

TOWN OF DRYDEN
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
December 21, 2020
Via Zoom

Present: John Kiefer, Chair, Tom Hatfield, Craig Anderson, Tony Salerno, Daniel Bussmann, Joe Wilson, David Weinstein, Alice Green (alternate), Simon St Laurent (alternate)

Absent:

Staff: Ray Burger, Planning Director

Liaisons: Dan Lamb & Loren Sparling (Town Board), Craig Schutt (Conservation Board)

Chair Kiefer called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Public Comment

None

Approval of Minutes

J Wilson would like the Town Attorney's instruction on how to analyze the Varna LEED Green Bonus added to the November 18 minutes. On motion of J Wilson, seconded by C Anderson, the minutes were unanimously approved.

Town Board Update

Dan Lamb said the Town Board was impressed with the Stretch Code presentation. His sense is the board would like to pursue this in anticipation of the way the building codes are evolving with the goal of making the town more energy efficient sooner. He would like the Planning Board to make a formal recommendation to the Town Board to do this so that it gets on their agenda.

The Short-Term Rental law was passed by the Town Board and there will be an insert in the tax bills to help make the public aware of it and so that those who are operating these facilities know that they must comply with it and register. They will be looking at amending the law so there is a mechanism for revoking an issued permit in the event of repeat offenses.

With respect to the Planning Board vacancy, applications are being accepted for consideration. Because there are two alternates currently available, there is no real rush to make this appointment. J Kiefer said one or two Planning Board members could be available for any interview process.

**97 Southworth Road
Rolled Roofing Business**

The board previously determined that this project could move forward as an ag-related business. The applicant will provide more details and the board will conduct a sketch plan review in January, then perhaps move forward with a formal site plan review in February. D Bussman said he would like clarification on the driveway. Will it be a shared driveway or another option, and is the existing driveway throat wide enough to accommodate trailers coming in?

1920 Slaterville Road Site Plan Review

This project requires site plan review because the site has been vacant and a business use is coming in.

Adam Fishel of Marathon Engineering introduced Ely Burbank of Incodema, Lincoln Morse of Strategic Elements Real Estate Development, Craig Modisher of Stream Collaborative Architects, Monk Panko from Panko Electric and Ela Burbank, President of Incodema. An application has been submitted for Incodema to relocate from 407 Cliff Street in the City of Ithaca to 1920 Slaterville Road. This is an existing 24,000 sq ft building that was previously used for a light industrial use. They believe this use qualifies as industry, light given the planned operations.

Ela Burbank said Incodema was founded in 2001 and they have grown significantly over time. They are a precision sheet metal manufacturer of parts that are custom to each individual customer. Everything is made to customer specifications and most of it will fit in the palm of your hand. They use several different processes, including laser and water jet technology, and they have a fleet of press brakes that take the flat parts and form them to customer specifications. They have a 6-8 day turnaround. There is no chemical alteration of parts or mixing that occurs at the facility.

Renderings of the site were displayed and described. There are currently three points of access from Slaterville Road. The center one will be removed so that maneuverability for tractor trailer trucks will be enhanced. This concept has been reviewed with NYS DOT and they are in favor of it. It was noted the state right-of-way along Slaterville Road has been widened there, making it closer to the existing building. There is potential for a future expansion off the back of about 4,800 sq ft. Currently the site plan does not show that, but it will be outlined in the next submission together with any additional stormwater mitigation provisions that may be necessary due to the addition. As designed now, the project falls within the DEC's redevelopment criteria. The total impervious cover is being reduced by 25% so they won't have to do any stormwater mitigation immediately. The building addition, expanded parking, and added impervious surface for the truck circulation will mean they have to do some stormwater quality mitigation and maybe some water quantity mitigation. Again, there will be more detail in their next submission.

The use intended by Incodema is better suited than what is there now. Preliminary floor plans have been submitted. 47 parking spaces are proposed, primarily because they currently see close to 1 vehicle per employee. One front-facing overhead door will be eliminated, and the building will look more like an office. Pickup and delivery will be accomplished on the back side of the building. Dumpsters will be located in the back, as well as a dust collection system and hydrogen tank. The only part of the operation that will generate noise would be the dust collection system located in the back. They anticipate that noise from the system would return back to ambient within 100' or so from the unit and not compromise the neighborhood character by exceeding noise thresholds outlined in the zoning law.

The board discussed what additional information might be needed in order to conduct site plan review next month.

- The project fits the definition of light industrial.
- Photos of what is there and what is proposed from an architectural standpoint. (current photos and proposed new façade were displayed).
- Landscaping plan – much of the frontage is DOT right-of-way and applicant is working with them on what can or cannot be put in there. Just mowing would be an improvement.
- A monument sign could be an issue with the extended road right-of-way.
- Bike rack location.
- Bus stop location and defined walkway to property.
- There is good rationale for the parking spaces shown.
- Traffic flow plan.
- Phase 2 plans if applicant is seeking approval for that simultaneously.
- Landscaped islands for parking areas – may need relief for that.
- Exterior lighting plan, dark sky compliant lighting.

The board does not believe a public hearing is required for site plan review next month. It is an allowed use in an allowed district. R Burger will initiate county review on the project. Applicant has completed the long form SEQR in order to provide as much information as possible, though short form may be all that is necessary.

J Kiefer noted the next two agenda items are for special use permits before the Town Board. The purpose of the SUP process is to allow the board to impose regulations to insure harmony with local laws and no adverse impacts on the community. The purpose of this discussion is to identify any potential issues for the Town Board to be considered in their review of the projects. Planning Board members have reviewed the materials submitted to the Planning Department.

1622 Dryden Road Proposed Contractor Yard

J Kiefer noted the Planning Director granted a temporary permit for this site and the applicant would now like to make this a permanent situation.

Comments:

- This is inconsistent with its surroundings and an eyesore.
- Rural residential district is intended to retain an area of the town where residential uses are situated in a rural landscape and constitute the primary use.
- Doesn't fit well, even if it were screened.
- Perhaps could be considered for a temporary use, but it is not appropriate permanently.
- Could there be a time limit on a special use permit?
- There is no formal mechanism for a temporary permit for a contractor yard in a rural residential district.
- Issuance of an operating permit was not the right tool; a special use permit is the right tool.
- Another temporary use would extend the impact on an area that is inconsistent with the zoning.

- Need a complete application. The entrance shown is where it is now; it doesn't show a shared driveway. It shows a berm.
- Need a landscaping buffer according to Section 909.
- Detail on height of plantings.
- Need detail on the driveway location.
- Commercial Design Guidelines talk about not cutting and filling.
- It is a good site for something other than a contractor yard.
- Perhaps a temporary yard, and then something else in the future.

Applicant, Nick Bellisario, said he had submitted a shared driveway plan to the Planning Department (then displayed by the Planning Director). He said there is residential property across the street, but there is commercial on either side of the property, and he felt it fit in well.

J Kiefer summarized the discussion. Visually, this is quite different than what surrounds it. It is not an ideal use for the area over the long term. Short term, this would enable the leasing contractor to support local development. The screening in the application is inadequate (use of a berm). Encourage applicant to look at the design guidelines. Screening should be considered on all three sides. Three board members believe this is not an appropriate use. Temporary use was suggested, but there is no consensus from the board that the use should continue. Section 909 of the zoning law should be considered in any buffer discussion.

**RESOLUTION #16 (2020) – CONTRACTOR YARD AT 1622 DRYDEN ROAD –
RECOMMENDATION TO TOWN BOARD**

J Kiefer offered the following resolution and asked for its adoption:

RESOLVED, that the Town of Dryden Planning Board hereby finds that use of the premises at 1622 Dryden Road as a contractor yard is inappropriate as a long-term use.

2nd D Bussmann

All in favor

**1279 Dryden Road
28 Unit Multi-family Dwelling
Sketch Plan**

C Anderson asked for clarification/determination on whether the property is located within the commercial corridor district in the commercial design guidelines (p 24). It is in the mixed use/medium density zone. Site plan as submitted was displayed. The site is on a hill. J Kiefer said the board should consider compatibility with the neighborhood. It was pointed out that there are things about the plan that make it difficult to evaluate. Applicant, Richard Wawak, described his proposal.

- This project is on the site of a former greenhouse.
- It will be about 14,000 square feet.
- There is about 17,000 square feet of parking.
- There will be two curb cuts.
- Applicant also purchased the house at 1269 Dryden Road and it will share a driveway with the project and the house out back.

- There will be 3 buildings in the project.
- Most units will be studio apartments (16 units).
- There will be 12 one-bedroom units.
- A retention pond of about 4,000 square feet is planned between Route 366 and the project.
- The property also fronts on Baker Hill Road.

Town Board will need formal architectural drawings, elevations, descriptions of materials, an engineered site plan showing existing conditions, proposed conditions, traffic flow and such.

J Kiefer asked board members for particular concerns:

Use of natural gas? No, will use electric heat pumps and radiant heat floors.

Will units be affordable as defined by the County? Expects to rent 1-bedroom for \$1200-\$1300 and around \$1100 for a studio with a loft.

Will applicant respond to the Tompkins County recommendations for energy efficiency and use in new construction for residential properties? The slope of the room would work well for solar panels on the south side. The building may be energy neutral. R Burger will provide the county document.

Site plan should show location of any recreation areas. The property is ten acres and the upper portion could have walking paths.

A stormwater plan is necessary; SPEDES permit will be required. An architect and engineer will be hired.

J Kiefer asked whether the board felt the project was in harmony with existing town laws and guidelines and compatibility with the neighborhood.

Comments:

- Project is fairly consistent with what is around it.
- Parking size and location needs consideration.
- Will the two lots be merged? If the Town Board would like them merged.
- Are there plans to develop the upper portion of the lot? Only to improve the driveway.
- Would buffering between the two zoning districts be required? Zoning district line could be extended. Section 909 requires a 20' buffer between residential and multi-family.
- Is there a way to create one driveway for the project? Having two provides space for trash and recycling in a remote location. (One is the recommendation of the Zoning Law.) Two driveways may be needed on the site. Going from three to two is an improvement. Applicant is trying to keep the project symmetric.
- Screening may be needed for 1265 Dryden Road.
- This project seems to fall into incremental development.
- The former owner commented on how the water flow keeps changing on the lot. Stormwater plan should take into consideration the ravine at the back and how that may change.
- There is a lot of nice soil on site; something good should be done with that.
- The parking lot at the Plantation overfills frequently. Applicant should consider preventing that from overflowing into his property and that traffic pattern interacts well if Plantation lot is full.
- Applicant want to consider more soundproof construction than usual due to noise from the Plantation and Route 366.

Summary: Planning Board finds no incompatibilities with the neighborhood and no incompatibilities with town law and guidelines except as noted. Better plans would have been helpful. The Planning Board would like to see the project again after engineered plans are complete.

Modify Sign Law

The Zoning Board of Appeals has recommended that the Town's sign law be modified. J Kiefer said he is inclined to add this to the list of other items in the Zoning Law that need to be reviewed or modified, unless a member is inclined to take this up now. He will circulate the list again soon for review and suggested additions.

Comp Plan Update

There will be a steering committee meeting on January 13, in advance of the public workshops, if needed.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bambi L. Avery