

Village of Manlius

Planning Board

October 5, 2021

In Person and Streamed Live on Facebook

Present: Chairman Urciuoli; Board Members Erik Hehl, Dick Bilharz and Bridget Maloney

Absent: Board Member Linda Hatch

Others: Brad Hunt, Attorney for Planning Board; Martha Dygert, Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer; Hank Chapman, Trustee; Mike Decker, Codes Enforcement; Matt Lester, Eric Drazkowski representing Fayette-Manlius LLC (via Zoom); Shawn Logue, MRB Group; Christine Stevens.

There being a quorum present, the meeting was opened at 7:05 p.m. by Mr. Urciuoli.

Minutes – September 7, 2021

The Minutes of the September 7, 2021 meeting were provided to the Board for review. Ms. Maloney noted a typographical error which will be amended. Motion by Ms. Maloney, seconded by Mr. Urciuoli to approve the minutes as amended. All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

Site Plan Review - Planned Unit Development (PUD) 402-406 Fayette St Fayette-Manlius LLC
024.-01-08.1 & 024.-01-05.0 Zoned District: PUD

Samples were provided by the Developer and the engineer. Mr. Drazkowski representing Fayette-Manlius LLC updated the Planning Board on the status of the information required by the Village engineer and all the items on the MRB response letter. He stated that they are working through the listing of outstanding items:

1. Currently they are in the second stage of approvals with the NYSDOT.
2. OCWA Legal Description and Easement maps should have been received by the Village.
3. Stormwater has been addressed and will be updated; MS4 Acceptance form should be completed by the Village in order for Excel to submit the NOI.
4. Plans for Preconstruction meetings added to the site plan, as requested by the engineer.
5. Fencing – Hope to finalize at this meeting. There was the request for additional natural screening and fencing on the eastern side of the lot and the creek, which Mr. Drazkowski thought had been addressed at a prior meeting.
6. Stormwater Maintenance Agreement – being drafted by the Village.
7. Final approval from all regulatory agencies should be completed and signed.

As such, Mr. Drazkowski feels they are in a position to receive conditional approval from the Planning Board at this time and for a building permit to be released. He referenced the samples and the building elevations description should be in the possession of the Planning Board at this time.

Questions and comments by the Board were solicited at this time. Mr. Urciuoli stated he had reviewed the MRB letter and was confused on the chronology. He has the Excel letter dated September 20, 2021 which has engineer questions and responses outlined in red. What was received a few days ago is in response to the September 20th letter, as per Shaun Logue of MRB Group.

Mr. Urciuoli reviewed the latest letter and feels that the engineer is comfortable with the progress and will work with the Village Attorney, the Codes Officer and the developer to bring this to completion. Mr. Hunt stated that

the site plan issues (i.e. fencing and screening) should be handled first; once these first items are finalized, the rest can be handled through his office and the Codes office. In short, he is comfortable with the Planning Board issuing a conditional approval. There will be a resolution related to SEQR and site plan approval drafted to include all conditions agreed upon at this meeting. A draft of this resolution was distributed to the Board.

Mr. Lester talked through the fencing which they would be comfortable with white or a steel gray he believes the color of the fencing is “Sherwood Gray”. The Board agreed that the latest submittal of the site plan was acceptable to the Board, more so than the last copy provided. Ms. Maloney stated she had some follow-up questions:

1. Lighting spilling over into the neighbors/photometric plan – does the rendering submitted address the issue of spillover or is it “dark sky” compliant? She is concerned that some of the light levels to the neighboring properties doesn’t mitigate the total issue with lighting. Mr. Lester stated that there are shields which can be installed to alleviate this issue. He (Mr. Lester) stated that there is a lumen level which would need to be in place to keep the safety considerations, to be code compliant. The shields would be in place to retain safety levels but would eliminate some of the spillover to the neighboring properties. The best case would be to install per the plan and then modify with shields once construction is completed. Mr. Urciuoli questioned the height of the poles/lights and Mr. Draskowski stated that the height proposed is twenty (20) feet and further added that there would be screen planting which will limit the lighting spilling to the north. The initial planting of the trees would result in 10’ tall trees, also limiting light pollution. He doesn’t feel that the plan would result in problems in the north property line.

Mr. Urciuoli asked what lighting strength would be typical of a streetlight in that area, for comparison for those on the Board who aren’t familiar with the lumens proposed. Mr. Draskowski stated that there are 0.1 lumens proposed near the woods and 0.4 in the main areas, with anything lower being too dark. He believes that street lights are from 4.0 to 8.0.

WellNow Urgent Care/Starbucks/Multi-Story Building – rendering presented and explained by Mr. Lester. On the western line they will have the same limestone at the base. The brick will be on Starbucks and the multi-story. Mr. Urciuoli asked if this WellNow differentiated from the other WellNow structures and Mr. Lester stated this one would be completely different from the standard design. Fiber cement trim and siding (wood grain) on the WellNow with a stone sill and horizontal wood grain board, gray color. All samples were viewed by the Board. They discussed the architectural element (“Craftsman type”) throughout the project.

Starbucks

- Stone base
- Stone sill
- Horizontal woodgrain board in gray

Mixed-Use Building

- Limestone base
- Brick woodgrain columns/posts,
- Shingle and siding rendering in the “*Shoreline Expression*” color and “*Lakeshore Blue*” in the Dutch lap style.
- Roof shingle would be burnt sienna, or brown/black.

Mr. Urciuoli discussed the difference between clapboard versus Dutch lap style siding.

Attorney Hunt recommended that the siding type and color could be decided later and be included in the conditional approval. Mr. Urciuoli concurred and would like this to be decided separately. He encouraged the Board members to research the different types prior to the next meeting and those two items, type and color, can be decided later.

Ms. Maloney asked about the performance bond confirmation had been resolved, which was discussed at the last meeting. Attorney Hunt will be bringing those remaining items to the Village Board for approval.

Engineer Comments

Shaun Logue went through the SEQR documentation. He went through briefly – and with this project being in a predominantly urban area, there are very few impacts to the natural landmarks. There were no large impacts identified relating to stormwater. They won't be signing off on the stormwater plan until all items are addressed. The only moderate impact identified by the Village engineer was #7 – the possibility of the Northern Long-Eared Bats as a threatened and endangered species. He is not concerned by this as there is very minimal tree removal and off-season will be coordinating with US Fish and Wildlife. He will be submitting the final draft with the full EAF. 13(a), 15(e), and 17(a) identified – relating to the drive-thru which has already been discussed during the PUD approval process. SHPO has signed off on this plan and have no concerns with this project.

All SEQR documentation will be included in the full project file.

Ms. Maloney spoke with Mr. Logue relative to the phasing question as to whether there would be a none to small impact or moderate to large impact. He stated that this would be up to the discretion of the Board. According to Mr. Logue, If there were to be several "moderate to large impact" notations on the SEQR, then the Village would be required to go through the Environmental Impact Statement which would be costly.

Mr. Logue stated that, in his opinion, this is not a wildlife corridor and wouldn't be clearing a large land area, there wouldn't be a large impact. Mr. Hunt stated that this are discretionary meanings which are more specific according to the NYSDEC. He stated that the Board would make the determination whether there would be a significant environmental impact, or a small environmental impact and this form is to assist the Board in making this determination. Any moderate to large impact designation would need to be explained in detail as to why this determination was made. Typically, much larger projects would require an EIS but this would not, in his opinion, be a project of a scale which would require the Environmental Impact Statement.

After a lengthy discussion between Board members and Mr. Logue and Mr. Hunt, Mr. Urciuoli asked if the Board is comfortable with the EAF. The consensus was that they were comfortable with the information provided.

Resolution: Fayette Manlius, LLC Site Plan

Fayette Manlius, LLC has applied for site plan approval for a mixed-use development in a PUD district at 332 & 402-06 Fayette Street in the Village. The application includes a proposed final subdivision plat dated April 10, 2020; and a set of plans labeled CO.1 through PXP2 with dates in August and September 2021.

The Village Board of Trustees held a public hearing on May 11, 2021 and approved the zone change to PUD on May 11, 2021.

The Onondaga County Planning Board issued a resolution dated August 25, 2021, finding that the project will have no significant adverse inter-community or county-wide impacts.

Regarding SEQRA, the Planning Board resolves to act as lead agency for a single agency, uncoordinated review of this unlisted action. Based on a review of the full environmental assessment form, the submitted plans, and all relevant information, the Planning Board determines that the project will have no significant adverse environmental impact. The Planning Board further determines that all questions on part 2 of the environmental assessment form may be answered, "No, or small impact may occur."

Pursuant to section 99-11.2(c)(8) of the Village Code, the Planning Board hereby grants final site plan approval for phases 1 and 2 of the project and finds that the requirements of section 99-37(D) of the Village Code have been satisfied. Pursuant to section 99-11.2(c)(9), the Subdivision is approved as part of the site plan. This final site plan approval is subject to the following conditions, which must be met before any building permit will be issued:

- Pursuant to Village Code sections 99-11.2(c)(7) and 99-37(2)(b), the applicant shall be required to post a security in an amount to be determined by the Village Board of Trustees and in a form to be approved by the Village Attorney, in order to ensure the completion of site improvements (excluding construction of the mixed use building) for phase 2 of the project, including demolition and removal of the existing building, environmental cleanup, landscaping, and site restoration.
- The applicant shall be required to enter into an agreement with the Village Board providing for the applicant's operation and maintenance of the stormwater drainage system, including the posting of any security required by the Village Board. This agreement shall be subject to the review of the Village Engineer and Village Attorney before Village Board approval.
- The applicant shall be required to prepare and enter into easement agreements under which all the lots on the site have rights to shared parking and access to the site. These and any other required easement agreements shall be subject to the approval of the Village Attorney.
- The applicant shall obtain permits from the New York State Department of Transportation, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, the Onondaga County Water Authority, and the Onondaga County Department of Water Environment Protection to authorize the work on the site. These permits shall be subject to the review and approval of the Village Engineer and Village Code Enforcement Officer.
- The applicant shall not engage in outdoor storage of vehicles on the site, either during or after construction.
- The applicant will use lighting shields as necessary to prevent spillage of light onto the neighboring properties.
- The applicant shall obtain certificates of occupancy for phases 1 and 2 within 3 years of the approval of the PUD district by the Village Board of Trustees.
- Fencing as shown on sheet C2.4 shall be Nantucket Grey.
- With respect to siding on the phase 2 mixed use building, the Planning Board will determine, at a later date, the color of the siding and whether it will be Dutch lap or clapboard style.
- The applicant shall fulfill any other legal and engineering requirements as determined by the Village Engineer and Village Attorney.
- The applicant shall submit a set of final signed site plans for filing with the Village Clerk.

On motion by Mr. Bilharz, seconded by Mr. Urciuoli to approve the site resolution as amended with the additional approvals required for the fencing color, mixed-use color and type of siding and the light shields installed as needed.

Roll Call Vote:

	Aye	Nay	Other
Mr. Urciuoli	<u> X </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Mr. Hehl	<u> X </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Ms. Hatch	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Absent
Ms. Maloney	<u> X </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Mr. Bilharz	<u> X </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

All in favor. MOTION CARRIED

The applicant shall submit a separate application for signage approval.

There being no more business before the Board it was on motion by Mr. Urciuoli, seconded by Mr. Bilharz to adjourn the meeting at 8:24 p.m. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha Dygert
Village Administrator/Clerk-Treasurer