

Village of Liverpool Planning Board
Special Meeting
Wednesday March 14, 2018
7:00 PM

Present:	Joseph Ostuni, Chairman	Peter Osborne
	John Eallonardo, absent	Jim Rosier
	Mike LaMontagne	Bill Reagan, Codes Officer, absent
	John Langey, Attorney	Sandra Callahan, Secretary
	Greg Sgromo, Engineer	

Call to Order

Chairman Ostuni called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) – Meyer Manor Apartment Project

Attorney Langey started by explaining the process and that there are two approvals required for this project. The first was the zone change request, which was approved by the Village Board of Trustees in December, 2017 and the second is the site plan approval. We have to complete the long Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) Part 2 that contains 18 areas of review. Each section has the general question as to whether it will affect that specific part of the environment. If answered Yes, the subsection questions must be answered.

Mr. Osborne had a question regarding Part 1 of the EAF completed by the developer, question D.1(g) answered no regarding non-residential construction. He asked if the rental office/laundry facility was considered non-residential. Attorney Langey said it is an accessory structure and part of the residential project. Steve Calocerinos, Engineer for the project, said there would be one 1-story 25'x50' structure approximately 1320 sq. ft. that would be heated and cooled.

Mr. Osborne asked about question D.2(b) regarding wetlands answered no. He said the project would be altering the wetland by cutting down trees. Attorney Langey said it will be discussed in depth in Part 2 of the EAF.

Mr. Osborne questioned D.2(k) – energy demand answered yes but no estimate provided. Mr. Calocerinos said the information wasn't available at the time of completion.

Attorney Langey said this is an uncoordinated action and the Village Planning Board is the Lead Agency. The Planning Board will have to decide if this is a positive or negative environmental declaration. Attorney Langey read the instructions and explained that the Board will decide how large the impact will be.

Full Environmental Assessment Form – Part 2 Identification of Potential Project Impacts

Question 1 – Impact on Land answered Yes

Some comments mentioned were regarding the impact on surface water, the water table is less than 3 feet. What mitigation is in place?

What is the length of the construction phase?

Question 2 – Impact on Geological Features – answered No

Question 3 – Impact on Surface Water

Mr. Sgromo said any breach would be mitigated by DEC/SWIPP and there would be continual inspections. The area is flat with no hills, there should not be a significant impact.

Question 4 – Impact on Groundwater – answered No

Questions 5 – Impact on Flooding – answered No

Question 6 – Impact on Air – answered No
Question 7 – Impact on Plants & Animals Answered Yes
There is a breed of bat that roosts during April to October.
Question 8 – Impact on Agricultural Resources – Answered No
Question 9 – Impact on Aesthetic Resources – Answered No
Question 10 – Impact on Historic an Archeological Resources – Answered Yes
Question 11 – Impact on Open Space and Recreation – Answered No
Question 12 – Impact on Critical Environmental Areas – Answered No

Question 13 – Impact on Transportation – Answered Yes
Mr. Rosier stated that the traffic studies that have been done were within 75’ of the project, not done on the whole road and the impact it will have. Over 5,000 cars were reported in 2014 and traffic has increased significantly.
Mr. Sgromo said there was a GTS study and DOT traffic counts have been done. The Town of Salina Engineer has stated there will be no significant traffic impact.
Mr. Osborne said this needs to be discussed further.

Question 14 – Impact on Energy – Answered Yes
Question 15 – Impact on Noise, Odor and Light – Answered yes. There is a Village noise ordinance in place.
Question 16 – Impact on Human Health – Answered No
Question 17 – Consistency with Community Plans – Answered Yes
This needs to be discussed further. We are also awaiting County Referral.
Question 18 – Consistency with Community Character – Answered Yes
Mr. Rosier said this would cause an increase in the Police force. Mr. LaMontagne said this is consistent with the requirements of the design and code but further discussion is required.

Further discussion will take place on the questions answered yes at the next meeting.

There being no further business, Mr. Osborne moved and Mr. Rosier seconded the motion to adjourn. All ayes.
Meeting adjourned at 8:30.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra J. Callahan
Deputy Clerk