

WORKSHOP MEETING AGENDA
TOWN OF LLOYD PLANNING BOARD

Thursday, January 21st, 2021

CALL TO ORDER TIME: 5:30pm

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

**ANNOUNCEMENTS: GENERAL, NO SMOKING, LOCATION OF FIRE EXITS, ROOM CAPACITY IS 49,
PURSUANT TO NYS FIRE SAFETY REGULATIONS. PLEASE TURN OFF ALL CELL PHONES.**

OFFICIALLY OPEN THE MEETING
VIA Webex

Old Business:

**Andola Subdivision: Conservation Subdivision: South Street in AG zone
(For subdivision sketch plan discussion)**

Applicant desires to create a 16 lot conservation subdivision on two parcels in the Ag zone.

New map submitted, lower lot count.

SEQRA status: Undetermined

**January 2021: New maps submitted on 1/12/2021. Andy Learn reviewing.
Circulated to Board.**

Board discussion on new maps. Talk of an easement being added for lot 7 & 8 of 50 ft. Talk of building on lot 10 as its being constructed between 2 steep slopes. Steep slopes should be avoided if possible and the house should be 100 ft from the slopes. Board raised questions on the driveway for lot 10. Sal asked if the driveway would be less than 15% grade and how long it would be? Andy replied the driveway would be less than 15% grade and would be 500 ft long. [Andy advised the Board that waivers would be required for Lot 10.](#)

Concern was raised that since the project has been downsized that there should be an updated EAF. Also raised was whether the plans should include 10% of land set aside for recreation or if they would pay a rec fee. Ross replied that since the land they would be able to

set aside for recreation is environmentally sensitive that the fee would be better. Board appears to agree that a fee is more prudent in this case.

Question also raised about whether applicant's proposal for deed restrictions met Zoning Code requirements, to be addressed for Board by Paul. Board consensus was that, at the 1/28 Planning Board meeting, the Board could potentially determine that the sketch plan meets Town requirements so that the applicant can prepare a preliminary plat. The Planning Board also noted that a determination on SEQRA classification status and whether the Board seeks to coordinate SEQRA review as lead agency should be made on 1/28.

Board to circulate for Lead agency if required. Board to also send to County Planning Board as referral.

Selux Corporation: Solar Array, site plan (subject to site plan and SUP under Zoning Code 100-39-1); 5 Lumen Lane, in GB zone. (No updates provided or discussion needed)

Applicant is seeking commercial site plan and special use permit approval to construct and maintain a 750 KW solar array in an unused portion of the parcel.

Off agenda until amendment to SWPPP is completed. Board requires a survey showing more precisely the location of the arrays.

SEQRA status: Undetermined

January 2021: Nothing new from applicant.

Villages ALF: Site plan and SUP. Route 9W: master parcel # 95.12-1-15.100 (For information and continued discussion)

Applicant desires to consolidate Five (5) parcels with site plan review for an Assisted Living Facility (approx 120,000 sq. ft.) with Aquatic Therapy Center (approx 7,000 sq. ft.) and Primary Care Center (approx 5,000 sq. ft.). SEQRA review being conducted for entire retirement community. Applicant has indicated intent to submit an application to the Town Board for a PRRD based on recent zoning changes.

New plans submitted 11/04/2020.

Staff applicant meeting on 11/18/20

SEQRA status: Type 1 action based on Part 1 of FEAF; Planning Board is lead agency for review of retirement community; Town Board is an involved agency and coordinated review is required.

[John Furst indicated that the proposal for the PRRD is still being finalized and that the applicant does not have a timeline for submission of the PRRD to the Town Board. He indicated that its new SEQRA submission is intended to address Planning Board issues raised to date on the full build-out, and that binders will be provided for the Planning Board and Town Board members to assist their review. The Applicant desires to continue with the review of the Assisted Living Facility special use permit application.](#)

John Furst [proceeded to](#) ~~talked~~ about the new site plans [for the Assisted Living Facility](#). Instead of having a separate building for an aquatic therapy center and primary care center they are now all in 1 building. The aquatic therapy center and an adult daycare will be in the basement of the ALF building not stand alone. Questions were raised about the sale office building, the board wanted to know if it was going to be built to look like one of the cottages. John said yes that was the plan.

[The Planning Board, having just received the submitted materials, indicated that it would review the submission for future discussion.](#)

Goldenview II: site plan. Argent Drive. #96.29-3-3.11 in PUD (For discussion)

Applicant proposes to construct a three story, 55,000 square foot (total, all floors) affordable, rental housing complex for senior citizens. The complex will include 57, one-bedroom units, outdoor parking areas, a new roadway configuration from Argent Drive to access the complex and pedestrian connections to Argent

Review of the building height and required additional site plan elements.

Applicant to determine whether it can comply with 35' height limit imposed by Town Board, for Planned Unit Development.

SEQRA status: Unlisted Action based on Part 1 of SEAF. Planning Board is lead agency.

January 2021: New submission on 1/5/2021, Andy Learn reviewing, circulated to Board.

Justin talked about the height of the building and that by getting rid of the basement the building would comply to the max height of 35'. Talked about a proposal to put a 3-way light in on Argent to help with traffic. Also made it so trucks could turn around and not back up into road way. There was discussion on if the road would be town's job to maintain and if the town would agree. Rich mentioned that they wanted to straighten out Argent Drive in the area of the hairpin turn. Andy mentioned that easements can be offered to the town, but not dedicated to them. Carl suggested that they talk to the highway department for concerns about the road. The board then discussed the buffer to adjacent parcels. Justin talked about the plans for a vegetive buffer with a focus on the adjacent park.

Franco raised concerns about the increase in flows with all the other projects in the areas, should the pump station be upgraded. Franco asked about the pump station that would service the facility and that also services the area around it. Wingate, Hanaford's plaza, including future development south on 9W all feed into the pump station. Applicant responded that the calculation for usage for the proposed facility is based on standard DEC formulas, and that the actual usage of Goldenview 1, the existing facility, are less than what would be expected by using the DEC calculations for that type of facility. Applicant said that the existing facility usage is based on water bills. Franco and Board asked to see those bills to confirm. Rich said a study on flows was done but based on Goldenview's flow numbers of 160,000 gallons per quarter and they estimate that it would be less for this project. Andy figured out that if the flows were about the same that it would be about 1,600 gallons per day and that the pump station should be looked at to see if it could this and all the other projects in the area.

Also, there should be a fire flow study done to check and make sure they hydrants are okay.

Rich mentioned that because this project is an affordable housing for seniors (only over 62 years old) that they could get funding from the state and that the paperwork was already submitted to the state. Board asked what the cost for a unit would be. Rich said that for one person it would be a min. of 11,000 and a max of 33,000 and it would be more for two people.

Applicant will set up meeting with Andy Learn and Highway Super to discuss the proposed roadway that the applicant desires to have the Town accept as a Town road. Some discussion with the Board concerning the dedication of the road. Andy wondered why the Town would accept the roadway, asking what benefit to the Town would result. Rich Gerentine responded that there was another road on the far side of the property that might someday be connected. Board wondered about how that would occur unless there was a dedicated easement or similar to connect the two end points of the roadways.

Board discussed setting a public hearing for February.

The Views at Highland: Revised application for site plan review. 3715-3725 NYS Route 9W. SBL ## 95.2-2-12.100 and 12.200. (For discussion)

Revised application submitted to Planning Board on 11/9/20 with reduced proposal for forty-four 2d-floor dwelling units and 14,000 SF of commercial space on the first floor.

SEQRA status: Planning Board is lead agency and no determination of significance has been made.

January 2021: New landscaping plans received. New slip lane plans submitted to the County by the applicant for their review.

[Andrew Alec Gladd, attorney for the project](#), talked about the changes to the project. Which was that there are now half as many proposed units and traffic calming measures. For the traffic they propose that South Chapel Hill road be reduced in width to 10', new signs, new striping measures and a new stop bar at the end of the road. They sent the traffic plans to the county who suggested that the road be reduced to 10.6', and possibly put a bike lane. [Applicant](#) just got the county response haven't had time to discuss and possibly change the traffic calming measures. Board raised issues about left turns out of Mayer and if there would be new signage as it's not allowed. [Andrew Alec](#) said that they would add new signage and striping to prevent people from turning left. The board also asked about turning left from S. Chapel Hill onto Chapel Hill. [Andrew Alec](#) mentioned that it was not prohibited and that during their traffic study very few people turned left there. Board mentioned that a new traffic study should be done with all the other projects in this area. The board raised questions about a view buffer. Mike [Morgante, project engineer](#), showed proposed vegetative buffer map. Mentioned that no existing trees will be cut down, but the gaps would be filled in. Andy proposed that maybe trees should be planted along parking area and the retaining wall as it might look better than around the boarder. Pete [Miller, fire chief](#), asked about gradient of road at the entrance as it should be no more than 8%. Michael said it was at 10% and said that it should be okay as they had a turn radius map for fire trucks. Peter then asked about if the trees when they were larger if they would be in the way of the bucket on the truck. Michael said they would take a closer look at the trees that might be in the way of the bucket and would remove the trees that might be in the way. [Paul asked the applicant to review the application's compliance with the vegetative buffer requirements provided by the zoning code.](#) The board raised the question of how many parking spaces per apartment. Michael said it would be about 2.1 spaces per apartment. Concern was raised about parking with retail, would there be enough spaces to accommodate both retail and residential or [would there be a limit on retail hours to avoid overlap?](#) [The Planning Board discussed the possibility of setting a public hearing for the project at its January 28th meeting.](#) Paul mentioned that a public hearing could be set without a SEQRA determination.

New Business

Highland Estates, LLC: Site plan review: Route 9W: SBL: 96.9-1-35.210 in Highway Business District on 7.84 acres (For introduction)

Applicant desires site plan for mixed use building with 16,000 sq. ft. first floor retail space including a 3,000 to 4,000 sq ft gas station facility with four pump islands and second floor residential housing. Applicant also desires a second building with professional offices with 9,600 sq. ft. of office space (two story) on 4,800 sq. ft. footprint. Parking will be shared between the two buildings.

SEQRA status: Undetermined

Patti Brooks talked about the updated plans. 1st floor would be retail, 2nd floor would be residential, the hotel part has been dropped. Also there is a separate building for office use. Board noticed that the driveway crosses property lines and wanted to know if that was allowed. Patti said yes as there was an agreement when Walgreens was built that allows them to share that area. She said she would look up the agreement and get back to the board about the shared areas. Dave mentioned that the highway department would require a more laid out buffer, also has concerns about a gas station, traffic with the other proposed projects in the area, and will the shop/residential area match with surroundings. Andy suggested that a new SWPP be done and that the easements for the town lines be looked up. Board wanted to know how much parking was being provided. Patti said that there would be 64 residential, 30 retail, 20 office, 122 in total.

Board to review proposal to generate ideas in response to application. Patti suggested that once the Board had done so, the applicant would proceed to develop a fuller application with lighting, landscaping, etc, ideally based on the Board's input.

Green, Glenn, SUP ground mounted solar array. 611 N. Chodikee Lake Road, R-1 zone. 87.2-4-3.100. (For introduction)

Applicant desires to install a 1500 sq. ft. ground mounted solar array, consisting of 80 335watt panels. Array will be no higher than 12'.

SEQRA status: Undetermined

Erin McConnell of Empire Solar showed pictures of the property and plans of the proposed solar array. Sal asked if there was a battery storage system. Erin said there was no battery storage system. Franco asked if the array was fixed. Erin said it was a fixed array. Board had no more questions as the pictures showed that the array wouldn't be very visible to neighbors and suggested that they set a date for a public hearing at their next meeting on Jan. 28, 2021.

**Michael Serini; Lot Line revision. 326, 330 Vineyard Ave. R-1 zone.
95.2-6-29.140 + 95.2-6-32 (For introduction)**

Applicant desire to perform a lot line revision to make the lots more conforming.

Applicant was not at meeting so no questions could be answered, but maps of proposed line revisions were shown.

Motion to Adjourn.