

TOWN OF ONONDAGA

Planning Board

ALFRED J. FULLER
4564 Cole Road
Syracuse, NY 13215

DAVID C. BAKER
5577 Bull Hill Road
LaFayette, NY 13084

TOWN HALL
5020 Ball Road · Syracuse, NY 13215

MARC A. MALFITANO, Chairman
5155 Jupiter Inlet Way
Syracuse, NY 13215

LINDA M. CAMPBELL
4929 MacGregor Lane
Syracuse, NY 13215

JAMES MAHANEY
4934 Horizon Terrace
Syracuse, NY 13215

**Meeting Conducted at 7:30 p.m.
September 25, 2017**

Present:

Marc Malfitano, Chairman
David Baker
Linda Campbell
Alfred Fuller
James Mahaney
Nadine Bell, Attorney
Bill Perrine, Engineer

Chairman Malfitano called the Planning Board to order at 7:30 p.m.

Charles Luchsinger Subdivision

Jay Holbrook appeared for the applicant. Chairman Malfitano stated that the Planning Board was presented a re-labeled plan, with notes as previously requested, for a 3 lot subdivision. He asked if the setback line was cleared up and Mr. Holbrook responded that it was noting that it is 65 feet plus the right of way.

Chairman Malfitano stated that the Town Board has amended the zoning ordinance upon a recommendation of the Master Plan Committee to clear up the issue of the setback on collector roads and arterials which resulted in applicants seeking a setback variance. The zoning amendment changed the setback to 15 feet beyond the normal setback in each of the districts.

A Short Environmental Assessment Form was reviewed and completed. A motion was made by Mr. Fuller and Seconded by Mr. Baker accepting the Short Environmental Assessment Form, declaring the matter an unlisted action and a negative declaration was issued. With all in favor the motion passed unanimously. A County referral will be submitted and a public hearing on this matter will be scheduled for October 23, 2017.

Mr. Holbrook asked about waiving of contours and waiving the requirement to map out Harbor Brook. Chairman Malfitano responded that the Planning Board will waive contours. Upon review of the plan and discussion of the location of Harbor Brook which is mostly off the Luchsinger property, Chairman Malfitano advised that the Planning Board will waive the requirement to map Harbor Brook.

Burt Subdivision

Mr. Jay Holbrook presented a revised sketch plan for the Burt Subdivision noting that the application was filed and fees paid. Notes were added as per previous Planning Board comments. Chairman Malfitano noted that the Planning Board has waived the mapping of the boundary of the floodplain. Chairman Malfitano stated that for this subdivision, the applicant is taking Lot 2 out of Lot 1 and it will be conveyed to the adjoining property owner.

A Short Environmental Assessment Form was reviewed and completed. A motion was made by Mr. Fuller and Seconded by Mr. Mahaney accepting the Short Environmental Assessment Form, declaring the matter an unlisted action and a negative declaration was issued. With all in favor the motion passed unanimously. A County referral will be submitted and a public hearing on this matter will be scheduled for October 23, 2017.

Onondaga Senior Real Estate, LLC

Bridgette Shoemaker of AJ Sign Company and Mark Belanger of Peregrine Companies appeared before the Planning Board on behalf of Onondaga Senior Real Estate, LLC at the request of the Zoning Board of Appeals as it was determined the property is in the West Seneca Turnpike Corridor and therefore requires the review of the Planning Board.

Ms. Campbell asked what the applicant is asking for. Ms. Shoemaker responded that they are seeking approval for a pedestal sign at the entrance of the Senior Community Center, perpendicular to Peregrine Way. Chairman Malfitano stated that in addition, the applicant is seeking a setback waiver. Ms. Shoemaker replied noting that the utility easement pushed back the boundary line so the setbacks appear shorter than they are. The proposed sign is shown 10 feet from the utility easement but is actually 27 feet from the property line.

Chairman Malfitano asked what the problem is with the 15 feet requirement. Ms. Shoemaker responded that there is a light pole that has already been installed in concrete at the location the sign would be if it was setback 15 feet. Chairman Malfitano commented that this problem is self-created. Mr. Belanger agreed noting that the site lighting plan was approved previously, prior to the request for variance. He added that if this sign has to be 15 feet from the right of way line then they will accept it being 15 feet from the right of way line, however; they feel it would be more visible and attractive if it were set 10 feet back from the right of way.

Chairman Malfitano asked if the sign could be moved to the other side of the entrance then avoiding the light pole. Ms. Shoemaker noted that there is a retention area on that side of the driveway. Mr. Belanger added that there is also a gas line running down that side of the driveway. Chairman Malfitano, making reference to the plan, noted that 15 feet from all dimensions is the standard and moving the sign to the other side is an option. He added that the design was done by them and that was their choice. Mr. Belanger noted that it could be fit in between the driveway and the easement for the gas line. Ms. Shoemaker noted that with the curvature of Peregrine Way the sight line would be blocked. Mr. Belanger responded that would be fine. Chairman Malfitano stated that the 15 feet setback should apply and it is their choice as to which side of the driveway to put the sign.

Chairman Malfitano noted that the code would limit the size of the sign to 2 square feet. He referred to Section 284-34 of the zoning code and stated, in a planned residential community there is a track designation sign. This meaning that as part of the plan for the subdivision, there can be a monument sign at West Seneca Turnpike that says Peregrine Landing. Chairman Malfitano further explained that the other 2 signs permitted are a temporary sign and a professional or announcement sign for permitted non residential uses. Chairman Malfitano,

going further into the definitions, stated that a professional sign is 2 square feet maximum and an announcement sign is for churches or other places of worship or for parish house, club or school, or for a public or semi-public building, is double faced and is 6 square feet and must be affixed to a building wall. Chairman Malfitano confirmed that they will not be affixing a sign to the building wall and therefore noted that the only choice is a professional sign which is limited to 2 square feet.

Ms. Shoemaker stated that they have photographed and measured surrounding signs including at the bank, the 2 smaller signs at the Community College, at the parish and at Brookdale, and they are all at 24 square feet or larger. Therefore they felt comfortable asking for something that is consistent with what is in the surrounding area. She also noted that the bank sign is interior illuminated and the entire sign lights in the evening hours, the parish sign is not illuminated and Brookdale has directional lighting. Mr. Belanger added that Brookdale is in a planned residential district and the sign is 6 feet high and is a little over 23 square feet with exterior illumination. He believes it to be the most comparable with the sign they are proposing. Mr. Belanger stated that their initial proposal was a sign 8 feet in height but was brought down to 6 feet in height; and the initial request was also for interior illumination but they are prepared to change that to exterior non-glare illumination so that may be removed from the variance request as well. He continued noting that if they meet the 15 foot setback requirement, then the only request for variance would be the sign face dimensions.

Ms. Campbell advised that there is a different situation between the requested variance and the signs they cited. Ms. Campbell explained that they are putting the sign for this facility into an area where you will start off on a main highway into an area with multiple individual buildings and as you scroll back into that development there will be houses. Any recommendation to the ZBA or any deviation from code will create a precedent for all the other buildings when it is really a residential environment. Ms. Campbell recalled that one of the reasons for putting the senior center there was because it was part of a residential community. Therefore, the applicant can't readily compare with this situation.

Chairman Malfitano added that the Credit Union is part of a neighborhood shopping district. He further stated that this is supposed to be a residential development with certain compatible uses. He doesn't want this to be precedent setting. Chairman Malfitano noted that for other planned communities there is a planned hierarchy where other developers wouldn't have the ability to have a ground monument sign on West Seneca Turnpike that says Peregrine Landing that would be a way finder for people. A tract designation sign can be up to 32 square feet. With that "hierarchy" he is more inclined to 12 square feet (3'x4') for this sign and then has the big tract sign as a way finder. Chairman Malfitano stated he does not have a problem with the proposed design or the height but is concerned about the hierarchical scale given that this is primarily a residential context.

Ms. Shoemaker stated it was her understanding that this project, the memory care facility, is the priority and the applicant wants to get that up and running. Once established, other areas of the property will be fine tuned and established. She continued noting that as of now the address of the senior center cannot be GPS'd and being that they will have residents coming in before the first of the year, how are they going to find the property. Chairman Malfitano stated that no matter what the size of the sign is it will not be visible from the traffic light. Ms. Shoemaker added that they are hoping that the logo on the sign will be recognizable. Ms. Shoemaker stated that the only reason they had to come before the Planning Board is because the property is in the West Seneca Turnpike Corridor. She asked what is different about the corridor. Chairman Malfitano explained that the Town imposed an overlay district that affects everything along West Seneca Turnpike from the city line near Broad Road to the Town of Marcellus line. Buildings constructed in the corridor must meet design criteria, encourages parking behind the buildings and there is landscaping criteria. The requirement under 285-32 the sign objectives

for free standing signs shall provide only the name and address of the building, shall not be internally illuminated and project landscaping should be designed to incorporate free standing signs. Chairman Malfitano further explained that the corridor adds overlay requirements that are in addition to the underlying zoning. The Planning Board did work on the site plan even though the Town Board granted the approval.

Chairman Malfitano stated that to help people find the facility there should be a monument sign at the entrance that says Peregrine Landing. That sign could be up to 32 square feet and could be the way finder that people can see. Once they turn in to Peregrine Way there will be signs that meet a hierarchy of scale, and it works from a Town standpoint and it works practically from the developer standpoint. Mr. Fuller asked if there was a sign proposal for Peregrine Landing. Chairman Malfitano responded that there was not. Mr. Fuller noted that they will be before the Planning Board again should they decide to put a Peregrine Landing sign up. Chairman Malfitano agreed and stated it will not need to go to the Zoning Board but can come directly to the Planning Board. Ms. Shoemaker asked if it would still need a 15 foot setback. Chairman Malfitano responded that it will. She then asked for future planning if they come forward with a tract design sign, what size will be acceptable to the Town Board. Chairman Malfitano responded that the acceptable size is 3' x 4'. Other companies will not have to use a Peregrine font but it will have to be 3' x 4'. Ms. Shoemaker asked if others would have to stay with the architectural design. Chairman Malfitano responded that he likes the idea that the other signs would be a pedestal sign and that would give the other developers some guidance as to both flexibility and some consistency as to the idea of the development. Ms. Campbell noted that considering the new size requirement for the sign, now it may not be such a problem where it is located.

Mr. Belanger asked if they include the address below the sign face on the base, will it be included in the sign face calculation. Chairman Malfitano asked what the size of the numbers would be. Ms. Shoemaker responded that she believes they are 4 inches tall. Chairman Malfitano responded that the recommendation could be the 3' x 4' sign plus the address letters up to a maximum of x inches. Ms. Shoemaker shared her concern for assuring that the size of the letters is large enough to read when people are driving. Chairman Malfitano requested that Ms. Shoemaker suggest the size of the numbers she would prefer. Ms. Shoemaker suggested that the street numbers be 6 inches in height and that the street name will not appear.

Ms. Shoemaker noted that currently the acceptable methods of lighting are down lighting or exterior direction lighting. She explained that in a similar development they used a method with the LED lights inside the sign and only the letters light up at night; a technique called backed up or stencil cut letters which creates a glow. Chairman Malfitano stated that spotlights don't make a lot of sense when they are covered with snow and that he is agreeable with the internally illuminated light as it is presented. Ms. Campbell noted that the overlay requirement states that signs cannot be internally illuminated. Chairman Malfitano stated that he would defer to the proposal that it be internally illuminated by interior mounted LED's and reference this drawing showing that the only part that light up are the letters. Ms. Shoemaker added that basically the background stays dark. Mr. Fuller stated that he likes the idea. Additionally he noted that LED lights have different levels of brightness. Ms. Shoemaker stated that they use all high end well built LED's that is a softer light compared to a fluorescent light. Mr. Mahaney asked if other businesses will be held to that standard noting that we are working with Peregrine now but when other businesses come in, what options are they going to choose if they have internal illumination.

Chairman Malfitano responded that since this is the first individual lot sign within this development, the Planning Board is trying to set a criteria for general size and general design recognizing that a different business name will reflect their logo or their font and we are not asking for the same font. What we approve here and recommend that the Zoning Board do is

the model for which others could emulate and when others come to the Planning Board and do not want to do it that way, the Planning Board can explain the hierarchy that has been determined already. Mr. Mahaney noted that if another developer comes in with a design that the Planning Board does not agree with, there is already a precedent of allowing internal illumination. Chairman Malfitano stated that he believes the Planning Board is creating enough of a guideline here to be a template.

Chairman then dictated a letter to the Zoning Board of Appeals. A copy of the letter is attached hereto.

Mr. Fuller made a motion to approve the overlay district review in accordance with the contents of our dictated letter and forward the letter back to the Zoning Board as our recommendation. Mr. Baker seconded the motion and all were in favor, however; Ms. Campbell noted she is in favor with the limitation of not being in favor the internal sign illumination.

Planning Board Minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Mahaney, seconded by Ms. Campbell, that after minor changes, the Board approve and accept the meeting minutes of the September 11, 2017, meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Mr. Baker, seconded by Mr. Mahaney, that there being no further business to come before the Board the meeting be adjourned. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Melinda L. Mayer
Secretary

TOWN OF ONONDAGA

Planning Board

ALFRED J. FULLER
4564 Cole Road
Syracuse, NY 13215

TOWN HALL
5020 Ball Road · Syracuse, NY 13215

LINDA M. CAMPBELL
4929 MacGregor Lane
Syracuse, NY 13215

DAVID C. BAKER
5577 Bull Hill Road
Lafayette, NY 13084

MARC A. MALFITANO, Chairman
5155 Jupiter Inlet Way
Syracuse, NY 13215

JAMES MAHANEY
4934 Horizon Terrace
Syracuse, NY 13215

October 2, 2017

Mr. John B. Elleman, Chairman
Town of Onondaga Zoning Board of Appeals
5020 Ball Road
Syracuse, NY 1325

Re: The Application of Onondaga Senior Real Estate, LLC

Dear Chairman Elleman and Members of the Zoning Board:

Representatives of Onondaga Senior Real Estate, LLC appeared before the Planning Board in satisfaction of the West Seneca Turnpike overlay district review. We discussed a number of aspects of the proposed sign application and variance.

Part of our overriding thought is that this application is potentially the first of multiple applications for different uses that may be developed within the Peregrine Landing Development over a period of time. While the developer was not before us tonight, we talked about the beneficial nature of the developer of Peregrine Landing seeking construction of a tract sign at the intersection of West Seneca Turnpike and Peregrine Way. We advised that under the code that type of sign could be up to 32 square feet and we would highly recommend a ground mounted sign. The benefit of this is that it would establish a point of way finding for traffic along West Seneca Turnpike in identifying the overall development. We recognize that the choice of implementing that is with another entity related to this applicant.

With respect to this sign we also talked about the value of setting some hierarchy for signs in this development. We refer to the sign detail provided by AJ Sign Company dated June 2, 2017, as part of our further comment. We have discussed with the applicant our recommendation that the size of the sign be reduced to 12 square feet, approximately 4 feet x 3 feet in overall dimension, with a 7 foot overall height being acceptable which would be proportionate in the proposed reduction in size of the sign. The base size as shown is acceptable. We do not have any problem with the overall design of the pedestal sign or the cornice. We also talked about and we would recommend that there be a deletion to the reference of Peregrine Way but that the applicant be permitted to use numerals up to 6 inches high for the street number, in this case 4701. It was brought up that there really isn't a need to identify Peregrine Way since the fronting street is in fact Peregrine Way.

We also discussed the setback and believe that the existing code requirement of 15 feet should be complied with. We suggested that the applicant be given the flexibility to locate the sign either in its current location with the 15 foot setback or, alternatively, on the opposite side of the

driveway to avoid interference with the street pole light base. The choice is totally at the applicant's discretion.

We would approve of a sign similar to what is proposed that is internally illuminated with LEDs. The applicant has shown a night illumination representation on the plan and explained that the background would stay dark and only the lettering would be illuminated. We find that attractive and a tasteful design.

Very truly yours,

Marc A. Malfitano/mlm

Marc A. Malfitano, Chairman
Town Planning Board

cc: Cheryl Hammond
Ben Vincent, Codes Officer
Bridgett Shoemaker, AJ Sign Co.
Mark Belanger, Peregrine Companies