

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
March 19, 2024**

Donald Kasper (zoom)
Douglas Hamlin
Jill Marshall
Jon Holbein
Samantha Parker-Fann
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel
John Camp, P.E. (C&S Engineers)
Howard Brodsky, Town Planner
Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Cochair Hamlin opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. The meeting minutes of February 20, 2024 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 Member Holbein to approve the minutes as corrected. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Cochair	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Present	[Yes]
Member	Samantha Parker-Fann	Present	[Yes]

Continued Review -8-lot Subdivision

Applicant: Village Meadow LLC
57 State Street
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Property:
Franklin Street Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Parcel #047.-01-06.1.

Present: Josh LaGrow, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, Mike Lasell, MBL Group

Mr. Eggleston began saying that in a conventional subdivision, the entire subdivision needs to be at 10% impermeable surface coverage. Taking into account the road, sidewalks, and gutters in the road right of way, each of the eight lots will have an allowance of about 7% of impermeable surface coverage. As there is no permeable surface coverage as part of the infrastructure, each of the lots will be at a maximum of 20% total lot coverage.

Mr. Lasell presented LDAR data that shows the drainage pattern of the western lot to the applicants lot. There is a portion where stormwater is coming towards the applicant's lot; however, it is the same water that has been coming onto the lot and will not affect the proposed drainage plan design.

Water testing was conducted on Monday this week at the hydrant that is just uphill from the site on Franklin Street. The lot with the highest elevation is the farthest west lot from Franklin Street with an elevation of 1010 feet. There is a 50 foot elevation change from the hydrant location, and based on this calculation alone and not townwide, it would still carry 24psi for fire flow from the second floor of a building. Mr. Camp relayed information regarding the water testing conducted and its impact on the town water system. The test that was conducted earlier this week did not consider the fire flow pressure at the highest elevation near the proposed subdivision. There was one verbal complaint made during Monday's test. The next day there was another water test conducted on the same hydrant with a pressure gauge on the hydrant at the high spot on Clapp road. They were opening the hydrant gradually and at the same time monitoring the pressure at Clapp Road. Clapp Road pressure started to drop and when it hit 6 psi they ended the test. The hydrant was 50-60 % open when the residual pressure at Clapp Road got down to 6 psi. Presumably, if the hydrant were fully opened then the pressure at Clapp Road would go to 0%. The elevation of the Clapp Road hydrant is pretty close to the highest elevation of the proposed water system, although Clapp Road is further away and there are more losses due to the length of pipe. The water system is complicated there and the design phase for the water tower is just getting started. Once the tank is installed these conditions will change. One problem is water from the tank will have a bit of a long route to get to the proposed project site and there is a valve that in normal operation remains closed that makes that route a little bit longer. All of this should be put into the town's hydraulic model, run a couple of scenarios, and see what they get in that situation with the tower installed.

Mr. Lasell said he would like to try a couple of things without the tank as well for timing. Hydraulically, he thought the two hydrants would be on the same profile and it is not showing that with what was just explained. He would like to see the initial draw stabilized. There is a PRV on Old Seneca Turnpike which is operating to slow the water pressure going downhill. He thinks what is happening is the PRV is not allowing the water to be fed from both ways. If the water was fed from both directions the water pressure on Franklin Street would be better. There is something more that is going on other than the elevation change and the pipe length with such a pressure change. Running 800 gallons a minute on Franklin Street, maintaining 42 psi 800 feet away from where there is the issue on Clapp Road. They do make PRVs with automatic valving to allow flow both ways in a high demand situation that should be looked at.

Cochair Hamlin said that the plan is to do a dry run SEQR with a public hearing on the application next month, then a final SEQR determination. Counsel Molnar stated that the applicant has submitted the full EAF long form including part 1 that has been completed by the applicant He continued saying that the board could evaluate part 2 in draft review, and the board agreed that they were prepared to do a dry run review.

The board reviewed **Part 2 EAF**:

1 Impact on Land - No Yes UNANSWERED

- a. **No**
- b. **No**
- c. **No**, bedrock is more than 10 feet.
- d. **No**
- e. **Undetermined**, two years is for the total build out, infrastructure build out would be 3 months. The answer would be no based on the subdivision application. Within the HOA rules lot owners are required to build within 18 months. The land will not be

completely open within the two year time span. The construction of individual dwellings will be intermittent.

- f. **No to Small** The transition from agriculture to meadow and lawns would reduce erosion. The SWPPP and proposed stormwater system would mitigate any potential erosion making it a small impact.
- g. **No**
- h. **None**

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** The SWPPP will improve existing drainage conditions with the stormwater going into the swales and slowing the water.
- j. **No**
- k. **No**

4 Impacts on Groundwater - **No**

- a. **No** area is in the public water district and no wells are proposed.
- b. **No**, water is from lake.
- c. **No to small** Initial perc tests have been completed for individual septic systems. Formal submission to OCDOH has occurred with no anticipated roadblocks.
- d. **No**
- e. **No**
- f. **No**
- g. **No**
- h. **None**

5 Impact on Flooding - **No** **Yes**

- a. **No**
- b. **No**
- c. **No**
- d. **No to small** With mitigation it will improve the drainage situation and flooding.
- e. **No**
- f. **No**
- g. **None** Drainage pattern has been a big issue, and the proposed mitigation will improve the drainage.

6 Impacts on Air - **No** **Yes**

7 Impacts on Plants and Animals - No Yes

8 Impacts on Agricultural Resources - No Yes **UNANSWERED**

- a. **Unanswered** I Need more information regarding MS1-4 soil ratings.
- b. **No**
- c. **No**
- d. **Unanswered** Is the lot in a designated agricultural district? The lot is 11 acres.
- e. **No**
- f. **Yes moderate** There is other access to the adjacent farm fields. The land is in the water district and is adjacent to existing residential areas. The lot is also located in the rural residential district in the town.
- g. **No** The town does not have a municipal adopted farmland protection plan.
- h. **Other** There is development pressure as the property is located in the water district, adjacent to existing residential properties in the town and village, and the lot is located in the rural residential district.

9 Impacts on Aesthetic Resources - No Yes

- a. **No**
- b. **No**
- c. **No**
- d. **No**
- e. **No to small**
- f. **No** There are no visible projects that are similar.

10 Impacts on Historic and Archeological Resources - No Yes

11 Impacts on Open Space and Recreation - No Yes

- a. **No to Small** The development will improve the stormwater impact with no stormwater storage.
- b. **No**
- c. **No to Small**
- d. **No to Small**
- e. **None**

12 Impacts on Critical Environmental Areas - No Yes **NOT APPLICABLE**

13 Impacts on Transportation - No Yes

14 Impacts on Energy - No Yes

- a. **No**
- b. **No**
- c. **No**
- d. **No**

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

- a. **No to small** There will be a Small impact during construction. There is no noise ordinance in the town.
- b. **No**

- c. No
- d. No No lighting on street is proposed.
- e. No to Small The HOA will limit the residential properties to night sky compliant lighting.

16 Impacts on Human Health - No Yes

- a. No
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. No
- f. No There will be no impact now and the HOA will protect it in the future. licenses for any such activity were not requested by any one of the property owners.
- g. No
- h. No
- i. No
- k. No
- l. No

17 Consistency with Community Plans - No Yes

- a. No
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. **Unanswered** need more information on public water.

OCPB - The Onondaga County Health Department's Bureau of Public Health Engineering must formally approve a sewage disposal plan for the proposed lot prior to Department endorsement of the subdivision.

The Board offers the following comments:

1. This parcel/property is shown by the Onondaga County Ag Mapper to have high value for agricultural production and protection. Preservation of agricultural lands and protection of important farmland soils should be considered during municipal review.
2. The Board encourages the Town to consider the potential long-term effects of land fragmentation and large lot, subdivisions on the economic viability of agricultural lands, particularly within areas containing New York State Agricultural District properties and in farm/agricultural zoning districts. Potential conflicts with agricultural operations, changes to the rural character, increased public service demands and costs, reduction of open space and farmland, and impacts to road safety and mobility may cumulatively occur as a result of such subdivisions.
3. The applicant and municipality are encouraged to explore ways to retain more land in a natural and wooded state, possibly in a separate parcel, to conserve as protected open space, aid in stormwater mitigation, and enhancing the neighborhood by being available to local residents.

The OCPB comments are non-binding and that fragmentation comment not relevant to the application. Clustering of the dwellings was not viable for this location. There will be several

acres that will be maintained as meadows rather than the existing farming that has caused erosion. Each property owner will own a portion of the meadows behind their homes. The percentage of farmland being removed for this subdivision is a small percentage of the total farmland in the town. Onondaga County is also in need of more housing in the county.

- f. **No**
- g. **No** There will only be eight lots developed. There will be a physical connection to the western lot for any future connectivity if the lot were to be developed.

18 Consistency with Community Character - No Yes

- a. **No**
- b. **Small**
- c. **No**
- d. **No**
- e. **Small** The proposed lots are larger than the existing lots in the area; however, they are conforming to the zoning code.
- f. **No to Small**

Counsel Molnar said that there is additional information needed from the applicant for questions 1, 8, and 17. A public hearing could be held and after the public hearing the SEQR could be conducted including the comments from the public.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Cochair Hamlin and seconded by Member Holbein to schedule a public hearing on **Tuesday, April 16, 2024 at 6:00 p.m.** The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Public Hearing -Site Plan Review

Applicant: SkanEllus
1654 Cherry Valley Tpke
Skaneateles NY 13152
Tax Parcel #032.-03-16.0

Present: Cooper Pittman, Guy Pittman, Applicant Representatives

The revised site plans were submitted reflecting the proposed parking and the playground location. The site plan also indicates the flow of the traffic on the property. The first site plan shows the parking that follows the edges of the parking lot, and the second site plan expands the parking area to include a row of parking in the center of the lot running from the existing light post. Mr. Camp commented that the parking spots in the center of the lot will assist with protecting the light pole.

Cochair Hamlin said that the article in the newspaper discussed a dog park and a playground that was to be located on the property. Mr. Pitman said that he was unaware of the added amenities however they did show where the playground could be located. He continued saying that the area would be covered with a soft composite material, drainage, and away from the septic field. Mr. C. Pitman said that the OCDOH was doing a preliminary check on the building, and she had the old septic plans. She verbally approved the location of the proposed playground. Mr. Pitman said that he does not have any information on the dog park although he does not see it as a good match to be near the playground. Mr. Brodsky said

that if a dog park were going to be established then the applicant would need to come back to the board for approval as it is a new use. Mr. Brodsky said that the two submitted plans referencing the same page number and are almost identical. The preferred plan should be identified differently. He continued saying that the parking spaces should be numbered and that there should be a total count of the parking spaces for all of the uses on the property.

Chair Kasper inquired if the light pole in the center of the lot could be protected, and Mr. Pittman said that bollards could be utilized to protect the pole; however, the electrical wiring goes underneath the parking area and the bollards could damage the wiring. Chair Kasper said that a couple of bollards there would help to make the light pole more visible, and the pole should also be identified in yellow.

Chair Kasper asked on the size of the parking spaces and Mr. Pitman said that they will be 10'x18'. Chair Kasper requested that the dimensions should be noted on the site plan. Chair Kasper noted that there are proposed parking spaces in the road right of way and the parking space striping should not occur in the road right of way without New York State DOT approval. Chair Kasper asked how much parking they will need, and Mr. Brodsky said that parking is determined by the square footage of the building and the criteria in the zoning code. Mr. C. Pitman said that the occupancy of the restaurant is 60 people, with the requirement of one parking space per 3 people, there is ample parking. Mr. Brodsky said that there should be a table included on the site plan reflecting the parking for all of the uses on the property.

Chair Kasper noted that the location of the existing septic systems should be shown on the site plan as well to assist with any future development needs.

At this time, Cochair Hamlin opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor in opposition or had any other comments of the project. Mike Drake, 3657 Fisher Road, said that he is in support of the project; however, the survey is from last year, the submission needs to be improved, and there are two septic systems on the property, one for the restaurant and one for the vet/dog grooming. He continued saying that the playground will be within 50 feet of the septic systems. Also the parking needs to address all of the uses on the property. The application should be held to the same rules and guidelines he was required to adhere to with Mr. Pudders. Mr. C. Pittman commented that there are no required setbacks from the septic system for playgrounds. Mr. Drake commented that there are no details on what type of playground is being proposed and impermeable surface coverage. Cochair Hamlin commented that maybe the playground should not be on the site plan and that the applicant could come for an amendment when they decide they are going to have a playground and have more specifics. He requested that the playground should be removed from the site plan.

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

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Cochair Hamlin and seconded by Chair Kasper, 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. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

WHEREAS, the Planning Board in reviewing the Application under Special Permit and Site Plan review criteria, adopted the following findings (the “Findings”) for proceeding with a determination on the Application:

- (1) That the Application will 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;
- (2) That the Application will not adversely affect surrounding land uses by creating excessive traffic, noise, dust, glare, pollution, or other nuisances as the building will not affect the surrounding area due to the minimal activity proposed; The project will not affect anything as there will be minimal activity.
- (3) That the Application will not result in the release of harmful substances or any other nuisances, nor cause excessive noise, dust, odors, solid waste, or glare;
- (4) That the Application will not adversely affect the general availability of affordable housing in the Town;
- (5) That the Application will not cause undue traffic congestion, unduly impair pedestrian safety or overload existing roads, considering their current width, surfacing and condition.
- (6) That the Application will have appropriate parking and be accessible to fire, police, and other emergency vehicles;
- (7) That the Application will not overload any public water, drainage or sewer system or any other municipal facility or service, including schools;
- (8) That the Application will not degrade any natural resources, ecosystem, or historic resource, including Skaneateles Lake or Owasco Lake;
- (9) That the Application will 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 with the applicant’s proposed landscape plan;
- (10) That the Application will 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;
- (11) That the Application will be consistent with the community's goal of concentrating retail uses in the Village and hamlets, avoiding strip commercial development and locating nonresidential uses that are incompatible with residential use on well-buffered properties and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan;

(12) That the Application will be able to comply with site plan review standards in §148-10-6, and the Rural Siting Principles in Town Policy and Guideline Book have been taken into consideration; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Chair Donald Kasper, seconded by Cochair Douglas Hamlin, and upon an affirmative vote thereon as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board hereby **APPROVES** the Application, with the following additional conditions:

1. That the site plan approval shall expire if the applicant fails to obtain the necessary building permits or fails to comply with the conditions of the special permit/site plan approval within 18 month of its issuance, or if the special permit with which it is associated expires. The Planning Board may grant a maximum of three six month extensions; and
2. That a Revised Site Plan with Revised Narrative be submitted to the Planning Board Chair, Town Engineer, and Town Attorney for review and approval reflecting the following modifications required by this Resolution:
 - a. That the site plan reflect at least two 6 inch bollards placed around the pole in the parking lot;
 - b. That the site plan have the parking spaces numbered;
 - c. That the site plan indicate the location of all septic fields;
 - d. That any proposed parking located in the road right of way be removed;
 - e. That the site plan reflect the removal of the proposed playground, which is not approved according to this Resolution;
 - f. That the narrative be updated to reflect the parking analysis for all of the uses on the property including the veterinarian and dog grooming activity;
 - g. That the narrative reflect that the parking spaces are sized at 10 feet x 18 feet.
3. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application; and
4. That all existing outdoor lighting, if replaced, and any new lighting be night sky compliant; and
5. 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	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Co-Chair	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Present	[Yes]
Member	Samantha Parker-Fann	Present	[Yes]

Public Hearing -Special Permit

Applicant:	Robert & Diana Logan 3 Fennel St Apt 3 Skaneateles NY 13152	Property: 2010 West Lake Rd Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Parcel #058.-01-22.0
------------	---	--

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

Chair Kasper recused himself from the application. The ZBA will not be making their decision until their public hearing on April 2, 2024. Submitted was an updated site plan with topography as requested by the board. The grading plan shows that there will be a six inch berm that will keep the water going down to the trench drain that feeds into the bioswale. The gutters on the garage will go into the same drainage system. There will be a swale along the north side of the property that will direct the stormwater to the bioswale. The extra spoils from the bioswale will be utilized to level off the lawn. The plan also shows that there will be a couple of maples that will be planted down by the lake as most of the trees on the property are ash trees that will be removed. There is a maple tree on the Leverich property that will be protected during construction. There are a couple of trees on the Leverich property that will be removed at his request. The north property line has marked pins to provide clarity for the location of the property line. The row of arborvitae that Mr. Leverich had questioned is right on the property line. The arborvitae are fairly new, and it is likely that they will be able to avoid them during excavation for the garage and they will replace any arborvitae that did not survive. There will also be some native species shrubs planted by the parking area and along the side of the bioswale so as not to block views.

At this time, Cochair Hamlin opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor of the project and no one spoke in favor. Cochair Hamlin asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition or had any other comments. No one requested to speak. Cochair Hamlin said that the public hearing will continue at the next meeting.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Cochair Hamlin and seconded by Member Marshall the Planning Board declared this application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(18) and not subject by SEQR for further review. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmation of said motion with Chair Kasper abstaining from the vote due to his recusal.

Amendment Request– Special Permit

Applicant: Skaneateles PV LLC
Brewster & DeAnn Sears
2825 West Lake Road
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Parcel#051.-02-17.0

Present: Hayley Effler, Dimension Renewable Energy;

Counsel Molnar said that the applicant has requested for the board to approve the revised decommissioning plan and the terms and conditions of the decommissioning bond which would assure its compliance and completion. The applicant has also requested approval of the revised site plan that reflects that the spacing between the solar array rows will be reduced from 15 feet to 13.5 feet due to the change in availability of the panels for the project. The requested space is compliant with the town's zoning code and with NYS building/fire code. There were several meetings that took place to review the proposed decommissioning plan, and there were suggested changes. The largest risk to the town would be if the applicant defaulted on the bond to go without payment of the premium and the bond would otherwise expire on its own terms that would result in a situation where there were no applicant and no bond to assure the decommissioning. The problem would arise that the project would require decommissioning and the town would have no resources. The applicant worked extensively to resolve
pbn.03.19.2024

those fears by accepting the edits suggested in the decommissioning plan. Those edits include modifications to the bond requirements including review of the bond annually and the bond has no expiration point. The bond company will provide 60 days written notification to the town if the bond is going to be cancelled, that would trigger a waterfall of events. The applicant would be required to replace that bond with one that is similar with conditions placed on the prior bond and suitable to the town, or another vehicle that would provide assurance of the decommissioning plan.

The surety may cancel this bond at any time by giving the obligee 60 days written notice of its desire to be relieved of liability. Should the principal fail to provide a replacement bond or alternative financial assurance acceptable to the town within 30 days, the surety may reinstate the bond otherwise the surety will be in default of the bond and forfeit the full penalty sum of the bond to the town. Counsel Molnar commented that this condition he would recommend for the town to accept. The bond also includes an annual increase of 2.5%, with the penal total of the bond at \$236,992.59, and it will annually increase by 2.5%. Mr. Camp and his associates pointed out that the first estimated bond total was light, and the applicant consulted with their associates and increased the estimate accordingly. He stated that both the decommission plan and the decommissioning bond are worthy and recommended that the Town Board, Town Attorney, and Supervisor approve all of this as they would be the entity to execute the document for the town.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Cochair Hamlin and seconded by Member Marshall, the Planning Board adopted the prior SEQRA determination of the proposed Major Site Plan on July 6, 2022 that resulted in a negative declaration. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made Cochair Douglas Hamlin and seconded by Chair Donald Kasper, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the Amendment Application with the following conditions:

1. That the site plan approval shall expire if the applicant fails to obtain the necessary building permits or fails to comply with the conditions of the site plan approval within 18 months of its issuance, or if the special permit with which it is associated expires. The Planning Board may grant a maximum of three six month extensions; and
2. That the revised Site Plan SKA-E04-1 dated January 30, 2024 and revised narrative submitted February 9, 2024 prepared by Dimension Renewable Energy that is approved for the Project shall be followed in all respects, and
3. That the Decommissioning Plan and Decommissioning Bond dated March 18, 2024 prepared by Dimension Renewable Energy is hereby approved by the Planning Board as required by the Planning Board's November 15, 2022, and that same be found acceptable by the Town of Skaneateles Town Board, with the Decommissioning Plan signed and accepted by the Town Supervisor; and
4. Except as modified hereby, the conditions set forth in the Prior Approvals remain in full force and effect: and

- An as-built survey including impermeable surface coverage calculations is required to 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	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Co-Chair	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Present	[Yes]
Member	Samantha Parker-Fann	Present	[Yes]

Sketch Plan -Site Plan Review

Applicant: Joseph & Marcia Zappia
 2629 East lake Rd
 Skaneateles NY 13152
Tax Parcel #037.-01-16.0

Present: Bill Murphy, Space Architectural Studios

Mr. Murphy began by saying that during a recent storm a tree fell onto the existing detached garage causing damage to a third to a half of the roof trusses. As the whole roof will need to be removed, the applicant is proposing a second floor to the existing garage to provide storage for the property as the cellar heights of the dwelling are not conducive for storage. The second floor of the garage will have outside stairs and a deck to access the second floor. The second floor will also provide use of the building during the day.

The application requires variances for floorspace and for total footprint of structures, and the Zoning Board of Appeals will be holding a public hearing in April. Mr. Brodsky commented that the application is in front of the Planning Board due to the lot being within 1000 feet to the lake. There will be minimal land disturbance for the holes for the Sono tubes footings. Mr. Brodsky added that the application needs to obtain an additional variance for the height of the proposed garage. Mr. Murphy said that the proposed garage is not out of character of the neighborhood and that based on the topography of the area, the garage will not block any views of the lake for the neighbors. Member Parker-Fann asked about the ground cover in the area and Mr. Muphy said that it is mostly turf in the area with paths from the man door. Mr. Murphy added that there is a similar structure to the south that sets on a hill with the property to the north being vacant in the area. The proposed garage is set into the hill and would not have an impact to the other properties in the area as it sets down into the property. A site visit will be conducted on April 2, 2024.

Sketch Plan -Site Plan Review

Applicant: Robert Lotkowitz
 Susan Edinger Joint Revocable Trust
 1340 Thornton Grove
 Skaneateles NY 13152
Tax Parcel #056.-03-01.2

Present: Bob Lotkowitz & Susan Edinger, Applicants;

The applicants constructed their home in 1992 with the deck constructed of pressure treated lumber. The deck is now over 30 years old and needs to be replaced. Proposed is the multi-level deck and impermeable patio with a firepit on the south side of the dwelling. The lot is over 9 acres and not directly on the lake. Mr. Lotkowitz said that there are no watercourses, and any stormwater would sheet over the nine acres of lawn. The lawn is mowed about twice a year for maximum absorption of stormwater.

Mr. Camp inquired about the construction and Mr. Lotkowitz said that the site disturbance would be for the Sono tube footing holes and the patio. The topography is very gentle across the property. Mr. Brodsky inquired about the deed restriction. Mr. Lotkowitz said that the deed restriction limits building above a certain contour the height of any structure cannot be more than 35 feet. The only structure proposed that is in the restricted area is the proposed patio and firepit. The deed restriction is for 99 years, and they are in the 35th year of the restriction. Chair Kasper suggested that the property owner to the west of this property submit a letter of support as they would be the most impacted by the proposal. Member Parker-Fann recommended that a silt fence be installed during construction. A skid steer will be utilized for the construction.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Cochair Hamlin and seconded by Member Marshall, the Planning Board declared this application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(12) and not subject by SEQR for further review. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made Member Jill Marshall and seconded by Cochair Douglas Hamlin, and after a unanimous affirmative vote of the Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board hereby **APPROVES** the Application for minor special permit/site plan approval, with the following conditions:

1. That the site plan approval shall expire if the applicant fails to obtain the necessary building permits or fails to comply with the conditions of the site plan approval within 18 months of its issuance, or if the special permit with which it is associated expires. The Planning Board may grant a maximum of three six-month extensions; and
2. That Site Plan G101-G102,L101-L102, S100-S101, A101, and A201 dated February 18, 2024, prepared by Connelly Architect, Licensed Architect, with narrative prepared by the Applicant dated February 29, 2024 be followed in all respects; and
3. That the Applicant obtain and submit a no objection letter from 2332 West Lake LLC , neighbor to the west; and
4. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application; and
5. 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	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Co-Chair	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Present	[Yes]
Member	Samantha Parker-Fann	Present	[Yes]

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Cochair Hamlin and seconded by Member Holbein adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Additional Meeting Attendees:

Robert Eggleston	Josh LaGrow	Parker LaGrow
Grayson LaGrow	Justin Paradis	Mike Drake
Hayley Effler	Cooper Pitman	Guy Pitman
Jeff Chalupnicki	Susan Edinger	Bob Lotkowitz

Additional Meeting Attendees (Zoom):

Janet Aaron	Don Kasper
Mike Lasell	Lori Milne
Courtney Alexander	Chris Buff
347-628-1846(tsk property holdings)	