

Village of Cayuga Heights Planning Board  
Meeting #64  
Monday, July 25, 2016  
Fire Station – 7:00 pm  
Minutes

Present: Planning Board Members Chair F. Cowett, G. Gillespie, J. Leijonhufvud, M. McMurry, R. Segelken, and Alternate E. Quaroni  
Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross, Deputy Clerk A. Podufalski, Attorney P. Grossman, Trustee J. Marshall  
K. Michaels, Trowbridge Wolf Michaels Landscape Architects (TWLA)  
P. Levesque, HOLT Architects  
T. Votaw, Cayuga Medical Associates  
T. Ciaschi, Corners Community Shopping Center  
Members of the Public

Item 1 – Meeting called to order

- Chair F. Cowett opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.
- Attorney R. Marcus is unable to attend the meeting and his partner P. Grossman is attending in his place.
- Continuation of site plan review for the minor subdivision at 1010 Triphammer Road including the public hearing scheduled for this meeting has been postponed until further notice at the request of the applicant W. Kimble-Duggan.

Item 2 – June 27, 2016 Minutes

- The Board reviewed the minutes of the June 27, 2016 meeting.

Motion: R. Segelken

Second: M. McMurry

**RESOLUTION No. 192**  
**APPROVING MINUTES OF JUNE 27, 2016**

**RESOLVED**, that the written, reviewed and revised minutes of the June 27, 2016 meeting are hereby approved.

**Aye votes** – Chair F. Cowett, G. Gillespie, M. McMurry, R. Segelken

**Abstained**- J. Leijonhufvud

**Opposed**- None

Item 3 – Public Comment

- R. Bors, 121 Texas Lane, read the following statement:

My name is Ronald Bors. I am a former Trustee and member of the Planning Board of this village.

My wife and I have lived at 121 Texas Lane for 41 years, and thus are very familiar with the traffic density in and around Community Corners. As Cornell University has expanded, we have experienced the difficulty of navigating through the Corners area and adjacent side streets, particularly at certain times of day.

Any further increase in traffic density will make travel more difficult. Any **large** increase in traffic density will be intolerable. My concern is that this Medical Office Building will lead to a large increase in traffic density.

My hope is that the currently proposed project is substantially scaled back from the initial proposal. However, my fear is that it is still much too large. Based on the initial proposal, my calculation produced a **traffic density increase of approximately 1,000 cars per day**. Even half of that would be intolerable.

I would urge this Planning Board, as well as the Board of Trustees, to make traffic density a primary concern. Quality of life is at stake. Thank you.

- P. Bottorff, 2109 N. Triphammer Road, echoed the previous statement, stated that he often has trouble exiting in his car from his driveway onto N. Triphammer Road due to traffic, and asked the Board not to do anything that would make traffic worse.
- D. Donner, 107 E. Remington Road, thanked Corners Community Shopping Center owner Tim Ciaschi for the shopping center's contribution to the Cayuga Heights community, but requested that the Medical Office Building project be consistent with the Village's existing zoning and stated his opposition to densification inconsistent with the character of Cayuga Heights.

Item 4 – Preliminary Site Plan Review – Corners Community Shopping Center Medical Office Building Project

- G. Gillespie recused himself from review of the project as he is an employee of HOLT Architects.
- Chair F. Cowett appointed Alternate E. Quaroni as a voting member for this portion of the meeting.

- Attorney P. Grossman advised the Board that in the past his firm has represented both HOLT Architects and Trowbridge Wolf Michaels Landscape Architects.
- Chair F. Cowett recapitulated the Board’s review of the Medical Office Building project to this point; the project was formally presented to the Board in March as a three story building and discussed further in April with the Board which expressed concerns about the project including but not limited to the building’s size, its impact on traffic and parking, and pedestrian and bicycle connections; the project’s design has since been revised and returns to the Board for review as a two story building.
- K. Michaels, Trowbridge Wolf Michaels Landscape Architects (TWLA), explained to the Board the changes made to the project’s design based on the Board’s feedback; the building is now two stories and no longer requires a variance for building height; the project requires variances for lot coverage and distance between buildings; emergency and pedestrian access between Carriage House Apartments and the shopping center has been provided.
- K. Michaels further stated that at the Board’s suggestion a traffic study based on the two story building was conducted by SRF Associates of Rochester; the study found that the proposed development will not result in any potentially significant adverse traffic impacts to area intersections and that the proposed number of parking spaces will be sufficient to accommodate parking needs except for some times of the day in December when parking lots may reach 90% capacity.
- K. Michaels asked the Board about the schedule for site plan review.
- Chair F. Cowett replied that a potential schedule would be for the Board to declare itself lead agency for SEQRA at this meeting, schedule a public hearing and SEQRA review for the Board’s meeting in August, and reach a decision concerning the project at the Board’s meeting in September; Planning Board review of SEQRA in August would permit the ZBA to consider the project’s request for variances at the ZBA’s September meeting and avoid segmentation of SEQRA between the Planning Board and ZBA; this schedule depends, however, on what happens in the August meeting such as results of the public hearing and SEQRA review.
- Chair F. Cowett asked K. Michaels to confirm that a representative from SRF Associates would appear at the Board’s meeting in August to answer questions about the traffic study.
- K. Michaels confirmed that a representative from SRF Associates would appear at the Board’s August meeting and promised to forward any questions that the Board might have at this time about the traffic study to SRF Associates.
- Chair F. Cowett stated that he has many questions about the traffic study, but one traffic related question pertains directly to SEQRA Short Form Part 1 Question 8a, “Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic about present levels?” which the applicant has answered “NO” on a Short Form previously submitted; the traffic study found that the project would generate approximately 52(14) vehicles entering the shopping center during the AM(PM) peak hours

respectively and 25(66) vehicles exiting the shopping center during the AM(PM) peak hours, but concluded that this would not result in any potentially significant adverse traffic impacts to the study area intersections; the NYSDEC SEQRA website defines a “substantial” increase in traffic for a medical/dental office of 31,000 square feet as greater than or equal to 100 peak hour vehicle trips per day during the early morning and late afternoon peak traffic hours; the gross floor area of the revised medical office building is 28,200 square feet and it would be helpful to the Board if the representative from SRF Associates could explain how traffic study estimates for this project’s peak hour vehicle trips relate to the DEC’s definition of a substantial increase in traffic.

- K. Michaels stated that she would forward this question to SRF Associates; she also stated that the building architects would develop more detailed information in regard to the building’s exterior two weeks prior to the August meeting and that she would set up a public outreach meeting prior to the August public hearing.
- P. Levesque, HOLT Architects, displayed new project renderings and explained to the Board the changes made to the building’s design now that it is two stories in height; the proposed building is similar in height and scale to the adjacent buildings and its gables and dormers reflect the façade of adjacent buildings, but with an updated feel.
- Chair F. Cowett asked whether an updated feel meant that the building roof would not match the red roofs of many of the other buildings in the shopping center.
- P. Levesque replied that the new building’s roof would not be red.
- R. Segelken asked about the color of the new building.
- P. Levesque replied that the new building’s color had not been decided, but would likely be buff or off-white so as to blend in with the other buildings in the shopping center.
- Chair F. Cowett asked about the change in the building’s gross area footprint from 13,800 square feet to 14,100 square feet.
- P. Levesque replied that the building needed to become slightly larger to permit the redesign from three to two stories.
- Chair F. Cowett asked about the reduction in cardiology staff including providers from 25 to 22 and the increase in cardiology patients per day from 150 to 180.
- T. Votaw, Cayuga Medical Associates, replied that the reduction in employee numbers reflected additional study of the number of employees needed and that the increase in cardiology patients per day was a typo and the correct number is 150.
- J. Leijonhufvud stated her continuing concern about pedestrian and bicycle access to the shopping center and Medical Office Building, particularly from the bus stops on Pleasant Grove Road, and noted that the revised project drawings submitted to the Board show no change in access provision.
- K. Michaels stated that pedestrians could walk north on Pleasant Grove Road to Hanshaw Road, enter the shopping center on Hanshaw, and then walk south through the shopping center to the Medical Office Building.

- J. Leijonhufvud stated that this is too long a route, especially for medical patients, and that a shorter route is needed.
- K. Michaels stated that a sidewalk could be added just north of the fire station which would connect to the shopping center near the rear of the Medical Office Building; this same sidewalk could provide bicycle access once bicyclists dismount.
- Chair F. Cowett noted that the revised project drawings submitted to the Board show pedestrian access between Carriage House Apartments and the shopping center, but asked why the crosswalk extending south from the proposed new building to the parking lot had not been extended through the parking lot to connect with the access point with Carriage House Apartments.
- K. Michaels replied that extending the crosswalk through the parking lot would mean the loss of some parking spaces and asked whether the Board was requesting that this change be made to the project plans.
- Chair F. Cowett replied that the Board may want to request this change, but suggested holding off on making any change pending a discussion at the August meeting with the representative from SRF Associates about parking space calculations.
- Chair F. Cowett stated that, when he, Mayor L. Woodward, and Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross had met in May with the design team about possible revisions to the project, he had urged that pedestrian amenities be prioritized and had suggested that the Main Street treatment along the main drive adjacent to the building contemplated for future implementation be included as part of this project to improve walkability in the shopping center and pedestrian connectivity to the surrounding neighborhood; however, this does not seem to have been included in revised project drawings.
- K. Michaels replied that there are no plans to include the future implementation of the Main Street treatment as part of this project.
- Chair F. Cowett noted that building reduction to two stories had reduced the number of parking spaces needed, but stated his inability to follow the revised parking space calculations given the materials provided in the traffic study; for example, the peak parking demand month is stated as December and yet the appendix table listing peak medical office building parking demand is for January; it also isn't clear the extent to which a 5% reduction for shared parking in mixed use sites has been incorporated in parking space calculations nor whether a 5-15% reduction for mode share (walking, bicycling, and transit usage) has also been applied; it would be helpful to the Board if the representative from SRF Associates could explain step by step the parking space calculations at the Board's August meeting.
- Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross asked T. Ciaschi, Corners Community Shopping Center owner, if the project's modification of access from the shopping center to Pleasant Grove Road would reduce the practice of some drivers to park their car for the day in the shopping center and then ride the TCAT bus to and from Cornell.

- T. Ciaschi agreed that the project's modification of access to Pleasant Grove Road would likely reduce this unauthorized park and ride practice; he also stated that he occasionally gives permission to some of the neighboring businesses during their busy periods to park some employee cars at the shopping center; a couple of years ago he had a one year agreement with Sciarabba Walker to provide parking at the shopping center to construction workers during a remodeling project, but the term of that agreement has expired and there is no obligation at this time.
- E. Quaroni noted the traffic study found an increase in vehicle trips generated by the project, but is unclear how the study arrived at the conclusion on page 8 that, for the East Upland Road/Triphammer Road/Hanshaw Road intersection, development is projected to add less than approximately one vehicle every six (6) minutes to those intersections and account for a minor change of no more than 0.4 seconds per vehicle in delay over background conditions; she would also like to know how background condition delay times in Table II were calculated since little population growth is anticipated, yet there was quite a difference between existing and background conditions at some intersections.
- J. Leijonhufvud questioned whether Table II in the traffic study accounted for the project's modification of access to Pleasant Grove Road; it appears to reflect existing conditions, but not account for the effect of access modification with development.
- M. McMurry referenced statements in the traffic study stating the absence of any significant adverse traffic impacts to study area intersections requiring the need for mitigation; the study anticipates an increase in traffic due to the project, but how does a traffic study determine the significance of a traffic increase; does the significance of an increase depend on a change in the letter designation signifying a worse level of service?
- K. Michaels stated that she would ask SRF Associates to explain the determination of significance for a traffic study.
- K. Michaels further stated that, in general, if project development significantly worsens traffic and intersection levels of service, then the municipality will require mitigation; road improvements made by Kendal in development of that project are an example; however, if intersections are already receiving failing level of service grades prior to project development, then mitigation is not the developer's responsibility.
- J. Leijonhufvud asked whether it would be possible for SRF Associates to quantify more precisely the delay in seconds for those intersections in the traffic study's capacity analysis table rated F(\*) explained in table notes as greater than 100.
- K. Michaels replied that she would ask SRF Associates if intersections rated F(\*) can be quantified more precisely.
- J. Leijonhufvud stated that there seem to be a large number of mistakes in the traffic study and requested that updated and verified numbers for all tables be provided to the Board two weeks prior to the August meeting.

- K. Michaels replied that she would ask SRF Associates to provide updated and verified numbers for all traffic study tables to the Board two weeks prior to the August meeting.
- The Board discussed declaring itself lead agency for SEQRA review of the Medical Office Building project and categorization of the project for that review.

Motion: M. McMurry

Second: R. Segelken

**RESOLUTION No. 193**

**TO ACCEPT THE PROPOSED MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING PROJECT AT CORNERS COMMUNITY SHOPPING CENTER AS AN UNLISTED SEQR ACTION**

**RESOLVED**, that the Planning Board declares itself lead agency for SEQR review of the proposed Medical Office Building project at Corners Community Shopping Center which the Board categorizes as an Unlisted SEQR action and the property owner is to complete Part 1 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form.

**Aye votes** – Chair F. Cowett, J. Leijonhufvud, M. McMurry, E. Quaroni, R. Segelken

**Opposed**- None

- The Board discussed setting a time for the public hearing at its August meeting pertaining to the Medical Office Building project; although the Board intends to discuss the project with the representative from SRF Associates prior to the public hearing, it was decided to set the public hearing time at 7:10 pm so that members of the public can hear from the SRF Associates representative prior to participating in the public hearing.

**Motion:** J. Leijonhufvud

**Second:** E. Quaroni

**RESOLUTION No. 194**

**TO HOLD A PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE PROPOSED MEDICAL OFFICE BUILDING PROJECT AT CORNERS COMMUNITY SHOPPING CENTER**

**RESOLVED**, that a public hearing will be held on August 22, 2016 at 7:10 p.m. regarding the site plan review for the proposed Medical Office Building project at Corners Community Shopping Center

**Aye votes** – Chair F. Cowett, J. Leijonhufvud, M. McMurry, E. Quaroni, R. Segelken

**Opposed**- None

#### Item 5- Other Business

- The Board's next meeting is scheduled for August 22, 2016.
- M. McMurry informed the Board that she will be unable to attend the Board's August meeting.
- R. Segelken asked Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross if the Village is considering any traffic improvements that could be made in the Community Corners area.
- Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross replied that the Village is considering improvements that could be made; however, discussion of traffic improvements in the Community Corners area would take place with the Village's Board of Trustees rather than with the Planning Board.
- R. Segelken asked Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross to keep the Planning Board informed of these discussions.
- Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross agreed to keep the Planning Board informed.

#### Item 6 – Adjourn

- Meeting adjourned at 8:28 pm.