

**TOWN OF MANLIUS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
March 28, 2016**

APPROVED

The Town of Manlius Planning Board met in the Town Hall at 7:00 PM with Chairman Susan Moliski presiding and the following Members were present: Fred Gilbert, Ann Kelly, Joseph Lupia, Mike LeRoy and Walt Neuhauser. Also present were Attorney Timothy Frateschi and Town Engineer Douglas Miller.

Absent: Don Crossett

Also Present: Carl Ellis, Ray Scuton, Paul Curtain, Jake McKenna, Henry McIntosh, Stella & John Penizotto, and Greg Sgromo.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Minutes

Member Neuhauser made a motion, seconded by Member Kelly and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of March 14, 2016. Chairman Moliski abstained.

East Side Dental Associates, 7201 E. Genesee St, Fayetteville, New York 13066
PUBLIC HEARING – Amendment to the original application July 2015 adding 886 sq.ft.
Tax Map # 087.-07-46.0

Ray Scuton, the architect for the project, was there to represent the applicant.

Mr. Scuton stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals gave his client the variances that they needed for lot coverage and for parking. They are now back in front of this Board to get final approval for the project.

This project was sent to the Onondaga County Planning Board. The Planning Board received a letter back dated February 24, 2016 and SOCPA determined that the project will have no significant adverse inter-community or county-wide implications and may consequently be acted on solely by the referring board.

Member Kelly asked if the project should have some type of screening because the cars are being parked almost to the main road. Attorney Frateschi said that we can definitely look at that aspect during the Site plan process.

Attorney Frateschi reviewed the 11 questions in Part 2 of the EAF with the Board and the Board agreed unanimously that the action would have no, or, a small impact on the environment. The EAF was filled out accordingly.

Member Kelly made a motion, seconded by Member Gilbert and carried unanimously to issue a Negative Declaration under SEQR and to authorize the Chairman to sign the short EAF.

Member Gilbert made a motion, seconded by Member Neuhauser and carried unanimously to waive reading of the Public Hearing Notice.

Member Neuhauser made a motion, seconded by Member LeRoy and carried unanimously to open the Public Hearing at 7:06pm.

With there being no comments from the Public, Member Neuhauser made a motion, seconded by Member Kelly and carried unanimously to close the Public Hearing at 7:07pm.

Conversation ensued regarding the placement of trees to screen the parking lot from the NYS Rt. 5 (Genesee Street).

Member Neuhauser made a motion, seconded by Member Kelly and carried unanimously to include a condition to the Site plan to add 3, 6 foot, Blue Spruce trees to the plan, the placement of which will be at the discretion of the Planning and Development Office.

Member Kelly made a motion, seconded by Member Lupia and carried unanimously to approve the Site Plan for East Side Dental dated February 16, 2016, titled East Side Dental Specialists, prepared by Mr. Scruton, project # 15040, L.1, the overall Site Plan, A2.1, Exterior Building Elevations and A2.0, the exterior building elevations, a 3 sheet Site Plan package with the condition that 3, six foot (+/-) blue spruce (or similar trees) be planted to screen the parking from Genesee Street, the placement to be determined by the Office of Planning and Development.

Sparguellis, LLC, 422 Kinne Street, E. Syracuse, NY 13057
Site Plan Approval for a Repair Shop and Car Dealer located at 7048 North Manlius Rd.
Tax Map # 040.-01-08.1

Carl Ellis, the owner, was there and gave the following description to the Board: He would like to operate a garage to do light mechanical work and to sell cars. He would be open Monday through Friday 8-5, and not operate on the weekends.

Chairman Moliski asked about the traffic going by the location now. Mr. Ellis said about 2300 a day.

Attorney Frateschi said that in order for the Board to approve a Site Plan, they first need to know how many cars he is going to be selling, where the cars are going to be placed on the site, where the ingress and egress is going to be and they need a site plan. Currently they only have a survey of the property. The Planning Board Members agree that a site plan is required.

Attorney Frateschi stated that whomever did the survey should be able to produce a Site Plan that includes where everything should go on the property. He asked how many cars the applicant is planning on selling. Mr. Ellis said he had no idea. That is part of the problem because the Planning Board cannot approve something they can't see.

Engineer Miller said that the Site Plan should show lights, cars (how many), a sign (the size and location). It should also show how many cars will be out back at any given time.

Mr. Ellis said that he will bring in the Site Plan to the Planning and Development office and will reschedule a meeting with the Planning Board at a later date.

Shining Stars Daycare, Enders Rd., Manlius, NY 13104
Site Plan Review
Tax Map #'s 114.-01-09.0; 114.-01-10.0; 114.-01-11.0; 114.-01-12.0; 114.-01-13.0;
114.-01-14.0; 114.-01-31.0

Paul Curtin, Attorney, was there to represent the applicants. He stated that he had a meeting with, Attorney Frateschi, Engineer Miller, Chairman Moliski, Highway Superintendent Cushing, Code Officer Mike Jones, and ZBA Chairman Henry McIntosh regarding the daycare center last

Wednesday review the project.

Mr. Curtin said that in the meeting they discussed a 2 lot subdivision with plans for ingress, egress, lot coverage and the variances that they will be requesting from the ZBA.

A memo dated March 28, 2016 was passed out by Greg Sgromo regarding the previously discussed items. Parking is an issue and this memo details the parking plan.

Mr. Curtin stated that they moved the property line and made Lot 2 bigger and Lot 1 smaller in order to mitigate the impact of the property coverage area variance request. He also pointed where the access points will be and where the shared access points will be.

Banked parking is being shown in the front yard; the front yard parking will be parallel to the street.

Chairman Moliksi said that is why you have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. Curtin said yes because of the little strip of the banked parking. Attorney Frateschi said that the variance for the front yard parking is not for the parking that will actually be built, it will be for the banked parking in the front yard in case the parking that is going to be built is not sufficient enough to handle the requirements of the site.

Chairman Moliski said that since you moved the lot line over towards NYS Rt. 92, what did that do to the Lot Coverage? Mr. Curtin said it reduced the amount of the variance at full build out from over 60% to 56%. We picked up as much space as we could without creating a non-conforming lot for Lot 1.

Attorney Curtin said that up until today the building on Lot 1 was going to stay and they were going to continue to market Lot 1. The applicant, however, have changed their mind. The building will now come down after the new day care center is building. Therefore, Lot 1 will be a vacant lot. It's in everyone's best interest for the building to come down and develop that piece and then you will be looking at a clean slate and a developable lot. The lot will be approximately 1.78 acres.

Chairman Moliski stated that the way she sees things is that Lot Coverage is the big issue. She said that the lot coverage is a huge problem, it's still at 56% and it's supposed to be 35%. If they took out the banked parking, what would that do to the Lot Coverage? Mr. Curtin said that they might be down to 35% coverage.

Attorney Frateschi said that if the site is going to be developed as proposed, then they probably won't even need a variance for coverage, you may however, need a variance for parking, because now the banked parking is gone.

Engineer Miller said that the real issue that needs to be looked at is you have got a 15,000 square foot building and your code calls for 79? Parking spaces. There is nothing that says that this will be a daycare forever.

Attorney Frateschi said that the Board had to decide whether or not to send this application to the Zoning Board of Appeals with either a positive, negative, or no recommendation for a variance. Based on what he has heard tonight and in the past, the Attorney said that parking in the front doesn't seem to be a huge issue in terms of a variance. The issue that has been brought up the most by the Planning Board members is the lot coverage issue.

Attorney Frateschi reminded the Board that they do not have to make any recommendations tonight. The Board just received the maps tonight. The Planning Board meets one more time before the Zoning Board, so we can wait until the next meeting to make a decision. He also said that he wants to make sure the applicants know what variances are going to be recommended from the Planning Board and what they are comfortable with.

Engineer Miller said he wanted the Board to know that on the handout with the table of lot coverage for similar properties prepared by the applicant's engineer that the Board received this evening are approximated.

Member Gilbert said that he agrees with Chairman Moliski in asking for a variance for Lot Coverage as opposed to parking. Member Neuhauser also agrees. The Board would like to see the total parking required being accommodated on the site, even if it is banked.

Member Lupia thinks that a parking variance would be more appropriate. He knows that it limits the availability for future use. He also said that it is a self-created hardship.

Chairman Moliski thinks that if the Board recommends a lot coverage variance there will be more flexibility down the road with the building rather than a parking variance.

Member Kelly stated that she thinks there should only be one lot, not two. The applicant controls all the property and therefore no variances should be necessary.

Member Neuhauser said the three options for a recommendation are Lot Coverage, Parking or no recommendation at all.

Member LeRoy asked what the plans were for Lot 1. Mr. Curtin said that there isn't a plan at this time, only to take down the building and market the vacant lot.

Chairman Moliski said that the question comes back to the line between lots 1 and 2. How big can we make Lot 2 so that Lot 1 is still marketable? Lot 1 is almost as big as Lot 2 now, why do you need a 16,000 square foot building on it? Why can't you make Lot 1 smaller and put a smaller building on it? This might avoid the need for any variances and it seems to be better planning for this very busy and important intersection in the Town.

Chairman Moliski asked the Board if they need more time to review the project.

Engineer Miller said that Onondaga County Planning called him and they are going to review the project. They have as many questions as the Planning Board does.

Mr. Curtin suggested that they come back in two weeks. He stated that the variances they would be requesting are as follows:

1. The front yard for the reserved parking
2. Lot Coverage for Lot 2 from 35% to 56% (this includes the banked parking on Lot 2).

Chairman Moliski stated that the following items should be thought about regarding this project for the next Planning Board meeting:

1. What sort of recommendation does the Board want to make, positive, negative or no

recommendation at all.

2. Should the recommendation be on Lot Coverage or should it be on parking spaces?

Other Business

Engineer Miller stated that he received an email from the Home Owners Association in the Starview Development asking to see the plans for the Resort LifeStyles Communities. He responded by saying that the plans are in the Planning and Development office and can be viewed at any time.

Engineer Miller also said that he has spoken with Matt Napierala, the engineer for Resort LifeStyles Communities, regarding the new entrance into the Resort LifeStyles Communities off of Medical Center Drive. Matt stated that his client decided that the new driveway will be too expensive and are requesting to leave the Site Plan as proposed.

Further discussion ensued regarding the Lot Coverage and the parking issue with the Shining Stars Daycare, including reducing the size of Lot 1 and the desire to have a right in/right out on NYS Rt. 92, which will have some impact on coverage for Lot 1.

With there being no further business, Member Gilbert made a motion, seconded by Member LeRoy and carried unanimously to adjourn the Regular Meeting at 8:50pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Beeman, Clerk