

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
February 18, 2020**

Joseph Southern
Donald Kasper
Scott Winkelman
Douglas Hamlin
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 January 14, 2020 were previously distributed to the Board and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Marshall and seconded by Chairman Southern to approve the minutes as submitted. 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	Present	[Abstain]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Abstain]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

The meeting minutes of January 21, 2020 were previously distributed to the Board and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman 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	Present	[Abstain]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Abstain]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

Public Hearing Continuance-Special Permit Amendment

Applicant: Skaneateles Aerodrome, LLC
2984 Benson Road
Skaneateles, NY
Tax Map #051.-02-08.1

Present: Michael J. Lazar, Project Manager

The application has been modified to remove the request for the runway extension and only include the 15 feet by 200 feet extension to the south taxiway to make it the appropriate size and allow more room for

the three tie down areas for planes. The expanded taxiway area will drain into the existing underdrain that was for the runway, and no work will be done at the east end of the runway. There will be a temporary barrier during construction.

WHEREAS, the Planning Board, on June 21, 2019, adopted and ratified the prior SEQRA determination, last reviewed June 7, 2011 for the Application, which was a determination that the Application constituted an Unlisted Action with a negative declaration after review of the SEQRA forms submitted by the Applicant.

Counsel Molnar stated that the applicant has requested that a DV-21 form be completed for the application to be submitted to the State. It is to encapsulate the two actions, the Unlisted action determination just discussed and the Type II determination on January 2019 for the tree trimming on Hobbit Hollow in connection with the airport need.

Chairman Southern continued the public hearing, asking if there was anyone in the audience that would like to speak for, against or have other comments on the application. No one spoke regarding the application.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Member Hamlin to close the public hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

Counsel Molnar commented that he had notified the neighbor's counsel of the fact that this application was on the agenda for this evening and he believed that the information was forwarded to the neighbor. Member Kasper commented that the area variance was withdrawn and the application should be modified to reflect it. Mr. Lazar crossed off the area variance box and initialed it.

WHEREAS, the Board in reviewing the Amended Application under the special permit and site plan review criteria, adopted the following findings ("Findings") for proceeding with a determination on the Amended Application:

(1) That the Amended Application is consistent with the purposes of the land use district in which it is located; and

(2) That based on the narrative provided, the proposal will not adversely affect the surrounding land uses; and,

(3) The Amended Application is not contrary to the Comprehensive Plan as it is not removing any land out of production; and

(4) That all relevant site pan criteria as required under 148-18D have been satisfied.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Member Donald Kasper and seconded by Member Douglas Hamlin, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the minor special permit and site plan approval requested in the Amended Application, with standard conditions and the following additional conditions:

1. That the Findings are incorporated in this decision, as if set forth at length; and

2. That the Special Permit/Site Plan Approval shall expire if the Applicant fails to obtain the necessary building permits or fails to comply with the conditions stated within 18 months of its issuance, or if its time limit expires without renewal; and
3. The Site Plan C-102 dated April 1, 2019, prepared by O'Brien & Gere Engineers, Inc., Licensed Engineers, be strictly followed; and
4. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals New York State Department of Transportation and any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application; 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]
Vice Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

Sketch Plan-Special Permit

Applicant:

Bruce & Patricia Texeira
 17 Ridgeview Place
 Mt. Sinai, NY 11766

Property:

2141 Terrace Lane South
 Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #057.-03-02.0

Present: Bill Murphy, Architect;

The applicant is retiring and intending to live at the 16,341 square foot lot that is nonconforming with the nonconforming dwelling. They would like to add a deck with stairs down to the lawn, and a hot tub on the deck. The property slopes and is not conducive to placing the deck directly on the ground. The applicant would also like a 80-foot shed to house lawn care equipment, as their existing garage is very small. The concrete sidewalk will be replaced with permeable walkway.

The lot has existing nonconforming impermeable surface coverage of 21.8% that will be reduced to 20.98%. There is no area to be able to reduce the coverage further as the driveway is very limiting and is 35 feet wide allowing for two cars to be parked at an angle. The gravity fed leach field is located in the southeast area of the lot.

Member Winkelman inquired if the shed could be placed on the driveway. Mr. Murphy said that it would be difficult to maneuver a vehicle with the shed on the drive and allow the vehicle to pull out of the driveway rather than back out onto the road.

Mr. Brodsky inquired if topography was provided. Mr. Murphy said that a survey with topo was not done as the applicant did not want to pay the extra cost and there will be very little disturbance. Mr. Brodsky commented that the town's environmental resources map indicates the possibility that there are steep slopes on the site and that is difficult to determine without a survey with topo. The board will review the property at a site visit to determine whether a topo survey is required. A site visit will be conducted on February 22, 2020.

The nonconforming lot will require a variance for the size, the reduction in open space, and the shed will require a front yard setback variance as the lot has two front yards. The road borders on two sides and encroaches on the northeast corner of the lot. There is a hedge at the rear of the property to provide privacy.

Sketch Plan-Lot Line Adjustment

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

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect

The proposal is for a lot line adjustment to transfer three acres from the 14-acre agricultural lot owned by the applicant's father that will increase the applicant's lot from 12.8 acres to 15.8 acres. The applicant is interested in acquiring more land to the lot as the existing lot is at 9.5% impermeable surface coverage. The vacant property is all forest and the western end of the applicant's lot is actively farmed with his residence and business located on the eastern side of the lot. The far western corner of the lot is in the watershed and will not be disturbed. The lands in the surrounding area are farm lots.

There is a 30-foot right of way easement on the applicant's lot that leads to the vacant forest lot that is used for maple syrup harvesting. The applicant's lot will become an L shaped lot and the vacant lot will become a smaller rectangular lot. The application will continue next month.

Sketch Plan- Site Plan Review

Applicant:	Property:
Ronald Scott	1420 Thornton Hts
8922 Madeleine Drive	Skaneateles, NY 13152
Baldwinsville, NY 13027	Tax Map #057.-01-11.0

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect;

The 12,106 vacant lot has 50 feet of road frontage and has an existing shed and septic system. The existing impermeable surface coverage is 6.7% with 93.3% open space. The applicant ;owns a separate property on the lake that has an existing cottage that they had considered converting to a year round dwelling but it was determined that the access to the lake was steep. The proposal is for the construction of a one bedroom single family dwelling with cellar that will be used for storage due to the limited height. A bio swale will be integrated into the site on the west side of the dwelling so that the stormwater from the structures will be directed from the gutters to the bio-swale. Impermeable surface coverage will increase to 9.3% and open space will be reduced to 83.1%. The application is also under Zoning Board of Appeals review as the lot is less than 20,000 square feet.

The driveway is already in place and will be reduced to accommodate two vehicles. The one bedroom dwelling will be 1190 square feet, and the cellar has a ceiling height of 6/8", making it non-habitable space that could be used for storage and mechanicals. Mr. Brodsky inquired about the existing septic system. Mr. Eggleston said that the septic system is being used for the existing cottage and the proposed dwelling will have its own septic tank and pump to the existing leach fields of the existing cottage. Member Kasper inquired if the properties will have to be connected since they are sharing the septic system. Mr. Eggleston stated that there are two separate deeds with the two properties tied together in perpetuity. Mr. Eggleston will forward the legal documentation that connects the two properties together to Counsel Molnar. A site visit will be conducted on February 22, 2020.

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 property houses an 8-unit townhouse building that was used to house the factory workers for the Waterbury Felt factory on the property, which is located behind and to the north of this property. The former managers house was built in close proximity and there were other houses built for factory workers located on the same access way. All of the properties in the area were on one lot and throughout the years the land was subdivided to create a separate lot were created for each dwelling. The applicant's lot had the housing unit, and storage barn that was removed in 2007. In 2003, approval was given to allow ten apartments in the housing unit and the owner at that time failed to complete the project.

Proposed is an eight-unit townhouse building with parking located in the front and back of the building, with trash bin area located in the rear. The units will be developed as 3-story condominiums that will require a condominium association. The existing zoning code requires one acre for every four units regardless of what district it is located. This will require a variance from the Zoning Board. The owner of the factory, DeMarco has no interest in selling property to assist in making the lot conforming and has submitted a communication stating such. The second variance is for parking in front of the building although it will be screened by a row of trees and is located over 110 feet from Jordan Road. The neighborhood has over half of the properties with parking in front of the building.

The eight units will have the same floorplan with the first floor having entry from the east with access through the community porch leading to the dining/family and kitchen areas with a half bath. The second level will have access from the back porch leading to the living room and den with full bath and the third floor will have the master bedroom with full bath and walk in closet.

The OCDOH has required a 150-gallon per bedroom design rather than the standard 100-gallon as the units are one-bedroom units with multiple bathrooms. They are working with Andy Watkins on the septic design. As there are eight owners, they are working with the Town Board on establishing a sewer district similar to Lauder Lane. The condominium association will be responsible for the maintenance of the system and the town will collect a fee in the taxes that will cover the anticipated cost of maintenance. The condominium association will have the responsibility of contracting the work and the town would pay out for the work utilizing funds held in an escrow account. They will begin the process of establishing the district with the Town Board this Thursday. The properties owned by the Cowdens and the Cotters share the joint septic that is in poor condition, is located on the Cowden lot. The septic approval will provide

updated septic systems for all three properties, whether they are individual or shared on the applicant's property.

The fire chief from the Mottville fire department prefers the site plan that has parking in the front of the building to allow access to three side of the building and access to the Cowden dwelling. Once the septic design and approval has been finalized, they will incorporate a bio-swale to assist with stormwater management.

Member Kasper inquired if there was sufficient water service in the area to support the eight units. Mr. Eggleston said that it is on town water with more than adequate water pressure in the area. He continued saying that the water line comes up the community road and that the OCDOH may want to have this project have a dedicated line separate from the other residents. Member Kasper inquired if the three story townhouses require a sprinkler system. Mr. Eggleston responded that townhouses do not require sprinkler systems as they fall under the one and two family classification and each unit has independent entrances. Member Kasper inquired if there are separation walls in the building now. Mr. Eggleston stated that they are wood but they will be constructed to meet the building code guidelines for fire separation.

Mr. Camp commented that with the eight units there could be eight water meters by the road. Mr. Eggleston stated that it could be at the road or they could place them in the cellar space for the common utilities such as water. There is a 12-inch water main that comes down in the area and a fire hydrant at the road.

SEQR & Public Hearing Continuance- Special Permit

Applicant	Woodbine Group	Property:
	505E Fayette St #100	1046 Old Seneca Tpke
	Syracuse, NY 13202	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		Tax Map #028.-01-03.0

Present: Brian Bouchard, CHA Consulting;

Counsel Molnar began that at last month's meeting there was a quorum present to discussing the application. When the SEQR determination was completed by the Planning Board the determination did not pass as it should have with the majority of the members of the board, which would have been three out of five, although there were only three present. As a result, at the conclusion of that vote the matter should have been tabled for a vote when a full complement of Planning Board members was present to participate in the determination. The notice of public hearing was published with interested parties in the room who made time to be present and to speak, and the Planning Board proceeding to open the public hearing. He recommended that, as the full board is present that the board re-reviews the SEQR documentation to complete the SEQR determination of the application.

Mr. Bouchard requested to review the modifications to the application that the applicant has made since the last meeting before the board begins the SEQR review and determination. The OCDOT had requested additional traffic counts during the weekdays and weekends on Mottville Road. They have gone out and the weekends have been problematic as it has snowed every weekend and the snowplows have taking out the equipment lines. Member Winkelman inquired if the original traffic study was for an 88-room hotel and Mr. Bouchard stated yes, and that it included the restaurant as well. A traffic study is usually not warranted unless there are 100 plus trips per hour and this location has around 67 trips per hour. They hope to have that data for the next meeting, weather permitting.

Revised site plan drawings have been submitted to the board that reflect a reduction in the impermeable coverage of the parking lot, expanding green spaces in the parking lot, and the inclusion of reserve parking areas. The landscape plans have been updated based on public comments specifically on the bend in the drive. There will be larger tree planting along the drive and in parts of the parking lot. They had met with the fire chief regarding access to the building, allowances based on their equipment, and they fact that the construction of the building is cement and steel rather than wood framing. There will be fire access on both sides and standpipes in the center to allow the fire personnel to bring in their hose packs without heavy struggle to carry a weighted hose. The fire chief had submitted a letter to the board stating that the applicant has addressed any issues that they have had.

An updated narrative was submitted that discusses the intended use that is allowed in the IRO. The proposal fits with the comprehensive plan and fits in with the architecture, and the access. Also provided to the town is a series of photos of red balloon set at 35 feet that demonstrate the height of the proposed hotel in relationship to viewing from various points. The site is completely boxed in by hedgerows and the intent is not to hide the site as was mentioned in previous letters from the public. The building will be visible only from two vantage points such as from the hotel parking lot.

Member Kasper inquired about the proposed drainage plans including the swales around the parking lot, the snow plan, and the ponds behind the building that could affect the property to the west. The project is on a hill and at the edge of the hill, it goes down. Mr. Bouchard stated that the project is subject to all of the state regulations and the drainage plans were designed to have the post construction site equal to or greater than the pre-construction drainage of the site. The infiltration pond is a larger version of the residential bio-swales seen tonight with Y shaped underdrains that feed into the large bio-swale. The infiltration pond will drain into the existing natural spillway as it does today and into the wetlands. Member Kasper inquired as to what is the elevation of the pond in relationship to the houses along Mottville Road and the property to the west. Mr. Bouchard stated that he does not have the extension of the topography for those parcels but that he could look at that. Member Kasper commented that the discharge point is close to the property line and inquired where the water goes after it leaves the property. Mr. Bouchard explained that the parking lot is at the ridge of the hill and all of the runoff will be directed away from Mottville Road and towards the spillway. Member Winkelman inquired what type storm the spillway is designed. Mr. Bouchard stated that it is designed according to the SWPPP guidelines and the stormwater plan is being reviewed by the town engineer to confirm compliance.

Member Kasper commented that Mr. Eggleston had submitted some design ideas, one of which was the location of the driveway. Mr. Bouchard thanked Bob for his suggestions as he is very invested in the town and village. There is professional opinion on the shape of something or how it might be arranged, but they did try to capture as much as they could. The proposed driveway comes up along the edge of the property then into the proposed parking lot and hotel to provide the minimal disturbance to the site, while still trying to traverse the terrain. Mr. Eggleston's suggestion, without the full benefit of the site, was to bring the driveway along the wood line, which they had considered but determined that the topography is not improved. Secondly, he had stated that it would make a more usable area on the side of the driveway however; their intention was not to divide the parcel into two sections. The proposed driveway will hug the property line to the west of the driveway allowing it to fill in as a natural area and extend the buffer to the neighbors. Member Marshall inquired if it was tucked into the woods as Bob had suggested, would it provide more screening from the roads and neighbors. Mr. Bouchard stated that the proposed driveway and Bob's version are not really seen from the roads. Member Kasper stated that he was more concerned with the cut. Mr. Bouchard stated that Mr. Eggleston's version starts in a shallow area but then the cut would be the same as the proposed driveway and the steepness is the same. Member Hamlin inquired what the steepest slope is and Mr. Bouchard stated that it is around 8%. Member Marshall inquired if the driveway were moved, would it reduce the canyon effect. Mr. Bouchard stated that the property is not a

canyon, but a driveway cut into the slope to make the slope a consistent grade. There is a hill and there will be no other development on the hill to place a building; it would remain agricultural land.

Member Kasper inquired why the proposed driveway does not line up with the Hill-Rom driveway. Mr. Bouchard stated that there is a stream across from the Hill-Rom driveway location. He continued saying that sometimes opposing driveways tend to steal their own gaps and it is sometimes better to have them offset. Member Kasper commented that it may be a location for a future light. Mr. Bouchard stated that for a traffic flow of 67 cars per hour, the County would not place a light as it would not necessitate it.

Member Kasper commented that the hamlet committee submitted some suggestions. Mr. Bouchard said that he had read all of the comments and that the location of the proposed hotel is in the IRO district as an allowable use. The updated narrative does provide how the proposal fits in with the comprehensive plan that indicates that there is a desire for commercial businesses in the northern hamlet area and how it fits better than a manufacturing facility. Member Kasper inquired if there could be a walkway on the property as it is next to the hamlet area. Mr. Bouchard said that he had discussed it with the owner. There will be drainage ditches along the driveway, although the width of the driveway could allow a designated pathway to run along the shoulder of the driveway that could be used seasonally. Member Marshall said that it could be trails on the site that could be provided.

Member Kasper asked about the shuttle bus. Mr. Bouchard said that the owner would provide a shuttle bus for local use to tie in with the village's events so that guests at the hotel would not necessarily need to take their vehicle and find parking in the village. The private shuttle would also move guests to events at the Lodge or other venues.

Chairman Southern commented that the wetlands/drainage area is next door to a septic field that was approved for a project for 68 dwelling units and any overflow of sheeting onto this area would cause problems. Mr. Bouchard said that the drainage area is an existing wetlands and its conveyance cannot be under any septic system. The stormwater management will treat the stormwater from the post construction site where it charges and is no greater than the existing site. A new outlet is not being created; they will be using the pathway of the existing drainage and the way it flows to convey the water. Chairman Southern inquired if they anticipate any increase in stormwater. Mr. Bouchard said there will be no increase, and the stormwater water would be heading southwest on the property. The wetlands area is not buildable and will not be touched. Member Winkelman said that it would be nice to have the wetlands return to its more natural state as farmers over the years have encroached on it. Mr. Bouchard said that the fields behind the hotel will continue to be farmed with a possibility of some of that farming being available to the restaurant. They may use part of the area for a geo-thermal heating system.

Member Hamlin requested an explanation of how the septic system will work with 50,000 gallons a day. Mr. Bouchard said the system has a series of pre-treatment aerators (a commercial white night system) before it gets to the septic tanks. The septic tanks settles the solids out and then there is a series of leach beds that will be rotated in and out. They system is large enough to have redundancy built into it. A series of ten septic beds and only half of them will be utilized at one time. If one fails then there would be an opportunity to activate another bed. This allows for a portion of the beds to be shut down for maintenance or replacement if warranted. This septic system is reviewed by a SPDES permit through NYSDEC and the OCDOH.

Member Hamlin inquired if Welch Allyn could move their driveway to align with the proposed driveway. Mr. Bouchard said that Hill-Rom has a very specific peak and they have reviewed their site with the driveway location that they have used for years. The hotel traffic does not change that, and their traffic would probably be off-peak. Member Hamlin said they he is not saying that the hotel traffic would not

add to the traffic volume materially, but with the offset driveway, it is more of a safety concern. Member Hamlin also inquired as to the timing of the installation of the traffic light at Route 321 and Old Seneca Turnpike.

The Planning Board determined that as the review of the SEQR Part 1 of the EAF was completed at last month's meeting and determined that part 1 reflects accurate information, it did not need further review.

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

1. Impact on Land - No Yes

- a) No, According to part one the water table is not less than 3 feet.
- b) No
- c) No
- d) No, there are no soils are being removed from the site. There will be no mining on the property.
- e) No to small, single-phase construction will occur in a year with finish interior work completed in the second year.
- f) No to Small due to NYSDEC guidelines for erosion control with SWPPP being required for the project.
- g) No
- h) No to small as driveway will have an impact that would be mitigated by the SWPPP; the location is in the IRO district. There will be a change to the landform. Member Marshall said that it is a large impact because of the change from what is there now. Mr. Bouchard said that for a negative impact to stormwater it would be mitigated by a stormwater erosion control plan. Member Kasper said that it is a physical change to the land and Member Marshall said that it is permanent. Counsel Molnar stated that the guidance from the NYSDEC workbook states "the reviewing agency must determine if there will be an impact, the magnitude of the impact, depending on the overall scale of the project. The reviewing agency should be reasonable in conducting the review." Member Winkelman said that the cut of the driveway will be extensive, but when you consider the IRO district, the SWPPP, the stormwater control plan, it will be mitigated well that would make it a small impact. Member Hamlin commented that it does not after a large portion of the parcel. Counsel Molnar read the guidelines regarding question h where beneficial impacts can also be listed in this section. Member Marshall stated that there will be impact to the land and there will be excavation. She continued saying construction activity will go on for more than one year. Mr. Brodsky said that land construction will be under one year with construction in the building the next year. Counsel Molnar said that the DEC guidance on this question is "Construction that will continue for more than one year or completed in phases that can cause impact including traffic obstruction, use of heavy equipment with high noise levels, stockpiles of soils and materials, and other visual signs of construction that result in long term visual changes to the character of the area. If a project will be completed in one phase or construction with intermittent activity, check no to small impact. Moderate to large impact would be for construction that would occur over many years which would be considered long term." Mr. Camp recommended that the project could be viewed in terms of the Welch Allyn addition and construction time of that project. Member Marshall said that you could debate whether the construction will be completed in a year with trucks coming and going to the project site.

2. Impacts on Geological Features - No Yes

3. Impacts on Surface Water - No Yes

- a) No.

- b) No
- c) No
- d) No
- e) No
- f) No
- g) No
- h) No
- i) No
- j) No
- k) No
- l) Small- Member Marshall recommended that the board discuss the stormwater on the site. Member Winkelman said that the stormwater is a concern but that it is being addressed. Member Marshall said that there are concerns that it is all be discharged to the one point and where is it going downstream, although it is being mitigated. Member Kasper commented that the applicant still has work to do on the stormwater to ensure that it can handle large storm events. A mitigation for the impact would be through the Planning Board's site plan review to obtain additional information of snow management and to make sure that the outlet for the stormwater does not affect neighbors. Mr. Camp suggested that there could be a greater separation between the parking lot and swales to mitigate the concern or oversize the detention pond. Mr. Bouchard stated that this form is to address negative impacts and address those that need to be mitigated in part 3. The stormwater management system has been designed by a professional, reviewed by another professional engineer, and a SPDES permit that captures all of the technical elements of design, but that there may be little things that can be improved and addressed through site plan review.

4. Impacts on Groundwater - No Yes No

- a) No
- b) No the water supply is sufficient as it has been reviewed by the applicant's engineer, the town engineer, and the town water department.
- c) No
- d) No there will be DOH design approval and the applicant has designed the septic plan with a backup septic system.
- e) No
- f) No
- g) None

5. Impact on Flooding - No Ye

- a) No
- b) No
- c) No
- d) Small mitigated through the stormwater management plan.
- e) No
- f) No
- g) None

6. Impacts on Air - No Yes

7. Impacts on Plants and Animals - No Yes

- a) No,
- b) No
- c) No
- d) No
- e) NA

- f) No
- g) No to small
- h) No
- i) No.
- 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 , not in the Ag district.
- b) Small
- c) Small, the property is located in the IRO district and only a small portion of the 30 acres is being developed. Member Marshall commented that cumulatively it could impact land nearby. Member Kasper commented that the applicant intends to keep the agricultural use on a portion of the land. Mr. Brodsky suggested that the cumulative impacts does not fit in the context of this question and should be addressed in a different section.
- d) 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. The land could be reclaimed if all of the development was removed and replaced with topsoil.
- e) No
- f) Small, the town has designated development in this area over the years through the comprehensive plan and zoning.
- g) No
- h) None

9. Impacts on Aesthetic Resources - **No** **Yes**

- a) No
- b) No
- c) i. small, no designated vantage points.
ii. small
- d) No to small. The applicant provided photos demonstrating the height of the building in relationship to the surrounding area. Directly across the road is Hill-Rom, an industrial building and the proposed hotel will have a residential style. All members except Member Marshall commented that the impact was small.
- e) No
- f) No to small. Hill-Rom is within 0 to .5 miles.
- g) No, the cumulative impact to the area in the future is not under the control of the applicant. Member Marshall said that the project could have a cumulative impact on the aesthetics. Mr. Bouchard stated that if there were two projects occurring in the area at the same time you could compare them; however, it should not be compared to non-existent projects in the environmental review. Member Kasper commented that the applicant does not own the surrounding lands to be able to comment on future development.

10. Impacts on Historic and Archeological Resources - **No** **Yes**

- a) No
- b) No to small, due diligence with SHPPO approval and it is delineated on the site plan. SHPPO has rules that they will follow pre and post construction.
- c) No
- d) No

11. Impacts on Open Space and Recreation - **No** **Yes**

- a) Small, mitigated by stormwater management plan.
- b) No
- c) No

- d) No
- e) No.

12. Impacts on Critical Environmental Areas - No Yes

13. Impacts on Transportation - No Yes

- a) No to small
- b) No
- c) No
- d) No.

Member Hamlin inquired about the shuttle bus plan. Mr. Bouchard stated that the shuttle bus would be used in connection with the hotel. It would be used for known events, a function at the Lodge, a function in the village or when there is full occupancy of the hotel to take guests to the village. It would not be an individual taxi service.

14. Impacts on Energy - No Yes

- a) a, No
- b) b. No
- c) c. No
- d) d. No, proposed 57,000SF building
- e) e. No

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

- a) No
- b) No
- c) No
- d) No, night sky compliant lights and photoelectric plan has been submitted.
- e) No
- f) No

16. Impacts on Human Health - No Yes

17. Consistency with Community Plans - No Yes

- a) No to Small
- b) No
- c) No
- d) No
- e) No
- f) No

g) Small, Counsel Molnar read from the NYSDEC guidelines that a project could foster growth, is precedent setting such as a zoning change, or encroached on an area of open space. Mr. Camp said that this question is asking whether this project will spur growth that the town has not planned for, utilities cannot support, or road network cannot support. Member Kasper said that he has concerns with the intersections on the road. Mr. Camp suggest that the board look at hard data to determine the traffic conditions of the roads. Chairman Southern commented that it may spur development although not to any large degree. If additional development would occur it is in an appropriate area of the town. Member Hamlin said that the two developments together could cause more development pressure than just this one. Member Marshall said that hotels induce secondary development. Counsel Molnar continued reading from the NYSDEC guidelines will the development foster additional residential or commercial development in the future. Chairman Southern commented that the town would have to look at how much commercial development would be permitted in the town. Counsel Molnar continued saying that there are additional bullet points in the analysis, will the project induce additional land uses in the area in the future, will the public infrastructure be established for future growth to take advantage of, was a zoning change needed for the project that would set a new precedent for future growth in the area, is the project located in an undeveloped area in the community that could become a target for growth in the

future. A small impact would be that additional development could occur but road and other infrastructure, schools, etc are all below capacity and there will no expansion of infrastructure necessary. There may be a need for additional studies to determine how much how much additional growth could occur and this information may not be available in part 1. The reviewing agency could request this if needed, if the possibility or the existing community capacity could not accommodate induced growth, the reviewing agency should include impact of induced growth as a potential moderate or large impact. Moderate to large impact would occur if the project induces growth at a level that requires additional infrastructure, community services, at a density or type of land use that changes the community character. Member Kasper said that the hotel is being built because of Hill-Rom, Sinclair and other places like that. Mr. Camp stated that growth has been planned in the area for a long time in both the comprehensive plan and the zoning code. Member Kasper said that in other words, if the land was not zoned IRO it would be a large impact. Chairman Southern commented that there are restrictions on it that will tamper the development. All member except Member Marshall said the impact was small.

h) None

18 Consistency with Community Character - No Yes

a) No

b) No

c) No

d) No

e) Small

f) No to small

g) Moderate to Large, Member Marshall said that there will be a cumulative impact that could be moderate to large impact. The comprehensive plan references it to preserve and enhance the town's rural and agrarian land, enhance the gateways and it mentions that corridor. It could change the character of that gateway. Chairman Southern commented that Hill-Rom set the bar when it came to changing the gateway for that area. Member Winkelman stated that the fear of the community was for the typical chains would come in and effect could change the character of the community. Member Kasper commented that he could see another hotel coming in, although Skaneateles is a tourism town with the village getting busier and they are pushing tourism causing the town to grow. Chairman Southern stated that the comprehensive plan is pushing development towards the northern end of town away from the lake. Member Kasper reiterated that the hotel will spur growth. Chairman Southern agreed and said that there are restraints in place including no trademark architecture.

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 board must decide if an environmental impact statement is required or whether available information is sufficient for the lead agency to conclude whether the proposed action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact. The lead agency will need to identify the impact based on the part 2 responses; the magnitude considering factors such as severity, size or extent of the impact; assess the importance of the impact as it relates to geographic scope, duration probability of the impact occurring, number of people impacted by the project and any additional environmental consequences if the impact were to occur. The assessment should take into consideration any design element or project changes.

The only question that was answered yes was question 18g for the cumulative impact to rural community. Member Winkelman commented that this development could open the door to chain development. Chairman Southern said that the proposed hotel is not chain development. Member Kasper said that it is a large hotel and that even if you do not put Hilton on top of it, it does not mean that it is not a chain. He continued saying that the impact is that it could cause further development. Member Marshall said that it will increase pressure for services. Counsel Molnar reviewed the criterion saying that magnitude such as size or extent of impact based on the specific environmental setting where the activity is proposed, the type of resource being impacted, and on the values, history and preferences of the community. For many of the proposed projects, the impacts can be or are mitigated by changes to certain project components.

Member Kasper said that the magnitude of the impact is not with the hotel as it is just the beginning of it. Member Winkelman said that it is a small beginning as the impact is small right now. The duration is permanent. Counsel Molnar stated that the next category to be considered is the likelihood of a negative impact on the community character, that the proposed project is inconsistent with the community character. Member Winkelman commented that the hotel will be built and managed by a private entity and has the potential to be a unique building and a unique business in the community that could actually add to the character of the community as long as it is not done as a typical box hotel. Member Kasper said that there would be development pressure maybe not another hotel. Chairman Southern agreed and asked if that is not what we want in this district. Member Marshall said that there are a lot of ways to develop an industrial area and the increase for development pressure is real. Chairman Southern inquired if it is an undesirable pressure. Counsel Molnar reminded the board that they should also consider probability in determining significance or magnitude, duration and likelihood. Member Marshall said that it is a high likelihood that it will increase pressure. Member Hamlin commented that we look at projects on a case-by-case review, and continued saying that at some point there will be a tipping point. Member Kasper commented that they are concerned now. Mr. Camp suggested that the concern of the tipping point be elaborated. Chairman Southern said too many hotels, too many restaurants. Counsel Molnar said that the boards should stick to the factors of this application rather than being hypothetical. Member Marshall said that we have this zone where these uses are allowed, not exactly in the hamlet but adjacent to it. There could be things done to connect it to the hamlet and the comprehensive plan wants us to maintain our gateways. She continued saying that this project, even though it is in the proper zone, could put a lot of pressure on deteriorating the gateway and the agricultural resources. Member Hamlin commented that it could also put pressure on improving it. Member Winkelman said that it is going where we want it in the IRO district.

Mr. Camp inquired on the project and the maximum density allowed for the area. Mr. Brodsky stated that from a mathematical measurement, the impermeable surface coverage is low. Using that as an indicator, it is a light effect. He continued saying that there will always be some adverse response because people do not like change and that the board has tools to respond to the change. The zoning code could be amended in the future if the town determines that development needs to be restricted in the zone. Counsel Molnar commented that the board determining if there would be a cumulative effect and the board deliberation is whether or not that is a significant environmental impact. The board can explain where the impact has been identified moderate to large or where there is a need to explain where there is a particular element will not or may result in a significant or adverse environmental impact. Applying tools to mitigate include change to zoning in the future but also your present regulatory controls available to the Planning Board, the ZBA and Town Board, including the special permit criteria, findings, and understanding your applicant to be code compliant in all of their dimensional requirements and otherwise design the project to conform to chapter 148. Member Hamlin said that if the board determines that the significance is an adverse environmental impact, we would then be charged with asking the applicant to mitigate it. Member Kasper said that this project is the start of more projects to come. Member Winkelman said that it could also set a precedent for good design, good stormwater management, and energy efficiency.

Member Hamlin said that there is no way the applicant could mitigate our concern. Member Marshall said that the project is still increasing the pressure. Counsel Molnar commented that it may or may not represent an adverse environmental impact is the question the board needs to answer. Mr. Brodsky recommended that a mitigation tool is the present regulatory controls available to the Planning Board through the special permit and site plan review and future zoning code changes that could be made with the Town Board. All members except Member Marshall agreed that the present regulatory controls available to the Planning Board provide mitigation for any adverse environmental impact.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Chairman Southern, 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	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[No]

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Hamlin 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	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]

Counsel Molnar recommended that the board review and determine whether box A or box B should be checked. Box A reads, This project will result in no significant adverse impacts on the environmental impact and therefore an environmental impact statement need not be prepared. Accordingly, this negative declaration is used. Box B reads, although this project could have a significant adverse impact on the environment, that impact will be avoided or substantially mitigated because of the following conditions, which will be required by the lead agency. Based on the discussion, there are no conditions that would need to be met to warrant checking box B.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman the Planning Board checked off box A, issuing a negative declaration.

Member Winkelman recapped that a conditional negative declaration the applicant would not need to an environmental impact statement but they would have to take into consideration of the discussion. It was determined that the applicant cannot react to any of the conditions as the concern is a town wide character of the community concern. Counsel Molnar stated that the board can employ its resources to mitigate the potential negative impact on character of the community due to pressure by utilizing the tools in chapter 148 for major special permit and site plan approval including findings of fact. Member Winkelman agreed saying that the applicant is aware of the concerns on the board.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

At this time, Chairman Southern continued the public hearing and began taking comments from those in the audience that had requested to speak. All written correspondence received have been placed in the record and reviewed by the board.

Dessa Bergen, 1448 Old Seneca Turnpike, said that the discussion the board had on points 17 and 18 are her concerns as to character, tipping point and where the town is going. The vision of the comprehensive plan is that we are a small rural town. The historic character and ambience of the village and its role as a commercial and public center of the life of the village and town. We will lose the agricultural areas and landscapes throughout the town. This is the beginning and what bothers her is the scale of 88 rooms. In any month besides July and August, the village is wide open with no parking problem and there is no one in town. You could send a cannon down there and no one would notice. How is the 88-room hotel going to sustain itself in winter. We have two months of good season that is it. The scale of an 88-room hotel would initiate the beginning of the Lake George effect in Skaneateles creating a new center outside of the village. Excessive lodging would encourage excessive capital ventures. There is lodging five minutes from Hill-Rom and 15 minutes to the west. Hill-Rom said that 550 people visit their staff, which is 22 people on a business day. Maybe Tessy Plastics needs rooms but it does not equal 88 rooms. It is next to a residential area. Lodging facility in the IRO is a special permit and not permitted by right. She submitted a letter from CPCS that was in the Skaneateles Press.

Ed Frank, 946 Mottville Road, has talked to a bunch of people on Mottville Road that have problems with their basements with water. The septic field will be sitting on top of the hill behind his house and he is not familiar with how it will be aerated. The driveway concerns him, when he at his driveway he can see the crest of the hill with all of the traffic going up and down the hill. There is an opportunity to move the driveway to the east away from the two neighbors that are there. They protected the neighbors on Old Seneca Turnpike and they need to consider that. Tom and Norm want to talk, well talking is easy this is the thought part. He was against the building initially, but if it is approved will the building be commensurate to the area similar to the Lodge in architecture. It is critical to the character of the town, characteristic to the warehouse across the street, which is fairly nice.

Becky Heberle, 968 Mottville Road, had handed out the SHPPO map last month and said that it was not mentioned tonight. She asked if any consideration has been taken with the driveway going up as the testing was not done. It has to be every 50 feet. There were artifacts found and the area has to stay clear. If the driveway consistently goes to the west of the property, and the map needs to be reviewed. She is hoping to hear something positive about that. The drainage off the driveway that would go into the existing system, and asked what the system was as the water rushed down the street carrying all the trash that the Hill-Rom people throw from their parking cars on the street while they are smoking. It has flooded more than once over her driveway. The County has come out a couple of times after she has called. The markers on the road were there less than 24 hours before the plows took them out. She tried making a left out of her driveway twice last week in the middle of the day and she had to wait several minutes because of the traffic coming out of Hill-Rom. If the driveway were moved to the other side of the Hill-Rom entrance, it would help tremendously to the people coming out the hotel driveway. There is a lot of traffic already. This could still become a chain, it could be sold and become a chain.

Colleen Frank, 946 Mottville Road, the last two Woodbine projects, one went to Hilton and the other to Best-Western. That is there mo., 100%. There is a half a dozen houses on the base of Mottville near Jordan Road that have continual flooding problems and the fire department can attest to that. When a huge expansive hotel and parking on top of the hill, it is a U shaped area with Mottville, Old Seneca, and Jordan Roads, water is going to roll downhill. She cannot believe it is not going to affect houses. Everyone is comparing our area to Hill-Rom and they built a brand new house five years ago, she is comparing it to a neighborhood. This will affect the 80 houses on those three streets. The driveway is there to connect with Hill-Rom. There are smokers on the street and it is very dangerous. The 200 people can come out of the Lodge Friday and Saturday, with some intoxicated, scoot over Mottville Road and up the driveway. The driveway looks like a road. The other issue is that Hill-Rom has electrical issues in the summer and they have to run their generators when it is really hot. They would like that electrical line to run down the driveway right across so that they can have better electrical. That is the deal being made. There are 80 homes we are not Hill-Rom.

Bob Eggleston, 3441 Rickard Road, has submitted written comments previously. He complimented that applicant on breaking up some of the parking with green space, fire access and alternative parking. It shows that they are responding to some of the comments. He disagrees that his suggested alternative location for the driveway is not a better way to go. There are strip crops here because the area is steep. Bringing the driveway around is a better solution and should be explored. There will be a lot land that would be fragmented with their plan. There is a lot of development potential with the driveway location he has suggested. 88 hotel rooms in the village would be disastrous and it belongs here in the IRO district. The community need a more affordable kind of housing for transient lodgers whether it was for Hill-Rom's 5,000 work guests to accommodate or tourists. The event centers have 100 people coming to them and this would be an excellent addition. The hotel should be beautiful, chains can be beautiful if designed appropriately commensurate with the Lodge.

Charles Cargile, 3905 Gully Road, inquired why they could not go up to Old Seneca Turnpike so that you are not splitting up the farmland and not driving up the hillside. You could go left or right off Old Seneca Turnpike and not congest the right in front of the plant.

Holly Gregg, 3872 Jordan Road, said that he had sent a letter to the Press and the boards. It is the board's discretion to approve the permit. The board has the power and ability to say not now. He would like to board to take a time out now. There is a committee studying the zoning area and the comprehensive plan in the northern hamlets for the past several months before Woodbine stepped forward. The board and applicant have done a phenomenal job but there is no rush on this. The size of the IRO area is overwhelming especially in comparison to the hamlet size. Where the tipping point as the map is indicates a ton of open space for potential growth. We probably will not hit the tipping point until we have eight hotels up there. Maybe the IRO should be shrunk to control growth. The committee is working on this and the County has granted \$80,000 to work on this. We could bring in Joel Russell to look at this and present a picture of what it would look like fully developed. He would like to call a time out, do the study to imagine what it will look like. The tipping point is very vague with someday. The thing is the board will get a proposal and is that going to be the tipping point and if it is we can't say no because we have not changed the zoning. Now is the time to design it including the gateway and build something that would yield a beautiful gateway area.

The board discussed the possibility of closing the public hearing and determined that they would like to keep it open as they work through additional aspects of the proposal.

Guy Donahoe, 4503 NW Townline Road, said that the applicant has done a poor job addressing the concerns that board has expressed tonight. He recommended that the public hearing remain open until the issues are addressed and the public can respond.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Marshall and seconded by Member Winkelman to continue the public hearing on Tuesday, *March 17, 2020*. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Mr. Bouchard stated that he wanted to keep the public hearing open as well to continue to obtain feedback from the public. He continued saying that he could not find the SPHPPO map that Becky had but a report was submitted to the town that has a map in it. Member Winkelman inquired if it included the driveway. Mr. Bouchard said that it has the driveway included in it. They have also looked at her culvert and the culvert size is different from hers so that could be an issue. The owner is trying to reach out to her.

The proposed driveway is in a proposed easement and he will address the alternative driveway option with Hill-Rom. The location of the driveway on Mottville Road is still more appropriate than having access off Old Seneca Turnpike. Member Marshall inquired if the driveway could be off Old Seneca. Member Kasper said that the driveway would have to be longer and the area is wetter. Mr. Camp stated that it there will be a benefit to having it in the proposed location because the driveway may cut off a lot of drainage that goes down Mottville Road. Member Winkelman suggested that it should be considered when looking at all of the driveway options. Mr. Brodsky recommended that consideration should be given for the driveway location centered with the Hill Rom driveway. Chairman Southern reminded that there is a creek there. Member Winkelman said that there is a lot of concern on drainage but the proposed drainage improvements can make it better than the existing drainage.

Mr. Bouchard recapped that he will be addressing four points- the pedestrian trail connection to Mottville Road; the stormwater review to make sure the drainage does not go backwards toward the other way of the hill. There may be a widening or separation and requested for Mr. Camp to provide a professional opinion on the drainage plans. Member Winkelman said that the wetlands could be enhanced as it is at the top of a watershed. The water that is flooding a basement is not water that is running from a creek but rather wet ground. There is a creek that runs through those houses on Mottville Road. The driveway review and the last point is the architecture. The architect that designed the building met bullet points that they thought would fit a rural setting. It includes a barn gable pitch roof, lap siding and stone foundation around the base of the building. Mr. Camp commented that the architecture would not be visible from any of the roads. Member Winkelman said that it will be a big box and you will not be able to see the stones. Mr. Brodsky suggested that the exterior should be broken up so that it is not so boxy. Member Marshall said that it does not look like an agricultural building. Mr. Bouchard said that he has looked at a Country Inn Suites that is a true box hotel that have flat roofs with mechanical equipment on them. They have very futuristic colors with different shapes and window styles. The proposed hotel is made to be residential in character with accents like post and beam construction. Member Marshall said that it is better than those are but it could be better. Mr. Bouchard said that it is difficult to go back to the designer and tell him to improve it but without any additional input. Member Marshall says it goes back to community character and it is all under that. Member Kasper said that maybe barn doors are added. Mr. Bouchard said that they did the fake timber framing. Mr. Brodsky said that there is a provision about blank walls. Mr. Bouchard said that they are all broken vertically and horizontally. Mr. Brodsky inquired if there was a way to make the structure less massive instead of the big H. Mr. Bouchard explained the big H as the rooms are on each wing and the center is the common area where you come together and have the lobby, seating areas, and below is the pool. The two separated wings are the quiet spaces with the internal space where everyone is coming together. The H shape gives everyone windows and the entrance with covered

walkway. Mr. Brodsky said that it might turn out that you keep the design but there will be documentation that you have explored it. Mr. Bouchard stated that the proposed design does break up the flat walls with bump outs and textural difference. Member Marshall said that the architects could be more creative and shared a picture of a Fairfield Inn that looks like a barn. Mr. Bouchard stated that the hotel pictured is too tall to fit within the 35 foot height maximum. Member Kasper said that the only sides visible would be the northern and eastern sides. Mr. camp said that you may not even see that.

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 10:19 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull, Clerk