

TOWN OF LYSANDER
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
8220 Loop Road
Thursday, June 12, 2025 @ 7:00 p.m.

The regular meeting of the Town of Lysander Planning Board was held Thursday, June 12, 2025 at 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Corey, Chairman; Hugh Kimball; Steve Darcangelo; Doug Beachel and Matt Hunt

OTHERS PRESENT: Al Yager, Town Engineer; Barb LaPrease; Peter Hansen; Tim Gleeson; Jesse Plumley and Karen Rice, Clerk

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

I. PUBLIC HEARING -- None Scheduled

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Review and approval of the minutes of April 10, 2025 and May 8, 2025 regular Planning Board meetings.

RESOLUTION #1 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Darcangelo

RESOLVED, that the April 10, 2025 and May 8, 2025 Planning Board meeting minutes be approved as submitted.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

III. OLD BUSINESS

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Site Plan Review-Amendment | 8269-8289 Loop Road LLC/Colden Fire |
| Case No. 2023—015 | 8269 Loop Road |

Jesse Plumley, Plumley Engineering, represented the applicant stating we are proposing an amendment to the approved site plan to include the addition of the driveway for access on the road during construction of the new building. It was determined that access to the new building for the larger vehicles that are being serviced there is difficult through the existing parking lot, so they they're asking for a driveway on the South end so those trucks can get through. The lot coverage will increase from 49,849 square feet to 55,995 square feet which is below the maximum allowed coverage. The driveway will allow larger trucks to access the building directly rather than navigating through the existing parking. The stormwater management system has been expanded to account for the new driveway and the updated SWPPP was sent to the Town Engineer for review. The driveway permit has been applied for and verbally approved. There's a medical office in the front of this parcel, running fire trucks through there probably isn't the best idea in combination with the office space, so having a dedicated driveway makes sense.

There was some discussion regarding traffic. There's more than adequate sight distance either way with the current speed limit on the road.

There's a letter on file prepared by Al Yager, Town Engineer, dated June 12, 2025 that will be read into the record, in part:

I have completed my review of the revised Site Plan for the Colden Fire Facility, prepared by Plumley Engineer, dated July 2024 with a final revision date of May 2025. A SWPPP revision form has been provided. I have no further engineering related comments at this time. I would not be opposed to the Planning Board approving the revised Site Plan at this time. years of letter into the record your chairman for the plans for I have completed my review of

Steve Darcangelo questioned if there will be signage identifying the truck entrance and passenger vehicle entrance.

Mr. Plumley stated that that can be added.

Mr. Yager stated that Empire State Development will have to review and approve the signage. A building permit will also be required by the Town.

FINDINGS:

A separate environmental impact study is not required as one has already been provided.

There is a letter on file from Empire State Development dated October 26, 2023 that did not require modification per an email from Andrea Burdick, Project Manager, Radisson Development, dated May 28, 2025.

Verbal approval regarding the proposed driveway location was received from Jon Butler, Highway Superintendent June 12, 2025.

This action is consistent with the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

This action is consistent with the Town's current Zoning Ordinances.

This action did not require referral to the Onondaga County Planning Board for their review and recommendation.

This action will cause no adverse effects on the public health, safety and welfare in the neighborhood or district.

RESOLUTION #2 -- Motion by Corey, Second Kimball

RESOLVED, that having reviewed the Amended Site Plan, dated July 2024 and revised May 2025, prepared by Plumley Engineering, associated with the application of 8269 ~ 8289 Loop Road, 8269 Loop Road, Baldwinsville, New York and part of the Radisson PUD, to allow a second ingress/egress to the site to allow a better flow of traffic, the site plan is hereby approved, with the following conditions:

- 1) Review and approval by Al Yager, Town Engineer;
- 2) Final review and approval by Jon Butler, Highway Superintendent for access;
- 3) Truck and Passenger Vehicle Signage be reviewed and approved by Empire State Development Corporation;
- 4) A Building Permit is required for the additional signage; and
- 5) All fees associated with this application, including expert fees, be paid prior to the Code Enforcement Officer's final walk-through.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Mr. Plumley thanked the Board for their time.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Minor Subdivision
Case No. 2025—005 | Timbers LLC
3551 & 3571 Patchett Road |
|---|--|

This item will be tabled as it can be accomplished by a Division of Land.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 2. Major Subdivision—Final Plat | Timber Banks
Phase 4, Section 10
Forest Ridge Lane/Proposed Shagbark Lane |
|---------------------------------|---|

Ben Harrell, CHA, represented the applicant the applicant stating that this property is adjacent to the previous application that has been tabled. It is their hope to purchase a portion of it. There are currently no plans for it, but it is one of those 'it's a good opportunity and good property to own' adjacent to his current project.' The Final Plan shows how it can be connected to that

property and that is really the only change. There was a minor relocation of a manhole based off of field conditions so that is shown on the sewer easement. It is the same number of lots; the street name of Shag Bark has been approved by County 911.

There is a letter on file from Jason Hoy, P.E., acting on behalf of the Town dated June 12, 2025 that will be read into the public record, in part:

The Town of Lysander requested Van Buren's assistance in reviewing the design documents for Timber Banks, Phase 4, Section 10 due to CHA Solutions being the project designer as well as Lysander's designated engineer.

To date, we have received:

- *Construction drawings, dated July 18, 2024*
- *Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, dated May 2024*

It is our understanding that the Planning Board is again considering the subdivision of Phase 4, Section 10 based on a modification to the plans. This modification consists of the addition of a stub road (Road B) off Shag Bark Drive. The addition of this stub road allows access to the parcel to the west. While the stub road location is not exactly as shown in the GPP, the PUD Zoning allows for flexibility for the Town and developer to make changes through the course of the project.

There are no engineering concerns with the lot layout nor road alignments as shown on this final subdivision plat and that the plat can be approved.

A full review of the drawings and the SWPPP was completed and a recommendation for approval was submitted to the Town Board in December 2024.

Potential wetlands were discussed with Mr. Yager stating there is a stream that comes under the property to be purchased.

Hugh Kimball stated that he has a question that has gone unanswered since September 2024 and that is whether or not this plan is consistent with the plan that was approved 18 years ago. None of the Board members were here when this was originally approved. I do not want to hold this up but we are looking at something that was approved 18 years ago and there have been a lot of changes. One of the changes has been the addition of the Y.

Mr. Yager stated that the Y was approved in 2014. I am sure if you guys have questions I know Jason would pick up if you call and I am sure he will answer them or if you want to shoot him an e-mail

Mr. Kimball stated that he is sure it is fine, but if you were reviewing the project I would have brought up and I would have had great confidence in your answer, I still do but obviously I cannot ask you.

Mr. Yager stated that he believes Jason is alluding to substantially the same.

Mr. Darcangelo stated that he would like to make a comment that he believes is appropriate based on what you said. This is an extremely large development within a PUD where they are allowed to make changes over time. Any one of those changes are difficult to see whether or not they have much of an impact on the adjacent community on River Rd. Cumulatively they might, so I think it might be in the best interest of our process, I don't know who would do this or if we have the resources to do it, but it'd be nice to look at all of the changes that have occur in Timber Banks so that as another change occurs we're able to put that on the list and make a determination independently. This modification may not have much of an impact, but cumulatively along with all of the other changes that have taken place over the course of the last 20 years or so. Again, this was approved without any of us ever seeing it because we were not on the Board back then so as these changes come up it is difficult for us to determine whether or not the changes have the impact that we think would be significant.

I'm not saying that this change will, but I would have asked him that question and I would have gotten the answer and I would not have said anything more.

Mr. Yager stated that he thinks Steve makes a valid point in some ways, but this change doesn't increase density. We are moving a road. We did not change number a lots, so it is not increasing density. It doesn't increase traffic because it is still not exceeding the number of lots that are allowed in the subdivision. From a drainage standpoint it really does not change. From a utility standpoint it does not either because you are still talking the same number of homes; and from a fire flow and pressure standpoint from water it is not making a difference and from a sanitary sewer system design it is not necessarily making a difference. I could see how density changes the board would certainly be concerned. Or if you are going from single family lots to multifamily or townhouse style row house style lots, but that is not the case in this instance. This part of Timber Banks was always lower density, single family lots so that is not a huge change. I do agree with Steve that there are times when cumulative changes can make a difference, however in this instance the changes generally speaking are benign and also the other thing I think is worth noting is...We've been going over the Radisson Subdivision, Radisson Project for over 50 years. There have been a lot of changes to the original General Project Plan. That's the intention of PUD zoning is to allow flexibility for the developer as market conditions change, as environmental regulations change... all these things are considered. The first line of the PUD Zoning Code specifically states that the purpose of PUD zoning is to allow the flexibilities for developers to adjust the plan. It's the right of the developer to make minor changes and modifications. The Town Board adopts the General Project Plan and the Town's Planning Board approval is really a cursory review to those changes.

Mr. Kimball stated that he's not arguing any of that and I appreciate all your answers and help, but going forward can you maybe remind Jason that he's looking at something that's been going on overtime and we just need that answered in the letter that it is whatever is being presented is consistent with whatever we approved.

Mr. Yager stated that he can certainly ask that he do that in his letters moving forward.

RESOLUTION #3 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Hunt

RESOLVED, THAT THE Planning Board authorizes the Chairperson to review the Final Plat for the forty-four (44) lot subdivision application of J Alberici & Sons, The Timbers LLC, for property located at Timber Banks, Section 10, Phase 4, Forest Ridge Lane, Baldwinsville, New York, Part of Farm Lot No. 82 and Part of Tax Map No. 072-01-08.4, as shown on a map dated July 18, 2024, last revision date of May 15, 2025, prepared by Ianuzi & Romans, Licensed Land Surveyor and find that all modification s and conditions have been made; and that the Final Plat is consistent with the approved Preliminary Plat; and that any differences found are not significant; the Board authorizes the Chairperson to waive the Final Plat Public Hearing and sign the Final Plat.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

State law states that the applicants are allowed to plant manager coffee First off within 60 days from the date of final approval for structural changes shall expire the applicants are also filed one copy of the final plat in the Lysander Clerk's Office.

Mr. Harrell thanked the Board for their time.

V. OTHER BUSINESS June 12, 2025

1. Recommendation to Town Board: Proposed Lysander Code Updates

John Corey, Chairman, stated that the Town Board is looking for a recommendation on upcoming Code updates and asked if everybody has had an opportunity to review those changes.

As Karen has presented this, I think it is a good way to look at it. We can either look at it and say we approve the recommendations as submitted, or we approve the recommendations with the following modifications and/or considerations.

Mr. Corey stated that he was actively involved with the preparation of some of this, and Al Yager certainly was involved, and there has been meetings since I have not been involved, which I think, with Kevin Rode. I see that you guys have added some stuff that was not in what we approved. Your thoughts. I do not have much to add.

Lighting Districts:

Discussion: The addition of street lights at all intersections of new developments and any impacts on the development?

Mr. Yager stated that currently we require that when a new subdivision comes in, they form all the special districts at the time of subdivision, approval of the Contract Drawing for the subdivision. So that is an action of the Town Board. It is a Local Law action. Moving forward, the Town Board has indicated that subdivisions are going to include a Lighting District, and the Lighting District will have street lights that will be provided by the developer at the intersections. There's also opportunities for additional street lights to be added if there is a specific concern.

Mr. Yager continued stating that he just had a resident grab me in Timber Banks today when I was over there looking at a drainage problem, saying, 'hey, where the golf cart pass crosses forest Ridge crossing, when are you doing the street lights, it would be nice to have a street light there, because people walk that trail, especially in the Wintertime, after dark'. It is a very valid point; that is a location where having an additional street light, even though there is not a street intersection, makes sense. And those things need to be considered when we are reviewing Construction Drawings or Preliminary Plats for a Subdivision Site Plan, whatever you want to call it, that should be considered by the Board. There is certainly an opportunity to add street lights, but at a bare minimum, we think that the intersection should be lit.

Steve Darcangelo...so any subdivision that has formed, has to have a lighting district.

Mr. Yager stated any major subdivision going forward, we are going to require a Lighting District along with the Water District, Sewer District and Drainage District. We were talking before the meeting that sidewalks and lights are very controversial when you try to do a District after the fact, 9 times out of 10, even though the residents say they will be great...for example Highland Meadows. Highland Meadows should have street lights. Unfortunately, we did not require the developer to form a Lighting District when the Districts were formed and when the Town Board sent out a mailer about a Lighting District being formed and what the debt service was going to be, the residents voted it down. They did not want to pay the tax. That is a perfect example of a subdivision, that is a major subdivision, that you have street lights.

At some point in time, the Town Board really needs to step in and say, Yes, this is not a desirable situation to allow the homeowners to vote something down that affects public safety. Maybe they should not have a say in because it affects their taxes.

Mr. Corey asked the Board if it makes sense the way it has written, at the Developer's cost?

Board members concurred.

Mr. Yager stated that the other thing we added is a requirement to codify the driveway slope requirements, so that we do not have another Highland Meadows situation in some cases. We have got some driveways with slopes that are approaching 15% and we've had instances where people have parked their cars in the driveway in the wintertime and come out in the morning and the cars in the road because of freezing rain and slid down the driveway. So, we're requiring either driveways to be less than 10% slope or have a landing area in front of the garage that's at least 20 feet long, that is less than 4% slope to park a car on so it doesn't slide back into the road during icy conditions. I fully expect, when they do the Public Hearing for this,

we'll have every developer in Town come up with and speak about, but it's just a common sense safety thing for residents and everybody else.

Hugh Kimball addressed Mr. Yager and asked if there is anything in there that has changed from what was in the Land Use Plan. And are you content with the changes?

Mr. Yager stated that he's content with them. I guess the more I thought about it, we made an original proposal. We tried to focus in on solar farms and siting and stuff like that. I'm sure there's a fine line between trying to do something that makes sense for the people of Lysander in the town, and trying to stop something through Code. Maybe request greater setbacks.

Solar Fees:

There was some discussion about the assessment of \$500/acre for the siting of solar farms, like fees in lieu of land for public use.

Mr. Corey stated that he thought about that and thinks that the number is way too low. Personally, would put on here to increase that number. I don't know what the right one is. Is it 1000 is it 2000 is it 5000 I don't know, but I would leave it up to the board to pick that number, because they ultimately will pay, no matter what we suggest. But that would be one suggestion I would make. Now, what we did with the setbacks is suggest increasing the setback at the Planning Board's discretion, with or without additional screening. We said the minimum setback will be 200 feet and at the Board's option, depending on the environment, it can be moved back further. I'm still comfortable with that, because I think in most cases, we've come a long way with getting the kind of screening we're looking for now, because we understand it a little bit better.

Mr. Corey added that he would vote to approve the recommendations with an increase in the fee per acre of land for the 'loss' of the land.

Life Cycle Analysis:

Mr. Yager stated that he put together an outlet that we currently use, actually we've had it in place since 2016. It's actually proven out because I've been tracking costs and it looks like it's going to serve us pretty well. I mean, we can't read into the future if oil spikes and oil goes to \$200 a barrel and asphalt goes to \$200 a ton. Well, we might need to revisit it; but as of right now, with the assumptions we've made on inflation and everything else, it still seems to be tracking. Every Development is going to be different; but we an Excel template that we provide to the developers that they can plug in the number of units, the lot width and frontage and it works pretty well. Honestly, it's definitely proved out in Whispering Oaks Development. That was the first one we used it on, the Cabbage Patch Extension. It turned out pretty well when you start looking at what the costs are, what the revenue generated is. That may have been helped by the recent inflation and home appreciation. If it's something that we allow ourselves to update periodically we'll start seeing property values track and then see if it needs to be increased, then we need to look at that model again. But that core model, the framework of it, seems to be the right.

There being nothing further, Board members agreed to make a positive recommendation with modifications.

RESOLUTUON #4 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Beachel

RESOLVED, that at the request of the Town Board, the Planning Board, at their meeting of June 12, 2025, has reviewed the Recommended Changes to the Town Code; and

WHEREAS, the Town Board has requested the Planning Board to provide a written recommendation regarding proposed changes to the Town Codes, and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board hereby recommends that the Town Board approves the proposed Code changes as presented with the following modification:

- 1) The Town Board should increase the per acre fee (Section 320-86.4A) from \$500 to \$1,000 to \$3,000 per acre.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

VI. ADJOURN

RESOLUTION #5 -- Motion by Corey, Second by Beachel

RESOLVED, that the July 10, 2025, regular Planning Board meeting adjourn at 7:52 p.m.

5 Ayes -- 0 Noes

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Rice, Clerk to the Planning Board