

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
September 20, 2016**

Mark J. Tucker, Chairman
Joseph Southern
Donald Kasper
Scott Winkelman
Douglas Hamlin
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel
John Camp, P.E. (C&S Engineers)
Howard Brodsky, Town Planner
Karen Barkdull, Clerk/Secretary

Chairman Tucker opened the meeting at 7:30 p.m. and welcomed our newest member, Doug Hamlin. The meeting minutes of August 16, 2016 were previously distributed to the Board and all Members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Winkelman to approve the minutes as corrected. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion. Members Southern and Hamlin abstained from the vote.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Mark J. Tucker	[Yes]
Member	Joseph Southern	[Abstain]
Member	Donald Kasper	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	[Abstain]

The meeting minutes of August 21, 2016 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 Southern to approve the minutes as submitted. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion. Members Kasper and Hamlin abstained from the vote.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Mark J. Tucker	[Yes]
Member	Joseph Southern	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	[Abstain]
Member	Scott Winkelman	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	[Abstain]

Sketch Plan-Subdivision

Applicant:

Russel Zechman
PO Box 9
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Property:
3741 Fisher Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #033.-04-14.0 & 12.0

Present: Russel Zechman, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Architect

Mr. Zechman owns an .82-acre parcel with a dwelling on it on Fisher Road in the RR district and IRO district. The second lot is an 11.48-acre parcel with an accessory apartment, several storage buildings and 15FT of road frontage on Fisher Road. The larger parcel also has an abandoned airstrip with ponds and ditches to control drainage from the airstrip. Both properties have public water and are serviced by separate septic systems.

A lot line relocation is being considered to increase the size of the residential lot (lot A) to 3.69 acres with the larger lot (lot B) reduced to 8.61 acres. Lot A will have the residence, accessory apartment/repair shop and storage building, a shed, and two ponds. The driveway easement would become 30 feet wide with the southern half of the driveway easement part of the lot A.

An open space subdivision is being requested on Lot B for three residential lots varying in size from 1 acre to 1.22 acres, and a 5.21 acre conservation lot located at the west of the property that includes a pond area and some steep slope areas. The non-buildable portion of the conservation lot cannot be more than 25% of the total acreage, and proposed is only 15% non-buildable portion of the total acreage. The conservation area will also include a portion of the 30 foot driveway easement and hammerhead turnaround. The 30 foot driveway easement will serve the three residential lots and the accessory apartment located on lot A.

The conservation lot will be a separate deeded lot that will be restricted to be owned by one of owners of the three created lots. There will be no HOA but there will be a driveway easement agreement so that the four property owners will share in the responsibility and maintenance of the driveway.

Mr. Eggleston commented that a conservation analysis is required in an open space subdivision, and based on the last conversation with the Planning Board, the analysis was completed by the project architect. The conservation analysis prepared is included in the narrative and covered existing land use, steep slopes, farmland, wildlife habitat, wetland buffers, watercourse, and the view shed.

The property is in the IRO district that extends on the property in the southwest. These properties are large agricultural or vacant lots growing to natural succession. The adjacent properties to the north and east are in the RR district and are made up of residential lots that are 0.5 and 1.5 acres in size and have single family dwellings. The applicant's lot B is 11.51 acre mixed use lot with an abandoned airstrip on it. The owner also has an .87 acre residential lot located in the RR district.

Lot B has no steep slopes over 30% grade. A section of steep slope between 12% and 30% exists on the back half of the property that runs east to west, 35FT wide at its widest point, and

13,058SF in area. A smaller 2,896SF area with slopes between 12% and 30% that is less than 30FT wide is along the north pond and is not regulated by Town zoning. There are no significant steep slopes area of high conservation value and limited areas of moderate conservation value.

Lot B has no farmland and the eastern half has an abandoned airstrip, and is developed with mixed use buildings. The western half of the lot is vacant land in natural succession with more mature trees at the southwest corner that supports native wildlife. The southern corner of the property is actively farmed and the land to the west is vacant natural land that is contiguous to larger tracts of vacant land. The western half of the lot has high conservation value for wildlife habitat and being adjacent to farmland.

The lot is not visible from Fisher Road or Old Seneca Turnpike as it is surrounded by hedgerows and is relatively low sloping land. There are limited views from the property on the other lands mostly of the western half of the property. The property has low conservation value for view shed.

Lot B has three ponds and several drainage ditches that were constructed to support the airstrip. There are no wetlands and the adjacent property has no wetlands or watercourses. Drainage for the lot flows to the west; the ponds have high conservation value and the ditch on the western portion of the property has moderate conservation value. There is a gas line easement that bisects the lot with the land to the west of the gas line having high conservation value while the land to the east of the gas line easement having moderate conservation area. The northeast corner of the property has low conservation value as it is surrounded by residential lots.

The application also includes a request for a special permit for the three newly created lots to allow residential single family use on the lots as Lot B is located in the IRO district. The conservation lot would provide a buffer to the lots located to the west that are in the IRO district. The three new residential lots will have a 30FT ROW driveway that will provide access to the lots.

Member Winkelman inquired about the amount of water that enters the ponds. Mr. Eggleston commented that the ponds were installed to drain the air field. Mr. Zechman commented that there is very little water in them. Chairman Tucker commented that at the last site visit there seemed to be some seepage of water running steady. Mr. Camp stated that there was some water running into the ponds. Mr. Zechman commented that there is a ditch heading to the pond. Mr. Eggleston stated that there is a ditch that runs along the steep slope area that handles the local water on the lot.

Member Winkelman inquired on the future plans of the conservation lot. Mr. Eggleston commented that there is a standard for the limited uses for the conservation lot that would be followed. It could be used for passive recreation. A potential buyers for lot B3 could let their kids use the conservation lot for recreation.

Member Kasper inquired on the original lot line relocation, there are three driveways feeding that property. Mr. Eggleston stated that Fisher Road is the driveway access for Lot A. The 30' driveway to the north of lot A will serve the three new lots and the accessory apartment. Mr. Kasper commented that Lot A's garage also accesses the 30FT easement. Mr. Eggleston commented that it is out of convenience, and that the residential driveway off Fisher Road has been extended to the garage for access.

Member Kasper inquired on the newly created lots B1 and B2, why the side yard setbacks are only 10FT as the lots are in a rural setting. Mr. Eggleston stated that under the open space subdivision guidelines, setbacks can use the hamlet standards. Based on his experience with the Butters Farm subdivision, he uses the hamlet setbacks to provide maximum flexibility. Mr. Brodsky commented that the setbacks can be modified. Member Kasper commented that the subdivision is in a rural setting and you could have two garages twenty feet from each other. Mr. Eggleston commented that it is not necessarily a rural setting as there are less than one acre properties in the area; he would not characterize it as rural but a small residential neighborhood.

Member Kasper commented that more than likely the properties will have raised bed septic systems based on the water on the property. Mr. Zechman commented that they have not been given the information regarding the testing that has occurred and that they need to still do the testing on the third lot. Mr. Eggleston stated that they would like to put the septic systems in on the low end so that they are gravity fed.

Member Hamlin inquired if the applicant will be allowed to build in the steep slope areas. Mr. Eggleston stated that one of the conflicts in the zoning law is that 12% to 30% buildable land area is restricted from building structures, anything but walk paths and steps on greater than 30% slopes. In this application it is classified as non-buildable for the conservation classification. Member Winkelman stated that in the lake watershed and near a ravine, it would have more conservation value. Chairman Tucker inquired on the length of the driveway to the most westerly lot. Mr. Zechman stated that length of driveway is 770FT. Mr. Eggleston commented that it is under the 800FT for private roads.

Mr. Camp inquired about the storm water management plan for the subdivision. Mr. Eggleston stated that they would follow Mr. Camp's advice on it. They have minimal disruption for the road going in. The existing ponds service any runoff from the area and the old airstrip. Member Kasper commented that the driveway will be where the old airstrip is located so that will be less disturbance. Mr. Eggleston stated that there will be very minimal disturbance.

Mr. Brodsky inquired about the calculations for the open space subdivision as it appears to be limited to lot B and does not include Lot A, and there is no HOA. Mr. Eggleston stated that that observation was true. Mr. Brodsky commented that the accessory apartment and an existing residence are still tying into the common driveway, which is essential for this open space subdivision. Mr. Eggleston stated that they will be part of the driveway agreement. Mr. Brodsky queried if there was a possibility to eliminate the driveway connection from lot A to the 30' common driveway or eliminating the driveway from Fisher Road. Mr. Eggleston stated that the driveway from Fisher Road is the primary driveway for Lot A that will be expanded to the garage. Mr. Zechman stated that there is existing run of crush to the garage that is used for storage of the mowers and other items. He continued stating that a fence could be put in to block access to the common driveway. Mr. Eggleston stated that in order to store a boat in that garage, it would be easier to approach the garage from the common driveway to store the boat than winding around the existing dwelling from the Fisher driveway. He continued stating that only four dwellings are allowed on a private driveway.

Mr. Brodsky inquired how many apartments are located in the garage building, and the likelihood that it could become its own principal dwelling. Lot A is not allowed to have two single family homes as it does not meet the density requirements of four acres, but the garage building can have an accessory apartment under 1000SF by right. Mr. Brodsky recommended

that the Board re-visit the site as it has been over a year since the last site visit, and the conservation analysis could be validated at the site visit.

Mr. Brodsky commented that there is no HOA regarding the conservation lot and easement, and inquired if there has been any thought on creating a HOA. Mr. Eggleston stated that if the conservation lot and lot 3 were one large lot, then there would be a reduction in the size of the building envelope even further, limiting the development of the size of a double wide trailer. Functionally it makes sense to be part of the same lot; however, there is a dis-incentive the way the code is written to have one large lot.

Member Kasper commented that most of the new land is in the IRO. Mr. Eggleston stated that all of the land in Lot B with the exception of the 15' access strip is in the IRO. Member Winkelman commented that they would be allowed to have 30% impermeable surface coverage, but 15% on the overall subdivision. He continued stating that Lot A has 27.1%, although in the RR district the maximum is 10%. Mr. Eggleston commented that he will need to verify the calculations. Member Winkelman stated that the application is for 30% impervious coverage on a one acre lot and that defeats the conservation. Mr. Eggleston explained that it is 15% coverage on the entire subdivision. Member Winkelman commented that the conservation land compensated for the 30% impervious coverage on the buildable lots. Mr. Eggleston stated that it is similar to Butters Farm that allows 20% impervious coverage on the developed lots because of the open space land that is left unimproved. Mr. Brodsky stated that under dimensional table #3, the impermeable surface coverage in the RR district is 15% and in the IRO is 30%. He has a higher base to work with based on the zone district.

Mr. Camp inquired if the B lots are within a water district. Mr. Eggleston stated that they are in a water district and have access to public water. Mr. Camp stated that a public waterline would need to be built along the shared driveway. Mr. Zechman stated that a fire hydrant will also need to be installed at the end of the driveway. Mr. Eggleston stated that the intent was to bring a six inch line through and connect a hydrant at the end. Mr. Camp stated that the applicant will need to petition the Town Board for permission to do that. Member Kasper inquired if the water pressure has been tested. Mr. Eggleston stated that they have testing from down the road. A site visit will be conducted on October 1, 2016 with the Board beginning at 9 am at the Austin Pavilion.

Public Hearing –Special Permit/Site Plan Review-WITHDRAWN

Applicant:

Christine Daly	Property:
5891 Bennetts Corner Rd	1945 Stump Rd
Camillus, NY 13031	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Tax Map #020.-04-04.1

The applicant has withdrawn the application and no further action will be taken,

Sketch Plan-Special Permit/Site Plan Review

Applicant:

Deborah Delaney
2796 West Lake Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #057.-01-10.2

Present: Andy Ramsgard, Architect

The Delaneys recently acquired the property at 2796 East Lake Road. The proposal is for the relocation of the existing shoreline steps to the new location at the existing deck that is further north. New landscaping with a limestone boulder retaining wall will be installed. The existing wood stairs climb down and around to the existing wood deck that leads to the existing shoreline structure. The landscaping at the shoreline is overgrown and would be replaced with step terraces.

As they went to take photographs today, it was noted that an old stone step stairway had been abandoned and was hidden by the plant growth. There is a gate in the middle of the lawn that will be moved north to correspond with the new location of the steps. The fence will remain in its location. There is an existing small wood retaining wall will be removed and then stone and quarry rocks will be located, The rocks will be from 2.5 to 3 feet long, and there will be some grade disturbance with the area being 12-20feet in length. Chairman Tucker inquired if a cross section will need to be provided for review. Mr. Camp stated that a cross section will need to be provided to show how the area will be built. Most of the rocks will be set on grade. Mr. Ramsgard stated that the first ones in up to 4 to 6FT where a crib wall is that stops at the existing staircase. Chairman Tucker requested that a cross section be prepared and that Mr. Ramsgard work with Mr. Camp on what information is needed before the next meeting. Mr. Camp stated that there is a lot of proposed disturbance that a detailed cross section would help to clarify. A sit visit will be conducted on October 1, 2016. Mr. Ramsgard stated that the wood crib wall ends ambiguously at the crook and the intention is to keep as many trees as possible for privacy. Mr. Camp inquired if the work can be completed from the top of the bank, working from the south to the north. The existing gate and fence sections will be removed during construction. Chairman Tucker stated that the shoreline structures are over the 600SF allowed, this may be able to be reduced. Mr. Camp inquired how the proposed stone stairs will be set. Mr. Ramsgard stated that they will be natural stones cut and set with a garden feel. Member Winkelman inquired if the stones are permeable. Mr. Brodsky commented that it would depend how they were set. Mr. Ramsgard stated that the property impermeable surface coverage is within the guidelines as the prior property owner acquired additional property.

Informal Discussion

Applicant: Byrne Dairy
1 Eagle Drive`
Auburn, NY 13021

Property:
1387 East Genesee St
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #032.-03-29.0

Present: Christian Brunelle, Representative; Robert Eggleston, Architect

Byrne Dairy has been leasing the Kennedy Mobil property, that is now under contract, on East Genesee Street that consists of a 5.48 acre parcel with 244 feet of road frontage in the Highway Commercial Lake Watershed District. Proposed is the demolition of all buildings except the automobile detailing, and construction of a new Byrne Dairy store with relocated gasoline pumps.

The existing convenience store had received a special permit in 1996; the existing fueling station with three pumps and 6 fueling stations received a special permit in 1981; the car wash is a preexisting non-conforming use in the lake watershed; and the auto detailing received a special permit in 1998 and is a conforming use. The applicant would like to remove the nonconforming

car wash, and expand the fueling stations from 3 pumps to 4 pumps providing 8 fueling positions. The proposed store will be 4,232SF with a 30 foot porch facing Genesee Street and a 10 foot porch facing west. There will be 33 parking spaces located west and north of the store.

In section 148-12C(3) a nonconforming use can be expanded up to 500SF, and adding the extra pump increased the pump square footage by 405SF. The calculation for the square footage of the pumps is based on the gas island and the space occupied by a parked car for fueling. The existing square footage for the fueling filling is 1,131SF with the proposed 1,536SF, showing an increase of 405SF. Mr. Brodsky stated that they wanted to come up with a consistent way of measuring expansion, and inquired if the diesel fueling was being abandoned. Mr. Brunelle stated that the diesel station is incorporated with the 4 pumps proposed and will not be a separate area as originally discussed.

The existing underground storage tanks are located in the southeast corner of the property. When it rains the area floods as there is a high water table in the area. Proposed is the replacement and relocation of the underground storage tanks to the north of the proposed pump stations.

The building will be set further back from Genesee Street than the existing building. The two driveway cuts will be maintained for traffic flow, and there will be a proposed sidewalk to connect with other sidewalks as part of the eastern gateway plan. As a vehicle would pull into the property they would be able to turn left or right and go around the building with drive lanes 30 feet wide. Trees will be added to the front of the property and the applicant is willing to do any landscaping recommended by the Board. The existing septic system would be replaced with a new raised bed septic system located north of the building and dumpster enclosure. The dumpster will be enclosed and the design will coordinate with the main building. Night sky compliant LED lighting would be used with a lighting plan and analysis provided to the Board. The proposed open space would be 77.9% .

Mr. Camp commented that the site plan indicates that there will be one driveway feeding into the building, and that the stormwater plan is located on the high side of the property. Mr. Brunelle stated that although topography has not been provided yet, the area for the stormwater management is on the low side. Mr. Camp stated that on the other side of the property is a ditch. Mr. Brunelle stated that there is a ditch on the other side that is not on this property. He continued stating the he believes the low point is on the east side of the property. The west side of the property is parking for individuals who are not necessarily fueling their vehicle. Most of the delivery drivers will enter to the east of the building and then deliver on the north end of the building.

Mr. Camp commented that it is unusual that upon entering from the eastern driveway, you are right at the building and you have to make a decision to go either way. Mr. Brunelle stated that the existing condition is that you are 20 feet closer and have to make a decision to go to the pumps or go around. Mr. Camp commented that that is the goal right now as the destination is getting fuel. Mr. Brunelle stated that he doesn't have the study with him but most of the drivers will use this driveway to get to their destination. Mr. Brodsky stated that there is a fairly quick dead end that a driver would be facing when they turn in off the eastern driveway, and inquired if the building could be moved back further or a reduction in the size of the porch. Mr. Brunelle stated that the porch is for outdoor seating and the size could be reduced to be ten feet narrower. He continued stating that there is sixty-four feet from the ROW to the building; however the porch size could be reduced and the building could be shifted. Mr. Eggleston stated that moving

the building further back would be contradictory to the comprehensive plan that wants to get the buildings further up closer to the road. Mr. Camp stated that circulation-wise it is an odd layout.

Chairman Tucker commented that the wet area on the east is wet all of the time. Mr. Eggleston stated that there is a ditch there now. Mr. Camp inquired if that is where the watercourse comes under the road. Chairman Tucker commented that this is the location. Mr. Eggleston stated that water comes from across the road into the ditch which connects with the Kimball property. Mr. Camp stated that he thought he remembered that the water splits both ways when he was reviewing the former Bombard drainage plans.

Mr. Brunelle stated that the impermeable surface coverage will increase from the existing 20.2% to 22.1%, under the 30% maximum allowed. Mr. Brodsky inquired if the stormwater management system has been designed. Mr. Brunelle stated that it has not yet as this is an informal discussion to determine if the project is viable. He continued stating that the eastern corner is very wet and when it rains the driveway is under water.

Member Kasper inquired on the size of the fuel storage tanks. Mr. Brunelle stated that the existing fuel storage tanks are 10,000 gallon, 8,000 gallon, 2,000 gallon, and a 500 gallon tank; proposed are a 20,000 gallon and a 10,000 gallon tank. Member Kasper commented that the expansion should be viewed in terms of fuel storage, being in the watershed and not the pumps. Mr. Eggleston stated that the 5,000CF expansion is allowed. Mr. Camp suggested that the more practical approach is the fuel pumps as they have 3 pumps now and four pumps in the future.

Mr. Brodsky inquired if in previous conversation there was a discussion regarding having the doorway face the road. Mr. Brunelle stated that the lot is not wide enough. Mr. Eggleston stated is that you would only pick up twenty feet, if you remove the parking on the far west. Member Winkelman suggested that the traffic flow of the existing property can be observed at the site visit. Mr. Camp stated that the existing situation you are pulling right into the pumps and not forced with a decision. He inquired why someone would want to drive around the back of the building. Mr. Brunelle stated that deliveries and employees arriving or leaving to avoid congestion would use that path. He continued stating that they have studied driveways and circulation carefully as it is critical to their business. Mr. Eggleston stated that the proposal is a compromise as from a business standpoint you would want the pumps up front and the building behind, but with the comprehensive plan we want the building up front and pumps off to the side. Mr. Brunelle stated that most of their stores have the pumps up front and they have tried to comply with the comprehensive plan with this location.

Member Southern inquired what the setback is for the zone. Mr. Brunelle stated that the setback requirement is forty feet and the proposed building is sixty-four feet back. Member Kasper commented that he likes the idea of the porch and tables out front with ice cream. Member Winkelman commented that there will be sidewalks and there should be a nice little walk hashed marked across the lot to the building. Mr. Brunelle stated that they could do that.

Member Hamlin commented that the proposed building is three and a half times the existing building which will have three and a half times the impact to generate more traffic. Mr. Brunelle commented that there is no turning lane on Route 20 now but it may need to be considered. Chairman Tucker commented that NYSDOT does not like the turning lanes. Mr. Eggleston stated that you want a calming effect and slow down the traffic as they are starting to enter the Village. In the eastern gateway you do not want turning lanes but to slow people down, narrow up their perceptions and keep people from passing on shoulders.

Chairman Tucker inquired if the ditch will be filled in in the ROW. Mr. Brunelle stated that they probably will but it wouldn't be determined until they do topography of the lot. Mr. Camp commented that the ditch is most likely in the ROW. Mr. Brunelle stated that he would pull a State DOT permit for any work done in their ROW. Member Winkelman inquired if both Byrne Dairies would be maintained. Mr. Brunelle stated that their intention is to keep both Byrne Dairies as they are both doing well. Chairman Tucker commented that residents that live on the east side of Town find the location convenient and they do not have to travel through the Village for fuel.

Mr. Brunelle stated that the existing tanks were installed in 1995 and they would be replacing the tanks with state of the art tanks with monitoring systems. Mr. Eggleston commented that larger tanks are filled less often, and when the tanks are being filled is the time for potential issues. A site visit will be conducted on October 1, 2016.

Public Hearing –Special Permit/Site Plan Review

Applicant:	Geraldine Whitney	Property:
	5891 Bennetts Corner Rd	767 Sheldon Road
	Camillus, NY 13031	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		Tax Map #023.-01-15.0

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect

No one wished to have the public notice read. A site visit was conducted on August 6, 2016. The Onondaga County Planning Board stated that the sewage disposal plans should be approved by the OCDOH prior to approving the site plan and special permit in their resolution dated August 31, 2016.

There is an existing 939SF dwelling with two detached garages located on a 14,802SF lot in the IRO district. The concrete detached garage has been demolished and there is a watercourse that goes along the northwest border of the lot. Proposed is the removal of the second detached garage and construction of an attached garage that would be no closer to the watercourse than the existing garage. The back porch will be enlarged slightly, and the two bedroom house renovated. The property has a creek located to the west and the application meets to criteria for a nonconforming expansion and as such, no variances were required. A special permit is required for a residential use in the IRO district; however, the lot is small and not conducive to a commercial venture, and is located to other residential lots in the area.

The grade will be raised so that garage is not below the grade which will improve the visibility of Sheldon Road as a car is existing the property. The two bedroom house will remain a two bedroom house with approval received from OCDOH for the continued use of the existing septic system that consists for a septic tank and drywell. Silt fences have been placed on the property as the barn and garage have been removed.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Member Southern to consider the proposed action as a Type II SEQR action and not subject to SEQR review. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

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

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Member Scott Winkelman and seconded by Chairman Mark Tucker, 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, with the following 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. That the site plan 1 of 1 dated August 8, 2016, and Narrative dated August 1, 2016, prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be followed in all respects; and
3. That the Applicant shall obtain a foundation only permit and provide verification of structure conformance to setbacks, prepared by the Applicant's Architect, prior to issuance of the building permit for completion of the project.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Mark J. Tucker	[Yes]
Member	Joseph Southern	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	[Yes]

Member Winkelman recused himself as he is a relative of the applicant.

Public Hearing Continuance-Major Special Permit Site Plan Review

Applicant	Jonathan Cohan	
	Louisa Cohan	Property:
	241 Kenlyn Rd	3007 East Lake Rd
	Palm Beach, FL 33480	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		Tax Map #039.-01-15.0

Present: Jonathan & Louisa Cohan, Applicants; Robert Eggleston, Design Professional; John Langey, Attorney; David Lee, Contractor

Mr. Eggleston began addressing questions from last month's meeting that were unresolved that were focused on the grading plan and sequencing. There will be a little bit of grading over the septic fields that was satisfactory to OCDOH. Three or four wells will be removed in the area of

the tennis courts and they will be putting in a tertiary leach field in the north area of the property that is still in the design phase.

The phased grading plan, shows that the first phase includes the removal of the existing dwelling, and excavation for the tennis court with a base installed to create a staging area. As the project will occur over a few years, the staging area would be used for storage of materials. The area being disturbed is the demolition of the house and the area for the tennis court. The anticipated earthwork is 875CY of cut. The grading plan was analyzed by a civil engineering program, which determined that there will be 2,200CY of cut and the fill is 1,352CY. The structural fill, fill used such as gravel or stone for a base, will be 1,000CY as calculated by David Lee. The stockpile would be 1,875CY that would be from this phase and left over for future phases. There will be no general fill brought in for this phase.

Phase 2 for the project will include the foundation for the house and guest house, retaining walls installed around the future tennis court and to the south of the dwelling, internal work will be done on the boathouse, and begin grading work around the house. The net difference of cut and fill is 5,497CY, of which 1,038CY is the cut and the fill is 6,535CY. There is 1,875CY already stockpiled that will be used and about 2,650CY of structural fill, leaving a net import of 972CY of fill brought into the site. Chairman Tucker inquired as to how many truckloads this would entail. Mr. Camp stated that he had done some calculations and will discuss it later. Chairman Tucker commented that for the existing projects on East Lake Road, there have been a lot of truck traffic.

In the third phase, the driveway to the house from the road will be removed and installation of the driveway and around to the garage and lawn, then to the lower portion will occur. Site work will occur around the boat house. The net difference of cut and fill is 457CY, requiring only 7CY of non-structural fill to be imported. This phase would occur in spring/summer/and winter of 2018.

The final phase in spring 2019 is taking out the northern driveway and lake parking area that will be re-grassed, and the removal of the old guest house. There will be 120CY of cut that will be removed from the site. In comparison of a redeveloped lot versus a vacant lot, with a vacant lot the top soil would be removed and it would be stockpiled to the side. This lot has been redeveloped before and there is only six inches of topsoil, reducing the fill available to use. A new lot with a raise bed septic system will use 2500CY of fill coming in. This lot has an existing septic system. The Board seldom looks at the fill requirements of a site; the advantage of having a site where you need fill is that the construction manager can determine when the fill arrives. When a project has a detention pond there is a lot of fill that is removed from the site.

The property was redeveloped in the 1980s for the McDonalds, and impermeable surface coverage was not regulated. The existing sprawled out dwelling will be replaced with a compact house, and the proposed redesign of the property will reduce the impermeable surface coverage to 10%. Within 100 feet of the lake the impermeable surface coverage was 22% and this is being reduced to 4.2%. These changes are reducing the environmental impact of the property to the lake.

The existing McDonald house is a sprawling contemporary dwelling that will be replaced with a traditional style home that is more in keeping with Skaneateles. The existing McDonald house elevation change from the walkout basement to the crest of the prow was 38.3 feet of exposed house to the lake. The proposed house will be 32.9 feet, with the actual peak of the roof six feet

higher, the grade is being built up around it as there will be no exposed walk out basement. The profile of the McDonald house is massive with the proposed house being more compact. The garage will be located in the proposed dwelling that will be exposed on the side and have minimal exposure to the lake.

The change in grade by the lake is minimal as it will be just for the walking area from the upper level entry to the boathouse. Instead of the existing rock retaining walls and big pool areas, a gentle lawn area is being put back as it once was, and will be used as a stormwater absorption area. There will be fill and cut for the new tennis court area that will be set back into the ground so that there is no ten foot fence in the front yard. The guest house and storage bunker will be to the side of the tennis court area. From the road there will be very little perception that the tennis court is there.

The Lombardi cross section #2 shows the profile of the McDonald house with a lot more area exposed to the lake, whereas the proposed dwelling has a little extra height shown in the garage area. The proposed dwelling will be similar to many of the dwellings in the Town and along the lake with a classically designed stone and brick two story dwelling with a lawn in front of it. The width of the dwelling will be 140 feet with the existing dwelling 180 feet wide.

Chairman Tucker commented that the reduction in impermeable surface coverage to 10% is good as it has been a struggle with other properties. He continued stating that the dwelling is narrower however, it does have more height and is similar to other estates in Skaneateles. This site is appropriate for this type of dwelling. Member Hamlin inquired on the size of the lake frontage. Mr. Eggleston commented that it is approximately 400 lineal feet.

The Cohan property is twice as large as many in the neighborhood. The Shanley and Neumann properties have two story houses with lawns with areas built up. The Becks house is also a large dwelling on the property, and reflects the neighborhood.

Chairman Tucker requested that Mr. Camp provide his research concerning truck load capacity of fill. Mr. Camp stated that a ten wheeler has the capacity of 10-15CY of fill. At a 15 CY fill capacity, there would be 671 truckloads equating to 1342 truck trips round trip. At a 10CY fill capacity, there would be over 1,000 truckloads with a total of over 2,000 trips. 80% of the truck trips will occur in phase two as shown by the engineering calculation over the spring/summer/fall of 2017. Most of the reason for the fill is for the filling of the whole front yard and north of the pool area. From the bottom of the pool area to grade is almost 15 feet that would take a lot of fill. The existing topography is dynamic and the proposed topography will be more subdued. He continued stating that the existing house fits the topography and with the proposed dwelling the topography will be modified to fit the house.

Mr. Lee stated that there is a percentage of material that will be returning to the site that was removed in 1986. There was a tremendous amount of fill that was removed from the site with the construction of the McDonald site. The original house did sit up on a high point of the property. There is a tremendous amount of structural fill that would need to be brought in regardless of what is proposed at the site. Mr. Eggleston stated that the McDonald house fits the site because the site was modified to create the site. Mr. Camp stated that the sins of past do not change what has to happen now. Mr. Eggleston commented that the construction of the McDonald house was not done carefully with phasing as evidenced in the photos. He continued stating that the Cohan dwelling will be done carefully over a two year period and sometime projects like this are better phased. The owners want something that will be enduring and lasting; the house design was

done by Robert Sterns and the applicants have gone to great lengths to create a home to use for years to come. Mr. Lee stated that the house will last longer than 25 years. Mr. Eggleston stated that the McDonald house was nice for its era but it was not an enduring style. Member Kasper commented that it was not maintained.

Member Kasper commented that he likes the grade rolling up to the house instead of the scarring that was done with the existing house. Chairman Tucker commented that 2017 is when most of the material will be brought in. Mr. Eggleston stated that it would be an eight month period when the loads would be coming in. Mr. Brodsky inquired if the number of daily trips that it would equate to has been calculated. Mr. Eggleston stated that based on John's calculations it would be 4-5 loads a day on average during that phase. Mr. Camp inquired if the source of the fill has been established. Mr. Eggleston commented that they would be working with John Dudden who is adept on the coordination. He continued stating that three quarters of the fill is structural fill such as clay and gravel that will be coming from the gravel yard, etc. Of the 6,537CY of fill need only 972CY is generic fill. Mr. Camp stated that looking at phase two there is three times as much non-structural fill as structural fill. Mr. Eggleston commented that 1,872SF of generic fill is already stockpiled on site from phase one. Mr. Camp concluded that there will be twice as much non-structural as structural fill brought in during phase two.

Member Kasper inquired if the grade could be changed to reduce the amount of fill required. Mr. Eggleston stated that the house could be lowered with a walk out basement; however, this is not the desire of the applicant. Mr. Eggleston stated that the house location is in the optimal location and that they are mindful of the impermeable surface coverage of the property. The location of the house is in the approximate location of the existing house and the former Lombardi house, that sits on the crest of the sloping area. Mr. Camp stated that generally speaking, with any building project you try to alter the cut and fill ratio by raising or lowering the building.

Mrs. Cohan commented that the house could be placed closer to the lake. Mr. Cohan stated that they love the lake and are out on the boat all of the time, and they do not enjoy seeing the three story monoliths that are on the lake. They are not trying to overtax the roads with fill trucks, what they are trying to do is beautify the lake. They are trying to create a look that is more suitable and elegant to the area. They want it to be beautiful from the lake, and believe the house was moved further back some because they do not love it when you are on the lake and you just see a big three story house. They will do everything they can to accommodate the traffic but the end result will be a house that everyone can live with.

Member Southern stated that there is an end point to the truck traffic. Mr. Eggleston commented that David Lee has done projects around the lake for the last thirty years and understands the community, and he will control the site and make sure it is appropriate as possible. Chairman Tucker commented that it is too bad on the timing of this project in comparison to others that have recently happened that have removed fill. Chairman Tucker commented that his concern is with that many trucks on the road; however, he likes the layout with the long yards up to the house. Mr. Camp commented that the house could be lowered to reduce the amount of fill required and could be designed so that no importing of nonstructural fill would be required. Rather than moving everything on top you would move around what was there.

Member Kasper inquired if Mr. Camp could work with Rudy on it. Mr. Camp stated that Rudy did not do the grading plan but he could work with whomever. If the goal is to have a project with no importing or exporting material, there is almost always a way to do that. Member Kasper

commented that they could save thousands of dollars in fill. Mr. Camp commented that there is probably a quarter of a million dollars in fill for this project.

Mr. Eggleston commented that the is anxious on how this project got selected out as being over analyzed. There are probably a number of projects that have not been analyzed to this amount and there are other projects that have had this volume of trucks bringing in or taking out dirt. He continued stating that they have been over accommodating with a four phase grading plan and providing a lot of information. Mr. Camp commented that it would be hard to name a project that brought on a thousand truckloads of fill on site for a single residential project. Mr. Eggleston stated that it was never brought up with Lakelawn with what is happening on that site. Chairman Tucker commented that they didn't have much going in or out. Member Kasper commented that there are more trees coming in. Mr. Camp stated that there was very little earthwork at the Lakelawn project. Mr. Eggleston stated that there has been a ton of dirt taken out for the foundation of the house. Member Kasper commented that it is all on site. Chairman Tucker commented that there has been a fair amount that has been removed from the site, there was some grading, and a stockpile on the site.

Mr. Lee stated that he does not feel that this is something that has been counted in the past, so we don't necessarily have the data to compare this site to Lakelawn or some of the other sites we have done over the years. There will be a significant number of trucks coming on to the site regardless of the elevation of the dwelling. The structural fill is the preponderance of the fill required. Some of the fill is to fill in foundations that are being removed, which cannot be done with any other than the specified material.

Mr. Cohlan stated that the property has odd topography a bit like Moonraker, and they are restoring one of the most beautiful pieces of land back to where it belongs. You shouldn't penalize the community for the fact that years ago somebody attacked the property. The trade off for more trucks for awhile for the improvement of the land, and not be burdened from bad decisions before.

Mr. Langey stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals had done a thorough review of the waterfront structures, they commented extensively, and were very complementary to the design of the proposal. The applicant has brought the impermeable surface coverage to 10%, and there are a lot of positives that the applicant is bringing to the Board. To some degree we need to have a little bit of room from the Board to have the truck trips. Nothing has been established that the trucks will decimate anything. It is a temporary impact, we could limit the number of truckloads and still achieve what the applicant is trying to achieve we would love to do it. This will be a very nice project that will bring the property back to the way it used to be in terms of the original slope particularly from the house down to the lake. There will be some temporary impact that will not be significant impacts over a long period of time. The proposed phasing plan will mitigate the impact.

Member Kasper inquired what the elevation is from the road to the first floor of the house. Mr. Eggleston stated that the first floor elevation is slightly lower than the existing first floor elevation. Member Kasper commented that looking at the elevations of the properties to the north and south, the existing grade drops, so the proposal will have the elevations more level with the neighboring properties. Mr. Camp commented that there is a hole there right now and that is part of the reason there is so much fill required to achieve this grading plan. Member Kasper commented that the applicant is restoring the grade to what it was before. Member Southern stated that the Board should not worry about the trucks as it is a temporary situation.

They are bringing back more to the character of the neighborhood. Member Hamlin commented that having endured trucks when a big house was being constructed by his house, it does add up and a relief when it is over.

At this time, Chairman Tucker continued the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor of the project. No one spoke in favor of the project. Chairman Tucker asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition, or had any other comments. No one spoke in opposition or had any other comments.

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

Counsel Molnar recommended that the Board review the criteria for major project §148-16B and site plan review criteria §148-18D(1) to determine the findings prior to rendering their decision on the project. Mr. Eggleston commented that he had provided responses to the criteria in his submitted narrative. Counsel Molnar commented that the Board can take the responses into consideration when they make their review of the project considering the depth and breadth of the submission materials presented to the Board.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Southern and seconded by Chairman Tucker to review for compliance the criteria for Major Projects as listed under §148-16B. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

148-16B Major Projects

- (1) Will the Project comply with all provisions and requirements of this chapter and of all other local laws and regulations and will be consistent with the purposes of the land use district in which it is located, with the Comprehensive Plan and with the purposes of this chapter? Answer: Yes, there are no differences as the proposal fits in with the other houses in the area. The proposal complies with all other dimensional limitations and restrictions.
- (2) Will the Project result in the release of harmful substances or any other nuisances, nor cause excessive noise, dust, odors, solid waste or glare? Answer: Although there will be disturbance to the neighbors in the area during construction, the truck traffic will end within the three year construction phases and is not a problem as it will be temporary in nature. The benefits of the proposal are substantial as it will restore the property to its former condition and grading.
- (3) Will the Project adversely affect the general availability of affordable housing in the Town? Answer: No, this is a proposal for residential lot development.
- (4) Will the Project cause undue traffic congestion, unduly impair pedestrian safety or overload existing roads, considering their current width, surfacing and condition? Answer: No, the road the property is located on has heavy vehicle use. The proposal is for the redevelopment of a residential lot with construction that will be temporary in nature.
- (5) Will the Project have appropriate parking and be accessible to fire, police and other emergency vehicles. Answer: Yes, based on the size of the project, construction phasing of the project, and the proposed layout of the driveways.

- (6) Will the Project overload any public water, drainage or sewer system or any other municipal facility or service, including schools? Answer: No, this is a proposal for a single residential lot development.
- (7) Will the Project degrade any natural resource, ecosystem or historic resource, including Skaneateles Lake or Owasco Lake? Answer: No, construction will be completed in phases and at completion of the Project, the property will have conforming impermeable surface coverage and improved stormwater controls.
- (8) Will the Project be suitable for the property on which it is proposed, considering the property's size, location, topography, vegetation, soils, natural habitat and hydrology and, if appropriate, its ability to be buffered or screened from neighboring properties and public roads? Answer: Yes, the improvements to the topography and vegetation will return the property to its former appearance. The dwelling is set back from the road with trees and landscaping providing a buffer from the view from the road.
- (9) Will the Project be subject to such conditions on operation, design and layout of structures and provision of screening, buffer areas and off-site improvements as may be necessary to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses and to protect the natural, historic and scenic resources of the Town? Answer: No measures are necessary as the project will fit in with the neighborhood and area, and will protect the natural, historic and scenic resources of the Town. There are no off-site improvements proposed.
- (12) Will the Project have no greater overall impact on the site and its surroundings than would full development of uses of the property permitted by right? Answer: No, the lot cannot be subdivided and will remain a single family residence with two accessory apartments on the large lot.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Southern and seconded by Chairman Tucker to adopt the findings for Major Projects as listed under §148-16B. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Southern and seconded by Chairman Tucker to review for compliance the Site Plan Review criteria as listed under §148-148-18D(1). The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

(1) Layout and Design

(a) Will all structures in the plan be integrated with each other and with adjacent structures and shall, wherever practical, be laid out in the pattern of a traditional village or hamlet? Answer: Yes, the removal of the existing West Coast inspired contemporary dwelling and replacing it with a traditional style dwelling on a smaller footprint will be compatible to the area.

(b) Will Structures that are visible from public roads or Skaneateles Lake be compatible with each other and with traditional structures in the surrounding area in architecture, design, massing, materials and placement and shall harmonize with traditional elements in the architectural fabric of the area? Answer: Yes, the proposed dwelling will be constructed of stone and brick that will be compatible with the traditional housing style in the

area.

(c) Will Architectural design be in keeping with the small-town architectural character of the Skaneateles area, and avoid flat roofs, large expanses of undifferentiated facades and long plain wall sections? Yes, the architectural design will be a traditional style dwelling that will be in keeping with the neighborhood.

(d) Will, where appropriate, setbacks maintain and continue the existing setback pattern of surrounding properties? Answer: Yes, the proposed dwelling will conform to the setbacks for the district.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Southern and seconded by Member Kasper to adopt the findings for Site Plan Review criteria as listed under §148-18D(1). The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

WHEREAS, at its regular meeting July 19, 2016, the Planning Board declared this Application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(9) and not subject by SEQR for further review.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made Member Joseph Southern, seconded by Member Donald Kasper, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the major special permit and site plan review Application, with the following conditions:

1. That the Major Special Permit shall expire if the applicant fails to comply with the conditions stated herein within 18 months of issuance, or if its time limit expires without renewal; and
2. That the plans submitted and identified as: C-1 Site Esc & SWPPP Plan, C-1A Phased Site Esc & Grading Plan, and C-1B Site Esc & Phased Grading Plan, dated September 9, 2016 and prepared by RZ Engineering; Elevations and Floor Plans 1-7 dated May 23, 2016 prepared by Robert A.M. Stern Architects; Paver Dock Section 8 prepared by Gregory Lombardi Design dated May 23, 2016; and Site Plan 1 of 2 dated July 7, 2016, Site Plan 2 of 2 dated June 24, 2016, as well as the Grading Plan and House Design Narrative dated September 9, 2016, and revised Narrative dated July 7, 2016, prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be followed in all respects; and
3. That all future modifications to the approved Site Plan be submitted to the Planning Board for approval prior to commencement of construction; and

Prior to application to the Codes Enforcement Office for issuance of a conditional building permit, the following conditions must be met:

1. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from the OCDOH, City of Syracuse Department of Water, and any other agency or authority having jurisdiction of the Project; and

2. That a pre-construction meeting be held on site with the contractor, applicant's representatives, Town Engineer and Codes Enforcement Officer prior to issuance of a building permit; and

After issuance of a conditional building permit the following conditions shall apply in addition to those stated above:

1. That the Town Engineer shall review and verify completion of each phase prior to issuance of a building permit for commencement of the next phase; and
2. That an as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of the completed Project within (60) days of completion of the Project.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Mark J. Tucker	[Yes]
Member	Joseph Southern	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	[Yes]

Member Winkelman returned to the Board.

Continued Review-Major Special Permit/Site Plan Review/Lot Line Adjustment

Applicant	Finger Lakes Luxury Homes, Inc.	
	Rick & Debbie Moscarito	Property:
	120 Madison St	1601 East Genesee St
	Chittenango, NY 13037	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		Tax Map #032.-03-17.1 & 032.-03-17.2

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect

The final topography map has been received and the grading plan is being developed. It is expected that next month they are hoping to submit the engineering plans for Mr. Camp to review. The fire flows for the water flow test and the design includes the addition of a 50psi pump to increase the pressure for the fire prevention system and Mr. Camp had requested modeling to be done. Mr. Camp stated that they have a working model of the Village and Town water system. They plugged in the proposed fire protection system and the initial results are good, although final review has yet to occur as they are awaiting more input from the Village DMO. There may be one set of Village improvements that are not in their model. The water pressure on this side of Town has improved recently but is still sensitive. Preliminary results are good for fire protection.

Mr. Eggleston stated that approximately 8,000 gallons per day is what the septic is being designed as. Lodging requires a sprinkler system in all buildings including the cottages which would be the biggest demand. There is a fire hydrant in front of the building and the fire chief has suggested, and the applicant is willing to accommodate, dry hydrants off the pond. The fire trucks can pull the water out of the pond to supplement. Mr. Camp commented that the model is looking at the worst case scenario. Member Kasper inquired if the 8,000 gallons affect the daily

use of the system. Mr. Camp stated no, it is the fire flow that has the danger of sucking the rest of system below the standard 20psi.

Member Hamlin inquire how this dry summer has affected the pond. Mr. Eggleston commented that he thought the pond had maintained a reasonable depth unlike the Zechman property. Member Kasper inquired if this property backs up to the Zechman property. Mr. Eggleston stated that it comes close but no drainage is connected to it, but both properties feed the same wetlands. Member Winkelman commented that there is farmland in between the properties.

Chairman Tucker commented that the minutes from last month reflected a question from Member Kasper regarding camp fires at the cottages that was never addressed. Mr. Eggleston commented that they want to make it a family friendly place so use of the steel fire pits could occur.

Member Hamlin inquired about the restaurant and its operation. Mr. Eggleston stated that the restaurant is a future phase as initially it will be an event center and eventually has a kitchen and bar installed. The restaurant would evolve over a 4 to 5 year period. His first interest is in family accommodation and he wants to have amenities so that it is more than just a motel. Member Kasper inquired about a phasing plan. Mr. Eggleston stated that the initial thought was that the amenities and annex buildings would be constructed first; however, there is some economic opportunity to build with the cottages first and then the amenities building. The phasing plan will be developed as the engineering plans are more developed.

Chairman Tucker stated that in regards to the landscaping in the front of the property, there is a place near Albany off 87N, that has their parking up front, and the landscaping screens the view of the parking and hotel. He continued stating that he understands that the applicant would like the hotel to be seen as part of the feature of the development, but the Albany example has landscaping that obscures the parking lot from the road. Mr. Eggleston stated that one of the challenges is that the ideal location for the septic fields is in the front of the property. There are overhead wires that come across the road and the property that would limit the use of large trees. He continued stating that a landscaping plan will be provided to the Board and they will take into consideration the request to screen the parking.

Discussion

The draft solar legislation will be discussed at the next Planning Board meeting.

Discussion

The draft Open Space Plan will be discussed at the next Planning Board meeting.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Southern to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting at 10:30 p.m. as there being no further business. The Board having been polled resulted in favor of said motion.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull, Secretary/Clerk