

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES  
PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
February 18, 2025**

Donald Kasper  
Doug Hamlin  
Jill Marshall  
Jon Holbein  
Samantha Parker-Fann  
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel  
Caitlin Choberka (C&S Engineers)  
Howard Brodsky, Town Planner  
Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Chair Kasper opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. The meeting minutes of January 21, 2025 were previously distributed to the Board and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Cochair Hamlin 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]
Co-Chair	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Present	[Yes]
Member	Samantha Parker-Fann	Present	[Yes]

**Public Information Meeting – 5 Lot Conservation Subdivision**

Applicant	Schnapp Revoc. Trust	Property:
	David Schnapp	4081 O’Neil Lane
	15 Deer Run	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Skaneateles, NY	<b>Tax Parcel #027.-01-30.1</b>

Present Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, Corey McWilliams, Reid Engineering LLC

The property is served by public water, and they will bring in a four inch water line to serve the four residential lots. Of the 9 acres there is 1.8 acres of constrained land that includes the creek and steep slopes. A conservation subdivision requires 60% of the land to be placed into conservation, which will preserve conservation land and allows for greater density on the developed portion of the property. All of the building envelopes are located beyond the 100 foot setback from the watercourse. The lots are adjacent to the existing developed lots on Jordan Road and O’Neil Lane, and the conservation lot adjacent to the Charlie Major trail and town land.

A thirty foot shared driveway will be located on a forty foot easement that will also provide an area for utilities. The driveway will have an emergency turnaround that meets the requirements of the fire code. The residential lots will be under 20% impermeable surface coverage that is allowed in a conservation

subdivision. The areas in pink contain slopes that are 12% and are buildable, with lot 3 that will probably have a walk out basement style dwelling.

The driveway will be pitched to the east to a ditch that drains to a culvert across, then on its natural drainage pattern. The driveway design and drainage will reduce the amount of stormwater that currently goes onto the Buerkle property to the west. Ms. Buerkle had inquired about the large pine trees, and they are located on this property that will come down. A few years ago she had requested that one of the trees be removed and Mr. Schnapp obliged. There will be new trees put in place of the removed trees. The conservation land will be owned by lot 4 and will be available for recreational use by the four property owners.

Peter Bettis, 4098 O'Neil Lane, asked if the gas line will be brought in as there is no gas line on O'Neil Lane. Mr. Eggleston said that since it is not there they would not bring in gas and go electric.

Rick Naro, 935 Parker Lane, requested information on what is a conservation subdivision. Chair Kasper explained that with a conservation subdivision the dwellings are condensed on smaller lots preserving land to be set aside in a natural state that can never be developed. The town gains green space although it is not owned by the town.

Mike Sweet, 909 Parker Lane, asked where the Hamlet of Mottville is in relationship to the property. Mr. Egglestone explained that the property is not located in the Hamlet, however, with a conservation subdivision you are allowed to use the Hamlet dimensional standards. Mr. Sweet commented that he bow hunts at the back of his property that backs up to this property and was concerned with the proposed conservation land being connected to the Charlie Major trail and having the public in the area. Mr. Eggleston said that the conservation area next to the land on his property is better for the wildlife as it would be contiguous to it. He continued saying that the conservation lot will not be open to the public.

Chair Kasper commented that a letter was received from Mrs. Buerkle, 4083 O'Neil Lane, neighbor to the west. Mr. Eggleston said that her first concern was that the subdivision does not comply with the code, and the proposal is conforming to the code for conservation subdivisions. In regard to her concern about drainage, the drainage and stormwater will be pitched away from her property and brought down in the back of her property. C&S has reviewed the drainage plans. In regard to the setbacks, it meets the zoning requirements for a conservation subdivision. Concerning the trees, the pines are on the Schnapp property and Mrs. Buerkle has been concerned about trees falling on her house. The large trees will be removed, and native species pine trees will be placed in the area.

Chair Kasper said that he revisited the property and said that there is an elevation change from this property to the Buerkle property. With the removal of the existing trees, the property will probably need the land to be filled in up to the road. He requested that a cross section of the driveway be provided to the board. The road will be a twelve foot wide blacktop surface and pitched to the east. Chair Kasper said that there is probably a four foot rise to this property from the Buerkle property. Ms. Choberka said that the runoff by the driveway will be captured by the swale. Mr. Eggleston said that the slope is a mow-able slope less than 30% slope.

Chair Kasper said that on the east side of the driveway the land will need to be cut back. Mr. Eggleston said that it will be shaved back, and they will do proper grading. There will be pine trees that will be planted back in on the west side of the driveway. Chair Kasper inquired if there will be enough space to

plant the trees. Chair Kasper said that the plan also indicates that the drainage from the driveway will be directed to the rear of the Buerkle property and suggested that the drainage be directed further south so that it stays on this property before it drains onto the town property. Mr. Eggleston said that they are returning the water where it drains today but at the end of the Buerkle property. Mr. McWilliams said that drainage sheet back towards the west property, the road will drain to the east to the proposed swale and directed to the lowest point for drainage. He continued saying that there are proposed check dams that will remain after the proposed swales are constructed that would slow down the water. There will be rip rap protection proposed at the end of the outlet that will also aid the drainage by allowing the water to sheet flow onto the rear of the property.

Mr. Bettis, 4098 O'Neil Lane, commented that there is a lot of water that comes through the south side of O'Neil Lane. Chair Kasper said that the outlet needs to be moved further south so that the stormwater is not released on the Buerkle property. He continued saying that one of his concerns is the transition of the proposed driveway to the Buerkle property and the hill is being cut for the road.

Chair Kasper said that someone turning onto the driveway coming down on O'Neil Lane on a snowy day could run off the road so there may need to be a guard rail added to the west of the proposed driveway. Mr. Bettis said that he has been there forty years and has seen where someone has missed it but not gone over the bank. Chair Kasper asked how the stormwater will be captured off the other driveways. Mr. Eggleston said that there is a road ditch, and it would drain towards the creek. Chair Kasper asked about the septic for lot 4. Mr. Eggleston explained that they have moved the proposed location for the septic field to an area near the driveway in a meadow and that they are still working on the septic designs that have been hampered by the weather. Member Parker-Fann asked if the applicant is agreeable to a good neighbor agreement for improvements done on the Buerkle property and Mr. Eggleston said that they can talk to her. Member Parker-Fann asked if the pines along the road could be mixed with deciduous trees, and Mr. Eggleston explained that Mrs. Buerkle was concerned with noise and lights so the evergreens would provide better screening.

Chair Kasper suggested that the application continue to next month as the board needs to hear from Mr. Camp regarding the project. Ms. Choberka said that Mr. Camp's concern was with the road drainage being located to the east side of the driveway. She continued saying that it does not appear that based on the road grading, the applicant is adding more stormwater runoff on the neighboring property than exists today but rather less than what exists today. The drainage could be watched and a determination made on whether the drainage pipe would need to be upsized. Chair Kasper said he is concerned with the contour going down her property because it looks like it will have to be filled in to put the road in. Mr. Eggleston said that they can provide a cross section of the existing and proposed to the board. Chair Kasper asked if the town highway department had been contacted regarding the access to the lot. The town received the fire department comment on the project.

**Public Hearing Continuance- Special Permit/Site Plan Review**

Applicant	AADP development LLC	Property:
	Andrew Peterson	1068-1074 Old Seneca Tpke
	17 Academy St	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Skaneateles, NY	<b>Tax Parcel #028.-02-01.0</b>

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, Corey McWilliams, Reid Engineering LLC

Most of the development will be on the south side of the watercourse. The septic will be located to the north of the creek. A SWPPP and long form EAF has been provided to the town. Chair Kasper said that last month there was a question regarding the dumpster and Mr. Eggleston said that they will put an enclosure around the dumpster. Chair Kasper said that all of the exterior lighting should be night sky compliant, and Mr. Eggleston explained that they will consist of dark sky compliant wall packs on the buildings for the parking area that can be controlled by time. There may be one or two left on for security.

Chair Kasper continued the public hearing and inquired if there was anyone who wished to comment on the project. No one spoke in favor, opposition or had any other comments.

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

Counsel Molnar stated that the applicant has submitted the full EAF long form including part 1 that has been completed by the applicant and that the board could evaluate part 2:

The board reviewed **Part 2 EAF**:

**1 Impact on Land** -  No  Yes

- a. **Small**, greater than three feet.
- b. **No**
- c. **No**
- d. **No**
- e. **No to Small**, unaffected in phase one
- f. **No to Small**
- g. **None**

**2 Impacts on Geological Features** -  No  Yes

**3 Impacts on Surface Water** -  No  Yes

**4 Impacts on Groundwater** -  No

**5 Impact on Flooding** -  No  Yes

**6 Impacts on Air** -  No  Yes

**7 Impacts on Plants and Animals** -  No  Yes will be adding a meadow

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

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

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

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

**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
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No mitigated with night sky compliant lighting, the lighting angle and placement of the parking areas in the center of the buildings will have the lighting not affect the roads with the lighting on a timer.
- e. No

**16 Impacts on Human Health -**  **No**  **Yes**

**17 Consistency with Community Plans -**  **No**  **Yes.** It will be designed as a farm setting.

**18 Consistency with Community Character -**  **No**  **Yes**

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Cochair Hamlin and seconded by Chair Kasper, the Planning Board, after thorough review of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (“FEAF”) submitted by the Applicant, dated February 7, 2025, made a negative declaration determination of significance under SEQR. 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; and
- (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; and
- (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; and

- (4) That the Application will not adversely affect the general availability of affordable housing in the Town; and
- (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; and
- (6) That the Application will have appropriate parking and be accessible to fire, police, and other emergency vehicles; and
- (7) That the Application will not overload any public water, drainage or sewer system or any other municipal facility or service, including schools; and
- (8) That the Application will not degrade any natural resources, ecosystem, or historic resource, including Skaneateles Lake or Owasco Lake; and
- (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; and
- (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; and
- (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; and
- (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.
- (13) That the Application will have no greater overall impact on the site and its surroundings than would full development of uses of the property permitted by right.

Chair Kasper said that the neighbors were concerned about the height of the trees proposed and Mr. Eggleston said that the trees will be native hardwoods like a red maple, and be a three inch caliper that are six to twelve feet high. Chair Kasper inquired about the use of pine trees and Mr. Eggleston explained that they are proposing pines to shielding the parking area with the perimeter trees being deciduous species. Chair Kasper requested an updated narrative that includes detail on the lighting, detail on the trees, and enclosing the dumpster area. A sidewalk easement is being proposed along Route 321 and Old Seneca Turnpike.

Chair Kasper asked about C&S reviewing the stormwater management design and Ms. Choberka said that Mr. Camp had reviewed the design and site grading and had no issues with what was being proposed.

Chair Kasper said that there should be \$250 for engineering review and escrow of \$500 for legal review of the easements. Chair Kasper said that fire department has not review the project and Mr. Eggleston said that the driveway and turnaround is designed for a commercial activity and provides sufficient access to the fire department. Counsel Molnar will prepare a draft resolution, and the board will consider the resolution at next month's meeting.

**Application Continuance- Special Permit/Site Plan Review**

Applicant	2880 West Lake Rd LLC	Property:
	Michael Cregg	2880 West Lake Rd
	12 E Epping Wood	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Pittsford, NY 14534	<b>Tax Parcel #052.-01-06-.0</b>

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects,

The application is for the redevelopment of the existing boathouse on the same footprint as the existing boathouse. There will be an internal crane being utilized to house four boats than will increase the volume of the boathouse. The proposed repair for the piers will increase the square footage of the docks as shown of the cross section prepared by Fritz Estlinbaum. Chair Kasper requested that actual increase in the square footage of the repair. Mr. Eggleston replied that it will be approximately seventy square feet. Chair Kasper reiterated that the increase in square footage should be provided to the town and Mr. Eggleston agreed that he will submit the revised calculation. Member Parker-Fann requested that the if there is any disturbance to the monoculture of grass be replaced with native species plantings.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Cochair Hamlin and seconded by Member Holbein 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 Member Parker-Fann, the Planning Board declared this application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.5(c)(11) and not subject by SEQR for further review and The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, upon a motion made Chair Donald Kasper and seconded by Member Jonathan Holbein, 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 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.
2. That the Site Plan 1 of 5 dated January 15, 2025, 2 of 5 through 5 of 5 dated December 3, 2024, with Narrative dated January 15, 2025, prepared by Robert Eggleston, Licensed Architect, along with the dock repair detail prepared by Fritz Estlinbaum submitted February 3, 2025, be modified to reflect the updated size of the square

footage of the docks on the site plan and narrative as applicable, then submitted to the town, and followed in all respects; and

3. That the Planning Board waives the requirement for special permit findings as the scale of the proposed for shoreline improvements to a residential property will not have impact on the function of nearby farm operations, or adverse impact to the scenic, natural, and historic character of the Town; and as the Project is not complex requiring findings more applicable to larger projects which include use approvals; 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 the Applicant undertake all necessary measures to prevent invasive species entering the lake or neighboring properties during construction; and that native species shall be utilized in any landscape improvements; and
6. That all replacement or new lighting be night sky compliant, turned off when the boathouse is not in use and otherwise remain Zoning Code compliant; and
7. That an as-built survey for this project is required for the Application, which must be prepared and submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of all phases of the 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 Continuance- Special Permit Amendment/Site Plan Review**

Applicant	MC Skaneateles LLC	Property:
	Byrne Dairy	1387 East Genesee St
	171 US 5	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Weedsport, NY 13166	<b>Tax Parcel #032.-03-29.0</b>

Present: Marshall Winn, Sonbyrne Sales, Inc.

Mr. Winn stated that the site plan has been modified with the twelve parking spaces on the west side moved ten feet to the north to accommodate the increase in size of the stormwater pond next to it. Fifteen trees, including seven Norway spruce trees and eight white pines out in the north end of the property will be planted to buffer for any noise and light. The lighting plan has been submitted reflecting 0.0 footcandles on all property lines. The parking lot, store, and entrances will be well lit while leaving the north end of the property and near the road not lit. As the operation is 24 hours, the exterior lights will



be on from dusk to dawn. He continued saying that Mr. Camp had reviewed the SWPPP and grading plans and did not have any further concerns.

Chair Kasper said that at the site visit it was noted that on the west side of the parking area the existing swale was close to the parking area. Mr. Winn said that they had shifted the parking area further north to accommodate for the location of the swale.

Chair Kasper continued the public hearing and inquired if there was anyone who wished to comment on the project. Mr. Hunt, neighbor to the north, inquired if the drainage plans have been reviewed and Chair Kasper explained that the plans have been submitted and reviewed by the town engineer. Chair Kasper inquired if the drainage plans capture the water to the north and Mr. Winn said that he believed it does. Mr. Hunt said that it is damp back there and the leach field is back there. The septic system is a raised mound and Chair Kasper asked if the water is moving around it. Mr. Winn said that it does not go towards the neighbor's property. Ms. Choberka said that there is no proposed land disturbance beyond the septic field so that if it is wet today it will be wet and not caused by any development on the south end of the property. Mr. Eggleston commented that the drainage runs south from Mr. Hunt's property towards Route 20. Mr. Hunt said that his concern is for when the mound system is installed if the water flows around it. Mr. Winn and Mr. Eggleston stated that the septic system has already been installed as the prior septic system failed. Chair Kasper suggested that if water backs up onto Mr. Hunt's property that he contact Byrne Dairy as they are very responsive.

Member Parker-Fann said that the proposed trees at the north end are proposed at four feet in height and she recommended some should be at ten to twelve feet in height. Mr. Hunt asked how far off the property line the trees will be located and Mr. Win explained that they will be approximately ten to fifteen feet and staggered. Mr. Hunt said that he will also be planting trees on his property as well.

Bob Eggleston, neighbor to the east, spoke in favor of the project.

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

Counsel Molnar stated that the applicant has submitted the full EAF long form including part 1 that has been completed by the applicant, and that the board could evaluate part 2:

The board reviewed **Part 2 EAF**:

**1 Impact on Land** -  No  Yes

- a. No
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. No
- f. No
- g. No.

**2 Impacts on Geological Features** -  No  Yes

3 Impacts on Surface Water -  No  Yes

4 Impacts on Groundwater -  No

- a. No
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. No
- f. Small the project will be improved to NYSDEC guidelines
- g. No

5 Impact on Flooding -  No  Yes There is proposed stormwater management

6 Impacts on Air -  No  Yes

7 Impacts on Plants and Animals -  No  Yes

8 Impacts on Agricultural Resources -  No  Yes

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

12 Impacts on Critical Environmental Areas -  No  Yes NOT APPLICABLE

13 Impacts on Transportation -  No  Yes

14 Impacts on Energy -  No  Yes

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

16 Impacts on Human Health -  No  Yes

- a. No
- b. No to small
- c. No to Small
- d. No
- e. No

- f. No to Small
- g. No
- h. No
- i. No
- k. No
- l. No

17 Consistency with Community Plans -  No  Yes.

18 Consistency with Community Character -  No  Yes

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Holbein, the Planning Board, after thorough review of the Full Environmental Assessment Form (“FEAF”) submitted by the Applicant, dated November 13, 2024, made a negative declaration determination of significance under SEQR. 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; and
- (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; and
- (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; and
- (4) That the Application will not adversely affect the general availability of affordable housing in the Town; and
- (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; and
- (6) That the Application will have appropriate parking and be accessible to fire, police, and other emergency vehicles; and
- (7) That the Application will not overload any public water, drainage or sewer system or any other municipal facility or service, including schools; and
- (8) That the Application will not degrade any natural resources, ecosystem, or historic resource, including Skaneateles Lake or Owasco Lake; and

(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; and

(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; and

(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; and

(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.

Counsel Molnar will prepare a draft resolution including the above findings, and the board will consider the resolution at next month's meeting. Conditions to be included in the resolution for the request for \$1000 in escrow for engineering review, \$500 in escrow for legal review, that the proposed trees to be located at the north end of the property consist of one half of the pine trees at four feet in height and the other half as larger trees, that a sign permit be obtained for any signage, and that there be no signing located on the canopy.

Member Marshall asked about the lighting being on 24/7 and if the number of lights could be reduced. Mr. Winn explained that the proposed lights on the facility are for the employee safety, vehicles going in and out, size of the pumps, and product deliveries that happen at night.

**Continued Review- Site Plan Review**

Applicant David & Judy Fennessy  
883 Franklin Rd  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Parcel #047.-04-02.2**

The applicant's representative requested that the application be continued at the next meeting.

**Amendment Request- Site Plan Review**

Applicant Self Storage 321 LLC  
4437 State Street Rd  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Parcel #022.-01-12.3**

Present: Matt Slade, Self-Storage 321 LLC

The applicant is seeking a special permit amendment for the newly installed sign on the property. In 2024 they have updated all of their locations with new signing and had obtained a building permit to install the existing sign. In 2006 the self-storage project was approved with a condition that the sign that was to be erected shall not be lit. Member Parker-Fann commented that the town has been allowing lit signs and Chair Kasper added back lit signs as well.

Mr. Slade said that the lit sign provides a measure of safety in the area to provide drivers the location of the driveway to the facility. Member Marshall asked about other lights in the area and Mr. Slade explained that there is landscape lighting along the driveway.

Chair Kasper inquired if the facility is 24 hours and Mr. Slade affirmed that it is a 24-hour facility. Chair Kasper said that he preferred the internal lit signing rather than having spotlights on a sign. Counsel Molnar commented that the board has modified the approval several times including in 2023. Member Parker-Fann said that she thought the lighting is distracting and Member Marshall said it is dark in the area and she does not like lights there. Chair Kasper said that down the road is Baxter where their lights are internally lit. A nighttime site visit will be conducted by each of the board members. The application will continue at next month's meeting.

**Sketch Plan-11 Lot Conservation Subdivision**

Applicant	Calvin Winkelman 2866 County Line Rd Skaneateles, NY	Property: County Line Rd/Kane Ave Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Parcel #048.-01-23.2</b>
-----------	--	--

Present: Cal Winkelman, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, Corey McWilliams, Reid Engineering LLC,

Mr. Eggleston said there were a couple of open topics from last month's meeting that he would like to address. One was the snow mobile trail on the northern neighbor's property. CNY land trust said that they will not allow public access on their lot. Mr. Winkelman said that he was told in the fall and then again in January, that there will be no walking trails or public access on their property. They also said that they would review the language on the grant to determine if there is any leniency for allowing it. If there is no access on the CNY land trust property then there would be no reason to access this property.

Secondly, there was comment regarding the watercourse crossing with the driveway. There are two 24 inch steel pipes, 24 feet long, with two feet of cover over them. The culvert complies with the regulations and Mr. Camp has reviewed them. Ms. Choberka said that there was no evidence that they would be unstable if they were to construct a roadway on top of it. As part of the final design there can be an analysis of the culverts to ensure that they will continue the drainage and would not fail under the road. Chair Kasper commented that he had stopped out there after the last meeting and noted that part of the culvert is on the land trust property. He continued saying that they are tilted the wrong way about 4-5 inches to a pond behind it on the land trust property. They may need to be head-walled to control erosion. There is a thirteen foot wide blacktop and where the guardrails will be located. He requested a cross-section to be provided to the board to understand how they are all going to fit. The applicant may need to go on the land trust property to do that. Chair Kasper reminded the applicant that it is a class C watercourse.

Member Parker-Fann asked if NYSDEC has been contacted to determine if they consider the watercourse navigable, and if so they would need an Article 15 permit. Chair Kasper commented that the watercourse is very narrow and is considered class C since there is water in it year round.

Member Marshall said that she wants to verify the information on the snow mobile course. Counsel Molnar said that if the CNY land trust says there is no access limitation in the grant by which they purchased the property, the board has to take them at their word. Chair Kasper said that it is not up to the board if they do not want it on their property. Mr. Eggleston said that the sole purpose for that trail was for access to the gas station and the club could find alternative access on another property.

Chair Kasper inquired how far along the septic and road plans are and Mr. Eggleston said that Mr. Reid is close to completion on the plans.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Marshall to schedule a public hearing on March 11, 2025 at 6:40 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

**Continued Review-3 Lot Subdivision and Special Permit Extension**

Applicant        Jeremy Kimball  
                      1351 Cherry Valley Tpke  
                      Skaneateles, NY  
                      **Tax Parcel #032.-03-30.1**

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects,

A plat plan has been submitted reflecting the proposed three lots that will have four easement agreements. The easements would be a drainage easement between lots A and B, a shared driveway easement between lots B and C, a stormwater management easement between lots B and C, and a ten foot sidewalk easement on all three of the proposed lots. The stormwater easement will include ten feet around the pond for maintenance access. Counsel Molnar will prepared a draft resolution that will also include establishment of a \$500 escrow for legal review of the easements. The applicant would like an additional eighteen months for the special permit extension that will also be included in the resolution.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Marshall to schedule a public hearing on March 11, 2025 at 6:50 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

**Continued Review- Site Plan Review**

Applicant        Michael Strangeway  
                      2763 East Lake Rd  
                      Skaneateles, NY 13152  
                      **Tax Parcel #038.-01-25.0**

Present: Michael Strangeway, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects,

Mr. Eggleston began saying that they had to propose the permanent dock at the existing stairs location and at an angle out into the water due to the centerline of the lake. The proposed dock is similar to other

docks that the board has reviewed the plan, and it meets all of the zoning criteria. Chair Kasper asked why the platform was so large at the end of the dock. and Mr. Eggleston said that the applicant has two boat hoists that he would be storing here right now as the neighbor to the north jams up the north end.

Chair Kasper said that the board did a site visit and commented that the zoning code is being reviewed by a committee for some changes to it. In the future the property owner may be required to provide notification to any easement owner on their property. Mr. Eggleston said that this easement was written in 1924 and that right now the Tuckers own the easement. Mr. Eggleston said that the easement holder has rights. A copy of the easement has been provided to the town, and it is for the ingress and egress of oxen, cattle. Counsel Molnar clarified the easement by reading a copy of the deed into the record saying that MKJ Farms, that together with the right of way in and over a certain strip of land 15 feet in width extending from East Lake Road to the easterly shore of Skaneateles Lake, for said party of the second part, his heirs and assigns, and his servants and his tenants. At all times to freely pass and repass on foot, or with horse, wagon, automobile, or other vehicles.

Chair Kasper said that he did notify Mark Tucker only to let him know that there was something happening on this property as he has known Mark for 17 years as friend. Anybody else would appreciate somebody being told that their rights may be impacted by a proposed change. So I encouraged Mark to talk with the new owner, and that is all I encouraged because there was a new owner.

Counsel Molnar said that the party that says what we can and cannot do in the in the lake is the State of New York. The State of New York delegated to the Town of Skaneateles the right to self-regulate the placement of docks, etcetera up to 1500 feet into the lake from the lake line. Then the town of Skaneateles went forward and developed a code on point, and the code specifically gives rights to an easement holder. Section 148-7-1-K.6 Easement areas. The easements related to the water area associated with a lot shall be subject to all requirements applicable to the entire lot, such as water, perimeter, setback structures and number of watercraft. Then there is an exception. A limited exception for lots subject to an easement in existence prior to January 1, 2024. Within the offshore easement space seasonal structures may be placed within or outside of the water perimeter applicable to the parcel, provided the seasonal structures comply with dimensional requirements of the chapter. So the easement holder has a limited exception in the code regarding placement of seasonal structures. That is an important distinction, which I think supports the conclusion that the easement holders should be notified. Mr. Eggleston said that the plan does not supersede the rights of the easement holder.

Chair Kasper commented that the easement does not affect the location of the proposed dock. Counsel Molnar said that there is room for it to go there. Mr. Eggleston said that his understanding is that the language read said to the low water mark because the property ownership goes to the low water mark. Member Marshall said that you just would not put permanent docks out, but it is different for seasonal docks in terms of setbacks. Mr. Eggleston said that setbacks are based on property, not easements, and there is a 15 foot easement. The property has 60 feet of lake frontage for which there is a 10 foot setback for the property. Member Marshall said if the applicant is doing a permanent dock, then there can only be a seasonal dock for the easement owner. Mr. Eggleston said that it would have to fall within the rights of the seasonal section of code and within the limitations of the easement. Member Marshall asked what the setback is for a seasonal dock, and Chair Kasper commented that the code allows a seasonal dock to go up to the property line. Mr. Eggleston said that the easement would only go to the low water mark. He said that the water is owned by the State from the low water mark out, so then you deal with the state, and the easement goes to the highway to the low water mark. Counsel Molnar added that the state

delegated that to the town, so we self-regulate. Chair Kasper said that there is nothing hindering him to do anything and there would not be any limitation put on a seasonal structure. Mr. Eggleston said that the only limitations the Tuckers have is what is the 1924 easement, and Chair Kasper added that says you can bring a truck down there, whatever, with the purpose of getting to the water. Member Marshall said that if a seasonal dock is placed, it might have to be arranged so you can maneuver boats depending on where they want to put a permanent dock.

Mr. Eggleston said that Mike Strangeway has made application for a legal permanent dock and that is what the board is considering today. Chair Kasper said that he suggested that Mr. Strangeway, the new owner, and Mr. Tucker talk. Chair Kasper said that the easement owner is not hindered from placing a seasonal dock. Counsel Molnar said that the easement is not being hindered, and that the easement holder has a right to put a seasonal dock in without even pulling a permit right to the edge of the property line. Chair Kasper said that what is for the board's consideration tonight is for the proposed permanent dock.

Chair Kasper requested that large wash stone are put up against the sea wall or the shoreline underneath the dock for erosion control. Mr. Eggleston said that he will add the stone.

**WHEREAS**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Holbein, the Planning Board declared this application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.5(c)(11) and not subject by SEQR for further review and 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 Site Plan Approval, with the following conditions:

1. That the 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.
2. That the Site Plan 1 through 3 dated January 9, 2025, with Narrative dated January 9, 2025, prepared by Robert Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be followed in all respects; and
3. That the Planning Board waives the requirement for special permit findings as the scale of the proposed for shoreline improvements to a residential property will not have impact on the function of nearby farm operations, or adverse impact to the scenic, natural, and historic character of the Town; and as the Project is not complex requiring findings more applicable to larger projects which include use approvals; 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 the Applicant undertake all necessary measures to prevent invasive species entering the lake or neighboring properties during construction; and that native species shall be utilized in any landscape improvements; and



6. That scouring rocks are placed underneath the dock along the shoreline for erosion control; and
7. That an as-built survey for this project is required for the Application, which must be prepared and submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of all phases of the 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]

**Continued Review- Site Plan Review**

Applicant      Benzion Klein  
                       1603 40<sup>th</sup> St  
                       Brooklyn, NY 11218

Property:  
 2900 West Lake Rd  
 Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Parcel #052.-01-09.3**

Present: Benzion Klein, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects,

A grading plan was submitted and has been reviewed by Mr. Camp. The property is a large lot, and a large portion of the water is already taken care of with the existing northern swale that feeds into a culvert under the driveway that will lead to the proposed bioswale. The proposed house is partially on the location of the existing barn. Impermeable surface coverage will be reduced with the modification to the seasonal driveway to the cottage converted to a grass strip driveway. The existing cottage will be cleaned up and kept as the accessory apartment. Also proposed is a permanent dock and platform. The existing gabion structure will remain as it is performing well. Chair Kasper commented that wave stones should be added in front of the existing gabion wall.

Chair Kasper said that at the site visit it was noted that the property to the south had been clear cut all of the way up to the house which is not what the board likes to see. Mr. Eggleston suggested that a designated person meet with them on site in the spring to determine what trees should be replaced. He continued saying that the other property did have some mature trees left. He recommended that nothing should be cut from the seasonal driveway to the lake until the meeting with the Planning Board representative has occurred. Member Parker-Fann suggested that there could be a tree replacement percentage established. Member Parker-Fann said that the bio swale calculations were based off existing conditions, and they were not considering removal of trees and the impact to sheet flow.

Chair Kasper said that the shoreline trees should remain as they provide stability for the hill. Member Marshall said that you also have to consider the view. Mr. Klien said that nobody likes to leave the trees on the lakeside of their property. Chair Kasper said that it is not to block the house out but that the view from the lake up is just as important as from the property to the lake and there needs to be landscaping. Mr. Eggleston said that buffer plantings and shrubs help to manage the water. Mr. Klein said that the

other property had vines in the plantings and trees and killed off the brush. Mr. Eggleston added that the landscaping had not been maintained for some time. Chair Kasper said having lawn all the way to the shoreline is not environmentally sound and many fertilize the grass, although it is not allowed up to 100 feet of the lake line.

Mr. Brodsky said that section 148-7-1-J. states that the area should be kept in a natural state, no pesticides or fertilizers utilized within 100 feet of the lake line. He suggested that a landscaping plan is submitted for at least the first 100 feet of the shoreline. Mr. Eggleston said that he would like to make that a condition of approval as they would not be doing landscaping at this time. The applicant could be prohibited from clear-cutting trees or vegetation on the site, and there shall be no removal of trees to the east of the seasonal driveway to the lake line without a planting plan approved by the Planning Board, which planting plan shall be prepared by the Applicant and submitted to the Planning Board for review and approval. Mr. Brodsky added that the listing of the types of plants should be included in the planting plan. Chair Kasper said that the applicant could hire a tree expert to determine what trees cannot be saved.

**WHEREAS**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Cochair Hamlin, the Planning Board declared this application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR 617.5(c)(11) and not subject by SEQR for further review and The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, upon a motion made Chair Donald Kasper, seconded by Member Jonathan Holbein, 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 Site Plan Approval, with the following conditions:

1. That the 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.
2. That the Site Plan 1 through 7 dated January 8, 2025, grading plan 2 of 8 dated January 17, 2025, with Narrative dated January 9, 2025, prepared by Robert Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be followed in all respects; and
3. That the Planning Board waives the requirement for special permit findings as the scale of the proposed for shoreline improvements to a residential property will not have impact on the function of nearby farm operations, nor adverse impact to the scenic, natural, and historic character of the Town; and as the Project is not complex requiring findings more applicable to larger projects which include use approvals; 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 the Applicant shall not clear-cut trees or vegetation on the site, and there shall be no removal of trees to the east of the seasonal driveway to the lake line without a planting plan approved by the Planning Board, which planting plan shall be prepared by the Applicant and submitted to the Planning Board for review and approval; and

6. That the Applicant undertake all necessary measures to prevent invasive species entering the lake or neighboring properties during construction; and that native species shall be utilized in any landscape improvements; and
7. That the accessory structure be connected to the new septic system proposed for the lot in addition to the proposed dwelling; and
8. That the Applicant establishes an escrow account with the Town of Skaneateles in the amount of \$500 for engineering review; and
9. That scouring rocks are to be placed underneath the dock along the shoreline for erosion control; and
10. That an as-built survey for this project is required for the Application, which must be prepared and submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of all phases of the 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-Special Permit/Site Plan Review**

Applicant:	Richard & Marie Garlock 81 Alexander St Princeton, NJ 08450	Property: 1777 Russells Landing Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #063.-03-05.0</b>
------------	---	---

Present: Richard & Marie Garlock, Applicants; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

The applicants had received approval for modifications to the dwelling and the existing garage. As they had to redesign the garage based on input from the neighbor, they have further modified the decks and walkways that is reflected on this site plan. All of the coverages are consistent or better than approved. The exterior stairs from the dwelling deck will be removed. The second and third steps to the bank will be rebuilt in kind. The existing multilevel shoreline decks will all be modified to the same level as the top level with the shed. The stairs will be shorter and then the crib dock itself is lower than the deck. They are going to keep the crib dock and encapsulate the existing dock by putting piers in alongside and laying a dock over the crib dock. The dock will expand to eight feet in width and at the recommended flood level of 867 foot elevation. A small portion of the existing dock that is submersed will be removed.

Additionally, a six foot wide permanent dock extension will connect to a covered boat slip with a nine inch walkway around two sides. At the end of the six foot dock there will be a 128 square foot widened area of the permanent dock. Cochair Hamlin inquired about the dock encapsulation. Mr. Eggleston explained that rather than removing the dock the piers and top will surround the exiting crib dock and there will be

a small gap between the crib dock and the new dock surface that would not be accessible. Mr. Eggleston continued saying the if the crib docks fails the wood would break out and the rocks would fall to the base of the lake and become splash rocks.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Cochair Hamlin to schedule a public hearing on March 11, 2025 at 7:00 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

**Discussion- Special Permit/Site Plan Review**

Applicant Jolene Fitch/Fingerlakes Fabric  
1400 East Genesee St  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Parcel #042.-01-10.1**

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects.

Counsel Molnar stated that the applicant has amended their application as the classroom instruction would be considered a service business use and would be a second primary use for the location. The applicant subsequently is requesting that the proposed lodging facility be considered an accessory use to a service business use for the group education. He recommended that the board revise their requestion for interpretation of the Zoning Board of Appeals to reflect the interpretation of whether a lodging facility is an accessory use to a service business use. Mr. Eggleston said that he assumed when the retail use was approved that the applicant had also included the classroom instruction, which she did not.

Mr. Eggleston added that based on the Zoning Board of Appeals site visit, he had added a door on the east side that would lead to a small deck on the east for easy access out in the event of an emergency. Chair Kasper inquired about the loft that is located in the retail store. Mr. Eggleston explained that the loft is physically open to both the retail and education areas, however, it is just mechanical equipment up there. They can place a barrier on it so that it is not open to the public.

**WHEREAS**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Cochair Hamlin, the Planning Board refer to the application to the Zoning Board of Appeals for an interpretation. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

**Discussion**

The board discussed the draft shoreline guidelines, and the draft guidelines will be sent out to the board.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Marshall to adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 9:33 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Additional Meeting Attendees:

Robert Eggleston

Rick Naro

Peter Bettis

Charles Hunt

Barbara Hunt

Matt Slade

Benzion Klein

Ken Osmun

Additional Meeting Attendees (Zoom):

Kyle Pellizzari

Corey McWilliams

Mark Tucker

Cal Winkelman

Rich Strangeway

Howard Brodsky

Scott Winkelman

Roy Gilhooley, Esq.

Bruce & Todd

Richard & Marie Garlock