

**Town of Ithaca Planning Committee**  
**Thursday, March 15, 2018**

**Committee Members:** Rich DePaolo, Chair; Rod Howe and Pat Leary

**Board/Staff Members Present:** Tee-Ann Hunter, Bill Goodman; Sue Ritter, Chris Balestra, Bruce Bates, Dan Tasman and Paulette Rosa

**Others:** David West (Randall+West), James Gensel (Fagan Engineers)

1. **Persons to be heard** – None
2. **Committee announcements and concerns** – None
3. **Consider February meeting minutes** – Approved with minor edits.
4. **Review and discuss draft Chain Works District Planned Development Zone language.**

CWD Design Guidelines

Committee reviewed the revised Schedule A: Design Guidelines (2/15/18) containing new precedent images and previous missing subarea descriptions in Section B. The committee had no comments or edits.

CWD PDZ Language

The committee continued review of the draft PDZ (1/17/18) picking up from the February meeting on page 7.

Pg. 12 – change “stripped” to “striped”.

Pg. 14 – second to last paragraph, change “and approximately” to “at approximately”.

Pg. 16 – Chart shows permitted building types for each of the subarea zones. Sue explained that the selection of building types mimic those proposed by town’s zoning working group for a form-based code. David explained that the “small house” type is not actually being proposed by the developer, but it is in the PDZ and remains an option.

Subareas CW2B and CW3A have the exact same permitted building types, but in looking at the specifications, CW3A, located along the road frontage, allows fewer stories for the larger buildings than CW2B, which is situated further back on the site and on lower slopes.

Pg. 17 - The minimum story height is 9 feet and is measured from floor to floor. While the Energy Code allows a minimum story height of 7 feet, the 9 foot minimum was chosen because it is more of the norm. It also tends to be more aesthetically appealing at the street (at the first floor) and can offer better air circulation for cooling. No changes by the committee.

Pg. 19 – Lot size minimums are defined but no maximums. The committee suggested 7,500 sq. ft. for the maximum lot size.

Pg. 21 – Lot area (row A) indicates both minimums and maximums, but the text only states minimum. Add “max” to row A.

Pg. 33 – The “single story shopfront” is included as a building type, but it is not allowed in any of the CWD subareas. The committee discussed the rationale for having it included. It is a building type that is proposed elsewhere in the town via the form-based code, but the single story building is not considered applicable for the CWD site. The committee decided to keep the building type in the PDZ because it eliminates any question of what constitutes a “single story shopfront” and provides clarity that it is not permitted.

Pg. 37 – “General building” has no minimum lot area. This building type is allowed only in CW3B, which is in the center of the site, where buildings currently exist. Given the context and this building type (commercial use), there seemed to be no rationale for prescribing a minimum. If a building can be squeezed in within the developed/renovated buildings there seemed to be no rationale for what is too small. No changes by the committee.

Pg. 39 – “Service station” is handled the same as single story shopfront. It is shown as a building type, but not allowed in any of the subareas.

Pg. 46 – Change description under Outdoor Lighting 1. Light output, from “then current” to “the current”.

Pg. 47 – “Artisan” definition - add the word “may” between “this and includes” to read as “this includes related sales...”

Pg. 47 – “Design Speed” definition – change to reflect that this is not the velocity people are actually driving, but instead a target based on components of the design elements. Committee requested a new definition to reflect that the design speed is the geometric/physical features of a thoroughfare designed to induce driving of a certain speed. Also see ASHTO standards for input on revised definition.

Pg. 49 – Violations – this section needs to be reviewed for consistency with NYS Town Law. The committee requested Susan Brock’s review of this section.

Dan asked if the committee was interested in adding a section to address requirements for park and trail types and configurations. For instance, to make sure parks are not privatized behind backyards, but would be integral, available, and useful to the entire neighborhood and not tucked away somewhere unused. David West noted that there were some requirements outlined in 271-17.4 A and in the park/open space definition. He suggested sorting out how these are designed during site plan review and noted the abundance of open space and trails proposed in the conceptual plan.

Pg. 47 Day care definition – add language that this pertains to “adult” day care not just children. This would also be consistent with the table on pgs. 4-5.

Pg. 46 Signs – Chris suggested that for CW2 and CW3 the language be changed to “residential zone” for all residential zones and “commercial zone” for all commercial zones because that is how the new town sign law is written; it doesn’t differentiate. Committee agreed.

**5. Discuss potential legislation allowing duplexes in the High Density Residential Zone.**

Rich updated the group on a recent meeting held with several local development professionals (architect/builder/engineer). The discussion was an attempt at prioritizing architectural design elements by considering their costs and benefits (aesthetic improvements). One approach that came out of the meeting was the idea of creating a cost-benefit matrix and a menu of requirements from which builders could choose, rather than a set list of requirements.

The group agreed to meet again to discuss potential architectural/site requirements that would be reasonable and not cost prohibitive. For instance, requiring articulation of the duplex (to create an off-set and variability between the two units) would affect foundation costs and was considered costly, while adding window trim, fascia, roof articulation and other detailing was not.

Rich explained that architectural standards could also apply to other areas in the town identified as TND focus areas, not just the HDR zones. Staff will develop a cost/benefit matrix, based on elements from the duplex toolbox, to help guide a subsequent conversation with the development professionals.

**6. Staff updates and reports.**

East Hill Village charrette is scheduled for the week of April 9<sup>th</sup>.

**7. Discuss next meeting date and upcoming agenda items.**

For a future meeting Sue would like to discuss possible legislation to allow vegetation management using sheep or goats.

Next meeting is Thursday, April 19<sup>th</sup> starting at 4:00 pm.