

**Village of Cazenovia Planning Board
Meeting Minutes
August 8, 2011**

5

Present: William Hall, Chair; Richard Huftalen; Charles Macaulay; and Anne McDowell.

Absent: Diane Webb.

10 Others Present: William Carr, Planning Board Advisor; Mark Tierno; Pringle Symonds; Don
Ferlow; Sue Berger; Chris Heberle; Carlos Gavilondo; Jennifer Gavilondo; Chris Clark; Joe Behan;
James Catella; Wayne Westervelt; Dorothea LaGinestra; Robert Kenna; Amy Mann; Kevin Mann;
15 Laura Benoit; Eric Lints; Sean Reimann; Anna Reimann; Peggy Van Arnam; George Van Arnam;
Howard Hart; Kevin Bernstein; Dennis Gregg; Robert Kent; Barbara Clarke; Cyndi Pratt; Carol
Satchwell; Beth Carroll; James Joseph; Wallace McDonald; Andrew Johnson; Robert Glass; and
others who did not sign in for a total of approximately 50 people.

W. Hall called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. and introduced the Board.

20 W. Hall asked if there were any corrections to the meeting minutes of July 11, 2011. W. Hall noted
a change on line 110. The word “of” should be changed to “if.” He also suggested that line 156 be
changed to read as follows: “Ms. Berger indicated she had no objection to holding a public hearing,
but noted that it could be problematic with the construction schedule and the funding threshold.”
The motion was made by R. Huftalen to approve the minutes with the change. C. Macaulay
25 seconded. The motion carried.

* * * * *

30 **Cazenovia College, Public Hearing, Site Plan Approval to Replace Natural Grass with
Synthetic Turf**

W. Hall said this is a continuation of the public hearing from Tuesday, August 2. W. Hall asked for
any comments. C. Macaulay asked for permission to read aloud his written comments based on last
Tuesday’s meeting. His comments will be entered into the record.

35 W. Hall asked for comments from the floor.

Pringle Symonds, president of Cazenovia Preservation Foundation (CPF), read aloud a letter from
CPF. This letter was entered into the record.

40 W. Hall noted that the College has updated the full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) and it
does indicate the project is contiguous to an historic district.

45 Carlos Gavilondo, a resident of Lincklaen Street: At the last meeting on August 2, there were a
number of comments made and issues raised, especially the fact that the College would be
modifying its plans. I think it would be appropriate for the applicant to make their presentation and
describe what changes have been made in the plans before the community responds.

W. Hall said that the details and the design have been modified to reflect some of the concerns and recommendations of the Village Engineer. He then called upon Jim Catella from the Clark
50 Companies to explain the modifications.

Mr. Catella gave some highlights: In accordance with what Delta Engineers had given the Village Engineer to conform with his suggestions he made and what we agreed to with decompaction of the subgrade and raising the flat underdrain pipe up into the stone layer, we revised our details. We
55 acknowledged, in writing, all the points in his letter. We revised our cross sections and showed them as part of the details we had drawn per the agreement we reached with the Village Engineer. There was quite a bit of discussion regarding the construction schedule. The anticipated construction schedule is based on this specific site and on our experience with having done a number of these. From the time we break ground to completion will be 7-8 weeks. The site will be stabilized in
60 3-4 weeks, in accordance with what New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) would call stabilization of the site. There would be a period of 3-4 weeks when the construction activities are going on and the site is a construction site. The difference is, once that porous stone is in place, the DEC considers it a stabilized site. For the last 3-4 weeks of construction, it would be mainly installation of the synthetic turf and the operations that happen
65 around that. There was a note that construction would be performed consistent with the Village's noise ordinance. We discussed construction vehicles and what actions could be taken to ensure that trucks do not track mud or dirt onto Village streets. The College noted they would make sure we implemented the use of a stabilized construction entrance, which is shown in our erosion and sediment control plan. We will employ sweeping equipment if necessary. Exiting vehicles will be
70 going through the College's parking lot first before entering Village streets. We will take all appropriate steps to make sure that mud is not tracked onto Village streets. There was a discussion regarding stockpiling of excess material that would potentially be reused on the site. Also discussed was disposal of excess material. The only material that will be leaving the site is topsoil. We can't have organics trapped underneath. A lot of the topsoil will be reused around the site to soften slopes and transition areas. But for the most part, a lot of the topsoil will exit the site with our current
75 design. The site is too small to create stockpiles. Whenever you stockpile something, you have to implement proper erosion and sediment control. We will not be stockpiling on site. We will try to utilize that material as we strip off the topsoil and put it in place. Any excess will be taken off site. We are coordinating with the College to use their equine farm and education center as a site for
80 storage and reuse of these materials. We discussed a little bit about the erosion control measures. The fact that if silt fence is not installed properly, it doesn't work. We have to do this on college campuses all the time. They will be properly keyed into the soil. They will be inspected on a regular basis. DEC requires that they be inspected by a certified technician who is certified by DEC. We will be inspecting them after all rain events. Mats and erosion control blankets will be installed
85 on any of the slopes. We put those in place as soon as slopes are trimmed. We seed and install our blankets immediately so that we get the growth of the reseeding started right away. DEC requires that these erosion control measures be inspected on a weekly basis. But we inspect them after every rain event. We noted that the stormwater retention facility the College has put in writing to the chairman, that they agree to provide a report to the Village after construction to show that the pond
90 as it is currently constructed is sufficient to handle the reduced flow from the synthetic turf field and this evaluation will focus on the actual effect of the replacement of the field and is not evaluating any upstream flows that may be using the pond for stormwater retention. There was discussion regarding maintenance and cleaning of the field. With the synthetic turf field, we do provide a piece of grooming equipment, which is a brush with tines. It can be pulled by any utility cart. We advise
95 that be used every 4-6 weeks during use of the field. It is not something that is done very often. There is no spraying of any chemicals, no detergents. Rain and sunlight will wash this field and will

100 keep bacteria or anything from growing on the synthetic turf. Traffic: Other than temporarily during construction, it is not expected that the replacement of the existing field with synthetic turf will have any impact on the current traffic flows on Liberty Street and surrounding streets. There is a note in the letter that came to the chairman that the College has agreed and is willing to participate in community discussion regarding these traffic conditions on Liberty Street. There was discussion about plantings and fencing. The application does not include provisions for plantings or fencing. There were no lights in the scope of our project.

105 W. Hall: I know you are a consultant and have standard contract documents. There was a concern expressed to me that any damage to Village streets, the sidewalks, or infrastructure, I am confident that your contract documents will indicate that the contractor would be responsible for any damage done. I want to confirm that. Mr. Catella: Yes. That language is in there. As a design builder of these fields, I don't have any place to turn to point a finger. We are the designer, the builder, and the contractor. We are responsible. The onus/burden for any damage done during the construction has to be taken care of by the contractor—in this case us.

115 Mr. Gavilondo: I understand Mr. Catella addressed a number of issues. I was wondering if anything has been submitted in the record aside from the letter from Dr. Tierno and the one-page cross section of the revised design for the drainage.

W. Hall replied that the record has been receiving additional submittals on a daily basis. He assured Ms. Gavilondo that the letters have been submitted for the record.

120 Jennifer Gavilondo, a resident of Lincklaen Street, read her letter aloud that has been submitted into the record.

Peggy Van Arnam read her letter aloud that was submitted for the record.

125 Eric Lints: We should expect the possibility of repairs adjacent to the College. I urge the Village to take a photographic record of the vicinity. I urge the College to do the same because there may be damage to their property during construction. I started a neighborhood coalition on Liberty Street to talk about the traffic issues. I invited the College to join us and they have accepted that invitation. We will be starting to meet next week. I'm not sure how to share the information we collect with the Village. We have an agenda and we will be taking minutes and will supply those to everybody. I started a website (<http://libtystreetcoalition.weebly.com>) that will be a repository for information.

135 Mr. Gavilondo: I would like to make sure materials get into the record. We have provided copies of the letter Jennifer read from. In addition, we provided a copy to the Planning Board of some relevant legal authorities that govern this sort of project. Drafts of these were previously emailed to the Planning Board and to Attorney Stokes. We have a copy of Eric Lints' notice on the Liberty Street Coalition for traffic concerns. The fourth document for submission is the June 10, 1986, submission by the New York State Office of Parks and Recreation and Historic Preservation nominating the Cazenovia Village Historic District for National Register status. Enclosed is a letter of objection from the Cazenovia Junior College. There is a screen shot taken from the National Park Service listing of National Register locations in the Village. When I reviewed the record on August 5, a copy of the letter that CPF submitted was not in the record. My comments submitted on August 2 were not in the record. I have been assured by the Village Clerk that deficiency has been corrected. In addition, there is a copy of an email string from March 1 with an email from myself to Chairman Hall and members of the Planning Board and Attorney Stokes identifying my concerns on

145

originally learning of the conceptual plan that the College had for the athletic field at the February board meeting. It demonstrates the concerns we raised on August 2 were very much the same concerns we had back in March. We asked to be apprised of the developments of the turf field. Submitted is a copy of an email from May 2 from Jennifer Gavidondo to Dr. Susan Berger regarding, among other things, a lack of response from the College regarding our inquiry about the turf field that came after the February board meeting and Dr. Berger's response dated May 3, providing no additional information, but indicating that the Planning Board would be addressing it. Also submitted is a copy of a July 11, 2011, email with a time stamp of 11:25 p.m. notifying our neighbors that the matter had been placed on the Planning Board's agenda at the last minute for the Planning Board meeting on July 11. These are the documents that are submitted. I would just like to say that you are all volunteers and everybody appreciates the difficulty in doing this. Your job is very hard and not a popularity contest. It is not about making everybody happy. It is about implementing the laws to the best of your abilities and I recognize that you are trying to do that. But here we are on August 8, which is less than a month that this was first placed on the Board's agenda with no notice to the public, and less than one week after the first real public meeting on this where the plan was presented. There were a lot of issues raised at that first meeting. The College had to revise the plans as a result of changes that the Village Engineer presented at that time. The plans have been on the College's drawing board for months, but we haven't really had a chance to participate in a meaningful way during that time. Once the project is built, it is done and people around the area will have to live with the impacts. Given all the uncertainty and all this additional information that still needs to be processed and digested, I think it would be responsible for the Board to request additional information and take the adequate amount of time it needs to review that information to make a reasoned decision before it acts on this proposal. Thank you.

W. Hall asked for more comments from the floor. Howard Hart stated he had sent letters to the Board and proceeded to give the gist of the letters: Somebody suggested that people like me who do not understand artificial fields should go look at one and so I did. I went to Morrisville and looked at their artificial field. I observed very wide white lines with large numbers and yellow, white, blue, and purple lines. As I saw that I thought that would be viewed by many as a problem. The Board should require from the College the marking size and colors to be used. For the record, I would like to see the various delineations. How big is the logo?

R. Huftalen looked at the plans and said the logo is about 35 feet across. The field is 360 feet long by 240 feet wide. Mr. Catella said the circle is 30 feet by scale ruler.

Sean Reimann, a resident of Lincklaen Terrace: I have always enjoyed the College field—since 1959. With respect to plant materials, there were plant materials there prior to anything being built. The field was lined with spruce trees. The other concern I have is that the Village Engineer had a diagram that had an existing storm sewer through the middle of the field. Will that continue undisturbed? I'm not sure how the drainage on Lincklaen Terrace and Lincklaen Drive will be changed as it comes across the new system.

Mr. Catella: Basically, there is a line shown that goes under the field. It will remain undisturbed. Everything we are doing will happen in the topsoil layer. The outlets go into the pond. That will not be altered. W. Hall pointed out that the top of the drawing shows the right-of-way of the Village water line that goes around the athletic field and does not go under the turf.

W. Hall asked for other questions from the floor. There were none. He wondered if it would be appropriate to close the public hearing.

- 195 R. Huftalen: I have a question. If we close the public hearing now, would the Board be in a position to continue the public hearing? W. Hall: There will be discussion and comments from the Board and we can proceed. I don't think we can reopen the public hearing once you close it. Mr. Stokes: You can, but you would need to readvertise.
- 200 R. Huftalen: It is clear we have received a flood of information and there are still things coming in. I want to allay the concerns of the public and carry out our duties without casting aspersions on the College. I don't think this is an intentional withholding of information from the public. I suggest we try to draw some clear deadlines when we will take a course of action. Clearly, we have a
- 205 substantial amount of information. I want to preserve trust in the process, which the Board has earned. I'm sensitive to the fact that this was first brought up in February. A lot of concerns were discussed at that meeting. For some reason, more issues have come up now. I think in the interest of trying to preserve and build trust in the process, it might be prudent to extend the public hearing for some short period of time to digest these responses and then have one final "say it now or forever
- 210 hold your peace" meeting. Once it gets built, it is built. I think so many of the issues have been adequately addressed. Most of the people who raised objections have stated they are in favor of the project moving forward. I think what so many of the concerns revolve around is just clarifying the steps that would be put in place to ensure the adequate execution of the project. In addition to the trust I have in my fellow members of the Board, I have an immense amount of trust in the Village
- 215 team to enforce the mandates that we put forth as a Planning Board. As a business owner and trying to get projects going, I recognize how troubling it is to have things delayed by the public process. My recommendation is to have one last public session for final comment, recognizing that if it is not out in public now, it better be shortly because I think we have considered the bulk of the material that needs to be considered.
- 220 W. Hall: I agree with you. We have been receiving volumes of information for days. It is a lot to assimilate and try to realistically look at this information and try to make some reasonable decision. I will refer to the Village Attorney. Does it make much difference if we close now or keep it open and schedule a future date to meet? Mr. Stokes: You have the option. You can close the public
- 225 hearing and still continue to receive written comments and ask the applicant for more information. If you are going to have another meeting anyway, there is no downside to keeping it open. It would be appropriate to determine when you will continue the public hearing.
- W. Hall: After I make my comments, I would like to reschedule the hearing for the next meeting.
- 230 Hopefully by then we will have had adequate time to review all the information submitted and come to a reasonable conclusion.
- W. Hall: I have heard and listened to everybody for several weeks. I would like to read aloud my prepared comments for the record (which he did).
- 235 W. Hall asked Mr. Stokes if it would be appropriate to proceed with Part 2 of the long EAF? Mr. Stokes advised to hold off on that until the Board determines what it is going to do with the public hearing.
- 240 **W. Hall made the motion to continue the public hearing for August 22 at 7:00 p.m. R. Huftalen seconded. The motion carried.**

245 **Dennis Gregg, Final Phase South Village 2**

Dennis Gregg came forward to give the Board an update and to coordinate with the Board, the Village Attorney, and the Village Engineer. He stated that the road base is in and the infrastructure is in. The hydrant is in toward lots 8 and 9. The sewer is in. The detention basin has been completed with a stone wall with four bays to gather water before it flows over into the remainder of the detention pond. The road is ready to pave and he has contracted for paving, which should happen in a couple of weeks. In the meantime, he will get the maps ready. Mr. Gregg stated that he has people interested in lots 11, 13, and 14 and he needs to complete the paving and get a map filed. He is requesting final plat approval for the final phase (2C), contingent upon getting the remainder of the work done.

255 W. Hall recalled that last time, the Village Engineer signed off and the project was completed—paving and infrastructure—and then he signed the final drawing after everyone else signed it. Mr. Gregg said he is requesting the same procedure. W. Hall said he does not have a problem with that and last time Mr. Gregg and Mr. Stokes worked together for final site plan removal.

260 Mr. Gregg indicated that instead of waiting for the September meeting, if everything is done and everyone has signed off on it, he would like to have final plat approval before then. Mr. Stokes advised that Mr. Gregg would need to get a cost estimate from the Village Engineer that includes the base and binder and everything else that is not done. He continued that it would be a lot simpler for Mr. Gregg to wait until everything is done.

270 Mr. Gregg showed the Board some sketches for a house on lot 5, Atwell Ridge. The sketch included dormers, shakes, and a gable over the garage. Although the sketch does not show stone, Mr. Gregg said he knows they plan to use stone. Also, Ron Merle from Merle Builders is hoping to build a speculation house on lot 3. This particular model exists in a development called Timber Banks in Baldwinsville. It is a craftsman style house. The projected selling price of this house would be around \$384,000.

* * * * *

275 **Beverly Merola, 15 Hurd Street, New Carport**

Robert Kent, architect, presented the project. Ms. Merola would like to construct a carport to give her protection from the elements as she pulls up to the house door and unloads groceries, etc. The driveway comes from Hurd Street and the garage sits way back. There is an entrance door on the side of the house. The supporting columns for the roof need to be right on the property line to allow enough width for a car and snowplow to go under it. The shape of the proposed roof is the same shape as the existing porch roof in front with the same roof pitch. It will have the same details, brackets, and supports. The stone base of the columns will match the house. The roof will be 12 feet wide with a small overhang, which makes it 14 feet long overall.

285 W. Hall asked if the Board had any other questions. Hearing none he continued with the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) determination. He made the motion to declare this a Type II action under SEQR 617.5(c)10, therefore, no further action is required. A. McDowell seconded. The motion carried.

290

W. Hall explained the unique situation of this application. Mr. Kent was planning to go to the Historic Preservation Committee (HPC) first, but was misdirected and told to go to Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) first. He went to the ZBA and got approval and was told to go to the HPC.

295 W. Hall continued that he had spoken with Ted Bartlett of HPC. Due to the miscommunication, Mr. Bartlett indicated that if the Planning Board wants to approve this application contingent upon HPC approval, it would be alright with him. That is not usually the way things are done, but under the circumstances, it does save the applicant at least a couple of weeks because HPC will meet next week.

300 W. Hall recommended approval of the project contingent upon HPC approval. C. Macaulay made the motion, A. McDowell seconded, and the motion carried.

* * * * *

305 **Martin O'Brien & Beata Piasecka, 18 Hurd Street, Replace Garage and Add New Siding**
No one was present to speak on behalf of the applicant. W. Hall noted that this application has Historic Preservation Committee (HPC) approval. The application is to replace siding on the house and tear down the whole garage and build a new one in its place. Drawings were in the file and were
310 discussed by the Board. W. Hall commented that the new garage will more closely match the original architectural features of the house.

W. Hall made the motion to declare this a Type II action in accordance with State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) 617.5(c)10, therefore, no further SEQR action is required. A. McDowell
315 seconded. The motion carried.

W. Hall asked for any further comments from the Board. Hearing none, he recommended approval of this project since it has HPC approval. C. Macaulay made the motion to approve the application in accordance with the drawings by Crawford and Stearns dated July 9, 2011, Sheets S2, S3, S4, and
320 S5. A. McDowell seconded. The motion carried.

* * * * *

A. McDowell made the motion to adjourn the meeting, C. Macaulay seconded, and the motion
325 carried. The meeting was adjourned at 9:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

330
Marlene Westcott
Recording Secretary