



Present: Mayor Woodard; Trustees: Biloski, Friend, Marshall, McMurry, Robinson, and Salton (arrives at 8:50 p.m.); Village Engineer Cross; Clerk Walker; Attorney Marcus; Planning Board Chair: Cowett, Members: Segelken, Quaroni, and Monroe

1. Call to Order: Mayor Woodard calls the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

2. Presentation by Kim Nason of PhillipsLytle LLP who represents the applicant, M. Mecenas.

•K. Nason states that at the December Board of Trustees Meeting, Mr. Mecenas submitted an application for rezoning of his property to a Planned Development Zone.

December 9, 2019 Formal Submission Link:

[http://cayuga-heights.ny.us/Text%20and%20PDFs/Planning%20Board/2020/Upland%20Heights%20Rezoning%20Petition%20E-Filing_LOI%20and%20Exhibits\(4625113.1\)%20\(1\).pdf](http://cayuga-heights.ny.us/Text%20and%20PDFs/Planning%20Board/2020/Upland%20Heights%20Rezoning%20Petition%20E-Filing_LOI%20and%20Exhibits(4625113.1)%20(1).pdf)

•The Project includes 3 buildings with a mix-use condominium complex with commercial retail space and will be built in phases.

•At that meeting, the Village Board of Trustees declared itself as lead agency for the purpose of a coordinated review with the Village Planning Board of SEQR.

•At the conclusion of the December Board of Trustees meeting, the Board requested more specifics on the following:

1. Density and Parking:

•The original application proposed 90 dwelling units. At the December meeting, that number was reduced to 46. Today the applicant is proposing 38 units.

•The applicant originally proposed 95 parking spaces for 46 units. In response to the Boards concerns about sufficient parking, the applicant is looking into car sharing which would open up more spaces. In addition, the applicant has a signed letter from the owner of the Corners Community Shopping Center allowing the Upland Heights project 70 parking spaces for overflow parking.

•Planning Board, Chair F. Cowett asks the applicant who they are marketing to. If it is college students, they are less likely to have cars. If you are marketing an older population, one car per dwelling doesn't work. Overflow parking at the Corners Community Shopping Center is already at 95 % capacity at peak months. In addition, the Corners Community already has an overflow parking relationship with the Country Club of Ithaca. So how can they offer spaces when they don't even have them? Planning Board Chair F. Cowett states that the Village Planning Board will not be receptive to this approach for overflow parking.

•Planning Board Chair F. Cowett states that in this latest proposal there is an increased number of bedrooms with the reduction of dwelling units which will have a direct effect on density.

2. Traffic:

•The Board requested more details on what type of retail and commercial business this project would attract.

- K. Nason states that the applicant is envisioning a small grocery store (5000 sft) and several different types of eateries.
- The applicant is pursuing the services of SRF and Associates to conduct a traffic impact survey for the proposed commercial space.
- B. Cross states that there have already been traffic studies done and the Village Planning Board is well aware of the Village traffic issues. It would be more beneficial for the applicant to review the Bergmann and Associates traffic study completed last year.

3. Wetland and Stormwater management:

- Current Village Zoning Law has very specific regulations on wetland and wetland setbacks. In this latest submission the applicant has further reduced the impact to the wetlands and buffer.
- The applicant is interested in making the wetland better by changing the water depth and biodiversity.
- Planning Board member A. Monroe asks if all the stormwater functions will be completed in the first phase of this project. K. Nason states that yes, all stormwater management facets will be completed in phase one.
- David Herrick of T.G. Miller and Associates states that this project will have a permanent pool (manmade wetland) which will outlet to a drainage pipe that goes under E. Upland Rd.
- Planning Board Member A. Monroe asks where the intermittent stream starts and if the zoning restrictions are different for intermittent streams versus wetlands.
- B. Cross states that the wetland buffer zone exceeds the intermittent stream buffer zone.
- Planning Board Chair F. Cowett states that the activities are regulated differently for intermittent streams and wetlands.
- Planning Board Chair F. Cowett asks if there is any watershed mapping that will show where and how much water passes through the property. Herrick of T.G. Miller will provide that as part of the stormwater management plan.
- Bernie Carr, from Delta Engineering, states that there is a discrepancy from the County Map versus the NYSDEC map on intermittent streams which are defined as having a rock bed or bank and a defined channel. B. Carr believes this was formed from old grading or spoil materials from a past Corners Community project. Planning Board Chair F. Cowett points out that there is a 1936 aerial photograph showing a stream through the Mecenass property.

4. Benefits to the Community & Sustainability:

- K. Nason states that the goal of this project is to make this site better than it is currently. This would be accomplished by providing modern housing and commercial retail space. The applicant is also interested creating a wooded trail system on the undeveloped slope.

January 24, 2020 Revised Submission Link:

http://cayugaheights.ny.us/Text%20and%20PDFs/Planning%20Board/2020/Supplemental%20Submission%20with%20Project%20Revisions_Upland%20Heights.pdf

- Trustee Biloski states that she would like to see a viability report for this project. K. Nason states that as soon as the Board and applicant agree to a number of units for this project, they would be able to determine the feasibility of the project.
- Trustees Friend and Marshall voice concerns on the overall shortage of parking spaces associated with this project.
- K. Nason states that in this application, parking is 1.33 parking spaces per dwelling unit (as zoned in the multifamily zone) and that the applicant will be requesting to change that to 1 parking space per dwelling.
- Trustee Marshall states that the parking requirement for commercial floor space is 1 parking space for every 100 square feet of commercial space. The proposed commercial space for this project is 12800 square feet. This would require over 128 parking spaces.
- K. Nason states that the applicant is hoping to have the Planning Board waiver parking requirements.
- Planning Board Member A. Monroe asks if the applicant has looked at changing the parking area of building A and placing it in the 30ft setback adjacent to the parking lot at the Corners Community Center.
- Village Engineer B. Cross states that is a good observation and the applicant should look at that.

Mayor Woodard opens the floor for public comments.

VILLAGE OF CAYUGA HEIGHTS
Public Hearing – Upland Heights Mixed-Use Development
 January 27, 2020 – 7:00 PM – Marcham Hall

	PLEASE PRINT Name/Anonymous	Address	Do you wish to speak? Indicate Yes or No
1.	Jeffrey Rusten	319 East Upland	YES
2.	Kim Anderson	305E. Upland	YES
3.	John Bark	"	no
4.	Louise Holmes	402 E Upland	NO YES
5.	Sonia Thaler	402 E UPLAND	YES
6.	Rick Burgess	316 E Upland	Yes
7.	Beatrice Seelby	104 K'woods	NO
8.	Cathy Wynn Lewis		no
9.	Bianca Indelicato	309 E Upland	NO
10.	Ilene Lambrose	406 E Upland	Yes
11.	SUSAN BARNETT	410 Triphammer Rd	Yes
12.	Asok		No
13.	Bami Carr	270 Thompson Rd	Yes
14.	Steve Flash	204 Klinewoods Rd	Yes

	PLEASE PRINT Name/Anonymous	Address	Do you wish to speak? Indicate Yes or No
1.	Jeffrey Rusten	319 East Upland	Yes
2.	Kim Andersen	305 E. Upland	YES
3.	John Brack	"	no
4.	Louise Holmes	402 E Upland	YES
5.	Sonia Thaler	402 E UPLAND	YES
6.	Rick Burgess	316 12 Upland	Yes
7.	Beatrice Seelby	104 K'woods	NO
8.	Cheryl Wray	316 E Upland	no
9.	Bianca Indelicato	309 E Upland	NO
10.	Ilene Lambrose	406 E Upland	Yes
11.	SUSAN BARNETT	410 Triphammer Rd	Yes

Mayor Woodard and Planning Board Chair, Fred Cowett read letters submitted to the Village Board.

Mayor Linda Woodard
Village of Cayuga Heights Board of Trustees
836 Hanshaw Rd
Ithaca, NY 14850

January 22, 2020

Re: Uplands Heights rezoning petition

Dear Mayor Woodard

As the owners of the property at 11 Lowell Place, we would like to comment on the above rezoning application. We are currently out of the country so will not be able to attend the January 27 meeting.

Our main concerns are the increase in traffic especially at the intersection of Upland and Hanshaw roads and the general impact of what will essentially be a small commercial mall on the residents on the other side of Upland road and on the general character of the area. The intersection is already a difficult one to negotiate and more traffic will make it even less safe. Has the applicant done market research to determine whether a mini-mall with twelve commercial businesses is viable? A two story solely residential building would be a preferable option.

One positive aspect of the application is the promised preservation as a green area of the elevated area at the south of Upland Heights' land. The Village should ensure that this area remains a green space, one of the very few in the Village and one that has unique development issues due to being part of one of the few glacial sand deposits in the general area.

Sincerely

Anita Watkins and Donald Campbell
11 Lowell Pl
Ithaca NY 14850

Good morning. I write to share my concern and misgivings regarding the newly proposed – or, the latest iteration – of Mecenass Development. Frankly, I had hoped that the project had been dropped.

I fail to understand the need for 46 condominium dwelling units and 12 spaces for commercial/retail tenants in this location. Is there a general understanding of the need for this project of which I am not aware?

The Corners area is already congested. I am anxious about the construction traffic/congestion as well as the fate of the finally freshly paved Upland Road. The increased traffic once the project is completed in the Corners area is cause for alarm. The Corners intersection of Hanshaw, Triphammer, Upland and Pleasant Grove Roads is already an entanglement. Parking for residents and additional shoppers will necessitate additional paving to which I am opposed.

I also need to add that although I am confident laws have changed since the Lowell Place development, drainage is also a concern of mine. My neighbors and I are frequently flooded. My back lawn is often quite wet or has standing water throughout the year. I have a commercial sump pump in my driveway and have worked to remediate the problem with only a slight measure of success. Certainly, maintaining as much of the wetland as is possible is also important to me.

Thank you for reading my email and sharing it with the members of the planning board.

Holly R. Tavelli
817 Triphammer Rd.
January 27, 2020

To: Mayor Linda Woodard, VCH Board of Trustees, Planning Board, Mr. Jeff Walker and Mr. Brent Cross

Re: Planned Development Zone application by Mark Mecenass

We are unable to attend the Special Board of Trustees meeting on Jan. 27, '20, due to a conflicting meeting. Please accept this letter as a statement vehemently opposing the request by Mr. Mecenass for a PDZ at the property in question, "Upland Heights", on East Upland Rd.

We live at 302 E. Upland, a home that has been in our family for two generations. Mr. Mecenass does not even live in the village. We depend on village zoning to protect us. Single-family homes, built according to existing zoning regulations, are in keeping with the inherent nature of our village and the existing R District is a proper designation in this residential setting. This project is an inappropriate change in density, use and intent. It does not provide an adequate transition from the existing commercial area to owner-occupied residences.

It will have a severely detrimental impact on the neighborhood, increasing noise and traffic on an already-problematic road, and causing extended disturbance to the neighborhood.

This proposal will create more impermeable surfaces in a location that already has many problems, and Mr. Mecenass's request is dismissive in tone regarding the need for wetland mitigation. Estimates regarding "100-year storm events" are clearly no longer accurate. Our village engineers continue to address drainage and runoff problems on our block of E. Upland Rd., and we see no viable plans from the developer to improve the situation.

We see no positive benefits to us, or the village. We are opposed to adding 46 housing units and 12 commercial spaces and granting waivers for numerous zoning requirements.

We request that you respect the point of view and feelings of the immediate neighbors over the ambitions of an outside developer and deny his application.

Carol and Ron Schmitt

302 E. Upland Rd.

Ithaca NY 14850

As a long-time village resident who has seen the village evolve over the years, I would like to make a few comments about the proposed rezoning of single-family residential parcels for intensive development just south of the Community Corners shopping center. Although I understand that the proposed development would probably make the developer a lot bigger profit than what is legal to be put there, that should not be a consideration of the village authorities. The parcels were bought with the full knowledge that they were zoned single family residential and that the land included wetlands and steep slopes that reduced the available developable area. That is why the land was not that expensive to buy. The only circumstances under which the village government should allow the developer to do something other than what is currently legal is if it delivers a benefit to the community. I believe that is what the law says.

Many people seem to be saying that it is desirable for the community to add to the commercially zoned area so that we can get a small grocery store like a Greenstar and maybe another restaurant or pub-like place for community gathering. It is true that those things would be nice. However, there is no guarantee that we would get either of these things if the area is rezoned. Recent evidence suggests that commercially zoned space that becomes available is used for offices. That is what the market seems to say. Look at the big medical building recently added at Community Corners and the empty retail further north in Lansing. So, unless the trustees are going to specify that the only things allowed in any newly granted commercial area are a restaurant and a small grocery store, I would say you should not allow more commercial. We do not really want more offices. It doesn't enhance the atmosphere as a community center or anything like that. We can all dream of an old-fashioned village with a general store and a butcher, but we can't recreate the past, unfortunately.

Regarding the residential portion, the residents on East Upland are entitled to look across the road at something that is approximately what they are legally supposed to be looking at. So, if the single-family houses that were supposed to be there would be two stories, then any replacement should be no more than two stories. If the single-family houses would have green space in front and between them, then that should be honored too. If the village is tempted to bend the rules for the benefit of the community because they believe there is a shortage of, say, townhouses, in the village, then allow those instead of single family, but be fair to the neighbors. Townhouses might be a good middle ground as a buffer between single family residential and the existing commercial area and the apartments on Pleasant Grove. So, if the existing legal layout of the whole group of parcels would fit 9 houses (considering the wetlands, steep sloped area, need for access road, etc.), then maybe allow 18 townhouses clustered on the flat area and leave the hillside undeveloped. That would

seem fair. It doesn't seem fair to the residents of East Upland to have to look across the road at a solid wall, three stories high, unbroken along almost the entire length of the road frontage, as well as a parking lot. Those people probably bought their houses hoping to have families living opposite them who would become friendly neighbors, not college students moving in and out every year and partying till dawn. If the argument is that it should serve as a transition between commercial and single family residential, then anything commercial should face the existing commercial area and the apartments behind, so it will look as much as possible like houses from the house side. The main point here, as I see it, is fairness — treating the existing neighbors fairly, while adjusting the rules for the benefit of the village (if, indeed, the trustees believe there is a benefit).

We don't want to see an office park. If the zoning is to be altered, it needs to benefit the community and not one individual. Consumer retail, restaurants, and green space would probably benefit our community the most.

The architect's rendering shows a row of trees to shield the residential from commercial...but will retail want to be shielded from the street?

The plan to share parking with Ciaschi is not a plan, it is an argument waiting to happen. Mark Mecnas needs to provide ample parking for his condo owners and retail tenants. If there is a shortage of or a disagreement over parking, Ciaschi's parking agreement may disappear.

I would like to see a conservation easement on the remaining green so that it cannot be developed in the future.

Will Mecnas rent the condos if he does not find buyers?

Public Comments:

- Village resident Curt Ashman states that he is concerned about the water that drains from a 24" drainage pipe from the applicant's property. Typically, it floods his property 3 time as year. Another concern is the traffic counts. As a homeowner, he would rather look at houses and not commercial buildings. He asks if this project follow the long-term plans of the Village.
- B. Cross states that T.G. Miller's stormwater study will address this and will have to control or diminish any drainage flows below the applicant's property.
- Village resident Sally Grubb summarizes her letter to the Boards.

I want to express my opposition to this request as it is presented to us.

First, I would like to say that I am fully in favor of increased residential building density in the Village. However big apartment blocks are not the only way to achieve increased density.

I agree the application is very seductive. On the face of it, it offers everything the comprehensive plan calls for. However, when you read the details and look closely at the plans what is offered is much less attractive.

The following questions need to be asked and answered by both Planning Board and Trustees, as well as the developers.

Traffic

Traffic is already a problem at the Corners. We need to solve existing problems before we add significantly more cars to the mix. Just saying the project is designed for pedestrians doesn't mean they will come and not use their cars. How far has the Village got with plans to improve the many periods of heavy traffic we face daily at Community Corners?

The Retail/Commercial units

When the comprehensive plan was introduced, we were promised small retail and commercial establishments easily accessible on foot, between green spaces and outdoor sitting. What did we get – a Large Medical building and reconfigured parking spaces with no outdoor seating and awkward delivery space for Flowers by Haring and Cayuga Heights Café. This proposal does not provide pedestrian accessible retail spaces.

What commercial retail businesses do the developers anticipate coming to Community Corners? A Vietnamese nail salon perhaps. Has anyone been to Ithaca Mall recently – it is mostly empty store fronts? Does this indicate new businesses are out there looking for spaces? Do we need more retail? Triphammer Mall is already in walking distance and there are spaces there.

Parking

I find it difficult to see where all the 96 parking spaces will be and how far residents will have to walk to their cars. Where are the parking areas for Buildings B and C? The developers say there are plenty of spaces. What if every 2•bed apartment has two cars, and every 1•bed apartment as one car and two bicycles where will these all go? If all are at home on a Saturday where will retail visitors park? Somewhere else? How many times have you tried to find lunch time parking to visit Alecante or Heights Café? Too often Cornellians park here and ride the bus onto Campus. The last thing wanted is more retail parking.

Residential Units – Owner occupied or rental?

There is no indication of whether the residential units will be for sale or rent. What is the anticipate cost of these units. Who is expected to live there? They are too small for families. What storage space do these apartments have? Where are those bicycles everyone will be using to get around be stored? For increased housing density, why didn't the developers consider Town Houses with attached garages and rear garden spaces. The present plan offers no private outdoor space. Nowhere for a kid to kick a soccer ball or ride a bike safely. No place to sit outside in the sun. No communal gathering spaces.

Wetlands

I am concerned that space is being taken from the designated wetland area. This is justified on the basis of data collected in 2018. Every year recently, weather has become more extreme with more heavy rainfalls resulting in localized flooding and heavy run off. I would be less concerned if data had been collected in 2019 which was wetter than 2018. We need less black top not more. We need more wetland not less.

Many of us now regularly cope with flooded driveways, yards and basements after heavy rain that we never experienced when we first moved into Cayuga Heights. Increased blacktop all over the Village, and heavy rains are causing major problems. Loosing even a small area of wetland is not the answer.

- Elizabeth Mount reads her letter to the Boards

Friends,

As a Village resident living at 303 E Upland Road, I am protective of our road, so beautifully repaved in 2019 after several years of waiting to hear Mr. Mecenass' new plans. I am now thinking of all the heavy trucks driving over it to build this newly proposed development, now in its (4th?) iteration.

I am also thinking of the increased paving/roofs that will be built, leading to even poorer drainage than what we experienced ever since Lowell Place was developed thirty•some years ago. Our own basement still floods, even after **many** \$\$\$ and years have passed by.

I give Mr. Mecenass credit for not giving up but can't imagine this will enhance our neighborhood as much as his own bottom line. Forty•six condos and 12 commercial spaces on a mere 6+ acres? I remember when the (previously designated) Lot #9 was set aside for serious drainage, most likely a pond. Drainage there is terrible!

I would far prefer The Mecenass Park with Pond which would enhance the whole Village.

I know a number of our neighbors feel the same way and hope you will hear from them, one way or another.

- Village resident Joy Barr states that the zoning for this parcel should stay the residential. This is a Village; we should keep it a Village, don't make it a town and eventually a city.

- Village resident David Filiberto summarizes his letter to the Boards.

My name is David Filiberto, 206 Klinewoods Road, Ithaca, NY. I am offering my support for the Upland Heights Rezoning petition for the mixed residential and commercial development proposed in the application. I was a member of the recent Zoning Review Committee for the Village update of the Zoning Ordinance of 2018 and am acquainted with the current provisions therein. As the Board is aware, the purpose of the Planned Development Zone section is to permit appropriate flexibility and encourage imaginative development within the Village planning process. The applicant seeks a PDZ as it is the method for such development supported by the Village Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, the Comprehensive Plan speaks to this type of mixed•use development regarding the area in Community Corners (Corners Community), with a priority to encourage the development of housing and commercial space to reinvigorate our Village 'Commons'. From my read of the application, the applicant proposes imaginative development within the existing height requirements and lot coverage as outlined in the current Zoning Ordinance of 2018, which would serve to increase housing stock and commercial space.

As has been well documented, there is a need for increased housing options throughout Tompkins County. The proposed housing potentially serves a growing market for those no longer desiring larger single•family homes, homeowners who wish to 'age in place' in their own residence. Lastly, the opportunity to entice and establish new commercial space, providing walkable offerings for Village residents is vigorously supported by this resident.

I encourage the Village Board of Trustees to approve the application of the Planned Development Zone as proposed in the Upland Heights application.

Sincerely,

David Filiberto

- Village resident Rob Poprawski found this project online and thinks this would be a great place for his mother-in-law to move to. He likes the idea of offering condominiums available in a small community and the ability to age in place.

- Village resident Jeff Rustin states that his property borders the applicant's project and is concerned that they will lose a lot of greenspace. His house is 30ft from the property line; if this project is approved, they will have to continue to landscape and might have to move their driveway. He would like more information on how the wetlands will be managed and maintained. Mr. Rustin asks the Board to clarify why they are taking the lead agency.

- Attorney R. Marcus states that "lead agency" is a term used under the State Environmental Review Act (SEQR).

- NYS requires a "agency" to act as "lead" to determine the environmental impact of an action.

- B. Cross states that the Village has identified four permit-issued agencies. 1. Board of Trustees 2. Planning Board, 3. NYSDEC, 4. US Army Core of Engineers. All have been notified that the Village's Board of Trustees is to act as lead agency for SEQR. This does not mean that the Village Board of Trustees or the Village Planning Board are in favor of this or any project.

- F. Cowett states that this is a notification of the interested parties when it comes to conducting SEQR, not a sign of support for the project.

- Planning Board member E. Quaroni states that there are several professionals assigned to deal with the stormwater and with the drainage on this project.

- Village resident Kim Anderson states that drainage is definitely a concern for them. Stormwater management should take into account the amount of water that enters the local watershed. She is also concerned with the layout and the parking lot locations next to the road. Kim states that there is too much light pollution coming from the Cayuga Medical Center building and more is not desirable. Kim would also like to see all the mailboxes moved to the same side as the houses are on. There is lot of cut through traffic on E. Upland Rd.

- Village resident Louise Holmes states that her concern is the loss of the wild areas around her home.

- Village resident Sonya Thaler is very concerned about the traffic, especially at the 5 roads that intersect at Hanshaw Rd. She also states it is getting harder and harder to find retailer to fill open spaces.

- Trustee Salton arrives at 8:50 p.m.

- Mayor Woodard informs the public that a traffic study was completed by Bergmann & Associates <http://cayugaheights.ny.us/Text%20and%20PDFs/BOT/2019/9.16.2019%20Meeting%20Minutes.pdf> The Village Board is waiting for the ability to get federal funding from the Federal Highway Transportation Bill before any proposed traffic study changes can be addressed.

- Village resident Rick Burgess states that he is in support of any effort to provide additional housing in the Village and expand the tax base. Traffic calming measures might be helpful for E. Upland Rd. He is also concerned about the viability of any commercial businesses given the state of retail.

- Village resident Ilene Lambiase reads a letter to the Boards.

I have lived in the Village since 1974 and adjacent to the Community Corners since 1977. I've owned my home on East Upland since 1987. I never imagined that a major commercial/multi-residential development would be

contemplated on East Upland. There are considerable density and traffic issues in the Corners area already. There are water and runoff issues on Upland which would likely be further exacerbated by such a development.

The lots on East Upland have always been zoned residential by design. They provided a buffer zone between the commercial development at the Corners and the existing East Upland residential zone. My house, as well as most of the others on East Upland, was built in the 1950s. The expansion of the Corners with the multi-residential development of the Carriage House Apartments did not happen until the mid-1960s.

The Upland Heights proposal claims that the buildings would be a good fit for the Corners despite the fact that at 35' they would tower over the existing structures. Nor do they mention the impact this urban-type development would have located directly in front of the residences on East Upland.

Envision a 35' high building right next to Upland Road. There is a reason for 100' setbacks and building height limits when commercial zones abut residential zones. A building as close and as tall as the one proposed would infringe on privacy even in the back yards of the homes on Upland Road.

I have further concerns regarding the type of development. Since inception the Savanna Park condominiums have had issues with non-owner-occupied units and absentee landlords. Who will mediate issues between condominium residents? Who will mediate issues with condominium residents and the Village? It is much easier to have an incompatible tenant leave than a condominium owner. Is the developer planning on maintaining the commercial space or does he plan to sell that as well? Who will manage the commercial space? Will commercial tenants have to be approved by the Board to ensure the commercial space is used in a way that is compatible with Village expectations? Basically, what I think the Board needs to know is who is going to remain responsible for ensuring all goes well once the project is completed. When you have a multitude of owners and no single responsible person or entity that can be problematic.

The developer would argue that he has made an investment in the land. When he made his fairly recent investment those lots were clearly zoned residential for 50+ years. Instead of developing as zoned he has chosen to seek a multitude of exceptions and changes to the zoning rules to build what would negatively impact those of us who made decisions to live on East Upland under the existing zoning rules.

This PDZ is a risky experiment. Once it is done, it cannot be undone. I ask that the Board carefully weigh the benefits to the developer against the negative impact on the Village residents.

- I. Lambaise states that she had asked the applicant why he didn't go forward with the plan from 8 years ago and build houses and duplexes. She states his response was that no one wanted to live that close to the Corners Community Shopping center.

- Village resident Steve Flash states that he is in support of the project. "This is a good addition to the Village, and the water problems that have occurred are not caused by the applicant". T.G. Miller and Associates is qualified to make sure that drainage issues are corrected. Parking should be based on demand. He also feels that an increase in tax revenue is a good thing.

- Village resident Susan Barrett states that she urges the Board to evaluate where there truly is a benefit to the community as a whole.

- Village resident Bea Szekely states that if you are interested in the history of the Corners Community you can learn more at: <https://www.cayugaheightshistory.org/village-history.html>

- Village resident Brian Eden states that there is a real shortage of housing in this County. Cayuga Heights needs to do its part to provide housing. He hopes the Board will find a solution that will work for everyone.
- Planning Board Member Elaine Quaroni asks Village Resident Steve Flash about parking spaces at his apartment complex in downtown Ithaca.
- Mr. Flash states that there are 16 units (8 studio and 8•2•bedroom town houses) with 8 reserved parking spaces. He states that in the city of Ithaca there is no parking requirement.

Public comments concluded.

- Mayor Woodard states that the developer and his team will be responding to all of these comments. The next step is another reiteration and presentation to the Village Board of Trustees and Planning Board.
- Trustee Salton asks the developer, if it is possible that, based on the public comments, that they will present another modified submission. K. Nason, representing the applicant, states “yes” the applicant would like to respond to the feedback presented here tonight.
- Village resident Sonia Thaler asks K. Nason how they are planning on marketing these units. K. Nason states that the applicant still needs to determine that information.
- Planning Board member R. Segelken asks “with the concerns of retail market spaces, how do you respond to the suspicion that the only reason the applicant has commercial space in this project is to have a 3•story building?” Why not go back to just a 2•story residential unit project?” K. Nason states that the applicant understands there are struggles with retail, but that the goal of the project is a mixed•use development. Commercial space is an important component of this project.
- Planning Board Chair F. Cowett revisits Planning Board Meeting Minutes from March 28, 2016 which points out that Corners Community owner, T. Ciaschi, did not feel that commercial retail or restaurant space was viable around this area.
- B.Cross pointed out that T. Ciaschi had already had a potential tenant for all the spaces available and he was not motivated to find more tenants.
- K.Nason states that the applicant wants the project to be successful and the marketability of what type of retail to attract will be examined.
- Mayor Woodard would like to adjourn the Public Hearing until February 24th at 7:00 p.m. and set another meeting with the Board of Trustees and Planning Board.

Resolution # 8584

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: the Village of Cayuga Heights Board of Trustees hereby schedules a special joint meeting of the Board of Trustees with the Village Planning Board on the February 24, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.

Motion: Trustee Biloski

Second: Trustee Marshall

Ayes: Mayor Woodard; Trustees: Biloski, Friend, Marshall, McMurry, Robinson, and Salton

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Motion Carried

Resolution # 8585

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: the Village of Cayuga Heights Board of Trustees hereby continue the Public Hearing on the Upland Heights Mixed•Use Development Project at a special joint meeting of the Board of Trustees and Village Planning Board on the February 24, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.

Motion: Trustee McMurry

Second: Trustee Salton

Ayes: Mayor Woodard; Trustees: Biloski, Friend, Marshall, McMurry, Robinson, and Salton

Nays: none

Abstentions: none

Motion Carried

•Attorney R. Marcus states, for the record, that the article in the Ithaca Voice made reference to this project as a collaboration with Mr. Novarr, Mr. Mackesey, and Mr Mecenasa. That is not the case. The confusion arose from Mr. Mecenasa's LLC which happens to use the mailing address 109 South Quarry St. This is the same location where Novarr•Mackesey Property Management resides.

•Mr. Mecenasa acknowledges the newspaper's mistake and informs the Village Board of Trustees and Planning Board that Attorney Marcus is correct.

•Mayor Woodard adjourns the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

