

Village of Lansing
Planning Board Meeting
Minutes of Monday,
April 8, 2024

The meeting of the Village of Lansing Planning Board meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM. A Zoom option was also provided.

Present at the meeting:

Planning Board Members: Mike Baker, Lorraine Capogrossi, Pat Gillespie and Lisa Schleelein (Zoom).

Alternate Member: Yamila Fournier (Zoom) but arrived at 7:07

Village Legal Counsel: Natalie French

Village Engineer: Absent

Village Trustee Liaison: Susan Ainslie (Zoom)

Village CEO: Michael Scott

Public included: Jim McCauley as a member of the public, Carla Marceau representing the Community Party and Kathleen Yen

Baker appointed Fournier as a voting member

Approval of the Minutes

Gillespie moved to approve the March 26, 2024 minutes. Seconded by Capogrossi.

Ayes: Baker, Capogrossi, Fournier, Gillespie and Schleelein.

Nays: None

Public Comment Period:

Susan Ainslie as Trustee liaison. Carla Marceau is observing for the Community Party.

Schleelein moved to close the Public Comment period. Seconded by Capogrossi.

Ayes: Baker, Capogrossi, Fournier, Gillespie and Schleelein.

Nays: None

Baker read the following agenda item:

Discussion of Possible Tree Law Changes

Baker has some notes that he and Schleelein had discussed as possible changes to the Tree Law as well as some comments from Fournier. As the Planning Board goes through the Tree Law, Baker will inject these comments.

45 The Planning Board discussed the section relating to clearing over 25% of the trees over a 3-year
46 period from a property and how to keep tract of this and if it is possible.

47 French commented that the intention of this section was to prevent clear cutting of an entire
48 property.

49 Fournier questioned if the overall intention of this section was for aesthetics or ecological
50 impact.

51 Schleelein feels that ecological and environmental concerns should be emphasized more and the
52 wonders if the purpose statement for the law captures that enough.

53 Baker stated that he feels the purpose statement does include ecological and environmental
54 concerns but, understands Schleelein concerns.

55 Schleelein also questioned whether items such as root structure should be included within the
56 law. This would prevent overcrowding of trees and provide a best-case scenario for growth.

57 The Planning Board discussed conveyance of stormwater from one property to another as a result
58 of removing or adding trees.

59 French stated that case law does not support a scenario where a resident removes a large tree
60 which results in the change of stormwater to a neighbor's property.

61

62 The Planning Board discussed the recommended \$1,250 tree planting value that had been
63 provided by John Courtney who told Scott that the DPW would have to pay prevailing wage to
64 do the planting and that the price also takes in consideration the tree care needed until that new
65 tree becomes established.

66 Baker stated that within the wording of the Tree Law, the Planning Board has the authority to
67 reduce that price. This was the case with Northeast Pediatrics because the facility has solar
68 panels installed on the roof. Should the Tree Law state something about offsetting the carbon
69 footprint by other means?

70 French feels that "offsetting" could be installed in the "Tree Bank" part of the law.

71

72 The Planning Board next discussed the exemptions for tree removal such as dead trees that may
73 cause damage to life or property. There was a concern about a developer who might poison or
74 intentionally harm trees on a developable property just to avoid the Tree Law obligations.

75

76 The Planning Board moved on to tree unit requirements and whether 30 tree units is the proper
77 amount. Another possibility would be whether residential should be a different amount than
78 commercial.

79 Fournier suggested removing the required parking space and/or building space from the
80 calculated usable land for commercial properties.

81 Scott will calculate the required units for Northeast Pediatrics using Fournier's suggestion.

82

83 The Planning Board discussion turned to whether shrubs should count in the tree unit calculation.

84 There was a suggestion that a shrub percentage should be adopted and even a percentage for
85 deciduous versus evergreen trees.

86 French does not understand why a "buffer strip" is not calculated within the tree unit count.

87 The Planning Board discussed this and buffer strip responsibilities.

88 Fournier suggested adding "may" instead of "shall" when it comes to counting the trees of a
89 buffer strip toward total tree unit count.

90 The Planning Board talked about requiring a minor subdivision to conform to the Tree Law and
91 possibly removing any special permit that does not change the footprint of a building. A special
92 permit for a home occupation is one example.

93

94 The Tree Law discussion ended with comments on who is qualified to present a landscaping
95 plan, whether a stamped plan is necessary and how to calculate tree canopy calculations.

96

97 **Trustee Report**

98 Capogrossi gave a breakdown of the April 1st Board of Trustee Meeting
99 The meeting can be seen on YouTube.

100

101 **Other Business**

102

103 Schleelein, Capogrossi and Fournier attended a parking lot webinar.

104

105 There will be a joint meeting on April 15th with the Board of Trustees to discuss the Solar law.

106

107 Scott emailed his Brixmor contact about the Planning Board concerns with the traffic at the
108 Cayuga Mall and the dangerous speeds that vehicles travel near the stores.

109

110 **Adjournment**

111

112 Capogrossi moved to adjourn at 8:30. Seconded by Gillespie.

113 Ayes: Baker, Capogrossi, Fournier, Gillespie and Schleelein.

114 Nays: None

115

116 Minutes taken by: Michael Scott, CEO