

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES  
PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
July 19, 2022**

Donald Kasper  
Douglas Hamlin  
Scott Winkelman arr. 6:33 p.m.  
Jill Marshall  
Jon Holbein-Absent  
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel  
John Camp, P.E. (C&S Engineers)  
Howard Brodsky, Town Planner  
Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Chair Kasper opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. The meeting minutes of June 21, 2022 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 Hamlin to approve the minutes as submitted. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Donald Kasper	Present [Yes]
Vice Chair	Douglas Hamlin	Present [Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Absent
Member	Jill Marshall	Present [Yes]
Member	Jon Holbein	Absent

**Continued Review –Site Plan Review**

Applicant: Michael & Anne Marie Fallon  
2583 East Lake Rd  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Parcel#023.-03-15.1**

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

The site plan has been revised to reduce the impermeable surface coverage to a conforming 10% lot coverage, and no longer requiring a special permit or public hearing. The proposal is for a permanent dock and to replace the existing stairs and deck. A 4,000 square foot tennis court had been removed prior. The existing impervious surface coverage will be reduced from 11.6% to 10%. There was a question on whether the replacement stairs design created by RJ Estlinbaum is designed to work with the bank topography, and Mr. Eggleston reviewed the measurements, had them verified by Mr. Olszewski, and determined that the stairs will work with the bank as it was designed.

Member Winkelman inquired if the applicants now plan to play lawn tennis and Mr. Eggleston said that he had worked with the Colony group to see if a pickle ball court could be added but concluded the additional impermeable coverage reduction was difficult to locate to allow for the pickleball court.

**WHEREAS**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Hamlin, the Planning Board declared this application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(11) 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 Member Douglas Hamlin, and after an affirmative vote of a majority of 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 of 1 dated June 27, 2022, and Narrative dated June 27, 2022 prepared by Robert Eggleston, Licensed Architect, with Design plans 1 of 3 through 3 of 3 dated June 1, 2022, prepared by F.J. Estlinbaum Barge and Crane Service, Licensed Contractor, be followed in all respects; and
3. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application; and
4. That the Applicant shall seek amended site plan approval from the Planning Board if there will be any modifications to the existing shoreline stairs that have not been articulated in the narrative dated June 27, 2022 prepared by Robert Eggleston, Licensed Architect; and
5. That an as-built survey be 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]
Vice Chair	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Absent	

**Public Hearing – Subdivision**

Applicant: Roy Lootens  
3943 East St  
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Property:  
710 Visions Drive  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Parcel #023.-01-08.8**

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects;

The applicant had received an approval for the algae fertilizer production facility on the lot in 2019. The lot is six acres, and the applicant would like to subdivide the lot with two acres for the existing structure with a 50 foot access easement for access to the four acre of the lot that is vacant land. Although with the original subdivision for Visions Drive excluded commercial access off Sheldon Road for this lot, residential

access could be provided off Sheldon Road. Chair Kasper commented at the site visit it was noted that there was a fill pile in the rear of the property. Mr. Eggleston said that it was from the development of the building and the pile stabilized. He continued saying that they found no evidence of a stream on the property. Mr. Eggleston said that the stream is off the property and drains to the culvert although the building envelope location would be affected by the location of the stream. Chair Kasper said that site plan approval would be required for development of the new lot. Counsel Molnar inquired if there is an existing drainage easement for Lot 1, Tessy Plastics, and Mr. Eggleston replied that he is not aware of one although there is natural drainage in the area. Counsel Molnar asked if the Lootens property drains into the watercourse and Mr. Eggleston said that the natural drainage is to discharge towards it but does not tie into it.

At this time Counsel Molnar recommended to the Board that the application be an Unlisted Action and reviewed the short form SEQR with the Board. In evaluating each of the criteria set forth in Part II:

Part II	No or small impact	Moderate to Large impact
1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulation?	X	
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?	X	
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?	X	
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a CEA?	X	
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking, or walkway?	X	
6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy, and it fails to incorporate available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?	X	
7. Will the proposed action impact existing public/private water supplies and/or public/private wastewater treatment utilities?	X	
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archeological, architectural, or aesthetic resources?	X	
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g. wetlands, water bodies, groundwater, air quality, flora, and fauna)?	X	
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding, or drainage problems?	X	
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental or human health?	X	

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

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

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Hamlin and seconded by Chair Kasper 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 Chair Donald Kasper duly seconded by Member Jill Marshall, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board hereby **APPROVES** the two-lot Subdivision, with the following conditions:

1. The Final Plan of the Subdivision, be prepared and then submitted for the Planning Board Chairman’s review and signature within 180 days from the signing of this resolution; and
2. That the Applicant shall prepare and submit a draft Access Easement, as reflected in the Application (the “Access Easement”), for Planning Board Chair and the Planning Board Attorney approval, and that once approved, the Access Easement shall be recorded by the Applicant in the Onondaga County Clerk’s Office contemporaneously with the filing of the Subdivision Map; and
3. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or Application; and
4. That Planning Board Site Plan Approval is required for proposed lot 5-A.2 for review in conformance to §148-5-4-E, and that same be noted on be Subdivision Map; and
5. The Subdivision Map and Deed transferring the property(ies) must be filed in the Onondaga County Clerk’s Office within sixty-two (62) days of the signing of said Map, or the Subdivision approval shall be invalid. Proof of said filing shall be immediately forwarded to the Secretary of the Planning Board upon receipt by the Applicant and/or Applicant’s representative.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Vice Chair	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Absent	

**Public Hearing- Special Permit**

Applicant      Joseph Mollendorf  
                      274 Ruskin Road  
                      Amherst, NY 14226

Property:  
 1801 Russell’s Landing  
 Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Parcel #063.-03-10.0**

Present: Bill Murphy, Space Architectural;

A site visit was conducted, and as part of the discussion concerned the seawall and platform by the lake. A revised site plan has not been prepared for the board at this time. The seawall will be removed, and a system of piers will be utilized to lift the dock platform that would be at the same size, rather than a wall foundation.

They have not received any comments from the NYSDEC, although they have acknowledged receipt of the submittal. Mr. Camp inquired if the existing seawall will be removed. Mr. Murphy stated that the existing seawall is not really a seawall but a pier system, and although the staircase to the lake is over a 40 years old made of metal and is sturdy, it is not easy to traverse as it is spiral shaped.

The application will also have the house raised to place a basement underneath, with the excess soils moved off site. The dwelling is not used year round but could be used year round. Member Winkelman inquired if the house could be raised a bit so that the basement would not have to be dug as deep. Mr. Murphy stated that if they hit a lot of bedrock they may consider it. They will be doing test holes before they begin lifting the dwelling and excavating underneath. The project will be done in phases with the shoreline work completed first before beginning the basement project.

**WHEREAS**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Marshall, the Planning Board declared this application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(11) and not subject by SEQR for further review. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

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

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Marshall to continue the public hearing to next month's meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

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

Applicant	Sue Edinger	Property:
	Edinger Lakehouse LLC	2316 Thornton Grove South
	1340 Thornton Grove	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Skaneateles, NY 13152	<b>Tax Parcel #056.-03-07.0</b>

Present: Bill Murphy, Space Architectural;

improvements to the property. Proposed is a 130 square foot addition to the dwelling that would include a full bathroom and an area for laundry facilities. The existing porch would be replaced by a new porch with a similar footprint. The bathroom on the first floor will be more accessible for the matriarch of the family when she visits. The property is also at 16.2% impermeable surface coverage and will be reducing this to 15.5% with the removal of some pavement and payment of \$15,742.87 to the DRA fund. The Zoning Board of Appeals granted the variance for lake yard setback.

The small stormwater management system may not capture the stormwater from the camp itself but will assist with the management of the stormwater that comes down the road and onto the property. There also is no appropriate location for the bioswale elsewhere on the site. Mr. Camp inquired if it could be located on the lakeside of the driveway/parking area and Mr. Murphy explained that there is a retaining wall and septic equipment located in the area and the bank and trees are well established in the area. Chair Kasper stated that it was an established area that more damage would occur with disturbance if it were located there. Chair Kasper commented that a proper swale around the addition could assist with the drainage. Member Winkelman commented that the bank is very well established and stable with the brush and trees. He continued saying that the ditch along the road is also managing the stormwater and it may not be ideal

to have the bioswale located along the road, it will still help with the watershed. Mr. Camp reminded the board that the bioswales are for water treatment and not for erosion control. Mr. Brodsky inquired if there were any additional areas that could be removed to help reduce impervious surface. Member Marshall asked if the retaining wall is inhibiting drainage of the area and Mr. Camp explained that it is a dry stack wall it allows water to run through it then sheets through the landscape to the lake. Member Winkelman asked if the bioswales can be designed so that there is minimal disruption employing the use of berms. Mr. Camp acknowledged that they can be constructed in a manner that will not cause deep disturbance of the land. He continued saying the most effective location is east of the driveway although a couple of trees would need to be removed. The proposed location is better than no controls in place. Chair Kasper reiterated that the landscaping is one of the better established lots in the area.

**WHEREAS**, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Chair Kasper, the Planning Board declared this application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(11) and not subject by SEQR for further review. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

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

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Marshall and seconded by Chair Kasper 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 Member Scott Winkelman and seconded by Chair Donald Kasper, and after an affirmative vote of a majority of 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 Z-1 through Z-2 dated July 6, 2022, prepared by Space Architectural Studio, P.C., Licensed Architects, be followed in all respects; and
3. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application; and
4. That all conditions imposed by the Skaneateles Zoning Board of Appeals, in connection with its approved variance, be fulfilled; and
5. That the Applicant establish an escrow account with the Town of Skaneateles in the amount of \$250; and
6. That \$15,742.87 be submitted to the Town of Skaneateles Land and Development Rights Acquisition Fund; and
7. That an as-built survey be 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]
Vice Chair	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Absent	

**Sketch Plan- Special Permit**

Applicant	MWB Family I, LLC	Property:
	13915 Old Coast Rd 1003	1326 New Seneca Tpke
	Naples, FL 34110	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		<b>Tax Parcel #043.-04-09.0</b>

Present: Asher Bitz, Applicant: Bill Murphy, Space Architectural;

While the applicant is pursuing a zone change with the Town Board, they have decided to submit an application for a special permit for various uses in the RR district to be able to attract tenants to the building today. A floorplan and parking analysis have been provided that indicates that there is sufficient parking on site for the proposed and existing uses. Based on the calculations there would be fifteen spots left for guests or visitors to the building while providing the required parking for the employees of the businesses. Lab Co. Workspace will be in the northwest portion of the building, then there will be anchor tenants at the southwest corner of the building indicated as PJO space, WAM space for the vault and office space in the center of the building. The existing catering kitchen with café located towards the front of the building would be for service in the building, and the existing bathrooms would remain. There is a mix of closed offices, open offices and conference rooms that could be used by any tenant of the building. There is a small vestibule and receptions at the main entrance to the building. The building is a single story building built in 1953 with mechanicals located on the roof.

Chair Kasper inquired on the existing layout of the building. Mr. Murphy explained that the existing space is wide open, and they intend to convert some of the areas to private offices. With the recent changes to how people work, with some work completed at home, the Lab Co. Workspace and flex office space would allow someone to meet a client or hold a meeting. Their belief is that most of the tenants using the spaces will be from the local community.

The additional special permit uses being requested to augment the existing permitted office use are for Craft Workshop, Light Industry, Recreational Business, Service Business, Health Care Facility, and Membership Club. These uses would be for future tenant A, future tenant B spaces, and a service business classification for the existing cafe. They are looking to provide more flexibility for the applicant to attract businesses to lease the areas. Although there is no breakdown for the future tenant spaces, they used the parking ratios that were used for the PJO office space to create the parking analysis. Based on the calculation the total building requires 74 parking spaces and there are 87 parking spaces on the property. It was noted that the application has an old aerial photo as the parking lot was restriped in 2017. Mr. Camp commented that the parking lot space is tight. Mr. Murphy noted that the existing parking lot has a one way direction parking. Mr. Camp inquired about potential delivery access and Mr. Murphy replied that the parking lot is front loaded leaving the back lot clear with ample room in the rear for truck maneuverability. The prior tenant would not use that rear portion of the parking lot on delivery days.

Chase Design, the prior tenant, did some interior renovation in 2009 and the OCDOH did approve the septic that included the kitchen design. Member Hamlin commented that the applicant is requesting a series of

several special permits for the mixed use building. Mr. Brodsky agreed and added that the special permits requested are for a variety of uses without the specifics as to location and size of the uses. Member Hamlin said that the applicant could have a future tenant that would occupy both spaces and Mr. Murphy said that if that were to happen it would not affect the parking requirements. He continued saying that he does not believe that there is a different parking load for any of the uses he is asking for. Member Hamlin commented that a use may require more parking and Mr. Murphy stated that there are fifteen extra parking spaces that provide that buffer. Mr. Murphy continued saying that he could calculate what the maximum amount of parking that could be required although he did not foresee that it would exceed the 87 spaces available.

Chair Kasper said that the board will have to determine what uses would be allowed. Mr. Murphy commented that the hours of operation would be normal business hours including the catering business. There may be some weekend traffic for the catering business, but it would not be a high volume of traffic. Mr. Murphy commented that they are trying to put tenants into the building and not leave it a vacant building. Chair Kasper commented that there is a need for office space in the town. Mr. Murphy noted that the board has a concern for retail use such as a Target there, and they are not asking for that type of use. They are asking for what is allowable in the RR district to give the applicant more options in attracting businesses to lease space. They are getting more interest in other uses that are not an office use. They are continuing to pursue the zone change to the HC district with the Town Board.

Member Marshall inquired about the medical facility use and Mr. Murphy explaining that they are not pursuing an ER type of facility but an IV center where you can go in and get IVs. They have had discussions regarding a gym and a barber shop. Chair Kasper said that the barber shop would have a lot of people coming and going, and Mr. Bitz responded that the business owner has a specific client list, and it would not be off the street business.

Counsel Molnar stated that he has recused himself and that any questions should be directed to Brody Smith. Member Hamlin inquired of Chair Kasper if a special permit has ever been issued for an unknown project. Chair Kasper responded that he does not remember any that may have occurred. Mr. Brodsky interjected that Member Hamlin is correct in that historically the town practice is to do special permits for known uses, characteristics, and potential impacts. The board usually has more detail than the plan that has been presented, and the board usually does not grant approval to a series of unknowns. The applicant has a reasonable interest in wanting to avoid having to come back repeatedly. Mr. Murphy added that there will be no change to the exterior of the building or property. Mr. Brodsky commented that even without change to the exterior, other factors are related to the occupancy; the uses impact parking demand, traffic flow, and septic needs. The board may authorize some degree of special permit approval; however, a greater level of detail in the submission is recommended before approval. If the board has concerns, the uses could be parsed and not all approved, .e.g. membership club has a high traffic component to it, with people coming and going. Also a medical building has people coming and going, and although they are allowed uses, they may not be suitable uses for this property without knowing more detail. A dentist occupying 1,000 square feet will have a different impact than a clinic occupying 1,000 square feet just based on scale of use.

Any signing for the building will comply with the zoning code and the applicant is planning to re-use the existing sign. Chair Kasper commented that the board needs legal representation and will need to meet with Counsel Smith before moving forward. Member Hamlin said that the board needs to consider the intensity of the proposed uses for the property. Mr. Camp said that the board typically reviews an application where the applicant proposes a specific use, with details, and the board determines feasibility of the project. Here the applicant is asking the board to produce a limit and the board may not legally have that ability. Mr. Murphy said that with a new building you have that flexibility, but this is an existing building, and it has space that can be utilized by several uses that they are trying to lease. They are hoping to have a little bit more flexibility regarding the uses that can occur. Chair Kasper commented that the board may consider

what uses are allowable with the condition that approval is received by the Planning Board, and it is done in one meeting if it fits in the town's guidelines. Mr. Murphy stated that he would be amenable to that. Chair Kasper recommended that the applicant refine the list of proposed uses. Mr. Murphy added that he will also obtain more information from the OCDOH regarding the septic system.

Member Winkelman inquired if a public hearing could be set for next month and it was determined that there is not enough information to set a public hearing. Mr. Camp suggested that maximum square footage could be set based on a proposed use for the site which would give the board something to consider. Mr. Bitz said that it is only tenant space A and B that is in question as the rest of the space is dedicated to existing uses. Mr. Murphy reiterated that tenant space A and B are the only spaces that have not been defined as Lab Co is office use, and the service area is the catering kitchen. Chair Kasper suggested that the board could look at all uses in the building in case someone calls up and wants to accept the other offices for a different use. Mr. Bitz clarified that Lab Co is the investment that the family is interested in doing. Member Marshall said that the applicant is looking for a blanket approval for spaces A and B, and the catering business. She continued saying that a list of potential ideas for each of the spaces A and B could be provided to the board. Mr. Camp commented that the attorney advise may indicate that the board cannot grant approval for something that is not specific that might not meet the terms of a special permit. The application will continue next month.

**Continuance– Special Permit**

Applicant: Mandana Farms LLC  
John Cherundulo  
4638 Kingsford Terrace                      Properties: 1871 West Lake Rd  
Syracuse, NY 13215                              **Tax Parcels #061.-01-12.1**

Present: John Cherundulo, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects;

The public hearing had been closed last month. Chair Kasper commented that the draft resolution does not discuss the north driveway being limited to farm access only. Condition 4g. was added stating :The applicant will utilize the north access drive off West Lake Road for farm access only.” Counsel Molnar reviewed the draft resolution with the board.

**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. The Application is consistent with the purposes of the land use district in which the Property is located, and with all applicable provisions of Chapter 148;
2. That based on the narrative provided by Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC, dated June 7, 2022 (the “Narrative”), the Site Plan prepared by Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC updated June 7, 2022 (the “Site Plan”), the floor plan prepared by Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC dated June 7, 2022 (the “Floor Plan”), the elevations prepared by Eggleston & Krenzer updated June 27, 2022 (the “Elevations”), and the Mandana Farms Storage Site Development Plans prepared by Edward Reid Engineering, PLLC, dated June 27, 2022, the Planning Board has determined that the Application will not adversely affect the surrounding land uses by creating excessive traffic, noise, dust, odors, glare, pollution or other nuisances;
3. The Application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; and

4. That all relevant Special Permit and Site Plan Criteria required by Chapter 148 have been satisfied.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, upon a motion made by Chair Donald Kasper and duly seconded by Member Douglas Hamlin, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the Application, and hereby issues a Special Permit with Site Plan approval for the Application, with standard conditions and additional conditions as follows:

1. The Board hereby adopts the Findings, as if set forth herein at length.
2. 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
3. That the Narrative, Site Plan, Floor Plan, and Elevations prepared by Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC, be strictly followed; and
4. That the following special conditions apply to use of the intended warehouse/storage facility located upon the Property:
  - a. Orientation and placement of the warehouse/storage barn shall be as set forth on the Site Plan, without deviation, including placement of paved roadways, fencing and lights being on motion sensors and placed above the entry and overhead doors per the Site Plan and Narrative;
  - b. The Applicant shall not be permitted to provide repair services to boats and other vehicles stored at this location, except for minor maintenance and/or ordinary maintenance of farm equipment stored therein, as set forth in the Narrative;
  - c. Water service shall be permitted at the site; however the Applicant has not proposed an onsite sewage disposal system, which would require Onondaga County Department of Health Approval, and must provide portable toilets if necessary for employee use, in lieu of constructed restroom facilities within the warehouse/storage facility;
  - d. The Applicant is not permitted or allowed to trailer boats to and from the Skaneateles Marina on a daily or frequent basis, nor store boats or other parked vehicles with trailers on the Property except within the proposed storage building and/or gravel lot surrounded by six foot high fence.
  - e. Storage of boats and other vehicles on the Property is permitted on a seasonal basis only with boat/vehicle removal in spring, and placed in storage in autumn; and
  - f. The Applicant shall screen the Premises with plantings, as set forth on the Site Plan, which shall be strictly maintained by the Applicant.
  - g. The applicant will utilize the north access drive off West Lake Road for farm access only.
5. That the Applicant notify the New York State and Onondaga County Departments of Transportation, and obtain a SWPPP, as suggested by the SOCPA Modifications, as applicable, and comply with any conditions and/or requirements of the SWPPP; and
6. That the Applicant obtain the approval of any other agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Application or Property.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]

Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[No]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Absent	

**Continued Review – Site Plan Review**

Applicant: Daniel Pajak  
 2896 East Lake Rd  
 Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Parcel#036.-01-38.1**

Present: Mike Conese, Anchor QEA, LLC

A revised site plan package has been submitted to the town based on the suggested revisions from the board and a joint application has been submitted to the NYSDEC, ACOE, and the City of Syracuse Department of Health. The Onondaga County Planning Board had reviewed the project and commented that NYSDOT should be contacted for any work that is done in the right of way. The applicant contacted the NYSDOT, and they do not require a work permit for the plantings that will be placed in the right of way.

Mr. Johnson stated that Rich Abbott, City of Syracuse Department of Water, had concerns with the toewood being utilized, although it is preferred by US Fish and Wildlife, USDA, and Conservation. He continued saying that there will be more shrub like plantings by the toewood that will have a significant root structure to grow into that. Mr. Camp commented that based on his conversations with Rich Abbott and it was his understanding that he was not satisfied with the design proposed. He has not issued a follow up to the town from his earlier comments on the project. Mr. Camp continued saying he and Mr. Abbot share the conflicted view that a lot of the watercourses need attention, and they function well if stabilized; however, they are a source of material going into the lake. He has a concern in placing wood in a design like this as the life span of multiple decades is not sufficient as at some point the wood will rot and go away. The approach will look very natural for a few years, but it will shift once it starts to decay. The design has heavy rocks sitting on top of the wood as the embankment that is problematic. The application has material being added back into the stream and lake. It is nature based approach but may not be the proper stabilization needed. There were no peak velocity calculations provided and if it were below six or seven feet per second it may be acceptable.

Member Marshall inquired how long the technique with toewood has been in use in the state. Mr. Johnson stated that it has been used across the county and has been used in stabilization projects 10-15 times the size of this project. The toewood is buried and not exposed to oxygen, and when combined with layering and planting, it creates a stabilized shoreline system. The NYSDEC does not want armored stone on the banks as they do not have the ecological and environmental function as some of the naturalized systems. There is quite a bit of material to keep that channel alignment. The large stone on the backside is there for aesthetic and not structural development as it is not intended to hold the wood in place. The orientation of the toewood and the root bogs perpendicular to the force of the water in the channel coming down is the naturalized system. The stones are something the property owner wants and due to the weight will stay there. Mr. Camp stated that he prefers an engineering type approach because it is dependable, with science behind the design. Usually when the board is reviewing stormwater management it is in terms of a 100 year storm, which are occurring more frequently. He continued saying that he does not have a comfort level with the naturalized approach. Rich Abbott has not sent his final comments on the project that he typically does when he is satisfied with the project.

Member Winkelman said that this is an evolution from rip-rapping the entire project. Proposed is a green infrastructure with woody shrubs holding the bank and the rocks holding the bank, replicating nature much better. This is an experiment, and they are putting a lot of money into this. With the frequency of the larger

storms we will be re-doing all our tributaries in the next 30 years. Mr. Camp said that we may be experimenting with something that ends up in the lake. An engineer could design a rock structure that will stay in place, and he does not have that comfort level with the proposal. The proposal indicates that there will be 3-4 inches of plantings on top of the wood, and will it remain in place in a large storm event. Mr. Johnson explained that the area is backfilled after the toewood, and root bogs are placed to expand the floodplain. By expanding the area the velocity will be reduced. Mr. Camp stated that there is no quantification of the velocity change of the stormwater from the pilot channel up to the floodplain or 5-year flood bench. Mr. Johnson said that they have all the USGS data calculations and Mr. Camp responded that the velocity calculations are not included. Mr. Johnson stated that the design was created by their engineers and that they take on the responsibility of the design. Chair Kasper inquired if concrete could be used instead of the toewood, and Mr. Johnson replied saying that state and federal agencies have been moving towards nature based designs. The hardwood logs are 15 feet long and 15-18 inches in diameter that are used for the toewood. Member Marshall said that the proposal will add habitat to the environment and that there are a lot of ways to look at the project other than sediment control which is also important. Mr. Camp said that habitat usually occurs further up because the water is moving rapidly through here as it is heading to the lake.

Mr. Brodsky said that the toewood is 13 feet wide and the flood bench is being widened and asked if that is the proposed disturbance. Mr. Johnson stated that it will be 15 feet wide and that there is a reasonable stream bed before you get to the channel and the desire is to expand that to reduce the velocity as the flow comes through. Mr. Brodsky inquired if the eventual goal is for the toewood to degrade, and Mr. Johnson responded saying that over an extended period that could happen. With the plantings they are creating a root based stabilized slope that would be secure for multiple decades. Mr. Brodsky inquired about the selected plantings and Mr. Johnson explained that there will be a variety of plant species that have a woodier and denser root structure to stabilize the stream. NYSDEC comments on the project are pending. Member Winkelman inquired about the NYSDEC stormwater design manual that was developed that talk about green infrastructure and Mr. Camp clarified that the manual was in response to site development with onsite holding facilities such as detention basins. When they talk about green infrastructure in that context they are talking about stormwater detention facilities to look more like ponds. The manual did not have a stream remediation component. The NYSDEC concerns are different than the Town's concerns related to this project.

Member Winkelman inquired about what was installed at the Lakelawn property and Mr. Camp explained that that was a slow meandering stream. He continued saying that what is being proposed is an increase in the width and if the stream is flat the velocity will be slow; if it is steep then the water will move through quickly. Mr. Johnson said that there is not a severe drop in elevation. Mr. Camp commented that if the velocity speed were at 4 or 5 feet per second it would be a low velocity; at 10 feet per second the stormwater would tear material out of there.

Member Winkelman said that the existing condition of the stream is bare dirt, and the proposal would be better than doing nothing. Mr. Camp said that if there is another large event storm like 2017, then the material will end up in the lake. Mr. Johnson said that the NYSDEC does not want to approve projects that are heavily armored that they prefer the natural approach. They have been to the site several times and did not express concern with the method proposed. The applicant will provide to the town the velocity calculations, obtain all necessary permits and approvals for the NYSDEC, ACOE and the City of Syracuse Department of Health as part of a conditional approval. Member Winkelman stated that the source of funding for the project is through the Skaneateles Lake Association and Mr. Johnson stated that it is in addition to the applicant and a grant through Great Lake Research Consortium which they have applied.

**WHEREAS**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Marshall, the Planning Board classified this application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(8) and not subject to further review under SEQR. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, upon a motion made by Member Scott Winkelman and seconded by Member Jill Marshall, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the Site Plan, 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; and
2. That the Site Plan 1 of 10 through 10 of 10 dated June 28, 2022 prepared by Anchor QEA, Engineering PLLC, be followed in all respects; and
3. That the applicant will ensure that all comments from the City of Syracuse Water Department be addressed, reflected in the appropriate site plan, and be fulfilled, with copies submitted to the Town; and
4. That the applicant’s professionals provide velocity calculations for the proposed stream remediation to the Town Engineer with a copy provided to the Town; and
5. That a contact number of the responsible individual available 24-hours, 7 days a week, be supplied to the Codes Enforcement Officer; and
6. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from the NYSDEC, ACOE, and any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or Application.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Vice Chair	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Absent	

Mr. Bliss stated commented that he used to be the NYSDEC manager for the area and wanted to share a couple of thoughts. One of New York’s best designers for this type of project is Carl Schwartz, US Fish and Wildlife Service based in Courtland. He would be able to provide the background and criteria for this type of project He will have the projections regarding 30 year and 100 year storm events. When Mr. Bliss would review these projects, he would require dead man posts or anchors higher upland from the stream to which the trees would be cabled that would hold them in place even if the rest of the lawn went into the lake. The bio-engineered projects have a lot of advantages with the habitat more important upstream from the project. When you have the hardened structure it can often transfer the erosion downstream with a bio-structure absorbing more. If a project is designed well it is considered an improvement over hardened designs.

**Continued Review – Special Permit**

Applicant: Brewster & DeAnn Sears  
2825 West Lake Road  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Parcel#051.-02-17.00**

Present: Brewster & DeAnn Sears, Applicants; Nancy Vlahos, Kevin Bliss, RIC Energy; Ivo Tomchev, Nicholas Fozmanowicz, Wendel Co.;

Member Winkelman point out that at their site visit they noted that the proposed location for the solar array is hidden and far away from the road. Mr. Camp commented that the location is hidden, and it would be unlikely to be seen from any vantage point. The slopes are flat in the proposed location.

Chair Kasper said that based on the conversations in the emails, the fire department would prefer to have a loop access road around the entire solar array. Mr. Camp remarked that he has never heard of this requirement for a solar array. Member Hamlin said that the reasoning was based on an unlikely event occurring that could also occur in a farm field just as easily. Mr. Bliss added that the aisles between the arrays are fifteen feet wide. Chair Kasper said that proposed road goes up  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the way and Mr. Camp noted that a loop road would be over a mile long. Mr. Bliss stated that a loop road would kill the project but that they could place the inverters closer to the proposed road for easier access. Mr. Camp said that if the entire array burned, there would not be much to burn, and the fire would be over quickly. The proposed service road is twenty feet wide and is designed according to the national fire code. Mr. Camp remarked that they review solar arrays in other communities and there has never been a request for a loop road. Member Winkelman reminded everyone that the property is in the watershed, and we encourage the reduction in the use of impermeable surface coverage.

Counsel Molnar stated that the fire chief advised is more than the national standard and the board could override the recommendation. It could be done based on mitigating factors such as aisle width between the arrays, the woods are setback more than 20 feet from the rear of the arrays allowing emergency access, the frequency of employees to the site of 3-4 times a year. Mr. Camp said that this type of facility should not need access of this type.

Counsel Molnar commented that the applicant suggested that the project would be considered a type I action and based on Mr. Bliss's comment that this is in an agricultural district and the land disturbance threshold would be at 2.5 acres, and this solar array will encompass 28 acres. The board should declare the action as a type I action, declare itself as lead agency and advance the SEQR review on a coordinated basis with other potentially interested agencies. Subsequently, with input or not, advance the determination as lead agency and review the full EAF prior to the determination.

Counsel Molnar recommended that the applicant have a discussion with the fire chief regarding national standards so that valid concerns can be considered, and reasonable solutions can be arrived at. Satisfying his concerns would be an appropriate solution. Mr. Bliss commented that potentially moving the location of the converters closer to the road may be a good compromise. Mr. Camp said that he believed the fire chief's concern is getting into the road and having access to the array. Chair Kasper inquired how often someone would be at the facility and if the road would be plowed, and Mr. Bliss replied that after it is built it would be 2-3 times a year and would not plow it all the time. Mr. Camp said that that information would be good to share with the chief providing him with the information regarding the width of the aisles and how often there will be people there. There will be no propane tank stored there.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Hamlin to accept the applicant's request to function as lead agency, consider the proposed action as a Type I SEQRA action subject to coordinated review, that the Planning Board will serve as Lead Agency for the SEQRA review, and requests that board Counsel to circulate notice to all potential interested parties including OCIDA, that is part of the application. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

The board discussed the timing of a public information meeting and will provide a presentation at that meeting.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Marshall and seconded by Chair Kasper to schedule a public information meeting on *Tuesday, August 16, 2022 at 6:30 p.m.* The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Member Winkelman inquired about the decommissioning plan and the concrete footers. Mr. Bliss explained that the concrete footers would be removed so that it could be restored as a farm field as it is today. Chair Kasper recommended that the applicant focus on the visual impact of the project when they are doing their presentation for the public information meeting. Mr. Camp suggested that a visual from the lake would also be helpful.

**Sketch Plan- Special Permit**

Applicant	Daniel Smith 4772 Sheppard Rd Marcellus, NY 13108	Lukins Mine Property: Sheppard Rd Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Parcel #020.-02-09.0</b>
-----------	---	--

Present: Daniel Smith, Applicant

The board did not review the application as no one was present to represent the application.

**Extension Request- Special Permit**

Applicant	Marilynn Bonniver PO Box 569 Skaneateles, NY 13152	Property: 1041 Old Seneca Tpke Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Parcel #028.-01-04.0 &amp; 027.-03-01.1</b>
-----------	--	--

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects;

Mr. Eggleston stated that the last extension approval was for three years, however COVID happened, and it limited the ability for the property to be sold. There are now two interested individuals in the property, and they would like to request an extension to the approval.

**WHEREAS**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Marshall, with unanimous affirmation of said motion, the Planning Board adopted the SEQR findings of June 15, 2010 determined with a Full Environmental Assessment Form and a negative declaration determined at that time, which prior determination was adopted by the Planning Board in consideration of this Extension Application. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, upon a motion made by Member Scott Winkelman and seconded by Member Douglas Hamlin, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, the

Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the Extension Application for an additional thirty-six (36) months from the date hereof, with the following conditions:

1. That the Original Site Plan and Construction Narrative approved for the Project shall be followed in all respects for the construction of buildings and improvements not otherwise completed to the date hereof, and the Approving Resolution of the Planning Board be followed in all respects, except as extended hereby for a period of thirty-six (36) months from the date hereof.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Vice Chair	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Absent	

**Sketch Plan- Site Plan Review**

Applicant	Scott Heggelke	Property:
	110 Old Semet Ln	2645 East Lake Rd
	Syracuse, NY 13219	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		<b>Tax Parcel #037.-01-13.0</b>

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects;

The applicants have a small irregularly shaped lot which has their permanent residence. The proposal is for a 277 square foot dock. The surveyor determined the center of the lake and Mr. Eggleston recommended that the town invest in a survey to determine the center of the lake for all to use. Lot frontage is less than 100 linear feet, and they are allowed 400 square feet of shoreline structures. The L shaped dock will reinforce the dock and they will have a seasonal boat hoist. The location of the dock complies with the required side yard setbacks and the dock will be constructed with steel piles with clearance underneath the dock. A site visit will be conducted on Tuesday July 26, 2022,

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

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

**Discussion**

The board reviewed the Cannabis legislation the proposed Local Law B of 2022 Establishing Zoning Requirements for Cannabis Retail Dispensaries within the Town of Skaneateles, and after considering the referral by the Town Board, provides the following comments:

- Member Marshall urges caution in creating legislation that is encouraging strip development in the gateways;
- Member Marshall expressed her concern over the continued development of the gateways in a manner of strip development;
- A suggestions was made to add the section below:

In addition to the requirements of this chapter, all applicable requirements of the New York State Office of Cannabis Management shall be satisfied.

**Discussion**

The Planning Board reviewed the proposed Onondaga County Planning Agreement regarding SOCPA changes, and after considering the referral by the Town Board, the Planning Board expressed that the proposed modifications to the SOCPA procedures would not present a negative impact to the Planning Board.

**Discussion**

Member Winkelman queried why there was seawall repair legislation and Counsel Molnar clarified that there is a need to respond more quickly on shoreline repairs that include encasing the wall/dock rather than removal and replacement of the failing structures as the removal could cause more damage to the lake. The 20% increase allowance is for encasement only and not expansion of a structure. The board reviewed the legislation and provided the following comments and motion.

**WHEREFORE** a motion was made by Member Jill Marshall and seconded by Chair Donald Kasper, and, upon the affirmative majority vote of all Town of Skaneateles Planning Board Members present, **RESOLVED** to make the following recommendations. The Members of the Board having been polled, resulted in the majority approval of said motion.

- That the Codes Officer should also consider drainage in any seawall remediation;
- That the Planning Board prefers a stepped design for a seawall for wave attenuation rather than a solid wall;
- That the Planning Board recommends any proposed solid seawalls have stone placed in front to assist with wave attenuation;
- That the Town Engineer is available for any questions and assistance that the Codes Officer may have.
- That the Planning Board reserves the opportunity to provide updated comment on the policy as warranted.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Vice Chair	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Absent	

**Discussion**

The Town Board approved Video Conference Legislation to allow the continued use of Zoom.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Hamlin to adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 9:57 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Additional Meeting Attendees:

Robert Eggleston	Asher Bitz	Marilynn Bonniver
Bill Murphy	Tim Johnson	Bruce VanHoltz
Kevin Bliss		

Additional Meeting Attendees(Zoom):

Bob Lefkowitz	Camille Warner	Matthew Kalen
Sue Edinger	Chris Buff	Mark Tucker
Matthew Keller	Ivo Tomchev	Nicholas Fozmanowicz
Nancy Vlahos		