

**Dryden Planning Board**  
**August 10<sup>th</sup>, 2016**

**Members Present:** Joe Laquatra (Chair), Marty Moseley, Craig Anderson, David Weinstein, Tom Hatfield and John Kiefer. Marty Hatch excused.

**Staff present:** Ray Burger, Planning Director

**Liaisons:** Deborah Cipolla-Dennis

**Guests:** Gary Sloan, Steve Hugo, Ryan Kovac, Mr. and Mrs. Maxwell

Minutes are typed from a recording and notes taken by the Planning Director.

The meeting was called to order at 5:30PM.

- The purpose of the meeting is to review the Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) for the Planned Unit Development proposed at 1061 Dryden Road and provide comments to the Town Board. The Board determined to use comments/ questions provided by D. Weinstein as a discussion template for the EAF. (Italicized sections below are copied from Mr. Weinstein's analysis which is attached.)
- There was a discussion of what setbacks would be applied along different boundaries of the property.
  - o R. Burger suggested that concerns regarding setback buffers can be resolved by clearly specifying setbacks for any structure, including patios.

EAF

*Part I*

Section C.2.b.(page 2 of 13): Reference the NYS Route 13/366 Corridor Management Plan

- This is not in a Varna district but the Varna plan refers to the greater Varna area. Although this area is not directly referred to in the plan, there are elements of the plan that address this area, the plan guidelines do not directly apply to this parcel but they inform because of its adjacent/ peripheral location.
- R. Burger does think it is in a special district – route 13/366 corridor plan

*Section C-3 (b) (page 3 of 13): This should be marked "No", since this use is NOT permitted by a special or conditional use permit. It is permitted only by a PUD zoning change, as indicated in C-3 c.*

*Section D-1 (h) (page 4 of 13): This should be marked "Yes".*

- This was simply left blank and needs to be marked yes based on the applicant's answer to the following question.

*Section D-1 (h) iv (page 4 of 13): The proposed impoundment is undersized. Given the impervious nature of the soils, all water falling on the 4.5 acre section of this project that will be disturbed will have to be impounded. This size of a pond, if initially empty, is capable of impounding the rain from a rainfall of no greater than 2.44 inches. In the past 100 years Ithaca has had 80 days where the rainfall exceeded this amount, or in other words, such events occur on average every 1.25 years. To accommodate a 1 in 100 year rain event, this impoundment would have to be twice as large.*

*Section D-2 (c) ii (page 5 of 13): This should be marked "Yes".*

- Again, the question was left unanswered and should be yes.

T. Hatfield noted that question D-2 (d) iii should be checked yes. It was left unanswered.

*Section D-2 (f) (page 6 of 13): No information has been submitted to indicate that this development will not depend on natural gas for heating. Therefore, in addition to gasoline combustion, this site will also generate carbon dioxide from this source. Therefore, this should be marked "Yes", and under iii process emissions through heating should be mentioned.*

*Section D-2 (h) (page 7 of 13): This should be marked "Yes"*

*In our area, an average home using natural gas consumes about 90,000 cubic feet of natural gas for heating. The methane generated in generating that natural gas for 36 households is approximately 3.7 metric tons.*

*Section D-2 (k) (page 7 of 13): N/A, so "No" should not be checked.*

*Section D-2 (m) (page 8 of 13): This project will produce noise exceeding the ambient noise level. NY State and EPA guidance is that protective noise levels are 55 decibels (dB), and "most humans find a sound level of 60 to 70 dB as beginning to create a condition of significant noise effect" (EPA 550/9-79-100). They go on to state, "In non-industrial settings the SPL should probably not exceed ambient noise by more than 6 dB(A) at the receptor." Beyond 65 dB, undisturbed speech at a distance of 3 feet is not allowed. Backhoes and caterpillar tractors typically produce 70 dB measured 1000 feet away. I have personally measured dump trucks producing 105 dB at a distance of 1000' when they dump their loads. Noise would appropriately be measured at the nearest possible receptor, which in this case is much closer than 1000', and would experience a correspondingly higher dB level since noise decreases as the square of the distance.*

- D. Weinstein wanted more specifics added to this section and point out the significance of the noise that building can create.

Section E-3 (h) (page 13 of 13): This should be marked "Yes". Fall Creek is designated as a Federal Wild, Scenic, and Recreational River within 5 miles downstream.

- C. Anderson stated that this is also where the Route 13/366 corridor is identified as a rural highway corridor by the town.

Section F:

1. The soils on the site have special problems, as indicated in the Tompkins County Soil Survey. In particular, the soil survey indicates that the soils are not well suited to systematic drainage, and are unstable, posing special problems for construction.

Here is the information from that survey:

- a. Tompkins County Soil Survey Table 14, p. 94-95: **Interpretations of Engineering:**
  - "Suitability for Building Foundations: **Generally moderately low bearing capacity; variable compressibility**"
  - "Roads: Seasonally high water table; subgrades non-uniform and subject to differential heaving; slopes subject to seepage and sloughing."
  - "**Infiltration systems: Seasonally high water table; clay layers impede internal drainage.**"
  - "**Adverse ground-water conditions may require extensive measures for control of seepage in basements.**"
  - "No interpretation is feasible without extensive subsurface investigation."
- b. "Generally, this soil is **not well suited to systematic drainage.**" (Tompkins County Soil Survey p 135-136)
- c. "Wetness limits its suitability for many nonagricultural uses. The substratum in some areas contains layers of silt, sand, or clay that may be **unstable and consequently pose special problems in some kinds of construction.**" (Tompkins County Soil Survey p 135-136)

2. Because 36 units and 108 potential residents will produce a large amount of garbage, the developer should include specifics of how this garbage is going to be stored on site in a way that does not lead to the creation of any odors (or noxious animal infestation). They should indicate that  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a ton per month will be deposited at Seneca Meadows.  
- this is an issue that will come up at Site Plan Review and is being mentioned here because the old EAF would have addressed it. The applicant is using the current, updated version of the long EAF.

3. This action is not consistent with our current land use plans because those plans explicitly indicated dense development should be focused into nodal areas, such as the hamlet of Varna (comprehensive plan). The zoning followed this plan by indicating that this area should remain low density (2 units per acre rural residential) (zoning ordinance). It is not a reasonable land use argument to say that because this parcel is

*adjacent to a zone where higher density is allowed (but not in that zone), local land use plans are consistent with the idea that density should be increased on this parcel. If that argument were consistent with planning, we would have no mechanism to prevent sprawl along each of our roads adjacent to current nodal development. (It needs noting that this is D. Weinstein's opinion, not the Planning Board's)*

*4. The Varna Fire chief has expressed concerns about this development. These need to be enumerated.*

*5. A comment should be included to say that while the overall volume of traffic on adjoining roads will not be greatly increased, there is considerable concern that the necessity of cars needing to make left hand turns onto 366 during the morning rush hour could cause a dangerous situation.*

M. Moseley suggested the Town ask a third party to review the traffic analysis. It will verify to all that the findings are not skewed. The Planning Board agreed to include this comment in their recommendations.

R. Burger asked the Board if they want numbers 2, 4 & 5 (above) to be sent to the Town Board at this point or if they can wait until the Site Plan Review (which is when those issues are discussed). The Board agreed that they will hold those comments until the appropriate time.

J. Laquatra announced that he will be resigning his position as a Planning Board member at the August 25, 2016.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Erin A. Bieber