

Village of Cayuga Heights Planning Board
Meeting #119
Monday, December 18, 2023
Marcham Hall – 7:00 pm
Minutes

Present: Planning Board Members Chair F. Cowett, J. Leijonhufvud, M. McMurry, R. Segelken
Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross, Deputy Clerk A. Jacot, Alternate Member M. Johnston,
Mayor L. Woodard
R. Kawecki, Bousquet Holstein PLLC
D. King, 102 North Sunset Drive
Members of the Public

Item 1 – Meeting called to order

- Chair F. Cowett opened the meeting at 7:02 pm.
- Chair F. Cowett stated that E. Quaroni is unable to attend the meeting; Alternate Member M. Johnston is appointed a full voting member for this meeting.
- Chair F. Cowett further stated that Attorney R. Marcus is unable to attend the meeting; Attorney R. Kawecki, Bousquet Holstein PLLC, is attending the meeting via Zoom and is able to provide the Board with legal advice if needed.

Item 2 – November 27, 2023 Minutes

- The Board reviewed the minutes of the November 27, 2023 meeting.

Motion: J. Leijonhufvud

Second: R. Segelken

RESOLUTION No. 405
APPROVING MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 27, 2023

RESOLVED, that the written, reviewed and revised minutes of the November 27, 2023 meeting are hereby approved.

Aye votes – Chair F. Cowett, M. Johnston, J. Leijonhufvud, M. McMurry, R. Segelken
Opposed – None

Item 3 – Public Comment

- No members of the public wished to speak.

Item 4 – Subdivision Review – 102 North Sunset Drive

- Chair F. Cowett stated that the Village received an application to subdivide the property at 102 North Sunset Drive in the Village's Residence zoning district; the applicant appeared before the Planning Board at its October 23 meeting and provided a survey map showing the proposed subdivision; the Board accepted the project for subdivision review, declared itself lead agency for SEQRA, and scheduled both SEQRA review and a public hearing for this meeting.
- Chair F. Cowett stated further that, since the Board's October 23 meeting, the applicant has provided a revised survey map containing revisions requested by the Board, including a shaded area showing the possible building area for a residence with a slope less than 25% as required by the Village's Zoning Law, a legend including a symbol for deciduous trees with a dbh of 6 inches or greater, and a signature block with room for any conditions of approval determined by the Board; in addition, Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross has provided a Zoning Officer's Report stating that Parcels A and B created by the subdivision are compliant with Village Zoning Law requirements for road frontage, setbacks, and lot shape; however, the calculations for Parcel A incorrectly state average lot depth, width, and north side setback; the correct average depth is 384 feet, the correct average width is 221 feet, and the correct north side setback is 33.2 feet.
- Chair F. Cowett asked Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross to confirm the corrections to the dimensions for Parcel A and asked if the dimensions for Parcel A are still compliant with Village Zoning Law requirements.
- Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross confirmed the correct dimensions for Parcel A and stated that Parcel A dimensions are compliant with the Village's Zoning Law.
- Chair F. Cowett stated that the revised survey map, the Zoning Officer's Report, and the applicant's responses to the questions in Part 1 of the SEQRA short form were made available to the public via the Board's webpage in advance of this meeting.
- The public hearing commenced at 7:07 pm.
- No members of the public wished to speak.
- Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross stated that P. Ehrich, 2 Strawberry Lane, a resident of a property within 200 feet of 102 North Sunset Drive, visited him prior to the Board meeting with questions about the subdivision review and concern about a possible view easement associated with her property; he explained that her concern about a view easement was more appropriate to site plan review than subdivision review; she decided that there was no need for her to attend the Board meeting.

Motion: R. Segelken
Second: M. McMurry

**RESOLUTION No. 406
TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING**

RESOLVED, that the public hearing regarding subdivision review for the proposed minor subdivision at 102 North Sunset Drive be closed.

Aye votes – Chair F. Cowett, M. Johnston, J. Leijonhufvud, M. McMurry, R. Segelken
Opposed – None

- The public hearing was closed at 7:07 pm.
- Chair F. Cowett asked Board members if there were any questions or comments about the proposed subdivision prior to SEQRA review of the project.
- Board members had no questions or comments.
- The Board discussed the project in relation to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA) which it has categorized as an Unlisted SEQRA action.
- The Board reviewed the applicant's responses to the questions in Part 1 of the SEQRA short form.
- Chair F. Cowett stated that the total acreage of the site of the proposed action has been corrected from 2.97 acres to 3.31 acres consistent with the updated TG Miller survey map; the DEC's EAF Mapper kicked out a yes answer for Question 12b, but a letter from the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation confirmed that no properties including archaeological and/or historic resources will be impacted by this project; the DEC's EAF Mapper kicked out a yes answer for Question 15 and cited Lake Sturgeon as a Threatened or Endangered Animal, but the act of subdivision will have no impact on Lake Sturgeon habitat.
- Code Enforcement Officer suggested that Question 9 regarding NYS energy code requirements be answered as Not Applicable and the Board agreed.
- The Board accepted the applicant's responses to the questions in Part 1 of the SEQRA short form along with its revisions.

Short Environmental Assessment Form Part 1 - Project Information

Instructions for Completing

Part 1 - Project Information. The applicant or project sponsor is responsible for the completion of Part 1. Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification. Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information.

Complete all items in Part 1. You may also provide any additional information which you believe will be needed by or useful to the lead agency; attach additional pages as necessary to supplement any item.

Part 1 - Project and Sponsor Information		
Name of Action or Project: Subdivision 102 North Sunset Drive		
Project Location (describe, and attach a location map): 102 North Sunset Drive, Village of Cayuga Heights, NY		
Brief Description of Proposed Action: Proposed action is a minor subdivision of an existing tax parcel		
Name of Applicant or Sponsor: Elizabeth B. King	Telephone: 207-374-7112 207-374-7112	E-Mail: elizbking.33@gmail.com
Address: 63 Parker Ridge Lane #315		
City/PO: Blue Hill	State: ME	Zip Code: 04614
1. Does the proposed action only involve the legislative adoption of a plan, local law, ordinance, administrative rule, or regulation? If Yes, attach a narrative description of the intent of the proposed action and the environmental resources that may be affected in the municipality and proceed to Part 2. If no, continue to question 2.	NO	YES
2. Does the proposed action require a permit, approval or funding from any other government Agency? If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit or approval:	NO	YES
3. a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action? b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed? c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor?	4	□
4. Check all land uses that occur on, are adjoining or near the proposed action:	4	□
5. <input type="checkbox"/> Urban <input type="checkbox"/> Rural (non-agriculture) <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Residential (suburban) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> Aquatic <input type="checkbox"/> Other(Specify): <input type="checkbox"/> Parkland	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> 2.97 acres 3.31 0 acres 2.87 acres 3.31 </div>	

5. Is the proposed action,	NO	YES	N/A
a. A permitted use under the zoning regulations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Is the proposed action consistent with the predominant character of the existing built or natural landscape?	NO	YES	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
7. Is the site of the proposed action located in, or does it adjoin, a state listed Critical Environmental Area?	NO	YES	
If Yes, identify: _____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
8. a. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels?	NO	YES	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Are public transportation services available at or near the site of the proposed action?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. Are any pedestrian accommodations or bicycle routes available on or near the site of the proposed action?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
9. Does the proposed action meet or exceed the state energy code requirements?	NO	YES	
If the proposed action will exceed requirements, describe design features and technologies: _____ _____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
			N.A.
10. Will the proposed action connect to an existing public/private water supply?	NO	YES	
If No, describe method for providing potable water: _____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
11. Will the proposed action connect to existing wastewater utilities?	NO	YES	
If No, describe method for providing wastewater treatment: _____	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
12. a. Does the project site contain, or is it substantially contiguous to, a building, archaeological site, or district which is listed on the National or State Register of Historic Places, or that has been determined by the Commissioner of the NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation to be eligible for listing on the State Register of Historic Places?	NO	YES	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
13. a. Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency?	NO	YES	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b. Would the proposed action physically alter, or encroach into, any existing wetland or waterbody?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
If Yes, identify the wetland or waterbody and extent of alterations in square feet or acres: _____			

14. Identify the typical habitat types that occur on, or are likely to be found on the project site. Check all that apply: <input type="checkbox"/> Shoreline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural/grasslands <input type="checkbox"/> Early mid-successional <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland <input type="checkbox"/> Urban <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Suburban		
15. Does the site of the proposed action contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered? Lake Sturgeon	NO	YES
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Is the project site located in the 100-year flood plan?	NO	YES
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Will the proposed action create storm water discharge, either from point or non-point sources? If Yes,	NO	YES
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Will storm water discharges flow to adjacent properties?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Will storm water discharges be directed to established conveyance systems (runoff and storm drains)? If Yes, briefly describe:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that would result in the impoundment of water or other liquids (e.g., retention pond, waste lagoon, dam)? If Yes, explain the purpose and size of the impoundment:	NO	YES
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the location of an active or closed solid waste management facility? If Yes, describe:	NO	YES
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the subjects of remediation (ongoing or completed) for hazardous waste? If Yes, describe:	NO	YES
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE IS TRUE AND ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE Applicant/sponsor/name: <u>Elizabeth B. King</u> Date: <u>11/28/23</u> Signature: <u>Elizabeth B. King</u> Title: _____		

PRINT FORM

EAF Mapper Summary Report

Monday, November 6, 2023 10:49 AM

Disclaimer: The EAF Mapper is a screening tool intended to assist project sponsors and reviewing agencies in preparing an environmental assessment form (EAF). Not all questions asked in the EAF are answered by the EAF Mapper. Additional information on any EAF question can be obtained by consulting the EAF Workbooks. Although the EAF Mapper provides the most up-to-date digital data available to DEC, you may also need to contact local or other data sources in order to obtain data not provided by the Mapper. Digital data is not a substitute for agency determinations.

Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, USGS, Intermap, INCREMENT P, NRCan, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri Korea, Esri (Thailand), NGCC, (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

Part 1 / Question 7 [Critical Environmental Area]	No
Part 1 / Question 12a [National or State Register of Historic Places or State Eligible Sites]	No
Part 1 / Question 12b [Archeological Sites]	Yes
Part 1 / Question 13a [Wetlands or Other Regulated Waterbodies]	Yes - Digital mapping information on local and federal wetlands and waterbodies is known to be incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.
Part 1 / Question 15 [Threatened or Endangered Animal]	Yes
Part 1 / Question 15 [Threatened or Endangered Animal - Name]	Lake Sturgeon
Part 1 / Question 16 [100 Year Flood Plain]	Digital mapping data are not available or are incomplete. Refer to EAF Workbook.
Part 1 / Question 20 [Remediation Site]	No



**New York State
Parks, Recreation and
Historic Preservation**

KATHY HOCHUL
Governor

ERIK KULLESEID
Commissioner

November 30, 2023

FREDERICK COWETT
Chair, Planning Board
Village of Cayuga Heights
836 Hanshaw Rd
Ithaca, NY 14850

Re: SEQRA
Prospective subdivision, 102 N. Sunset Drive, tax parcel 8.-1-9
102 N Sunset Dr, Ithaca, NY 14850
23PR09338

Dear FREDERICK COWETT:

Thank you for requesting the comments of the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP). We have reviewed the project in accordance with the New York State Historic Preservation Act of 1980 (Section 14.09 of the New York Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Law). These comments are those of the OPRHP and relate only to Historic/Cultural resources. They do not include potential environmental impacts to New York State Parkland that may be involved in or near your project. Such impacts must be considered as part of the environmental review of the project pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York Environmental Conservation Law Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617).

Based upon this review, it is the opinion of OPRHP that no properties, including archaeological and/or historic resources, listed in or eligible for the New York State and National Registers of Historic Places will be impacted by this project.

If further correspondence is required regarding this project, please be sure to refer to the OPRHP Project Review (PR) number noted above.

Sincerely,

R. Daniel Mackay

Deputy Commissioner for Historic Preservation
Division for Historic Preservation

rev: D. Boggs

- The Board reviewed Parts II and III of the SEQRA short form.

Agency Use Only [If applicable]

Project:

Date:

**Short Environmental Assessment Form
Part 2 - Impact Assessment**

Part 2 is to be completed by the Lead Agency.

Answer all of the following questions in Part 2 using the information contained in Part 1 and other materials submitted by the project sponsor or otherwise available to the reviewer. When answering the questions the reviewer should be guided by the concept "Have my responses been reasonable considering the scale and context of the proposed action?"

	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Will the proposed action impact existing:		
a. public / private water supplies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PRINT FORM

Agency Use Only [If applicable]

Project:

Date:

**Short Environmental Assessment Form
Part 3 Determination of Significance**

For every question in Part 2 that was answered "moderate to large impact may occur", or if there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action may or will not result in a significant adverse environmental impact, please complete Part 3. Part 3 should, in sufficient detail, identify the impact, including any measures or design elements that have been included by the project sponsor to avoid or reduce impacts. Part 3 should also explain how the lead agency determined that the impact may or will not be significant. Each potential impact should be assessed considering its setting, probability of occurring, duration, irreversibility, geographic scope and magnitude. Also consider the potential for short-term, long-term and cumulative impacts.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action may result in one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts and an environmental impact statement is required.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.
Planning Board, Village of Cayuga Heights	December 18, 2023
Name of Lead Agency	Date
Frederick Cowett	Chair, Planning Board
Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency	Title of Responsible Officer
<i>Frederick Cowett</i>	
Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency	Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer)

PRINT FORM

Motion: R. Segelken
Second: M. Johnston

RESOLUTION No. 407
TO DETERMINE PROPOSED ACTION WILL NOT RESULT IN AN ADVERSE
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

RESOLVED, that the Village of Cayuga Heights Planning Board has determined that the proposed minor subdivision at 102 North Sunset Drive will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

Aye votes – Chair F. Cowett, M. Johnston, J. Leijonhufvud, M. McMurry, R. Segelken
Opposed – None

- Chair F. Cowett stated that the Village’s Zoning Law instructs the Planning Board to consider in subdivision review the planning guidelines and infrastructure design standards contained in § 305-123; most of the guidelines and standards are applicable to a major, not minor, subdivision; he asked if Board Members had any questions or comments before making findings for § 305-123.
- J. Leijonhufvud replied that a real estate listing for 102 North Sunset Drive had incorrectly stated several inaccurate points that would be misleading to a prospective buyer, including that "The seller has obtained a preliminary subdivision of the lot and building approval from the planning board, providing a buyer with one of the only remaining buildable lots in the entire village;" she stated that, although the listing has been corrected, it should be made clear to a prospective buyer that subdivision approval does not imply site plan approval.
- Chair F. Cowett agreed with J. Leijonhufvud and suggested that this can be achieved through a condition of subdivision approval.
- The Board discussed the planning guidelines and infrastructure design standards contained in § 305-123 of the Village’s Zoning Law applicable to a minor subdivision.
 - *Lot size and coverage:*

The subdivided lots comply with setback and street frontage requirements of the Village’s Zoning Law and are of a size consistent with the Residence zoning district and existing neighborhood character. In unimproved Parcel B, the survey map provided by the applicant shows a buildable area for residence construction with a grade less than 25%; if built upon, this area would comply with the lot coverage requirements of the Village’s Zoning Law.

- *Lot shape:*

The subdivided lots meet the requirements of the Village's Zoning Law for regularity of shape; the side lines of the lots are substantially at right angles to street centerlines and therefore compliant with the Zoning Law.

- *Lot access:*

The subdivided lots have adequate access to North Sunset Drive, an existing public street.

- *Driveways:*

Subdivided Lot A has an existing driveway. The survey map provided by the applicant shows a potential driveway for subdivided Lot B extending from North Sunset Drive to the proposed buildable area. This driveway has an average slope of approximately 10% which is compliant with the Village's Zoning Law. Additionally, the location of the proposed driveway can be expected to offer drivers exiting the driveway unobstructed views of North Sunset Drive for a distance commensurate with the speed and volume of traffic on that street.

- The Board discussed whether to approve, approve with conditions, or disapprove the proposed subdivision at 102 North Sunset Drive.
- Chair F. Cowett suggested that, if the Board approves the subdivision, it include two conditions of approval pertaining to the unimproved Lot B which would be printed on any approved subdivision plat; the first condition would state that any exterior site construction or change in the intensity of use at Lot B will require the review and approval of a site plan by the Village's Planning Board and the issuance of a building permit by the Village's Code Enforcement Officer; the second condition would state that no living trees with a trunk diameter at breast height of six inches or greater can be removed from Lot B prior to Planning Board site plan approval unless removal has been approved by the Planning Board after consultation with the Village Forester.
- Chair F. Cowett further stated, regarding the first condition, that Attorney R. Marcus had found language in § 305-116.A.3 of the Village's Zoning Law, a holdover from the old Zoning Law, stating incorrectly that site plan review is required for a subdivision of land in any zoning district; the Board of Trustees will soon be considering a Local Law to cure this issue by deleting § 305-116.A.3, but Attorney R. Marcus suggested including the proposed first condition to make clear that subdivision review is required and not site plan review in considering a potential subdivision; the language of the condition also addresses the issue raised by J. Leijonhufvud regarding the

misleading real estate listing for 102 North Sunset Drive by emphasizing that subdivision approval does not imply site plan approval and that site plan approval is required before any improvements can be made to Lot B.

- M. Johnston asked about the rationale behind the proposed second condition.
- Chair F. Cowett replied that the language in the proposed second condition reflects the language contained in the Village's Zoning Law both in § 305-118.A.1 which pertains to site plan review procedures and in § 305-124.A.1 which pertains to subdivision review procedures; however, it has been his experience as Village Forester that property owners sometimes overlook this language and, since there is a Unique Natural Area associated with the property, it is important this does not occur.
- R. Segelken agreed that it would be helpful if the second condition was included on the subdivision plat so that any property owner of Lot B would be aware from the start about the regulation of tree removals.

Motion: M. McMurry

Second: J. Leijonhufvud

**RESOLUTION No. 408
TO APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS THE PROPOSED MINOR SUBDIVISION
AT 102 NORTH SUNSET DRIVE**

RESOLVED, that, based upon the findings made by the Planning Board in consideration of § 305-123 of the Village's Zoning Law, the proposed minor subdivision at 102 North Sunset Drive is hereby approved subject to the following conditions applicable to subdivided Lot B pursuant to Article XVII Site Plan Review of the Village's Zoning Law:

(1) Any exterior site construction or change in the intensity of use at subdivided Lot B shall require the review and approval of a site plan by the Village's Planning Board and the issuance of a building permit by the Village's Code Enforcement Officer; and

(2) No living trees with a trunk diameter at breast height (DBH) of six inches or greater at subdivided Lot B shall be removed prior to the Planning Board's issuance of site plan approval, unless such removal has been approved by the Planning Board after consultation with the Village Forester.

Aye votes – Chair F. Cowett, M. Johnston, J. Leijonhufvud, M. McMurry, R. Segelken

Opposed – None

- Chair F. Cowett asked D. King, 102 North Sunset Drive, if he has been adequately informed by the Chair and by Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross about the process required to record a subdivision plat.
- D. King replied that he has been so informed; he then stated that, since the Board's November 27 meeting, the property is now under contract with a buyer who would prefer to leave the property as is and not subdivide it to facilitate the sale of Lot B.
- Chair F. Cowett stated that D. King is under no obligation to record the subdivided plat; however, if the applicant does not file the approved plat with the Tompkins County Clerk within 180 calendar days of the Chair signing the plat on behalf of the Village, then the subdivision is no longer valid.

Item 5 – Comprehensive Plan Discussion

- The Board resumed its discussion as to whether the Village's Comprehensive Plan should be updated.
- M. McMurry discussed the Transportation section; there isn't much to update in this section which is ambitious and she agrees with the goal of reducing vehicular traffic and diversifying infrastructure to accommodate modes of transportation other than cars; however, many specific recommendations have not been acted upon; the recommendation to maintain a maximum of one travel lane in each direction should include a bike lane; maintenance of Village streets should acknowledge the increase of traffic on those streets; encouraging public transit use by building more shelters and working with TCAT should be pursued; the recommended strategic plan for linking bikeways with adjacent municipalities should reference the Ithaca bikeway plan; the recommended walkability audit never happened; consideration should be given to mitigating traffic by reducing parking availability; if there are fewer parking spaces, fewer people drive.
- Chair F. Cowett stated that, while it is true that reducing parking is the best way to reduce traffic, a distinction should be made between local Village resident traffic and commuter traffic to Cornell.
- Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross stated that the City of Ithaca has reduced parking to be provided by developers.
- R. Segelken stated that this has happened in Collegetown; redevelopment of College Avenue did not entail the provision of new parking.
- M. Johnston asked Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross if there have been any requests for additional bus shelters in the Village or bus shelters with lighting.
- Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross replied that he is not aware of any such requests.
- M. Johnston stated that there have been requests at Cornell for bus shelters with solar lighting, outlets for charging devices, and screens; one such shelter has been built near Atkinson and the Dairy Bar.

- Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross stated that Cornell is looking to replace two old bus shelters at A Lot and that the new shelters will contain enhancements.
- R. Segelken asked about electrical vehicle charging.
- M. McMurry stated that the Transportation section doesn't address this, but it should be included.
- M. Johnston stated that EV charging could also be addressed in the Utility section.
- M. McMurry stated that EV charging overlaps with parking in that charging stations can be associated with bonus or preferential parking.
- J. Leijonhufvud stated that consideration from a safety standpoint should be given to electric scooters and electric bikes; Ebikes can be ridden in bike lanes on roads with speed limits under 30 mph.
- M. Johnston asked M. McMurry if her take on the Transportation section is that the ambition reflected in the section should be maintained.
- M. McMurry stated that the ambition should be maintained, but it's time to focus on better following through.
- Chair F. Cowett stated that the Board has completed its review of the individual Comprehensive Plan sections; he asked Board members if, based upon this review, they believed the Comprehensive Plan should be updated.
- Board members agreed with the need to update the Comprehensive Plan.
- Chair F. Cowett asked Board members how the Board should proceed in informing the Village's Board of Trustees of the need to update.
- Board members discussed this and agreed that the Board member responsible for reviewing each Comprehensive Plan section would briefly summarize the need to summarize that section for the Planning Board's February meeting.

Item 6 – New Business

- The next scheduled meeting of the Board is Monday January 22, 2024.
- Code Enforcement Officer B. Cross stated that the Board may be asked to consider two new projects at its January meeting; the first project is a proposed cannabis dispensary to be located at 840 Hanshaw Road in a former office near Ned's Pizza; the dispensary would require both a special use permit and site plan review; the second project is a proposed subdivision at 305 Highland Road where both a single family residence and two apartment buildings are located; the subdivision would allocate the single family residence to one subdivided parcel and the two apartments to the other subdivided parcel in order to facilitate the sale of the apartment buildings.

Item 7 – Adjourn

- Meeting adjourned at 8:28 pm.