

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
May 26, 2020**

Joseph Southern
Donald Kasper
Scott Winkelman
Douglas Hamlin
Jill Marshall
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel
John Camp, P.E. (C&S Engineers)
Howard Brodsky, Town Planner
Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Vice Chair Winkelman opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Public Hearing-Major Special Permit

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

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

The applicant has owned this property for a number of years and had a home-based business that turned into an excavation and construction business, of which he had received a special permit in 2010. Proposal a 10,500 square foot pole barn to store his equipment for his business and some personal items. There is an established wide driveway off Shamrock Road that has a sufficient width for loading and unloading his equipment off of a trailer.

The style of the barn will fit in the agricultural area and they have a received a variance for the total amount of commercial business building footprint. The variance was granted on May 5, 2020. There will be a bios wale directly under the eaves of the building that will be directed to an underdrain that will drain to the wetlands and to the road ditch. Impermeable surface coverage will increase to 9.9%. Mr. Regalia and Jerry Bile had spoken at the ZBA public hearing in support of the application.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Vice Chair Winkelman and seconded by Member Kasper, the Planning Board adopted and ratified the SEQRA determination reviewed by the Zoning Board of Appeals on May 5, 2020 for the application, which was a determination that the Application constituted an Unlisted Action with a negative declaration after review of the SEQRZA forms submitted by the Applicant. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

At this time, Vice Chair Winkelman opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor of the proposal. No one spoke in favor of the application. Vice Chair Winkelman asked if there was anyone who wished to speak in opposition or had any other comments on the project. No one spoke in opposition of the application or had any other comments on the project.

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

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Member Hamlin and seconded by Chairman Southern, the Planning Board reviewed the Major Special Permit criteria of §148-16B of the Town Code as it relates to the Application. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion, and rendered the following findings:

(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. Vice Chair Winkelman stated that the earthwork business use is compatible to the rural area.

(2) 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.

(3) That the Application will not adversely affect the general availability of affordable housing in the Town;

(4) That the Application will not cause undue traffic congestion, unduly impair pedestrian safety or overload existing roads, considering their current width, surfacing and condition.

(5) That the Application will have appropriate parking and be accessible to fire, police and other emergency vehicles;

(6) That the Application will not overload any public water, drainage or sewer system or any other municipal facility or service, including schools;

(7) That the Application will not degrade any natural resources, ecosystem or historic resource, including Skaneateles Lake or Owasco Lake;

(8) 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;

(9) 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;

(10) 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;

(11) That the Application will be able to comply with the rural siting principles in § 148-25, if applicable, and with the site planning standards of § 148-18D;

(12) 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.

WHEREAS, the Applicant proposed and the Planning Board found that the Application has been presented in compliance with site plan standards and criteria set forth in Town Code Section 148-18D, as set forth in the Narrative prepared for the Applicant by Robert O. Eggleston, Architect, last dated February 28, 2020 ("Narrative").

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made Member Doug Hamlin and seconded by Member Donald Kasper, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the major special permit, with standard conditions and the following additional 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 1 dated February 19, 2020, and Narrative with construction sequence dated February 28, 2020, prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be followed in all respects; and
3. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from OCDOT and any other agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or Application; and
4. That all conditions imposed by the Skaneateles Zoning Board of Appeals, in connection with its approved variance, be fulfilled; and
5. An as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project; and
6. That, except as amended hereby, all conditions of the Prior Approvals remain in full force and effect.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Sketch Plan- Site Plan Review

Applicant:

William Hayes
19 Sundown Rd
Freeville, NY 13068

Property:

1433 Heifer Road
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #061.-01-16.5

Present: William Hayes, Applicant

Last year the applicants acquired the vacant 2-acre lot from Mr. Karlik. They have designed a 2600 square foot dwelling with an approved raised bed septic system. The submitted site plan also includes a drainage system for the property. Member Winkelman inquired what the difference between a raised bed system and a mound system. Mr. Camp explained that the difference is based on the amount of additional fill required as a mound system is constructed entirely above grade and the raised bed system is constructed shallowly with additional fill of one foot added customarily.

Mr. Camp stated that the plan makes sense, but more detail is needed including a grading plan and elevations, and detail on the proposed swales. Also, the County would like to see the stormwater away from the leach field. Mr. Hayes stated that his consultant’s plan was to take water away from the northwest corner of the leach field, with the other retention area located near the northeast corner of the leach field. Mr. Camp commented that they should be reflected on the site plan and offered assistance with any questions regarding the site plan, if needed. Mr. Hayes inquired if there was anything additional needed and Mr. Camp said that top elevations of the bank area with overflow elevation, a grading plan and any swales on the property.

Member Kasper commented that this was one of the first lots that were recently created where the board had requested bio-swales. Mr. Hayes commented that when he was obtaining a building permit, he was advised that he did not need this review by the board. He was notified a couple of weeks ago that he needed

the site plan review although he already has a building permit issued. Covid-19 has delayed the commencement of construction and he has contractors ready to begin. Mr. Camp said that the requested information is very important to be shown on the plan however it could be handled off-line from a meeting. The application will need to be referred to Onondaga County Planning Board for their comments. Mr. Hayes stated that they are ready to begin and would like to begin construction on the house.

Member Kasper suggested that the applicant could get a foundation only permit while the board is finalizing the site plan review. Counsel Molnar commented that for present purposes a foundation permit could be issued, and the board could continue to review the site plan while waiting for response from the Onondaga County Planning Board. The board could reserve their rights to proceed with the application at the next meeting.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Member Hamlin and seconded by Chairman Southern, the Planning Board to classify the application as a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(11) and not subject to further review under SEQR. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

WHEREFORE upon a motion duly made by Chairman Joseph Southern, and seconded by Member Donald Kasper, reserving it rights to review the Application for compliance with all zoning code requirements after the Applicant submits information regarding a stormwater system to be installed at the Property, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board determined the following:

1. That a Foundation Only permit for the construction of the single-family dwelling may be obtained; and
2. That a building permit for the remaining proposed development of the property may be requested after the Planning Board grants site plan approval, conditioned as aforesaid, and all pre and post-construction conditions to the approval are met by the Applicant.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Sketch Plan- Site Plan Review

| | | | |
|------------|----------------------|-----------|------------------------------|
| Applicant: | 3406 W Lake Rd LLC | Property: | 2346Thorton Grove North |
| | 5197 Point East Dr | | Skaneateles, NY 13152 |
| | Jamesville, NY 13078 | | Tax Map #056.-03-16.2 |

Present: JoAnne Gagliano, Joe Falco. Kyle Volz; EDR Leif Kalquist, Holmes, Kalquist and King

The property has an existing single-family residence with a detached garage with apartment above. The new owner is in the process of restoring the mansion and proposed is a porch addition located to the south of the dwelling allowing the porch to wrap around the structure. The existing garage with the apartment above will be demolished as it is not in keeping with the historic mansion.

A new barn building located to the south of the mansion that will have an accessory apartment. The existing driveway will be reduced, and a secondary driveway will be added that will lead to the garage. An antique greenhouse will be added to the property located between the two drives.

The grading plan reflects a small-scale management area long the new driveway to the south. The existing area naturally pools stormwater. A SPEDS permit will be obtained based on the disturbance of the proposed modifications to the lot.

Member Hamlin inquired if there are any proposed modifications to the waterfront and Ms. Gagliano stated that there are no proposed shoreline changes as part of this proposal. The road is a town road and the road cut will require approval from the town highway department. Mr. Camp stated that the driveway closest to the corner of the proposed barn is very tight and it does not appear that a fire truck can pass that corner of the driveway. Ms. Gagliano stated that the corner is 11.4 feet wide and the driveway is 10 feet wide as you come from the driveway cut.

Mr. Kalquist reviewed the plans for the new barn building that has the garage to the west, a connection corridor building from the garage to the two-story building that will have an accessory apartment. On the first level will be the garage, access for storage for summer furniture and equipment, and the lower level of the two-bedroom apartment. There will be an underground tunnel link from the barn/apartment to the main house basement level at the site of the former kitchen.

The upper level has the classic barn ramp access that leads to the living area with windows facing the lake and the mansion. On the upper level will be two bedrooms located on the south side with their own bathrooms. A galley kitchen would be located in the link between to garage end of the barn and the apartment.

To the west through the service corridor, the area above the garage will be a loft living space for a game center for guests. The structure would be a classic gable style barn structure with three sections. The roof line will be changing with a traditional barn with overhangs.

There will be some grade modifications of where the existing apartment will be removed and around the proposed barn structure. There will also be grade changes around the main dwelling to bring it up to 30 inches so that the porch can be without rails and comply with code while keeping to the historic nature of the main dwelling. Member Kasper inquired what the proposed impervious surface coverage would be, and Mr. Brodsky said that it is 8.3% with open space at 91%. Member Kasper commented that there are no proposed sidewalks between the garage and the main dwelling and inquired if the ramp going to the apartment door will be grass. Ms. Gagliano said that their intention is to keep it grass and that there will only be one small sidewalk in front of the steps of the main dwelling. The stairs and edging of the ramp are included in the calculations of impervious coverage. The existing driveway will be reduced in size and there will be stone placed on top of the asphalt base of the driveway to provide a more agrarian feel to the property.

Member Kasper inquired whether the hedgerow behind the garage will be removed. The site plan shows the trees that will be staying with some unhealthy trees being removed. Member Hamlin inquired on the size of the proposed greenhouse and Ms. Gagliano commented that it is 92 square feet. Mr. Kalquist said that the goal is to restore the main dwelling back to its historical integrity. They are working on the historically replicated window package that will restore the visual character of the structure. Member Kasper commented that the main dwelling was a summer home for the guys that built Solvay Process. He continued saying that it has beautiful woodworking. Mr. Kalquist said that some of the house has double plaster walls with an airgap between.

Member Winkelman inquired what will be done along West Lake Street with the mix of big spruces and other landscaping. Ms. Gagliano said that the owner likes the hedges that are on the street and there is some existing privet with buckthorn mixed in. A lot of the trees have grape vine on them. They will be removing the grape vine that it is causing damage to some of the trees. There will be some evergreens coming out. There is a line of deciduous trees along the road and the hedge will be strengthened. The historic gate and posts will stay and there is a column at the corner of the southwest corner of the lot that will be re-pointed. They will be keeping as many of the trees as possible. A site visit will be conducted on June 6, 2020.

Member Hamlin commented that there was a significant drainage issue coming off the Lakelawn property and inquired where the stormwater is coming down the proposed second driveway will be directed. Ms. Gagliano said that it would go into the small-scale stormwater basin in the southwest corner of the lot. It would then go into a pipe that ties into the Lakelawn stream. She continued saying that the village had put in a drainage system that spans this property and the Kenan property that ties into the stream on the Lakelawn property. The location of the small-scale stormwater system is in the low point of the property that was not draining, and the basin will resolve the issue.

Sketch Plan- Major Subdivision

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Applicant | Chris Graham | Property: |
| | 4302 Jordan Rd | County Line Rd |
| | Skaneateles, NY 13152 | Skaneateles, NY 13152 |
| | | Tax Map #018.-02-29.1 |

Present: Chris Graham, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

Drawing CC-100 reflects modification of the layout with lots 1 and 19 being enlarged. The stormwater basin B on the northside has been defined. Basin A is still under development. The hammerhead on the northeast corner of the driveway has been enlarged for snowplow turnaround. The hammerhead on street C is incorporated into street C, and at the end of the hammerhead is a walking trail that ties into the Alibar trail.

The stormwater calculations have been completed for both stormwater facilities with the final design of basin B pending. Final engineering will be submitted in the next weeks and they have approved for the driveway cuts from the town. The plans have been submitted to the fire department for comment. SHPPO response has been received and they have submitted part 1 of the long form SEQRA review.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Member Marshall and seconded by Chairman Southern, the Planning Board to classify the application as a Type I action under SEQR and declared themselves as lead agency for SEQR determination. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Counsel Molnar will prepare the forms and circulate the lead agency request amongst interested agencies. Mr. Camp commented that the road grading is curious as most road construction has a balance of cut and fill with this plan showing mostly fill. In some areas the road would be 2-3 feet higher than the surrounding grade. Mr. Eggleston said that in the southeast corner the grade falls off and they have built it up a little to minimize grade. Mr. Camp said that everywhere you see the road grade higher than the surround grade and that is not typically what you see.

Mr. Camp inquired if they have spoken with Alan Wellington regarding the asphalt tip up gutter approach to the streets. Mr. Eggleston said that he had not spoken to him regarding that. Member Marshall inquired on the impact of the use of tip up gutters and walkability. Mr. Eggleston stated that the concern with

concrete gutters is that if they are not installed perfectly level the plow tends to catch it. Once that happens, they start spalling and breaking up, similar to what happened at Butters Farm. The tip up contains and directs water to the stormwater basin, that would be constructed in asphalt that has more pliability than rigid concrete. Member Kasper said that the Town of Camillus allows the asphalt tip ups; however, the plows had wiped out the tip up after the first winter, causing water to go into property owner's yards. He suggested that Mr. Eggleston, Mr. Camp and Mr. Wellington could see them in use in other towns. Mr. Camp stated that as the town does not do many large subdivisions, there is no acceptable standard and that Mr. Wellington should have the ultimate approval along with the town board on the construction of the streets.

Member Kasper inquired on how the 911 numbering would be assigned on the private drives as they would not be labeled roads. Mr. Eggleston stated that there will be street numbers at the end of the driveway of the named street. Member Kasper said that the fire department will need to provide comment. Member Marshall inquired if sidewalks were discussed and Mr. Eggleston said that what was discussed before was that it is more important to have links to surrounding neighborhoods as the proposed subdivision does not have through streets. Member Marshall said that one of the streets is designed so that it could extend in the future.

Mr. Camp inquired if the applicant has begun active discussion with the Town Board regarding the proposed streets, and Mr. Eggleston said that had not yet contact the board. Counsel Molnar stated that the Town Board would defer to the Planning Board on the street layout and whether sidewalks would be important, however, it will come into play when the Town Board needs to make a determination of acceptance of the streets as town streets. Mr. Eggleston commented that sidewalk maintenance has not been addressed in the town whereas in the village they do the first plow and the homeowner is responsible for the snow removal. He continued saying that there needs to be more study before requiring sidewalks in the remote hamlet areas. Member Marshall suggest that area could be set aside for future sidewalks in the event that they will be implemented. Mr. Eggleston said that with the town's 66 foot right of way, there is room to put sidewalks on each side. Member Winkelman recommended a sidewalk along County Line Road to create a loop for the subdivision for walkers to walk on the streets A, B, and C. Member Kasper commented that there could be wider blacktop as drivers would only 20 feet in width for two cars to pass. A walking shoulder could replace sidewalks and provide an area for walking and/or biking. He continued saying that there are no open areas for kids to play.

Member Winkelman inquired about the trail on the eastern side of the property. Mr. Eggleston stated that there is a sliver of property that was a walk path that Welch Allyn had provided for their employees to walk down and back. It is an existing walking trail that does not have public access. If it were public, they could tie into it.

Member Winkelman inquired about trees along the street and commented that County Line Road has an elevation that is higher than this property. There will be noise from County Line Road and there may be a way to have trees along any sidewalk on that road. A site visit will be conducted on June 6, 2020.

Sketch Plan- Special Permit

Applicant Diane Eggleston
4302 Jordan Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #018.-02-29.1

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

The property was acquired in 2001, and they had established an outdoor dog training facility. In 2006 the 60x99 barn with lobby connection to an existing building, and a 22-car parking lot was constructed. The applicant would like to convert the barn to automobile storage while maintaining the outdoor dog training facility and accessory apartment that is connected to the barn. The lobby would be used for customer contact regarding the vehicle storage. There is an overhead door on the north side of the barn and the barn can house 18 vehicles. The vehicles will have limited access in and out and would be for long term storage. This would be for storage of vintage or showcase vehicles. There will be no repair of maintenance on the premises and will only house accessory items to the vehicles such as an extra set of tires.

There will be electricity and heated space for the vehicles. The accessory apartment would be continued for guests. The applicant would like to keep the outdoor dog training seasonally with customers having access to the lobby and bathrooms.

Also included in the proposal is for outdoor storage of 20 feet by 120 feet, for vehicles such as boats, cars, small RVs from October through May. Member Kasper inquired why the indoor storage is specifically for autos and no other vehicles such as boats. Mr. Eggleston said that he does not want to store pontoon boats, etc., and could be limiting on space with RVs parked inside.

Member Hamlin inquired on the barn floor surface and Mr. Eggleston stated that it is a gravel base with vapor barrier and an athletic rubber mat on top to provide damp proofing. Member Hamlin commented that there is the potential for any of the other cars leaking. Mr. Eggleston said that it is not uncommon to park on a canvas or mat. Member Hamlin inquired how a vehicle owner would access their car. Mr. Eggleston stated that they would need to make an appointment with the property owner for escorted access considering that all of the cars would be open to each other.

Mr. Brodsky asked about the view from the road and surrounding properties of the potential outdoor storage. Mr. Eggleston said that when they developed the outdoor dog training facility, they had planted a row of trees along the corner of the training area to block the view to the three neighbors. The site is visible as you come down Route 20 although the corner of Route 20 and Rickard Road is screened by trees. As you come up the hill from 259A you can see some bush along the side, and you see the house and maybe a minimal view of the stored vehicles. A site visit will be conducted on June 9, 2020.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Member Winkelman to schedule a public hearing on ***Tuesday, June 16, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.*** The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Sketch Plan- Site Plan Review

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Applicant | Sinclair LLC | Property: |
| | 4302 Jordan Rd | County Line Rd |
| | Skaneateles, NY 13152 | Skaneateles, NY 13152 |
| | | Tax Map #018.-02-29.1 |

Present: Kelly Engles, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

The property has several buildings on site with one of the stone historic building converted to an event center that had received special permit approval in 2016. The applicant is proposing the construction of a 189 square foot gazebo for acoustical and amplified music during outdoor wedding ceremonies. There is an existing outdoor wedding ceremony area with typical ceremonies lasting 15 minutes to 30 minutes. The gazebo would be oriented towards the ceremony area.

Mr. Eggleston stated that he had had an office in this area for seventeen years and never saw the area flood. They do have extra parking available at the neighbor property across the street, owned by John Dudden, and they provide staff for safe crossing of Jordan Rd. Mr. Camp inquired on the construction of the gazebo and Mr. Eggleston stated that it will have a concrete base with the posts and roof attached to the base. Three sides of the gazebo will be enclosed and facing the sound towards the wedding event area. They will have mini speakers alongside the pews. Mr. Camp recommended that as the structures are going to be constructed in the flood plain, that the applicant take extra care when they are tied down, e.g. if they were going to support each 6x6 with two Simpson-strong ties, that they could use four instead. Mr. Eggleston said that there are standard flood plain requirements for anchoring structures that will be followed.

Chairman Southern inquired if outside music was approved on the previous approvals. Mr. Eggleston said that the actual music for the reception was to have all music inside. Typically, when you have a wedding ceremony you have music. It will not be a four-hour reception but 15 minutes to half hour ceremony. Member Kasper inquired if complaints have been made by any of the neighbors and Mr. Eggleston said that he thinks it is possibly from one party. Member Hamlin said that he has heard from one or two parties. Chairman Southern said that the intent was to avoid music outside. Member Hamlin commented that it is different timing with usually daytime events. Mr. Eggleston said that the ceremonies are daytime or early evening because there is usually a three to four-hour reception afterwards. The Sinclair has a 10 pm cut off, the ceremony has to happen before 6 pm. Member Marshall asked how the ceremonies are conducted now and Ms. Engle said that they typically have amplification just so that the audience can hear the vows, with an occasional instrument playing or music for the person to go down the aisle. We could put the speaker inside the Sinclair building playing out, but that would make the music louder. The proposal would have the speaker facing the Sinclair and encapsulating the music so that the music does not go towards the neighbors. She continued saying that they are trying to be good neighbors. Mr. Brodsky inquired if they have explored the use of small wireless speakers and Ms. Engle said that it is usually a small speaker facing the Sinclair that they use. Mr. Eggleston said that it is different than the music played at the receptions. Mr. Brodsky said that there is a concern with the sound and the placement of the gazebo in the flood plain and was wondering if there is a new technology solution that could work that would resolve both issues. Ms. Engle said they could look into that.

Member Kasper recommended that a public hearing should be held, and the hamlet committee should review it especially if it is in the hamlet. The property is not located in the hamlet and is not contiguous to the hamlet. Ms. Engle reiterated that they could put a speaker in the window of the building and pay music towards the wedding ceremony area; however, it would be louder. Mr. Brodsky inquired if the speakers were placed in the arbor. Mr. Eggleston stated that the gazebo would either have acoustical music such as a string quartet, or a sound board with DJ with the amplification in the arbor or pews during the wedding ceremony. It will not be a big speaker like at the park gazebo. Mr. Eggleston stated that the music would be for the duration of a half an hour but not the full half hour. Chairman Southern stated that the public hearing would be limited to discussion regarding this proposal only for music for ceremonies. Member Kasper requested that the applicant come up with time frames to consider.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Member Hamlin to schedule a public hearing on *Tuesday, June 16, 2020 at 6:40 p.m.* The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Continued Review – Site Plan Review

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Applicant | West Lake Road Properties LLC | |
| | 1200 State Fair Blvd | Property: |
| | Syracuse, NY 13209 | 1808 West Lake Rd |

Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #062.-01-09.2

Present: James Ranali, Owner; Brian Bouchard, CHA

The application has been revised to reflect the proposed pool and patio, removal of the tennis court, and rehabilitation of the existing grass strip driveway. Elevations of the proposed raised patio with a topography survey underneath have been provided to the board. The existing ground slopes away from the dwelling with the raised patio at 3 to 3.5 feet tall to its maximum at 10 feet tall where the stairs would go down to the lawn area.

The upper level pool has an infinity edge that flows to the catch basin pool area. The edges of the retaining wall, aprons for the pool and hot tub are considered impermeable. The patio would be constructed with pavers with appropriate gaps to be considered permeable. The prior driveway relocation and alternative treatment has been removed from the proposal. The existing tennis court removal provided additional permeable surface coverage for the lot.

The proposed impermeable surface coverage is 9.9% and the open space calculation has improved to 83.5%. Mr. Camp commented that the proposal does not meet the original intent of the code although it may meet the letter of the code. If the board is comfortable with the proposal, he suggested that there be a requirement for all fill inside the walled base be washed stone which would provide the best chance for the water to infiltrate the ground. Mr. Bouchard said that the grade slopes away from the house with the majority of the excavation in the ten feet is for the pool area. There will only be 3 to 4 feet of fill for the patio area over the removed soils from the pool area that will be utilized for the fill with #57 washed stone on top of that. The proposed modular wall will be permeable and will define the patio area. The patio area will have filter fabric and then washed stone. The 10-foot-deep section with washed stone and pavers will create a weight on the soil, which over time will compress it.

Mr. Brodsky said that he agrees with Mr. Camp and inquired if the applicant explored the possibility of using a raised wood deck to surround the pool. Mr. Bouchard stated that there are many ways in which you could construct the area around a pool. A large wood deck does not meet the aesthetics of the existing dwelling. Mr. Ranali said that it was considered; however, they had concerns that it could be a breeding ground for critters. Member Winkelman asked if consideration was given to lower the patio so that there were steps down to the patio. Mr. Bouchard said that the proposed plan is 3 to 4 steps down from the existing slider doors. The majority of the patio will be at grade and the pool and patio would be similar to other pools and patios with then exception of one side having a wall with the infinity edge of the pool cascading down.

Member Winkelman said that the history of the property is that the house was built oversized for the property and the big patio added is not in keeping with the watershed. Mr. Bouchard commented that the impermeable surface coverage is taken up by the dwelling and the driveway and that the grass strip in the existing driveway will be restored.

Member Marshall said that her concern is that the block wall and stone will concentrate water with runoff issues at the base of the walls. Mr. Bouchard said that it would be similar to construction on level ground, a substantial amount of water is allowed to permeate through the pavers and infiltrate the soil. Once the soil is saturated, any typical paver will have stormwater sheet flow water onto the grass area. Member Marshall stated that there will be a 10-foot wall which is different than an at grade level patio. Mr. Bouchard said that the wall itself cannot hold water back. Member Marshall expressed her concern on the amount of runoff around the structure because of the sheer size. In the proximity to the lake, this could create bigger issues from this solution. Mr. Bouchard stated that it conforms to the code.

Counsel Molnar inquired if the applicant believes that the stone that will be utilized will compact over time. Mr. Bouchard said that a #57 washed gravel has rounded edges will compact similarly to a glass of marbles where there are voids created to allow water to percolate. Counsel Molnar said that if the stones compact, then it could arguably be considered impermeable surface coverage under the definition. Mr. Ranali said that is why they want to use washed stone so that it does not compact. Mr. Camp said that there will be a void ratio of approximately 30%; they would not compress together; however, the concern is the weight underneath it is making it hard for water to infiltrate over time. Member Marshall said if the soil is compacted then the water would go through the wall. Mr. Camp said that there would be a huge storage capacity in that wall. With the wall being 10 feet and the void ratio of 30%, you would have the equivalent of three feet of depth of storage in there. Member Marshall asked if the water would seep out of the walls and then run down to the lake. Mr. Camp said that some water will soak in and some will evaporate, and if any water could not go into the soil it would go through the wall. Mr. Bouchard commented that with typical paver patios a strong storm event would have the stormwater sheeting off and not being absorbed in the soil below. Member Marshall said that when the patio is at surface the stormwater sheets over to the grass and this proposal is above ground if it cannot go down. Mr. Bouchard said that if there was a strong storm event, there would be 100 feet of grass for the stormwater to infiltrate before reaching the lake.

Chairman Southern inquired if the lawn area would be able to handle the stormwater. Mr. Bouchard said that the lawn would have a chance to percolate the stormwater over time. Member Marshall expressed her concern with this happening for any storm event. Mr. Camp said that small scales stormwater management would address any concerns for stormwater management. Mr. Bouchard suggested that a bio-swale could be added to the eastern side of the pool to address the stormwater. Chairman Southern stated that 100 feet of grass does not handle stormwater efficiently with a strong storm event. Member Winkelman stated that there is no stormwater management on the entire property and although he does not like the wall system, there are potential trade offs that could be done for the whole property.

Member Hamlin inquired what will be placed between the stone dust used between the pavers and the washed stone base underneath. Mr. Bouchard stated that there would be geo-fabric placed above the subsurface soil. Member Kasper commented that the paver base could act as a bio-retention area for the stormwater as it will not get any more rainwater than the grass next to it. The important issue is how it will be constructed to not compact. Landscaping surrounding the area would allow roots to access the water. The downspouts on the dwelling are diverted away from the proposed patio.

Mr. Bouchard said that the portion of the landscape bed would have a bio-retention swale with the landscaping in front. Member Marshall suggested that a bio-swale should also be located along the sides of the patio. Mr. Bouchard stated that it could be done with a narrower profile. He continued saying that a typical bio-swale usually has an underdrain at the base to direct stormwater otherwise it is a landscape bed. Mr. Camp said that the underdrains could outlet on the lawn or tied into the existing pipes that are perpendicular to the lake. Mr. Bouchard stated that the driveway drainage and the roof drainage is already established along the tree lines.

Mr. Bouchard requested that the minor updates to the site plan for the inclusion of the bio-swales and the comment on the washed stones could be conditions to an approval. Counsel Molnar informed the board that as the 239 referral has been received the board can deliberate and make a determination on the application. His notes included engineering of the bio-swales and how the drainage will be managed, and the fill is not compacted by way of a construction sequence. Member Winkelman commented that he would like to see the drainage of the dwelling and the patio into the north and south bio-swales. Mr. Bouchard stated that he would like to keep it to the proposal at hand as they may be back for approvals for modification regarding the driveway. Member Kasper requested that the bio-swale designs should be reviewed and approved by

Mr. Camp. Member Marshall suggested that Mr. Camp do an inspection before backfilling on the proposed patio.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Member Hamlin and seconded by Member Winkelman the Planning Board to classify the application as a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(11) and not subject to further review under SEQR. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Member Donald Kasper and duly seconded by Member Scott Winkelman, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the minor site plan, with standard conditions and the following additional 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. The Site Plan C-1 prepared by James Thrasher, Professional Engineer dated May 19, 2020, and preliminary wall elevations prepared by Civil Design dated May 21, 2020, be revised to include an engineered small scale stormwater management system, with the plans submitted to the Planning Board Engineer for review and approval prior to issuance of a building permit; and
3. That a landscape plan be submitted for the Planning Chair's review and approval; and
4. That the Narrative dated April 29, 2020, prepared by Brian Bouchard, CHA, P.E., be updated to reflect the final Project, and include a construction sequence indicating how the base of the patio will be constructed to prevent compaction. The narrative shall be submitted for review to the Planning Board Engineer, and after approval by the Planning Board Engineer, shall be followed in all respects; and
5. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application, including the City of Syracuse Department of Water and Onondaga County Department of Health; and
6. That the Applicant establish an escrow account with the Town of Skaneateles for engineering review in the amount of \$500; and
7. That the center grass strip in the existing driveway be restored to the prior approved standard; and
8. No certificate of occupancy/compliance shall be granted until the Applicant has filed a set of as-built plans with the Codes Enforcement Officer, indicating any deviations from the approved site plan. The Codes Enforcement Officer shall be responsible for the inspection of site improvements, including coordination with the Town's consultants and other local officials and agencies, as may be appropriate; and
9. That an as-built survey including coverage calculations be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project; and
10. Except as amended hereby, the conditions of any and all prior approving resolution(s) issued by the Planning Board concerning the Property remain in full force and effect.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Special Permit

| | | |
|-----------|--|---|
| Applicant | Woodbine Group 505E Fayette St #100 Syracuse, NY 13202 | Property: 1046 Old Seneca Tpke Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map #028.-01-03.0 <u>Tax Map 028.-01-01.0 (For Easement Through)</u> |
|-----------|--|---|

Present: Tom Fernandez, Woodbine Group; Brian Bouchard, CHA Consulting; Mike Lasell, MBL Engineering; Norm Swanson, Woodbine Group; Wayne LaFrance, Lake Architectural

Counsel Molnar reviewed the approved resolution with the board and applicant. Two modifications have been made. The woodland buffer 200 feet from the property line of the Woodbine Group property and they kept the 50 feet setback line for the Hill-Rom property. The 200 feet is satisfactory with the board. Mr. Bouchard confirmed that Hill-Rom is aware that they will need to maintain the 50-foot buffer on their portion of the property between the proposed driveway the edge of the property.

A letter from the Onondaga County Department of Transportation dated March 25, 2020 is now attached to the resolution. It approved the site of the driveway and the trip report prepared by SRF on behalf of the applicant.

**RESOLUTION
OF THE SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
Action date: May 26, 2020**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the following resolution was duly adopted at the May 26, 2020 Planning Board Meeting:

WHEREAS, application (collectively the “Application”) was made by Woodbine Group, Inc. (“Applicant”) for approval of a Major Special Permit and Site Plan Review permitting construction of an 88-room hotel with amenities (“Project”) on a 30.97 acre parcel located in the IRO District at 1046 Old Seneca Turnpike and Tax Map 028.-01-03.0, with Project access intended via an adjacent parcel on Mottville Road with Tax Map 028.-01-01.0, Skaneateles, New York (collectively the “Property”); and

WHEREAS, at its regular meeting held December 17, 2019, the Planning Board reviewed submission materials from the Applicant and its professionals, including a Project Application for Site Plan and Major Special Permit approval dated November 6, 2019, a narrative dated November 25, 2019, a Full Environmental Assessment Form (“FEAF”) Part I – Project and Setting, dated November 25, 2019, together with plans and other supporting materials (collectively the “SEQR Application Materials”), at which time

the Planning Board classified the action as an Unlisted Action under SEQR, and declared itself willing to act as lead agency under SEQR for coordinated review of the Application; and

WHEREAS, at its regular meeting held February 18, 2020, at which all Planning Board Members were present and acting throughout, the Planning Board re-reviewed the Application under SEQR with the consent of the Applicant, and thereafter adopted a Resolution declaring a SEQR Negative Declaration, with Findings in support thereof, at the Planning Board's regular meeting of April 21, 2020, pursuant to and in accordance with 6 NYCRR §617 et. seq.; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant made submissions to the Planning Board commencing on November 6, 2019, and made presentations to the Planning Board at each of its regular meetings up to and including May 12, 2020, and a public hearing was held on January 21, 2020, as extended to February 18, 2020, and April 21, 2020; and

WHEREAS, the Skaneateles Planning Board has made site visits to the Property, has reviewed and considered all of the material contained in the Board's file, has heard and considered submissions made on behalf of the Applicant, has heard and considered public comment and written objections submitted by interested parties and made part of the record of the Planning Board, has read and considered Resolutions of the Onondaga County Planning Board and other reviewing agencies, and has obtained engineering consultation; and

WHEREAS, the Board reviewed the Major Special Permit criteria required by §148-16B of the Town Code as it relates to the Application, and rendered the following findings ("Major Special Permit Findings"):

(1) That the Application will comply with all provisions and requirements of this chapter and of all other local laws and regulations and will be consistent with the purposes of the land use district in which it is located, with the Comprehensive Plan and with the purposes of this chapter;

(2) That the Application will not result in the release of harmful substances or any other nuisances, nor cause excessive noise, dust, odors, solid waste or glare;

(3) That the Application will not adversely affect the general availability of affordable housing in the Town;

(4) That the Application will not cause undue traffic congestion, unduly impair pedestrian safety or overload existing roads, considering their current width, surfacing and condition.

(5) That the Application will have appropriate parking and be accessible to fire, police and other emergency vehicles;

(6) That the Application will not overload any public water, drainage or sewer system or any other municipal facility or service, including schools;

(7) That the Application will not degrade any natural resources, ecosystem or historic resource, including Skaneateles Lake or Owasco Lake;

(8) 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;

(9) 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;

(10) 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;

Member Marshall stated that she has concern with potential strip development. Member Hamlin said that there is the potential to encourage strip development however this proposal does not represent strip development. The board voted to determine whether avoiding commercial strip development is being upheld by this application in the findings.

RECORD OF VOTE

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|---------|---------|
| Chair | Joseph Southern | Present | [yes] |
| Vice Chair | Scott Winkelman | Present | [yes] |
| Member | Donald Kasper | Present | [yes] |
| Member | Douglas Hamlin | Present | [yes] |
| Member | Jill Marshall | Present | [no] |

(11) That the Application will be able to comply with the rural siting principles in § 148-25, if applicable, and with the site planning standards of § 148-18D;

(12) 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; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant proposed and the Planning Board found that the Application has been presented in compliance with site plan standards and criteria set forth in Town Code Section 148-18D, as set forth in the Narrative prepared for the Applicant by Brian F. Bouchard, P.E, of CHA Companies dated February 5, 2020 (“Narrative”).

WHEREAS, the Applicant has also submitted for Planning Board review and comment the following engineered drawings, plans, correspondence and reply agency communications in connection with the Project:

1. Site Plan (collectively the “Site Plans”) prepared by MBL Engineering, PLLC, comprised of the following:

- Site Plan C-001 dated May 5, 2020
- Site Plan G-001 and G-002 dated March 4, 202
- Site Plan C-001 through C-004 dated March 5, 2020
- Grading Plan C-005 dated March 5, 2020
- Utility Plan C-006 through C-007 dated March 5, 2020
- Road Profile C-008 dated March 5, 2020
- Photometric Plan C-009 dated March 4, 2020
- Erosion Stormwater Control Plan C-010 dated December 31, 2019
- Misc. Detail C-011 dated March 5, 2020
- Misc. Detail C-012 dated December 21, 2019
- Landscaping Plan (“Landscape Plan”) C-013 through C-014 dated May 5, 2020
- Landscape Notes & Planting Schedule dated May 5, 2020

2. Elevation and Floor Plans (the “Floor Plans”) prepared by Lake Architectural A,AA,A101-103 and A300-301 dated March 4, 2020
3. Site Line Photos p1-8 prepared by CHA dated January 21, 2020
4. Survey prepared by Forest SeGuin, SeGuin Land Surveyors PLLC dated January 13, 2016
5. New York Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation letters

dated June 28, 2019 and August 31, 2018

6. Onondaga County Planning Board resolution January 15, 2020
7. Trip Generation Assessment letter by SRF Associates dated September 27, 2019
8. Onondaga County Department of Transportation letter of March 25, 2020
9. Mottville Fire Department letter (undated)
10. Town water Department-Joe Dwyer email dated January 15, 2020; and
11. Wastewater Correspondence letter prepared by Mike Lasell, MBL Engineering dated September 17, 2019.

NOW, THEREFORE, upon a motion made by Chairman Joseph Southern and duly seconded by Member Donald Kasper, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, **BE IT RESLOVED** that the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the Application, with the following conditions:

- A. The foregoing deliberation of Major Special Permit Findings pursuant to §148-16B of the Town Code are hereby approved and incorporated in this Resolution as if set forth at length.
- B. The Special Permit and Site Plan approval granted herein, which authorizes the Applicant to undertake and complete the Project, shall be completed in strict compliance with all drawings and plans constituting the Site Plans, and the Narrative.
- C. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any land disturbance or the construction of any structures, the following conditions shall apply:
 1. **THAT** no building permits be issued until the Applicant receives and/or provides to the Planning Board: a) the authorization from the County DOH relative to the design and construction of the onsite wastewater treatment and management system; b) a SWPPP prepared in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements, and c) a SPDES Permit from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation; and
 2. **THAT** a pre-construction meeting be held on site with the contractor, Applicant's representatives, Town Engineer, and Codes Enforcement Officer, prior to issuance of a building permit for any construction.
- D. After issuance of a building permit for the Project, the following conditions shall apply:
 1. **THAT** the completed Project shall be as depicted on all drawings and plans constituting the Site Plans and the Floor Plans; and
 2. **THAT** all required permits, if any, be obtained from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, the Onondaga County Department of Health, and any other agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or Project; and

3. **THAT** the existing trees, shrubs and ground cover (hereafter the “Woodland Buffer”) located at the northwest boundary of both Tax Parcels comprising the Property be left in a natural condition, undisturbed by the Applicant or any other party, for no less than Fifty (50) feet from the property line on Tax Parcel 028.-01-01.0; and no less than Two Hundred (200) feet from the property line on Tax Parcel 028.-01-03.0; and
4. **THAT** any proposed installation of above-ground or underground utility transmission lines in the “Proposed Power Easement” area, as depicted on the Site Plan, is subject to Site Plan Review by the Planning Board to minimize disturbance to the Woodland Buffer; and
5. **THAT** a survey will be required for all structures in the Site Plan and all plantings required by the Landscape Plan, for verification of setbacks and protection of the Woodland Buffer; and
6. **THAT** Project restaurant operating hours (“Operating Hours”) be limited to between 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. weekdays, and 6 a.m. to 11 p.m. on weekends; and
7. **THAT** no outdoor weddings or similar outdoor gatherings occur on the Project Property; and
8. **THAT**, if live music or DJ music is provided in the restaurant at the Project, such music must end one (1) hour prior to the conclusion of Operating Hours; and
9. **THAT** pool and other outdoor activities end no later than 10 p.m.; and
10. **THAT** an as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Office with verification of conformance of completed Project within (60) days of completion of each phase; and
11. **THAT** the Applicant fund an escrow to pay for engineering services and review by the Planning Board Engineer of not less than \$2,500.00.

RECORD OF VOTE

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|---------|---------|
| Chair | Joseph Southern | Present | [yes] |
| Vice Chair | Scott Winkelman | Present | [yes] |
| Member | Donald Kasper | Present | [yes] |
| Member | Douglas Hamlin | Present | [yes] |
| Member | Jill Marshall | Present | [no] |

An additional condition number 11 will be for the Applicant to fund an escrow to pay for engineering services and review by the Planning Board Engineer of not less than \$2,500.00. Member Marshall stated that the reason she voted no is that it is her opinion that there are ramifications with the development in that it could encourage strip development in the corridor.

Member Hamlin and Member Marshall said that the applicant did an admirable job with its application and working with the community. Member Hamlin suggested that the Town Board develop a northern gateway committee planning group. It was recommended that the northern gateway is a discussion items on next

month's agenda. Member Winkelman added that another discussion topic in regard to parking on Mottville Road by Hill-Rom employees.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman 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 9:42 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Barkdull, Clerk