significant adverse environmental impacts. This proposed resolution simply has a number of recital clauses about the project, just generally describing it, the applications, which include a special use and site plan review application; re-subdivision review, which is just a combining of the lots to erase the existing lot lines; architectural review; and a certificate of compatibility from the HPC. The Planning Board previously declared this to be a Type I action, which is the highest level of review under SEQR, and declared its intention to act as lead agency with a coordinated review under SEQR. Lead agency notices were sent on or about April 5 to the Village of Cazenovia Historic Preservation/Architectural Review Committee, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, New York State Department of Transportation, Empire State Development, Town of Cazenovia Sewer District, New York State Historic Preservation Office, Madison County Industrial Development Agency. Most of

1040

1045

1050

those agencies have responded and commented. None have objected to this Board acting as lead agency, which gives it jurisdiction to make this determination. It recites the fact that we have held this joint public hearing and also heard comments informally at prior meetings. As noted by the Chair, the applications were referred to the Madison County Planning Department and returned for local determination.

1055

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

1060

**A RESOLUTION MAKING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE STATE ENVIRONMENTAL
QUALITY REVIEW ACT WITH RESPECT TO REDEVELOPMENT OF 99-103 ALBANY
STREET AND 7 CENTER STREET**

WHEREAS, Albany Street Holdings, LLC (“Developer”) has submitted an application for a Special Use and Site Plan Approval, Re-subdivision Approval, Architectural Approval and a Certificate of Compatibility (“Applications”) to allow demolition of existing buildings and the construction of a four story mixed use commercial and residential building (the “Project”) on 4/10 acre of land located in the Village of Cazenovia at 99-103 Albany Street and 7 Center Street, also identified as Tax Map Nos. 94.52-1-58, 94.52-1-60, 94.52-1-59, (herein collectively referred to as the “Subject Premises”), and

1070

WHEREAS, this Planning Board previously declared this Project to be a Type 1 action and declared its intention to act as lead agency with respect to a coordinated review of the Project under the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”), and

1075

WHEREAS, on or about April 5, 2024, lead agency notifications were mailed to the following identified involved and/or interested agencies:

1080

- Village of Cazenovia Historic Preservation/Architectural Committee
- New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, Region 7
- New York State Department of Transportation
- Empire State Development
- Town of Cazenovia Sewer District

1085

- New York State Historic Preservation Office
- Madison County Industrial Development Agency, and

WHEREAS, no identified agency has objected to this Planning Board acting as lead agency, and

1090

WHEREAS, a joint public hearing regarding the Project was duly scheduled, noticed and held by this Planning Board and the Village of Cazenovia Historic Preservation/Architectural Committee (“HPC”) on May 13, 2024, during the course of which all those wishing to be heard were duly heard by the Planning Board and the HPC, and

1095

WHEREAS, informal comments from the public were also received by the Planning Board and HPC at prior meetings, and

1100 **WHEREAS**, the Applications were duly referred to the Madison County Planning Agency pursuant to the provisions of Section 239-m of the General Municipal Law, and

WHEREAS, the Madison County Planning Agency has recommended that the Applications be returned for local determination, and

1105 **WHEREAS**, the Planning Board, considering all the Applications to be a single action for purposes of SEQRA, has reviewed the full environmental assessment form submitted by the Developer and has reviewed all the criteria for determining environmental significance listed in section 617.7 of the regulations implementing SEQRA and has completed part 2 of the FEAF.

1110 **NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED**, that the approval of this action will not have any significant adverse effects upon the environment, and as such this resolution shall constitute a negative declaration based upon the following reasons:

1115 1. The Project involves the demolition of two derelict, vacant buildings at 99 and 103 Albany Street that have been a blight on the neighborhood for the better part of two decades. Although the building at 99 Albany Street has some historical significance, the existing buildings on both of these parcels have been condemned by the local code enforcement officer due to their poor condition, and their removal will not adversely impact the Village Historic District. The redevelopment of this site will be a significant benefit to the Village and the neighborhood.

 2. The house to be demolished at 7 Center Street is not within the Village Historic District and its removal will not have an adverse impact on the Historic District.

1125 3. The Subject Premises are currently completely developed and have been for many years. There is no conversion of green space associated with this Project and surface runoff from the Project as proposed will be managed in accordance with current applicable standards.

1130 4. The Project will be connected to existing public water, sewer, electric and natural gas utilities. No new utility service extensions or public drainage facilities will be required as a consequence of this action.

1135 5. The design of the proposed principal structure for the Project is compatible with the character of the neighborhood and the intent of the B-1 zoning district as stated in the Village Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan.

1140 6. The development of the Project will not add significantly to traffic flows on Route 20 or on Center Street north of the Subject Premises and is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on traffic flows in the area of the Subject Premises.

 7. No significant air or noise emissions are anticipated from the Project as developed.

1145 8. Exterior lighting for the Project will be dark skies compliant.

9. The proposed uses for the Subject Premises are compatible and in compliance with the requirements of the B-1 zoning district.

1150 10. There are no known sensitive archeological or geological resources on the Subject Premises that would be disturbed by this action.

1155 11. There will be no significant increase in energy use or impact on the Village water or sewer systems as a result of this action. The Project development will be in accordance with all New York State energy code requirements.

12. The Subject Premises are not located in a flood zone.

1160 13. No other adverse environmental impacts have been identified.

Dated: May 13, 2024

1165 Jim Stokes: *13. No other adverse environmental impacts have been identified.* That's important because under the regulations making the finding of determinants is one thing, but the Board needs to state its reasoning and rationale. And that's what those individual items are intended to do, consistent with the review of Part 2 of the FEAF that just took place. The requirement to make this finding is that no further new project approvals may occur until this Board makes its determination. This is a draft. It's written in accordance with what I was projecting where the Planning Board would be in its review of the project at this time. It is only a draft. If anyone wants to change it, supplement it, reject it in its entirety, you are certainly welcome to. Other than that, we would need a motion by a Planning Board member, a second, and then a rollcall vote.

1170 R. Huftalen: Thanks, Jim. I appreciate you putting that together for us. I think all of those items were addressed in our questionnaire. I don't see any cause for amendment. What about the Planning Board members?

A. Walburger: No, comprehensive.

1180 R. Huftalen: I make a motion to adopt the resolution as written.

D. Raleigh: I second.

The rollcall vote was:

1185 R. Huftalen: Aye
A. Walburger: Aye
A. McDowell: Aye
D. Raleigh: Aye
S. McEntee: Aye

1190 The motion carried with 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

R. Huftalen: The motion passes. The SEQR review is complete. Jim, that was the step that was needed for the HPC, is that correct?

1195 Jim Stokes: Right. Ted, we would just need a motion by one of your members, a second, and a rollcall vote to ratify approval of the certificate of compatibility for the demolition of the two buildings at 99-103 Albany Street.

1200 Ted Bartlett: I would like to confirm for the record that HPC approved the demolition of the NAPA building and gas station at our April meeting pending SEQR approval through the Planning Board.

Scott Shannon: I make a motion to ratify approval of the certificate of compatibility for the demolition of the two buildings at 99-103 Albany Street.

1205 Gene Gissin: I second.

The rollcall vote was:

Ted Bartlett: Aye

Bill Paben: Aye

1210 Gene Gissin: Aye

Scott Shannon: Aye

The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

1215 R. Huftalen: Is there any other business while we are here in joint session?

Anne Ferguson: When are you approving demolition of 7 Center Street?

R. Huftalen: That was part of the resolution adopted tonight.

1220

Jim Stokes: It's not in the Historic District, so they can just apply for a demolition permit for that.

1225 Anne Ferguson: I understand it is not in the Historic District. I was just going to ask that the Board, if it can be done in the resolution I don't know, but one of the best practices that other communities have adopted, having learned the hard way, is not having a house demolished before the total project is approved and underway. Where for some reason the project doesn't go forward and they discovered they have demolished the house for no reason in that sense. I just want to make certain that 7 Center doesn't get demolished before the total project has been approved and is motioned to go.

1230

R. Huftalen: Noted. It is not a condition of this approval that we just made. I think it would be something we would be working with the developer on and trying to effect the timing in such a way that the administration, our code enforcement, and permitting can make this happen in a way that is not putting the Village at risk of such circumstance.

1235

Anne Ferguson: I sort of understand what you are saying.

R. Huftalen: It is one of those belt and suspenders things.

1240 Anne Ferguson: Just learning what other communities have learned the hard way, you don't want to knock down a nice affordable house from 1850 and discover that the project is not going through.

That's the catch 22 you are trying to avoid. Whatever the mechanics are. Whether it's something the zoning officer doesn't give that permit out until we know we've gotten the final blessing and approval and funding is going forward and so forth.

1245

R. Huftalen: Demolition permits are issued at the discretion of the Codes Enforcement Officer.

Jim Stokes: Outside the Historic District, any property owner can demolish their house at any time. We don't tie it to funding or anything else. Once SEQR is done, they are clear to do that. As Rich said, we will be in communication with the applicant and work with him on that and the timing, and so forth.

1250

Anne Ferguson: In another meeting, we will be looking to decry that we don't have affordable housing in the neighborhood. I understand what you are saying. I just think it could be avoided.

1255

R. Huftalen: Any other business? If there is no other business, I will make a motion to adjourn.

A. McDowell: I second.

1260

The motion carried with 5 in favor, 0 opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

1265

Marlene A. Westcott
Recording Secretary