

**TOWN OF MANLIUS  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
January 23, 2023**

**APPROVED**

The Town of Manlius Planning Board hybrid meeting in-person and virtual live streaming with Chairperson Joseph Lupia presiding and the following members present: Ann Kelly, Arnie Poltenson, Richard Rossetti, Valerie Beecher, Judy Salamone and Erin Reynolds . Also, present were Attorney Jamie Sutphen and Planning Board Engineer Douglas Miller.

In-Person Attendees: Rod Ives, Joe Sallin, Rob Hausler and Mason Hausler

Virtual Attendees: David Tyler and Warren Linhart

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**Minutes**

Member Kelly made a motion, seconded by Member Rossetti and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of January 9, 2023.

**Time: 6:31PM - Daniel Nagy – 8014 Peck Road, Kirkville, NY 13082**

**Initial Presentation – 2-Lot Subdivision – Same Address**

**Tax Map #'s 043.-01-11.5 and 043.-01-11.9**

Joe Sallin, Licensed Land Surveyor, was present and spoke on behalf of the applicant. He stated that Mr. Nagy is buying some land behind his property that backs up to Chittenango creek. He stated that currently all the property behind Mr. Nagy is landlocked.

Chairman Lupia stated that the Town normally doesn't like to go into a landlocked parcel but what is being done is making part of the landlocked piece no longer landlocked and the remaining piece will stay landlocked. It is on the recommendation of the Planning Board Attorney, if this project is approved, that there be verbiage placed on the survey that says that the remaining land of the neighbor be marked as a "non-buildable" lot. The neighbor, Mr. Hausler is in agreeance that the remaining lot will be non-buildable.

Member Beecher stated that the parcels have 2 different zoning classifications assigned to them, R1 and RA, does the RA get absorbed into the R1? Attorney Sutphen said no the parcel will be split zoned.

Attorney Sutphen stated that the following items be placed on the final survey:

1. The remaining parcel owned by Mr. Hausler, shall say "non-buildable" lot
2. The final survey should have solid lines instead of dotted lines.
3. Lots be designated as Lot 1 and Lot 2

Member Rossetti made a motion, seconded by Member Poltenson and carried unanimously to declare the Planning Board Lead Agency for SEQR.

Attorney Sutphen reviewed the 11 questions in Part 2 of the EAF with the Board and the Board agreed unanimously that the action would have no, or a small impact on the environment.

Member Poltenson made a motion, seconded by Member Rossetti and carried unanimously to issue a Negative Declaration under SEQR and authorized the Chairman to sign the short form EAF.

Member Rossetti made a motion, seconded by Member Poltenson and carried unanimously to hold a Public Hearing on February 27, 2023, at approximately 6:35PM.

**Time: 6:43PM - Peregrine Development, LLC – 217 Montgomery St, Syracuse, 13202 - Discussion – Site Plan Amendment - Peregrine Assisted Living Center – Medical Center Drive, Fayetteville, NY 13066 - Tax Map # 086.-01-03.7**

Rod Ives was present and spoke on behalf of the Applicant. He stated that the applicant would like to add additional space to the footprint of the building for COVID reasons or if there is another event like COVID, they wanted space for families to be able to meet without having to walk through the entire facility. Nothing else is changing about the project.

Member Kelly made a motion, seconded by Member Beecher and carried unanimously to approve the amended Site Plan dated August 25, 2022, with a revision date of January 12, 2023; project # 22-2099.

Member Rossetti stated that for the future, he would like to see Developers who wish to do Site Plan Amendments, that they clearly redline or overlay the old plans with the new plans. Member Beecher agreed, adding that a memo with bullet points maybe helpful as well. Chairman Lupia agreed and asked that the Planning and Development office try and help with that when Site Plan Amendments come before the Board.

**Time: 6:51PM - RM Zone Discussion**

Chairman Lupia stated that the Planning Board was having difficulty with the new RM Zone and they have reviewed it and have given the Planning Board a new proposal to review for comment. Chairman Lupia stated that the RM Zone was created to retain the residential character of the neighborhood, some of the members of the Board thought that the changes to the Zone would prevent that from happening.

Member Rossetti stated that the definition of “small scale” is not in the resolution and is it up to the Planning Board to decide what “small scale” is? Attorney Sutphen is under the impression that they are trying to define it and a maximum of 50% of the existing building will be small scale. Member Rossetti asked if it was up to this Board to determine what a major alteration is? Attorney Sutphen said that it will come from the

Planning and Development Office and the Code Officer to determine what a “major” alteration may be.

The following are typographical errors that should also be fixed:

1. Page 3 – (3)(d) – maximus should be maximum
2. Page 4-5 – H – the word “in” belongs after forth in the following sentence: It is the intention of the Town Board to allow the uses set forth **in** 155-20B for new structures or buildings built in the RM Zone with the same restrictions set forth herein.

Member Beecher asked about parking spaces per apartment (Letter F, Parking), conversation ensued.

Member Rossetti made a motion, seconded by Member Salamone and carried unanimously to send a positive recommendation to the Town Board to accept the resolution with the above changes regarding the new proposed RM Zone.

With there being no further business, Member Rossetti made a motion, seconded by Member Poltenson and carried unanimously to adjourn the Regular Meeting at 7:15pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Lisa Beeman, Clerk