

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
January 21, 2020**

Joseph Southern
Donald Kasper-absent
Scott Winkelman
Douglas Hamlin -absent
Jill Marshall
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel
John Camp, P.E. (C&S Engineers)
Howard Brodsky, Town Planner
Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Chairman Southern opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. The meeting minutes of December 17, 2019 were previously distributed to the Board and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Marshall to approve the minutes as corrected. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Absent	
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

At this time, the Board discussed the appointment of Scott Winkelman as Vice Chair for the Planning Board for the year ending December 31, 2020.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman to appoint Member Scott Winkelman as Planning Board Vice Chair. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Absent	
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

At this time, the Board discussed the reappointment of Scott Molnar, Esq. as Attorney for the Planning Board for the year ending December 31, 2020.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman to re-appoint Scott Molnar as Attorney for the Planning Board. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Absent	
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

At this time, the Board discussed the reappointment of John Camp of C&S Engineering as Planning Board Engineer for the year ending December 31, 2020.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman to re-appoint John Camp as Planning Board Engineer. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Absent	
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

Public Hearing- Special Permit

Applicant Woodbine Group
505E Fayette St #100
Syracuse, NY 13202

Property:
1046 Old Seneca Tpke
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #028.-01-03.0

Present: Tom Fernandez, Woodbine Group; Brian Bouchard, CHA Consulting; Mike Lasell, MBL Engineering;

The proposal is for an 88-room hotel located in the IRO district. The hotel will be a custom design built to the site with a design that would be in keeping with respect to the natural surroundings including the placement of the building and the architecture and aesthetics of the building. The Woodbine Group has experience with this as evidenced with the Hotel Skylar in downtown Syracuse that was an adaptive reuse and the old elementary school along the Salmon river in Altmar, the Tailwater lodge, both owned and operated by the Woodbine Group.

The hotel is an allowable use of the 32 acres; a use less intense than some of the other uses allowed in the district such as warehouses, light industry, hospitals, and other uses that come with more impacts. The group has worked diligently for over twelve months on the design of the hotel with consideration to environmental factors. The wetlands, archeological assessment, septic design, coordination with the fire department for emergency access capabilities to the site, and traffic information has been submitted to OCDOT for their review. The site design has changed numerous times including access. There is about 400 feet off Old Seneca Turnpike; however, it was determined that access off Mottville Road would provide a safer access due the acute angle of the intersection of Old Seneca Turnpike and Route 321. The building is set back to the rear of the lot to minimize impact to the surroundings and to preserve hedgerows and screening.

The proposal parking area will accommodate 217 parking spaces for the hotel and restaurant, and there will be no venue space at the location. The proposal allows for 90% green space. The building has gone through reiterations including the building height that was reduced to a conforming 35 feet.

Additional information was submitted to the board including a lighting plan, landscape plan, the SWPPP, traffic information for the driveway access that has been submitted to OCDOT, and the SEQR lead agency notice has been sent to NYSDOT, OCDOT and other agencies.

The submitted landscape plan reflects the addition of 40-60 trees to the property that is completely encapsulated with hedgerows. Along the area of Old Seneca Turnpike there are gaps in the hedgerow and there will be evergreens and deciduous trees planted. Trees will also be planted along the proposed driveway. The site lighting plan is for the safety of the parking lot that is also screened by the hotel. The lighting will be night sky compliant. Revised architectural schematics that have been submitted reflect the design to fit in the surroundings that mimic residential construction with a pitch roof, stone along the base of the building, siding and decorative trim on the hotel.

There were questions about the water service at the last meeting and there is a 12-inch water main along Mottville Road that will be providing water service for the hotel. The scale and scope of this project is equivalent to 40gpm water usage, equivalent to 28 homes, which would not have a big impact on the large water main with 65 lbs. of pressure. One of the letters submitted is site specific to their issue with a smaller water main. There will be a fire suppression system, and in event of a fire, it would temporarily drop the pressure of the system; however, the daily usage would not have a dramatic effect on the system.

There were comments about stormwater, which is regulated by the DEC and the plan adheres to their guidelines. SWPPP plan treats all of the runoff on the site, has been submitted for review by the town engineer. The septic system is not a typical residential system, as it will have a pre-treatment prior to accessing the fields with three duplicate systems, two of which would be active at any given time with a backup provided if there was a failure.

At last month's meeting the Planning Board had classified the application as an Unlisted action and circulated lead agency request to interested agencies, of which the Town Board, Zoning Board of Appeals, NYSDOT, and SHPPO who all consented for the board to be lead agency. The Planning Board began the review of the SEQR **Part 1 of the EAF** that was submitted by the applicant and determined that part 1 reflects accurate information.

The board preliminarily reviewed **part 2 of the EAF**:

1. Impact on Land - No Yes

- a. No to Small, the depth of the water table is greater than three feet.
- b. No, northwest end of the lot has steep slope that the driveway is avoiding, The greatest slopes are in the driveway at 8%. The area of the driveway has slopes less than 15%.
- c. No
- d. No, no soils are being removed from the site.
- e. Moderate to Large, construction will occur over a year but there will not be phases.
- f. No to Small due to NYSDEC guidelines for erosion.
- g. No
- h. None

2. Impacts on Geological Features - No Yes the land is prior cropland without any unique or unusual landforms.

3. Impacts on Surface Water - No Yes the small wetlands will not be disturbed and there is a stormwater plan to manage drainage.

4. Impacts on Groundwater - No Yes There will be DOH design approval and the applicant has designed the septic plan with a backup septic system.

- a. No
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. No
- f. No
- g. None

5. Impact on Flooding - No Yes The land is not located in a flood hazard area.

6. Impacts on Air - No Yes

7. Impacts on Plants and Animals - No Yes DEC land mapper verified.

- a. No, there are no endangered species in the area.
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. NA
- f. No
- g. No to small
- h. No
- i. No to Small, lawn will replace a portion of the agricultural fields.
- j. None

8. Impacts on Agricultural Resources - No Yes The property is located in the IRO district and is not in an agricultural district.

- a. No to small, the land is not located in an agricultural district.
- b. No
- c. No to Small, the property is located in the IRO district and only a small portion of the 30 acres is being developed.
- d. No to small, although the project will disturb more than 10 acres, the final development will be occupying less than 10 acres. If the building and parking lot were removed, it could reverse back to an agricultural use.
- e. No
- f. Moderate
- g. No
- h. None

9. Impacts on Aesthetic Resources - No Yes Based on the moderate to large impacts below.

- a. No
- b. No
- c. i. small
 - ii. small Although it could be seen from Mottville Road, the road is not considered a publically accessed vantage point such as a nature center.
- d. Moderate
 - i. Moderate, although the hotel will sit 70 feet above Mottville Road.
 - ii. No
- e. Small, the project is located in the IRO district.
- f. Small, there are similar projects located within 0-.5 miles (Hill-Rom)

g. Moderate –The impact to the overall rural aesthetic of the town, although the project is located in the IRO district.

10. Impacts on Historic and Archeological Resources -No Yes It has been mitigated based on coordination with SHPPO and two approvals reviewed and received in section C.

11. Impacts on Open Space and Recreation -No Yes The property is not considered part of an open space resource of the town.

12. Impacts on Critical Environmental Areas -No Yes

13. Impacts on Transportation -No Yes C&S engineering did their study and determined that they were in agreement with the traffic study prepared by the applicant. OCDOT has reviewed the driveway location for site distance and concurred with the traffic study. They have requested additional trip counts to the driveway location on Mottville Road and they are currently preparing for submittal to OCDOT a request for a confidence letter that can be provided to the board. The proposal is projecting 67 trips per hour maximum and there are 6,900 vehicles that pass by on Route 321 every day. The capacity of the roadway is extremely high is comparison to what would result from this type of use. It is unusual to prepare a traffic study for any proposal that has less than 100 trips per hour as it is viewed as having no impact at all industry-wide. Part of the proposal that will benefit the traffic is the access off Mottville Road and that they will have a shuttle service to Hill-Rom, the Lodge, and to the Village to reduce traffic and parking.

a. No to small

b. No

c. No

d. No

e. Yes, Member Marshall commented that it would have an overall impact to the roads. Member Winkelman commented that Route 321 already has it issues and the hotel may cause a light to be installed at Mottville Road. Mr. Camp commented that the state and county DOT's would be reviewing the proposal for the impact as they have specific ways to measure and quantify the impact.

f. May be future impacts based on data from NYSDOT and OCDOT .

14. Impacts on Energy -No Yes

a. No

b. No

c. No

d. No

e. No

15. Impacts on Noise, Odor, and Light -No Yes

a. No

b. No

c. Small, from cooking.

d. No

e. Small, proposed night sky compliant lighting.

f. None

16. Impacts on Human Health -No Yes

17. Consistency with Community Plans -No Yes

18 Consistency with Community Character -No Yes

a. No

b. No to small

c. No

d. No

- e. Small The architectural character is more in keeping with residential as compared to the industrial use across the road not having a pitched roof and materials used on the exterior that are not of a residential character. The proposal is located in the IRO district.
- f. Small
- g. Located in the IRO district. Chairman Southern commented that the project is located immediately next to agriculture, it is appropriate for the zoned area. Mr. Camp said that the project is located in the IRO district immediately adjacent to the Hamlet and RR districts. Mr. Brodsky inquired if there are any mitigating measures that would buffer the impact to any of the districts and Member Marshall commented that there will be buffering to the residential lots. Chairman Southern commented that the project is being built in an appropriate designated district, making it a small impact for the overall community.

The board reviewed **part 3 of the EAF**:

Counsel Molnar stated that part 3 provides the reasons and support for the determination of significance. The lead agency must complete part 3, for every question in part 2 where the impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why there is a particular element that will not or may result in a significant or adverse environmental impact.

The questions highlighted were:

1e. The proposed action may involve construction that continues for more than one year or in multiple phases. Member Winkelman commented that the construction will continue for more than a year but will be governed by the SWPPP and SPEDS permit with regular inspections by the NYSDEC, with no impact to the land. Chairman Southern commented that there will be impact but it will be mitigated by the means Member Winkelman has enumerated. Member Marshall commented that there would be impact. Chairman Southern said that dust, noise, and construction equipment will have an impact, however, it would not be an environmental impact. Mr. Lasell stated that the site work would take four months, with interior finishes taking longer. Member Winkelman commented that the site work would take less than one year. Chairman Southern suggested that based on the discussion the response should be small impact. Counsel Molnar suggested that the board could leave it as yes and explain the mitigating factors. Mr. Brodsky said that you might feel that it is adequately protected or mitigated by the existing permit systems of a SPEDES permit and SWPPP with town oversight by the town engineer and codes enforcement officer. Chairman Southern said that they also would need to work within the building code. Member Winkelman added that the majority of the outside work would be completed in less than a year. The proposed action will not involve construction that continues for more than one year.

9. The land use of the proposed action are obviously different from, or are in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource

d. The situation or activity in which viewers are engage while viewing the proposed action is routine travel by residents, including travel to and from work.

g. other –Impact to the overall rural aesthetic of the town. Member Marshall commented that it would have a moderate impact to the aesthetic character even though it is in the IRO district. It will be in an area where the two come together and it will be different from what there is now, predominant residential and agricultural. Mr. Brodsky said that you are establishing differences of what is proposed and what exists, and asked if they are adverse to the community or if mitigation measures in place. Member Marshall said that there could be more done to mitigate the impact. Mr. Bouchard said that they had flown a set of balloons at the location at 35 feet and took pictures to demonstrate the screening. He continued saying that the question is not whether it is visible but rather if the architecture and screening in place and anything else that can be done to mitigate the impact. If it were a four-story box then you would want to see architectural features on it. Member Marshall said that it will have moderate to large impact

on the aesthetic resources and that there could be things done to the parking lot and building to improve those. For instance, vegetation in the parking lot. Mr. Lasell commented that the items can be addressed; however, not necessarily between a small or moderate impact. Mr. Bouchard said that the SEQR is not an approval of the project, but rather the environmental statement. That kind of issue can be addressed under site plan approval. Mr. Brodsky said that one strategy would be that you are comfortable that the impact can be mitigated through site plan review of the project where you can impose conditions on the design. Counsel Molnar said that what was suggested is that the impact may be mitigated with the regulatory controls in place with site plan review, planting plan and other conditions that are within jurisdiction and authority of the board. The board was in concurrence that the impact could be mitigated with the regulatory controls in place. Member Winkelman added that the proposed hotel is over 400 yards from the nearest road, mitigating design and landscaping being reviewed during the site plan approval.

13 Impact on Transportation Mr. Bouchard said that this goes down the same line in that you have potential concerns and more information is needed but the mitigation would be in place by way of the fact that the applicant cannot get a curb cut unless the OCDOT approves the traffic study. It can be mitigated even though the board feels there would be an impact. Mr. Camp said that the town does not have any authority to impose any traffic requirements, but the town can make comment. Counsel Molnar said that what was suggested is that the impact may be mitigated with the regulatory controls, jurisdiction and authority of the OCDOT and NYSDOT and their oversight of traffic. Member Marshall said that she still thinks it will have an impact although there are things that can mitigate would not change the fact that it would affect it. Chairman Southern said it is the degree of impact. Member Winkelman said that it could be mitigated through further processes with the applicant talking about shuttle vans. Mr. Camp said that the project falls under the threshold of a full traffic analysis. Chairman Southern said that when you are driving the road and particularly when Hill-Rom is letting out, there could be tremendous impact if it was prime time for the hotel. Counsel Molnar commented that there is a tremendous impact when the Lodge lets out. Chairman Southern stated that based on the applicant's study having been reviewed by the town's engineering (C&S Engineers), and agreeing that this will not be a significant impact, regardless of not have county or state information at this time, we could say that it is not a significant environmental impact. There are times now where it is not pleasant. Member Winkelman agreed and Member Marshall said that she did not necessarily agree, as there could be an impact. Member Winkelman said that it could be mitigated. Member Marshall inquired if there would be any further review. Counsel Molnar said that it would either move it forward with a positive declaration with an environmental impact statement with alternatives and mitigation measures if the board were to conclude that this would propose an potential significant adverse environmental impact requiring further study. Chairman Southern and Member Winkelman agreed that it could be mitigated and Member Marshall did not agree.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman, the Board reviewed this application as an Unlisted Action, and after review of the SEQR long environmental assessment form, determined that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Absent	
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[No]

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Marshall, the Planning Board requested that Counsel Molnar prepare a draft negative declaration including all findings for the Board to review.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Absent	
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

At this time, Chairman Southern opened the Public Hearing and began taking comments from those in the audience that had requested to speak.

Dessa Bergen, 1448 Old Seneca Turnpike, said that she was disappointed that the full board was not present. The look of the plan has been myopic, there are some very good attributes of the plan however, and she has not heard the comprehensive plan spoken about. The 2005 comprehensive plan talks about the preservation and enhancement of the character and vibrancy of the village. She suggested that the size and scope of the project is in competition with the village outside of the village, which is opposed to what the comprehensive plan is. This is in a rural area. Waterloo was a community that was trying to revive their village and have a renaissance, then the big box stores outside of the community opened and it stopped their vibrancy. This will compete with the village. 88 rooms is a big hotel. We have a lot of individuals that are doing a lot with their residences to accommodate people. 88 rooms when you consider double occupancy is a lot. This will be a precedence that will take out community out of its historic character. I have other comments that I will submit to the board.

Scott Brothers, 1179 Old Seneca Turnpike, have been there 30 years, they moved in when Welch Allyn was there so he is not surprised as they certainly have a right to use their industrial property the way it fits in the zone. The need for rooms for the Lodge is a good addition as he has had people on business that could not find rooms in the village. The rooms that are there are booked up through the summer and it makes it difficult. He has a small business and he understands the desire to make money. The concern he has is not the applicant's issue, is the safety of Route 321. The numbers of sirens come down to the Welch Allyn at about one to two a month. Route 321 does not have the capacity to handle to traffic from Welch Allyn and if you add people who are not familiar with the area with the Stump Road intersection, Mottville intersection and Old Seneca Turnpike intersection. There have been a number of fatalities on his corner because the people are not familiar with the road. He does not think DOT has the slightest idea of reviewing the road, as they do not understand the issues with the old Liverpool bridge. Maybe there can be some turning lanes or make it a wider highway. Gina Brothers 1179 Old Seneca Turnpike, the only thing she asks as the board is looking at this as it appears a lot of the i's have been dotted and t's crossed, sometimes reality does not always show that. She would like to know how to address issues after the building has been built.

Zac Benjamin, 3959 State Street Road at the corner of Jewett Road, has already submitted his comments to the board. Route 321 is dangerous. The town made him put his driveway on Route 321 despite the fact that his neighbors all have their driveways on Jewett Road. He cannot turn out onto the road without dodging cars. People come in and out of the village at 60-80 mph and do not slow down until they hit the YMCA. He does not think the DOT will do an adequate study and thinks it is imperative that the town looks into that. There is already a place for a hotel, which is the Birds Nest, which would be an appropriate place, and the board should take into consideration whether this is the proper place for this. He is not opposed to development but it needs to make sense.

Judy Suhr, 1153 Old Seneca Turnpike, is in favor of the proposal. Her family moved to Skaneateles eight years ago and visited about ten times to find a home. Every time they stayed they had to go to Auburn because the hotels in the village were so expensive, Mirbeau, Sherwood, and not everybody wants a bed and breakfast. I can see Welch Allyn from her home and their lights and it does not bother her. This hotel will not have as many lights as Welch Allyn. Yes, the traffic is bad on Route 321, but it is not the applicant's fault as it is something that has been ongoing for years. With 88 rooms, you may have 75 people, and 75 people on the road are not a significant amount when you look at the total picture of how many are already on Route 321. She hopes those things will be considered.

Colleen Frank, 946 Mottville Road, She said that her husband and her have owned rental properties in the town and village of Skaneateles for 40 years. Almost 5 years ago, they built a home at 946 Mottville Road. They have had 30 days to dance from last month's initial proposal by Woodbine. Individuals have spoken with architects and engineers, geologists, attorneys, state officials, and her husband has been in the town offices several times. They have spoken with Albion officials regarding the Tailwater Hotel. Mr. Bouchard, at last month's meeting, commented that the Tailwater was similar to the proposed project here. Tailwater has had two additions, and the size of the hotel doubled. She would strongly disagree that the areas are similar as Altmar has a population of 412 people and Skaneateles has roughly 7,200 people. Young married couples are not leaving this area and we do not have vacant school buildings to build a hotel in. It does not appear that we need minimum wage jobs either where they needed it at the Tailwater project. She is certain that this hotel will be a Hilton or a Best-Western branded. Good-bye to the charming B&Bs that are in the town and are the golden arches next. She does not think it is an answer to a cheap hotel. Mr. Bouchard was asked by the board why a hotel. His response was due to growth of venues here and a lack of hotel rooms and that this area is a tourist attraction. She said that she does not want to be Lake George without the mountains or Saratoga without the racetrack. The chamber of commerce does a great job attracting tourists from the Easter egg hunt to the winter fest and everything in between. The local hotels and B&Bs rarely have full occupancies. There are hundreds of hotel rooms eight minutes to Auburn, fifteen minutes to Camillus, and twenty-five minutes to Syracuse. We are not just taxpayers living in the northern section of the town, living on Jordan Road, or citizens living in the Hamlet of Mottville. They are eleven houses on Old Seneca Turnpike enjoying the mostly agricultural landscape. They are a neighborhood of eighty homes along Mottville, Road, Jordan Road, and Old Seneca Turnpike. She requested that her home, neighborhood, waterways and roadways be protected. The traffic on Mottville road, three times, six times a day, eighteen-wheelers, and vans, etcetera.

Ed Frank, 946 Mottville Road, they had moved their house in 450 feet from Mottville Road and he has concerns about drainage. All of the impermeable surfaces have been pushed from the front of their property to the back of the property. The logic is that they are nice to the neighbors on Old Seneca Turnpike so they are putting everything back there. The reason they are putting it there is because they have no access to gas and water off Old Seneca and now they have to go here and strike a deal with Hill-Rom to get access to the property, which he suspects, is legal. Hill-Rom has developed from 1998 to 2011 a wedding venue in their industrial capacity, which is now a profit center. The applicant is a profit center and they are mutually working together, will have a shuttle system and he is concerned about how much traffic it will bring, noise level at 11 p.m. at night in the parking lot above their house with people yelling and screaming and drunk from over at the Lodge. What kind of noise from garbage pick up as they have had noise from tractors in the field that they can hear twice a year that does not bother him at all. Every night they will hear people out there and they should move the hotel to the center of the property He is most baffled on how someone who lives here who is raising a family here wants to introduce all of this from more people and more capacity to the town. The town is already overcrowded. He is on the hamlet committee as well and we need to utilize the hamlet committee to hire our planners. This is a significant \$10 million project sitting in his backyard but we need to look at the community first to do our plan appropriately.

Becky Heberle, 968 Mottville Road, her property neighbors where the driveway will be, and she moved there four years ago from the Spafford area. There was a lot of talk about planting trees and it seems that it has already been done on the Seneca Turnpike side. She is concerned about her end and although there is a bit of a hedgerow, there will be cars that will turn into the driveway and point their headlights right at her house as they make the fancy turn up to the hotel. She is also concerned about traffic. An additional concern is that her property sits lower than the hotel property, and she already has wet areas on her property. She is worried about the drainage onto her land and does not want any flooding of her house. She would like to see the plan for the stormwater management system that has been designed. If it dumps out at the ditch at the end of road, it overflows over her driveway often. She did look at the Birchwood archeological report and the two letters from SHPPO, and when you look at the map that comes along with the second letter it does not look like they did the study in the driveway area, just the hotel area. Clusters of artifacts are 4,000-5,000 years old right next to where the pool will be and she wants to make sure that there is not anything else that is there. There are areas that are set to avoid and that if the hotel were sold that no one develop that area. Ms. Heberle submitted the picture that shows the areas that were studied in the archeological report.

Wayne LaFrance, 2100 West Lake Road, has been a resident for many years, said that the town has to figure out the problems and solve them. He trusts that the board will do it right and he support the proposal.

Scott Spanfelner, 4341 State Street, stated that he is in support of the project. There are obvious benefits to Hill-Rom but wanted to point out that last year they had about 5,000 visits to the site that are not employees. They are employees that do not reside in Skaneateles but typically stay in Auburn or Camillus. Those people are traveling back and forth from Auburn that are visiting Hill-Rom on all of those roads and the project will allow them to stay across the street as many cannot stay in the village hotels due to capacity. They are in favor of the project for the safety of their employees for the time lost due to travel and the time they are visiting with many not used to the winters and any social events at the Lodge. They would not be in support of anything that was not tastefully done. They have been in the community for a long time and they hope they have done the job of being respectful of the community. There would be a lot of advantages for convenience and less travel on the roads as a result of staying across the street.

Corrie Baum, 906 Mottville Road, works at Welch Allyn. She bought a house on Mottville Road in 2014 so that she can walk to work, walk to a relative's house, and walk to the village. Her concern is with the pressure to develop farmland. She understands the business benefits to Welch Allyn but the traffic is her biggest concern. There has been extra truck traffic past her house since the warehouse addition at Welch Allyn. She bought in Mottville, as there are not a lot of affordable properties in the village. There are trucks on Mottville Road that rattle windows, wake her up at night, and the increase traffic at shift change is very disturbing. There are a lot of smokers who line up along the road, as there is no smoking on the Welch Allyn property. She has seen the plow stop for them and almost hit them. Her biggest concern is the location of the driveway and the increase in traffic on Mottville road. The increase of 100 cars past her house is a lot of traffic for a small neighborhood. She would like a mitigation for traffic going onto Route 321 and Old Seneca Turnpike in addition to the Mottville exit. Maybe the traffic onto Mottville Road is only for the Lodge and not the entrance to the hotel.

Sharon Tanner, 1246 Old Seneca Turnpike, said that a lot of her concerns have been addressed with stormwater runoff and traffic. She added that the angle of the intersection of Old Seneca Turnpike and Route 321 is horrific, however they are putting in a full traffic signal. She wondered why it has taken over a year to put in a traffic light. The sight distance is difficult when you are coming out of the proposed right of way, as there is a blind little knoll if you are turning left going down the hill. It would make

sense to go where there is going to be a traffic light to mitigate some of the chaos at Mottville and Route 321.

Jim Condon, 3847 Highland Ave, He has lived on Highland Ave and is not opposed to the 88-room hotel. He stated that the town engineer, John Camp would do a good job. On Highland Ave, he has an existing 4" transit water line that is over 60 years old. He believes it would be in the best interest to make sure that all parties have done their studies and this water line on Highland Ave will not be affected. The current 4" water line does not meet the current code for a water service, and also will not meet the current fire hydrant required water pressures and volume. New fire hydrants require a 6" water service. If there was a fire on Highland Ave, and he has been told by a past fire chief that, the water line would more than likely collapse when used to fight the fire. At the current time on a Monday night in January at 6pm in the middle of the winter, he has 28-psi water pressure at his home. In the summer, it drops even lower. The water main on Highland Ave has a history of many water main breaks. On a dry summer day, you can see the green grass in a lot of yards where the water connection from the home connects to the transit water service in the road (this means it has a slow leak). There are a lot of heavy trucks and farm equipment that use this road, in his opinion this vibration loosens the brass connection at the transit main. He has expressed his concern about this for over 20 years to the Town Boards. He believes the Town of Skaneateles has the responsibility to maintain and replace old out dated infrastructure on Highland Ave as well as other similar neighborhoods that have this problem. We all pay enough taxes, and should be able to have a decent water service. A normal home should have between 65-85psi water pressure and adequate volume of water for the homes use and for the fire hydrants to operate correctly. He believes in his opinion and he has discussed with Civil Engineers over the years that if the water pressure were increased on Highland Ave that more than likely the main water service on the road would fail. By adding this hotel without doing a proper study of all the water districts would stress the existing water districts and would be a disservice to the whole Town of Skaneateles. Information he has researched with the little information we have been given on what the hotel has to offers is as follows: Has there been a study by an Engineer on how the 88-room hotel would affect the town of Skaneateles? Will this be public knowledge when done? This should be done in the middle of the summer at the time of maximum use by all parties using the water district as well when Hill-Rom is open for business. The 88-room hotel will have 88 rooms with a shower, toilet and sink this is around 1,179 fixture units of water use. There will be more fixtures than the 28 single-family homes noted. With this assumed information, He has figured the hotel will need at a minimum a 4" water service for the domestic water at a velocity of 6.4. The total water service he would believe would be an 8" combination fire and domestic water service. The current 12" water service on Mottville Road on the east side of the pressure-reducing valve is 100psi. The flow test on the first hydrant in this area is around 65psi static and 1300 GPM with a 32psi residual. The hotel will be roughly 70' higher than the road. With this head loss plus the head loss of the two-story hotel, in his opinion will stress the water district. In his opinion unless all the items he has noted are not properly vetted out by the town and the developer's engineers before this hotel is built would be a great disservice to all the existing tax payers using this water district. He would like the Town Board as well as the Town Planning Board to be transparent when this information is obtained with all members of the town before this application is approved.

Jim Moore, 95 East Lake Road, began speaking for Holly Gregg, CPCS, CPCS is always been a proponent of the comprehensive plan because it is the result of thousands of hours and tens of thousands of dollars spent by the town and years of testing in the real world. It is now being updated and hopefully someday the town zoning code will be too. In January 2018 the town, board appointed a special hamlet committee to study future developments in the hamlets of Mottville and the northern hamlets. In last November, the town applied for a \$170,000 grant from Onondaga County to fund the study. Both the county executive and the county legislator are in support of this study. The ways and means committee has recently approved that grant. One thing for sure though, neither the comprehensive plan nor the

mission statement of the committee recommends building large-scale hotels and restaurants in the northern hamlets. It is simply not part of the vision of our community. CPCS along with several residents on the town believe that large scale commercial structure like the one being proposed runs counter to the vision of the comprehensive plan. CPCS recommended that the Planning Board table this application until the planning study for the northern hamlet is completed and adopted before this proposal and any other major developments are done. Mr. Moore began his comments saying that Onondaga County executive is doing a feasibility study on the 30-35 million-dollar sports complex with turf fields, hotels and shopping. The relevance is that eight years ago we had something similar proposed and we issued a negative declaration which was re-looked at and a positive declaration determined and we avoided a disaster. His concern is that the project is another profit enterprise that could spur additional development. Tailwater Hotel has events and this could in the future.

John Duckett, 706 Franklin Street, spoke in favor of the project. The precedent was set for the applicant's land when Hill-Rom/Welch Allyn was constructed originally. In regards to views, you are driving by a manufacturing facility and there will be a hotel that will be well landscaped and shielded from the road. With regard to losing farmland, farming has become less viable over the years with farm prices at an all-time low. It makes it less desirable for land to be purchased by farmers for agriculture. The land was for sale for seven-eight months when it was finally sold by Jack Wooster. Anybody who has an issue with the future use of the land should have purchased it and then could have control of it. Trying to tell someone what they can or cannot do with their land when they have rights with their property; if it fits within the IRO district and meeting the zoning, there should be no issue. It is right next to Hill-Rom with development right there. The project should be allowed to move forward.

Bob Eggleston, 3441 Rickard Road, said that he has worked on the comprehensive plan since 1996. This is a good use and a good location. It is a permitted use by special permit. The comprehensive plan is for the use of old buildings and wished that the old Welch Allyn plant were turned into a hotel although that is not on the table. His concern is with the access with the seven-foot deep canyon that will be created for the driveway. That is contrary to a number of site plan review objectives and he would like to see a different plan with a longer drive that does not create the canyon. Good luck with plowing the snow out of it. The architecture is lipstick on a corporate suburban hotel. There is nothing architecturally attractive about it. There was an inspiration picture of a gorgeous three-story gable building that he thought was sharp and very nice. This is the gateway to the Mottville hamlet. The Welch Allyn building is very attractive for what it is. Frank Lloyd Wright said that a physician can always bury his mistakes but an architect can only suggest landscaping. Why is it being hid when you can make a beautiful building that is appropriate to the character of Skaneateles that becomes a statement. As you go down Route 321, you see Welch Allyn and also the Lodge peeking out of the trees and it is intriguing as the Lodge is a quality building. It would be nice to have something equal to it. He is disappointed with the parking as the code calls it to be broken up with landscaping and trees. He cited an example with the community center where they have center islands. The trees will cool the asphalt and green it up. Could the employee parking area be near the service area and not have a Walmart parking lot. Look at the criteria of section 148-18, 148-32 and 148-25 and address these in your narrative.

Chairman Southern stated that the list of speaker has been completed and asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak on the project.

Dick Eldridge, 776 Sheldon Road, said that it is about us looking to the future of the hamlets. Today it is about a 88-room hotel to support the Lodge but how about next week. What about new hotels to support other industries and new facilities in the hamlets. We have no plan in place for what we can do to make it a positive for the areas is his biggest concern. The comprehensive plan says that hamlets are where we are supposed to be growing residential areas. It does not say anything about hotels. The tourist areas are the

village and the route 20 corridor for hotels. We have the Sinclair, Frog Pond on Sheldon Road, all plugging the road with traffic that would love a hotel in the Falls.

Steve White, 20 State Street, Mr. Swanson is my friend but I am not in favor of the project. It is not what the citizens have come up with so far as far as the comprehensive plan, the effort to do more studies and so forth for the northern end of the community. The water system, we had that problem when the doctor wanted to put in the sports complex and the study was flat out stupid. This group has not done what should be. Hill-Rom bought the business and had the right to do what they wanted to do and if the former owners still owned it, they would not be in support of the hotel.

Dave Bales, Mottville Fire Department, the property will be protected if it is constructed. The fire department has a neutral stance. His concern is that there are three sides of the building with no access for the fire department for protection. He would like to meet with the designers on that.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman to continue the public hearing on **Tuesday, February 18, 2020**. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Chairman Southern reminded the audience that all members of the board do receive and review the minutes and that the full board should be in attendance next month.

Public Hearing- 3-lot Subdivision

Applicant:	Fox Hollow Properties Todd Keehfus PO Box 758 Latham, NY 12110	Property: 2532 Giles Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map #055.-03-27.0
------------	---	---

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect;

The applicant proposes the subdivision of 49.7 acres with Lot 1 consisting of 15.4 acres of vacant land, Lot 2 consisting of 6.5 acres with the existing dwelling and accessory structures, and Lot 3 is a flag lot configuration consisting of 27.8 acres of vacant land, Lot 3 has 60 feet of road frontage. There may be an agricultural access along the south side to access the fields. There is an interested party for lot 1 and the owner is interested in retaining lot 3.

The applicant has requested that a SEQR be completed on the proposal. At this time Counsel Molnar recommended to the Board that the application be an Unlisted Action and reviewed the short form SEQR with the Board. In evaluating, each of the criteria set forth in Part II:

Part II	No or small impact	Moderate to Large impact
1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulation?	X	
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?	X	
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?	X	
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a CEA?	X	
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or	X small	

walkway?		
6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?	X	
7. Will the proposed action impact existing public/private water supplies and/or public/ private wastewater treatment utilities?	X	
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?	X	
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g. wetlands, water bodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?	X	
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?	X	
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental or human health?	X	

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Southern and seconded by Member Marshall, the Board declared this application to be an Unlisted Action, and after review of the SEQR short environmental assessment form and determined that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

At this time, Chairman Southern opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor of the proposal. No one spoke in favor of the project. Chairman Southern asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition or had any other comments on the project. No one spoke in oppositions or had any other comments.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Marshall and seconded by Member Winkelman to close the public hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made Member Scott Winkelman, duly seconded by Member Jill Marshall, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board hereby **APPROVES** the three-lot Subdivision, with the following conditions:

1. The Final Plan subdivision of the Keehfus Subdivision, dated January 7, 2020 prepared by Paul Olszewski, Land Surveying, PC be submitted for the Planning Board Chairman’s review and signature within 180 days from the signing of this resolution; and
2. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or Application; and
3. The Subdivision Map and Deed transferring the property must be filed in the Onondaga County Clerk’s Office within sixty-two (62) days of the signing of said Map, or the Subdivision approval shall be null and void. Proof of said filing shall be immediately forwarded to the Secretary of the Planning Board upon receipt by the Applicant and/or Applicant’s representative.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Absent	
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

Public Hearing – Special Permit/Site Plan Review

Applicant:	Property:
Mary Sennett	1411 Thornton Heights Road
19 Goodspeed Place	Skaneateles, NY 13152
Skaneateles, NY 13152	Tax Map #057.-01-32.0

Present: Mary Sennett, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Architect;

The variances were granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals on January 7, 2020 for the non-conforming lot size and shoreline structures. The goal of the proposal is to take a dangerous stairway to the lake and make it code compliant that required the stairs to be placed off an angle that will float above the existing bank. There will be posts put in for the landing with a few areas that will need to be patched in with vegetation.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Marshall the Planning Board classified this application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(11) and not subject to further review under SEQR. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

At this time, Chairman Southern opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor of the proposal. No one spoke in favor of the proposal. Chairman Southern asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition or had any other comments on the project. No one spoke in opposition or had other comments.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Marshall to close the public hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Member Jill Marshall and duly seconded by Member Scott Winkelman, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the minor special permit/site plan, with standard conditions and the following additional conditions:

1. That the Special Permit/Site Plan Approval shall expire if the applicant fails to comply with the conditions stated within 18 months of its issuance or if its time limit expires without renewal; and
2. The Site Plan 1 of 2 through 2 of 2 and Narrative dated November 21, 2019, prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be strictly followed; and
3. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application; and
4. That all conditions imposed by the Skaneateles Zoning Board of Appeals, in connection with its approved variance, be fulfilled; and

5. No certificate of occupancy shall be granted until the Applicant has filed a set of as-built plans with the Codes Enforcement Officer, indicating any deviations from the approved site plan. The Codes Enforcement Officer shall be responsible for the inspection of site improvements, including coordination with the Town's consultants and other local officials and agencies, as may be appropriate; and
6. That an as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Absent	
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

Sketch Plan- 2-lot Subdivision

Applicant:	Kenan 2012 Family Trust LLC	Property:
	Bruce Kenan	3406 West Lake Road
	61 Main Street	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Camillus, NY 13031	Tax Map #049.-02-04.2

Present: Bruce Kenan, Applicant; Jeff Davis, John Langey, Attorneys; Paul Olszewski, Surveyor

Mr. Kenan explained the evolution of the acquisition of the three properties on West Lake Road. The two northern properties, one with the main dwelling and the second with the boathouse parking with the boathouse located over the lake, are located in the village of Skaneateles. In 1996, the southern lot located in the town was created, and the driveway to the main dwelling was expanded onto the lot with the garage including carriage apartment above renovated. Since 1996, a right of way was established to the boathouse property and the chicken coop was developed as a cottage. The proposal is to subdivide the town lot into two parcels and Mr. Kenan would like to connect the two southern lots to each corresponding northern lot and essentially have two lots.

The applicant would like to prepare either the main dwelling or the boathouse for sale. In doing so, they are requesting that the southern lot be subdivided into two lots with the northern portion connected to the main dwelling and the southern portion connected to the boathouse. The two lots would not meet the 2-acre requirement for new lots and require a variance for the nonconforming size.

The village provides public water and sewer for all of the structures including the ones on the town property. Member Winkelman inquired about the impermeable surface coverage of the town lot. He continued saying that the property lines go beyond the high water mark of 865.02 ft. Mr. Kenan responded that the survey reflects the deeds with the lot boundaries out into the lake. Proposed parcel 3A would have 20.7% impermeable surface coverage with 79.3% open space. Parcel 3B has the calculations to the mean high water line and to the deeded property line. Counsel Molnar noted that the land under water is owned by New York State, and recommended that the impermeable surface calculation for parcel 3B should be calculated to the mean high water mark. Parcel 3B would have 11.3% impermeable surface coverage with 88.7% open space.

Counsel Molnar said that it would be less of a challenge if the proposed two southern lots essentially become part of the two northern lots. He continued saying that consultation with the assessor would need to happen, as there would be a collapse of the tax parcel number. Mr. Kenan explained that what happens to the assessment is part of the consideration in combining the two lots. Mr. Langey commented that he has examined both the village and town zoning code and there is no prohibition of the town and village lot being tied together. Counsel Molnar said that the hard part is obtaining the variance to create two one-acre lots. Mr. Kenan said that lot 2 and 3B combined do not come up to 2 acres. Counsel Molnar inquired if the unity of the lots would be in perpetuity as one of the factors for consideration by the ZBA or Planning Board. Mr. Kenan replied yes.

Mr. Kenan explained that lot 2 and lot 3 are owned by the same entity and that lot 1 is a different entity. If the two lots were created, they would need to split the ownership before they could connect 3A to lot 1. Counsel Molnar said that if the applicant is willing to accept the covenant and condition in a deed from the entity to itself, which will perpetually retain ownership and unify it. Then the entity that owns lot 1 owns 3A under condition that title and ownership is perpetually unified, and lot 3B is conveyed to the owner of lot 2 under condition; you effectively tie the title perpetually. That would satisfy a condition proposed likely from the ZBA and/or the Planning Board so that we are not creating nonconforming lots that are subject to development in the future. Mr. Kenan said the he suspects that he would want to do that in the future; however, he is wrestling with the re-assessment and potentially losing the agreement he has in place for three years of no increase in assessment. Counsel Molnar said that you would be agreeing to never bifurcate them and not collapsing tax parcel numbers. Mr. Langey said that there would be two new tax parcel numbers created from the former tax parcel number. He continued saying that there has to be a discussion on that.

Member Winkelman commented that consideration of the impermeable coverage should be contemplated with the creation of the two lots. Mr. Langey said that they are not proposing any increase in the coverage; the existing coverage would be the new coverage. There would be no additional impact to the lake and environment. The existing coverage is not conforming on the lot at 11.7%. The minimum lot size in the village is 44,000 square feet. Mr. Kenan said that lot 2 has impermeable coverage of 12.6% and 3B has 11.3% coverage. Mr. Kenan commented that the parking for the boathouse is underground.

The applicant will need to obtain a variance from the Zoning Board Appeals. Mr. Langey requested that a public hearing be scheduled. Chairman Southern suggested that the survey be updated to remove the calculations of coverage based on the lot extending into the water.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Marshall to schedule a public hearing dependent on the variance decision, on ***Tuesday, March 17, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.*** The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Counsel Molnar stated that the boards would want to consider the connection of the potential two new lots with the northern lots in perpetuity. Mr. Kenan said he would seriously consider merging the lots provided that it does not negatively impact the assessment. Counsel Molnar commented that if there were a negative consequence of that then they would need to look how they could legally link them.

Amendment Request –Site Plan Review

Applicant

Lakelawn Properties LLC
1 Winthrop Square
Boston, MA 02110

Property:
3384 West Lake Street
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #049.-02-03.0

Present: JoAnne Gagliano, Joe Falco, Kyle Volz, EDR;

A site visit was conducted on December 28, 2019 to address any concerns. Five answers to the questions from the board from last month's meeting are being provided with the updated plans, narrative, paddle court information and lighting information. Impermeable surface coverage for the lot is 9.96%, and shoreline structures are 2,288 square feet. The tennis and paddle court lights are dark sky compliant and on a dedicated switch and used only in a playing situation. All other lights on the site are controlled by timers that go off at 11 p.m. at the latest. The waterfront slope had been changed and is currently has established sod. At the site visit it was determined that the sod should remain as it is established but in areas where there is disturbance, it should be planted with shrubs and trees. A cross section has been provided for the boulder seawall and plantings that had been installed.

Member Winkelman commented that the area of disturbance was more extensive than what was reflected on the former plans. Ms. Gagliano stated that the amount of coverage was reduced 30% from the original plan. Member Winkelman continued saying that the board was not informed on the boathouse although it is not in the town's jurisdiction. The shoreline work has been done well with nice material. Ms. Gagliano said that a final walk would need to be completed by Mr. Camp in the spring. She continued saying that they have added more silt fence and posted rolls to control any runoff. Mr. Camp stated that there were areas by the boathouse where there were raw materials that could have been used as stabilizers. Ms. Gagliano said that they used straw over the top and rope rolls staked into the ground for stabilization that has been completed. Their engineers suggested that additional silt fencing should be around the edges that were noted from the SWPPP inspection this week.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Marshall, the Planning Board adopted and ratified its prior SEQRA determination for the Application, which was a determination that the Application constitutes a TYPE II single family residential Project, not subject to further SEQRA review. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Member Scott Winkelman, seconded by Member Jill Marshall, and upon an affirmative vote thereon as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the Modification and amendment of the Approving Resolutions, with the following conditions:

1. That the Site Plan C1, C-200, and C-201, with Narrative, prepared by EDR, dated January 10, 2020, be followed in all respects, and
2. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application; and
3. That the Town Engineer review and verify compliance to the proposed plans prior to final Certificate of Occupancy issuance for the property; and
4. Except as modified hereby, the conditions set forth in the Approving Resolutions remain in full force and effect.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]

Member	Donald Kasper	Absent	
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

Sketch Plan-Major Special Permit

Applicant:	SSPP1 LLC	Property:	
	David Meunier		4545 Jordan Road
	PO Box 902		Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Indian Rock Beach, FL 33785	Tax Map #018.-02-10.0	

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect;
 The application will continue at the February 18, 2020 meeting if the Zoning Board of Appeals has rendered their decision on the variance request.

Special Permit Amendment

Applicant:	James Tracy
	2833 Shamrock Rd
	Skaneateles, New York 13152
	Tax Map #036.-02-02.0

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect

Mr. Eggleston informed the board that he has just been contracted to represent the application and would like to move the application to the February 18, 2020 meeting.

Public Hearing Continuance-Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment

Applicant:	Russel Zechman	Property:	
	PO Box 9		3741 Fisher Rd
	Skaneateles, NY 13152		Skaneateles, NY 13152
		Tax Map #033.-04-14.0 & 12.0	

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect;

The applicant has requested an extension to the application as the village has not completed the water project that would improve fire flows for this project, and has requested an additional year.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Marshall to extend the application to ***Tuesday, January 20, 2021***. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Amendment Request

Applicant:	Richard Moscarito	Property:	
	120 Madison Street		2699 East Lake Road
	Chittenango, NY 13037		Skaneateles, NY 13152
		Tax Map #037.-01-04.0	

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect;

A site visit was conducted with the town engineer. A permit was obtained to remove the bulk of the original cottage and the construction has commenced on the cottage. and then the applicant obtained a DEC permit to construct the dock When the application was approved in 2017 the shoreline wall was to be repaired; however, the seawall had suffered considerable damage in the ensuing two years that it needed to be replaced in kind.

An additional modification is the location of the approved 80 square foot shed from the southeast side of the property to be located on the south side of the single-family dwelling. The shed will be used to house the mechanicals for the building and have access from the outside. The retaining wall for the driveway and the drainage swale installation will be completed last as they are working the construction from the lake to the road. This change is reflected in the construction sequence submitted with the revised narrative dated January 7, 2020.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Marshall, he Planning Board adopted and ratified its prior SEQRA determination for the Application, which was a determination that the Application constitutes a TYPE II single family residential project action, not subject to further SEQRA review The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Member Jill Marshall, seconded by Chairman Joseph Southern, and upon an affirmative vote thereon as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board hereby **APPROVES** the Application, and amends the Approving Resolution, as follows:

7. The Site Plan 1 of 6 and 3 of 6 dated January 21, 2020, and Narrative dated January 7, 2020, prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be strictly followed; and
2. Except as amended hereby, the conditions of the Approving Resolution remain in full force and effect.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Absent	
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

Discussion

Applicant: Marc Pietropaoli
791 W. Genesee Street
Skaneateles, New York

Property:
Route 20 East
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #042.-01-13.1

Present: Marc Pietropaoli, Applicant;

Dr. Pietropaoli stated that he still owns the property and is still renting from Victor Ianno. The goal would be to move to that property or somewhere else if the opportunity came about. He would prefer to stay in Skaneateles, and his current location is constraining. Chairman Southern inquired if he was still considering his formal plan. Dr. Pietropaoli said that the project was proposed in phases and that they knew that it was unlikely that they would develop all of the phases. The reason the phases were given to

the board was that they were told that they had to provide what the full build out could be which was not likely to happen. What they originally proposed was not for the full build out option that was highly unlikely to be built. There is still consideration of getting an office out there for his business and other health and wellness businesses.

Counsel Molnar commented that Dr. Pietropaoli has provided the update to be compliant with the code and recommended that the board would need to accept the update if the board chooses.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Marshall to accept the update from the application to allow the application to remain active. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Merger Request

Applicant:	Kimball T. Kraus	Property:	3109 West Lake Road
	3109 West Lake Road		West Lake Road(Vacant)
	Skaneateles NY 13152		Skaneateles, New York
			Tax parcel: 051.-02-04.0 & 051.-02-06.0

The applicants are requesting the merger of their two adjoining properties with one of the lots consisting of vacant land.

WHEREFORE, a motion by Member Marshall and seconded by Chairman Southern to notify the Town of Skaneateles Tax Assessor that this Board has no objection to the request to merge the two parcels. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Absent	
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Chairman Southern to enter an attorney advice session. The Board having been polled resulted in favor of said motion.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman to return from attorney advice session. The Board having been polled resulted in favor of said motion.

The Board returned at 10:22 pm.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman to adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 10:22 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Barkdull, Clerk