

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
SPECIAL AND REGULAR
MEETING MINUTES
April 11, 2017**

Joseph Southern
Donald Kasper
Scott Winkelman
Douglas Hamlin
Anne Redmond
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel
John Camp, P.E. (C&S Engineers)
Karen Barkdull, Clerk/Secretary

Member Southern opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. The meeting minutes of March 21, 2017 were previously distributed to the Board and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Redmond to approve the minutes as corrected. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Anne Redmond	Present	[Yes]

Continued Review- Major Subdivision

Applicant: Tim Green/owner Loveless Farm Development 1194 Greenfield Lane Skaneateles, New York 13152	Property: 2783 West Lake Rd West side 051.-02-18.1 Vacant land: East side 053.-01-39.1`
---	--

Present: Kevin McAuliffe, Legal Counsel; Jeffrey Davis, Attorney; Thomas Dussing, EDR;

Mr. McAuliffe: A draft environmental impact statement has been submitted to the Board created by Plumley Engineering. As we had discussed at the last meeting, since this has been since July of 2015, and as there are new Board members, we would like to start with an overview tonight. The submittal is more for information rather than advocacy, because in May 2015, this Board made findings and determinations on an EAF. The Board has minutes, resolutions, and now this EIS in response to those questions sequentially. We are not engineers and as much, the

document will speak for itself. At some future point in time, we can address it once you have determined that it is complete and you handle it through the process there and out.

This is a 47-acre parcel of land on West Lake Road that Mr. Green purchased from Mr. and Mrs. Loveless years back. The proposal before you and the reason there is an environmental analysis, is that there is a request to subdivide this. There are seventeen acres on the east side of the road as show under exhibit 10. This is a modified configuration as the proposal started off as a seventeen-lot subdivision and is now down to fifteen lots. Looking at different plans you will find that the lots are not numbered sequentially; there is no longer a lot number six and lot number thirteen. On the east side of the road, we have four lots now east of route 41A where there were originally five. On each one of these lots, there are two things to note, there is an area where the house could go with a specific designation of where it could ultimately be located when a design is presented to the Board. Secondly, there are two different rectangular areas related to septic systems, with the first location of the initial septic system, and then consistent with the Onondaga County Department of Health, a 100% access area in the event there was a problem with the initial septic system, it could be located in the secondary area. On the west, side of the road was the prior location for the farm area and driveway.

Throughout the analysis of the stormwater, drainage and other things, in reaction to the answers in the EAF, the EAF said that the depth of the water here was anywhere from zero to greater than six feet. What was not pointed out was that the zero does not relate to anything but the wetlands. There is one Federal wetlands delineated that will not be encroached upon. There are others that were analyzed and the ACOE determined that they were non-jurisdictional areas that may have been former drainage swales.

The modifications that have been made over time include not only the reduction in lots but also other agreements such as reducing the heights of the houses that could be constructed along the east side of the 41A from the 35 foot height allowed by code to 30 feet. The placement of those have been changed as they have been moved back and tucked into the hillside so that they become less visible. The DEIS speaks for itself addressing the analysis and mitigation. In the exhibits, we have provided copies of documents that were previously on file with the Town. The non-visual aspects that were addressed were water, geology including things like whether the septic system works. As Mr. Camp has pointed out in the record a number of times, the acceptance of the design of those are up to the Onondaga County Health Department. There were questions about whether or not there would be sufficient ground water in the area. New York state law now mandates that before the subdivision map is filed that there has to be two wells drilled on the property with the results provided to all of the governmental authorities demonstrating that the property can support the water needs. All of the septic systems would have to be approved by the city and the county. We did provide information regarding all of the various perc tests that were completed as there were over eighty perc tests done with 27 on the east side and 65 on the west side, with three deep tests completed on the east side and eight deep tests done on the west side.

Mr. Davis: The visual analysis is the largest exhibit section of the DEIS that was created by EDR. All of the visual comments concerned one question in the Town's response to the EAF, impact on aesthetic resources. That question specifically asked, "Does the project land use

different from or in sharp contrast to the current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource.” In the Plumley response, they question a certain number of the designations from a visual standpoint that were marked as large. Either the voiced impact was not from an officially designated scenic or aesthetic resource, or as that is a coined phrase by the NYSDEC or it did not meet the definition of what a sharp contrast is. That is laid out in the draft EIS, the DEC sharp contrast explanation on page 29, considerations for communities as to visual impacts with discussion on page 31, and how a community should view and answer 9 was discussed at page 36. Plumley had some questions, and nevertheless in going through the specific questions and concerns raised by the Planning Board, it can be grouped into four categories. They are visibility from the lake, sitting at the lake looking back at the project, visibility from across the lake looking back towards the project, from route 41A, and from Brook farm, a national registered historic place. The DEIS lays out a response to each one of those areas. Those very broad categories that go across 9a through 9f of the questions receiving response.

Exhibit 13 addresses the potential concern raised by the Planning Board by the view from the lake back towards the project site, and in Plumley’s analysis in conjunction with the work that EDR had done, the exhibit reflects the existing conditions ½ mile out into the lake looking back with a comparison with the original proposal reflecting the houses at the 35 foot height limit with six homes up on the east side of the property, and a comparison with mitigation measures taken to reduce the height of the dwellings to 30 feet, reduce the number of dwelling by one and with the houses slid down the slope. The final comparison shows the modified view with landscaping and trees located around the dwellings. The ultimate conclusion by Plumley in drafting the DEIS in conjunction with the DEC criteria, was that this view is consistent with adjacent views and the expectation that the public would have for character, architecture, scenic quality does not meet the definition of what is a sharp contrast as defined by DEC and the DEC workbook.

Similarly, a concern was raised concerning the views from across the lake. From across the lake looking back at the property, as shown under exhibit 13, viewpoint 10 prepared by EDR, there are photos of the existing landscape, original proposal with dwelling heights of 35 feet, mitigated view with reduced dwelling heights, and mitigated view with landscaping. Plumley’s analysis commented that there is almost an indiscernible change on that side of the lake with the eastern shoreline project appearing to be consistent with all of the adjacent views seen in the view shed of the area. There is certainly no sharp contrast as that term is defined and viewed by DEC.

The next viewpoint which is exhibit 14, talked about specifically the view from Route 41A. Plumley’s comments beginning with their first in that Route 41A is not a designated scenic resource although it is accepted as part of the run around the lake. The picture shows three viewpoints with the top photo reflecting the existing view, the middle photo reflecting the original proposed view with the proposed dwelling heights of 35 feet, and the bottom photo reflecting the mitigated view. The EDR report was based upon the middle view in their determination. After EDR completed their process, additional mitigation were taken in from the public and the Board, and that is when they slid the homes down the hill and reduced the height. The bottom view shows the difference between the existing and the proposed with the full mitigation including as part of that an obligation to trim and maintain the evergreen hedgerow that is there now, so that existing view in the mitigated photo can be maintained. Plumley’s

determination is that the difference in the existing view and mitigated view is almost indiscernible from current condition and proposed condition as a result of mitigation measures.

The final area that the DEIS focuses discussions regarding the potential impact on the Brook Farm facility next door. Brook Farm is a national registered place based on its architectural merit. With the elimination of lot six on the east side that was along Route 41A and closest to the Brook Farm, the nearest location to Brook Farm from this proposal is lot 1 which is the one down along the water. The importance of the discussion from Plumley's visual analysis is that development of lot 1 will have no direct impact on the Brook Farm property. They will not be going on the Brook Farm property or be visually seen from the Brook Farm property with the large area of existing trees on the Brook Farm property. The distance and clump of trees is significantly larger than the clump of trees to the north by the existing homes to the north. The view out of Brook Farm could be impacted but with the visual screening that existing now on the Brook Farm property, Plumley questions whether a portion of project would be visible even in leaf off conditions. The view back from the lake at Brook Farm, this is the only view with any combined impact the project site could have, and Plumley ultimately determined that the project will introduce no visual element or new character that will alter the setting of Brook Farm, or interfere with or reduce the public's enjoyment or appreciation of the resource that is Brook Farm. Standards laid out by the DEC and case law for impacts on a designated historical resource is laid out in the discussion of the policies that is in the DEIS on page 31.

The other minor impact concerns that were raised under question 9, the Board raised potential concerns that there could be impacts of tourism or recreation. The boat tour goes by every day pointing out homes along the lake and who built them will not be impacted. In regards to recreation, there has been an increase in recreation on the lake in the last several years. Character, the Board did express concerns in a minor area of the impacts to the area or community, Plumley's response is that the project is consistent with the zoning classification for that area, and complies with the subdivision regulations for the town. It is also consistent with the development along the west side of the lake, specifically Wagon Wheel Drive, fire lanes 7, 8, 9, 13, 29, Oak Bluff, and Winding Way, are developments of similar nature that are within two miles of this proposed development. Wagon Wheel Drive being immediately adjacent to the south in which a six-house subdivision was done by the Greenfields in the 1980s to allow for development that you see there now. The Plumley analysis from a visual analysis conclusions overall with question 9, is that the project as proposed with the mitigation measures does not present a sharp contrast or is out of character with the existing surrounding area. They came to that conclusion in the thirteen pages that discuss it.

Member Hamlin: I have not found under the exhibits, a northbound visual assessment.

Mr. Davis: No, it is a southbound view, but it is a simulation of looking across. The interesting thing in that visual as I drive it on a daily basis, the southbound view is the view of the lake. The view coming north bound is more towards across the property. There is a 12-15 foot hedgerow when you are coming northbound, and once you get beyond that at fire lane 17 is when you have a brief view of the water. The southbound view has the most global view of the lake.

Counsel Molnar: I would recommend that we review some of the timeframes of the DEIS, where we are now and where the applicant would like to advance the project. First is under the regulations, the lead agency has 45 days from receipt of the DEIS to determine its adequacy. In so doing, the lead agency has the ability to analyze the document, suggest alternatives or corrections to better reflect the findings from the positive declaration and request that the applicant adjust the document accordingly before it can be considered a final version. I want to be sure what date we are all operating under concerning the Town's receipt of the DEIS. The DEIS arrived April 3, 2017. Under the regulations, the Planning Board has 45 days to determine the adequacy of the DEIS, and upon the determination, the Board can suggest that the applicant make modification or corrections and issue written findings requesting the same, or can determine that the DEIS is complete. Then the Board could determine on notice to interested parties that it is complete that begins a 30 days clock for interested parties to comment on the DEIS. The Board can simultaneously and although not mandatory, can call for a public hearing to better elicit public comment that could be on the 30-day clock. The times and the dates will not correspond to the statutory meeting dates for the Planning Board, so I would recommend that the Planning Board in order to be compliant and work cooperatively with the applicant, that the schedule be adjusted going forward into the future with a potential need for special meetings to be scheduled.

In terms of notice of completion of the DEIS which starts a 30 day clock for comment from interested parties, the 30 day window can also be noticed by the Planning Board for a public hearing on it, to complete accumulation of the record and comments from the parties. The public hearing must also include a requirement under the regulations that a comment period stays open for ten days subsequent from a public hearing for submission of written materials. After which the Board has to make a determination of whether it is a final DEIS that is acceptable and demonstrates mitigating measures sufficient to approve the action or otherwise. We have a series of dates to comply with this summer, a series of activities that are compulsory under the regulations, and I will calendar it for the Board.

Mr. Davis: There is a series, if the Board determines the DEIS is complete, there is a series of notices that go out to the interested parties but also the environmental notice bulletin, etc. All of that goes into effect in terms of interested parties that get their notification once it is final.

Counsel Molnar: I suspect that the parties of initial notice of lead agency determination.

Mr. Davis: Town Supervisor, lead agency, all involved agencies, any person who requested a copy previously, environmental notice bulletin, and the DEC all get noticed of the fact that a DEIS has been submitted and has been deemed complete to start the public review process. Those notices have to say where somebody can get a copy, etc. I have painstakingly outlined it and can send you all of that information. We want to be sure that when we get to that point that it is done procedurally correct.

Counsel Molnar: I would appreciate that so we can coordinate to whom and to make sure that all of the notices are adequately provided.

Mr. Davis: Because of its size, we did provide a CD copy to the Town that can be uploaded to a website. The only other thing I would add is the determination of completeness is an interesting way the DEC determines what that standard is. The standard is whether the document is sufficient to start public review. It is a standard that the DEC has set to determine whether a DEIS is complete. It is a response by the application to the EAF that the Board has reviewed and has an opportunity to review and take a look at that. The key element is if it is appropriate of a document to send back out to the public for comment.

Counsel Molnar: I do not disagree with that characterization, but it also includes an additional layer. The Board thoroughly reviewed the environmental issues and the full environmental impact statement provided to determine certain areas of significance. To the extent that the Board would like to see additional justification support or other materials on any one of the issues that it deemed to be important, I would recommend that that be part of your thinking when determining if it is a complete DEIS for circulation to the public.

Mr. Davis: And if that determination is not complete then we should get some kind documentation of what they would like to see. It has to be in writing.

Counsel Molnar: The Board would prepare findings according to the regulations and relay they back to the applicant. We will make sure that we are doing our best to be fully compliant with the timeframes and requirements.

Member Hamlin: And that activity is within the first 45 days.

Counsel Molnar: A great deal of it is, and it would be 45 days from April 3, 2017.

Chairman Southern: Perhaps we should choose a date for review of the DEIS by the Board and then proceed from there.

Counsel Molnar: I agree it is a lengthy document in answer and reply to the positive declaration previously issued. I would recommend that we page it so that to the best of our ability we understand the significance and the mitigating measures and discussion points offered by the applicant.

A special meeting to review the DEIS was scheduled for April 25, 2017 at 6:30 pm.

Public Hearing - Special Permit

Applicant: Graham Smith
1120 Jewett Road
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax parcel #044.-02-01.4

Present: Graham & Tammy Smith, Applicants; Robert Eggleston, Architect

No one wished to have the public notice read. A site visit was conducted on April 8, 2017. The property is located on Jewett Road and proposed is the construction of a 773SF accessory apartment with a two car garage on the west side of the property for his parents, who are elderly. The existing garage has been challenging to accommodate two cars, and the proposed garage will be easier to accommodate the cars. A special permit is required as there is less than sufficient acreage for the dwelling and accessory apartment. OCDOH has approved the tie in of the apartment to the existing septic system. A drainage swale will be moved to the west to act as a curtain drain for the property and the structure will be built slab on grade with the grade slightly modified.

Chairman Southern inquired if the level of the proposed structure will be raised to the level of the existing driveway. Mr. Eggleston stated yes, and that the driveway tapers away and is wet, and by raising it up to the driveway level, the garage will be slightly above the driveway level, to pitch away from the building, there should be no problem with water. Chairman Southern inquired if the majority of the flooding was coming from the west. Mr. Eggleston stated that basically, it is a low lot with the house built up and we are continue the pattern with the garage. The drainage will flow to the road ditch located to the north.

Mr. Camp inquired if the finished floor of the proposed building would be similar to the existing garage, with a pitch in the middle and runoff to the north. Mr. Eggleston confirmed it would be similar. Member Winkelman inquired if the septic system will need to be expanded for the apartment. Mr. Eggleston stated that OCDOH has approved the plan to use the existing system with the addition of a grinder pump with a low-pressure force main to the septic tank added for the apartment. A letter for OCDOH is pending. During the site visit, it was noted that there was no flowing water, just standing water, although it was raining. The neighbor's ditch is very deep and is also assisting with storm water control in the area.

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

At this time, Chairman Southern opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor of the project. No one spoke in favor of the project. Chairman Southern asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition, or had any other comments. Nancy Thomas, 1148 Jewett Road and neighbor on the east side, commented that with the recent storm there was a lot of water that drained fairly quickly. If there is a lot of rain then the water goes around their pool and her land is behind the applicant's property as well. The applicant has cut down a few trees that has taken away some of the absorption. The drainage has to run as proposed or it will run back on her property. She continued stating that it is wetlands no matter what anybody says. She told them a year ago when a new lot was created across the street and her sump pump runs 24/7. That water is pumped out to the road ditch. Last year we had a drought and the sump pump did not work all of the time. Member Winkelman commented that the water goes west to the roadside ditch and the new additional building will be on the west side of the existing house. It is unlikely that the storm water would exasperate any water problems on the east. Ms. Thomas commented that her concern is that no additional water enters her property.

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

The application will be continued at the May 16, 2017 meeting.

Continuance-Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment/Special Permit

Applicant:

Russel Zechman
PO Box 9
Skaneateles, NY 13152

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

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect;

Dave Loftus has been working on the draft easement language to forward to Scott Molnar to review. They are anticipating the draft being completed for the next meeting that is still within the 62-day period before decision. Member Winkelman commented that neighbor letters are still being received on the application.

Sketch Plan - Special Permit

Applicant: Bean Works LLC
3816 Highland Ave
Skaneateles NY 13152

Property: Vinegar Hill Road
Skaneateles, New York
Tax parcel: 022.-01-01.6

Present: David Bean, Representative;

Mr. Bean submitted a change in name on the application to Bean Works, LLC. The proposal is for a pole barn for storage of personal boats and an RV, and includes the addition of a driveway and parking. The pole barn would have electricity added, and water would be accessed by drilling a well or possible access to the City of Syracuse water line that runs across the property. The water would be used to wash his boats and RV and there will be no bathroom in the pole barn, only washing of the boats occurring outside of the storage building. Mr. Camp stated that based on the aerial photo he has researched, there is a watercourse that runs through the middle of the lot and inquired if it goes all the way through the lot. He continued stating that it almost looks like a hand-dug ditch, as it is pretty straight. Mr. Bean stated that he has not come across it on the land when he has walked it.

Mr. Brodsky commented that the pole barn is considered a warehouse and wanted to know the intended use. The use will be for personal storage of boats and a RV. Member Kasper recommended a site visit by the Board, and a site visit will be conducted on April 29, 2017.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Hamlin to schedule a public hearing on May 16, 2017 at 6:30 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

Sketch Plan – Site Plan Review

Applicant: Duncan and Barbara Wormer
176 Van Voorhis Rd
Pittsford, NY 14534

Property: 1840 Tamarack Trail
Skaneateles, New York
Tax parcel: 062.-01-09.5

Present: Duncan Wormer & Barbara Bennett, Applicants; Bill Ferraldo, Architect

The applicant is proposing the construction of a single-family dwelling on a lot over three acres that has an existing guesthouse near the lake. The plan has always been to construct the main dwelling at a later date. When the plans for the guesthouse were approved, the site plan had shown the main dwelling that would be located at a future date.

Mr. Ferraldo commented that the 3.2-acre lot does not involve the parcel close to the water. The survey submitted does not include the 33 x 58 foot wide area of land by the lake. The entire parcel includes the right of way, and the lot coverage chart includes the right of way and does not include the portion of the property that is by the lake. Impermeable surface coverage is proposed at 9.9%. Mr. Brodsky commented that he read that straight line as the demarcation of the lake setback for shoreline structures. A revised coverage chart was submitted now including the area of land by the lake and reduces the impervious coverage to 9.7%. Mr. Brodsky reiterated that the lot size and coverage should continue to include the right of way, as it is part of the lot. The length of driveway that serves three other lots works against the coverage on the lot. The septic system design is under review by OCDOH as it was approved many years ago. The proposed septic system for the dwelling will be independent of the existing septic system serving the guesthouse.

Mr. Camp stated that there is a swale that runs parallel to the driveway and where the proposed driveway for the dwelling crosses over it, and a culvert should be shown there. There is a curtain drain around the upper perimeter that is a good idea, however would suggest the addition of a swale on top of the curtain drain to catch the surface water better. In addition, a construction sequence should be provided to the board for review and give the contractor a stepped view of the project. Mr. Brodsky commented that one of the other issues is that the guesthouse is an accessory apartment that was granted a variance in the 1990s and we do not have the details of that review and how it addressed the future home. He continued stating that the board can approved the two dwellings on less than the required four acres as long as the septic system is approved by the OCDOH and that a stipulation is made that the lot cannot be subdivided at a future date. A site visit will be conducted on April 29, 2017.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Hamlin to schedule a public hearing on May 16, 2017 at 6:45 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

Sketch Plan - Special Permit

Applicant: TP Creek LLC
11 Fennell St Ste 1
Skaneateles NY 13152

Property: Jordan Road
Skaneateles, New York
Tax parcel: 045.-03-09.1

Present: Tim McNally, Representative;

The proposal is for a 7200sf Morton building on a vacant lot with the structure that has an intended use for storage of personal boats. The lot is located in the RR and HC districts, with the proposed building located in the HC district. The driveway cut has received approval from the Town highway department. A special permit will be required as the storage building is being constructed without a principal building located on the lot.

Member Kasper commented that the driveway will have a climb to get to the proposed structure. Mr. McNally stated that it may move 10-20 feet to get it in the right spot that will required the least amount of cut and fill. Member Kasper stated that it is quite a climb and the recent snowmelt was running across between a couple other buildings. Mr. McNally stated that the location for the structure was chosen to not impede the natural drainage into the large roadside ditch. Member Kasper commented that his concern is that it is a steep decline as you are driving down the driveway. Mr. McNally stated that the driveway could be pushed down further north but you would get into other issues. Chairman Southern commented that the concern is safety, as you would not want to slide down the driveway into the road. A site visit will be held on April 29, 2017.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Redmond to schedule a public hearing on May 16, 2017 at 7:00 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

Sketch Plan - Special Permit

Applicant: Allyn Paul
2369 Brickyard Road
Canandaigua, NY

Property: 4457 Vinegar Hill Road
Skaneateles, New York
Tax parcel: 023.-02-01.1

Present: Allyn Paul, Applicant

The applicant is proposing to take an existing building on the property and add 200sf on the main level to access a proposed second floor 744sf accessory apartment. The 2.89 acre lot will require a special permit for the main dwelling and accessory apartment with a requirement that the lot cannot be subdivided in the future. Mr. Brodsky inquired if the OCDOH has been approved the septic system. Ms. Paul stated that the septic system is over 40 years old, so a new septic design is in process and will be submitted to OCDOH for review and approval. Planning Board approval can be issued pending the OCDOH approval. Mr. Brodsky inquired what the shop use is, Ms. Paul stated that it is a hobby shop and no business is conducted. A site visit will be conducted on April 29, 2017.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Kasper to schedule a public hearing on May 16, 2017 at 7:15 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

Sketch Plan – Site Plan Review

Applicant: Mark Aberi
PO Box782
Skaneateles NY 13152

Property: 1017 The Lane
Skaneateles, New York
Tax parcel: 050.-01-23.0

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect;

The applicant is proposing a new single family dwelling on a vacant nonconforming lot located less than 1000ft from the lake. A site visit was conducted last month. Member Kasper commented that diversion swales should be considered for the lot to control the stormwater that is sheeting onto this lot from the lot next to it that is at a higher elevation. Mr. Eggleston stated that there is a curtain drain by the septic fields. Mr. Aberi stated that a swale could be added. Mr. Camp suggested that the swales run on the west side and along the backside of the lot to control the stormwater. He continued commenting that several of the properties in the area have the swales for stormwater control. Member Winkelman noted that a silver maple tree will be removed for the construction of the new dwelling. He commented that The Lane has a homeowner’s association that may have restrictive covenants that should be checked prior to construction of the dwelling.

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made Member Donald Kasper and seconded by Member Anne Redmond, 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. That the Site Plan 1 of 1 dated March 30, 2017 and Narrative with Construction Sequence dated March 30, 2017 be revised to include drainage swales to the west side of the lot, and with the revised plan and plans New Residence 1 of 4 thorough 4 of 4 dated March 30, 2017, prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be strictly followed; and
3. An as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]

Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Anne Redmond	Present	[Yes]

Sketch Plan – Site Plan Review

Applicant: Paul Garrett 8155 Ivy Trail Baldwinsville, NY 13027	Property: 2167 West Lake Road Skaneateles, New York Tax parcel: 059.-02-09.1
--	--

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect;

The applicant owns the property at 2167 West Lake Road and is proposing to construct a 1400sf detached garage with storage above, extend the height of the second story, convert a 48sf back porch into a 60sf mudroom, and add a 200sf permeable patio to the west side of the house. This will expand the cumulative footprint over 2500sf requiring site plan review. A construction sequence has been provided to the Board. A swale will be added to control the stormwater that will arch around the house and proposed garage. The City of Syracuse has inquired about the existing leach field, and they are investigating on whether the property has a traditional leach field or if it employs the use of dry wells. In addition, it will be determined if the tank is steel or concrete and if the distribution box is functioning.

Mr. Camp inquired if the foundation of the building is strong enough to be built upon. Mr. Eggleston stated that it has a stone foundation that has had concrete placed in front of it over the years. The northeast corner had failed and had been rebuilt with cement blocks.

Mr. Brodsky inquired about the excavation plan for the garage and parking area. Mr. Eggleston stated that there are a couple foot drops that will be cut and filled in and then regrading of the area for the pole barn. Mr. Camp stated that for the pole barn there will be a lot of earthwork. Member Kasper commented that there appears to be an 8-foot cut to meet the existing driveway. Member Winkelman commented that there seems to be natural spot for the garage and inquired what will be done with the excess spoils. Mr. Eggleston stated that they will the cut will be used for the fill in another portion. Mr. Camp stated that the garage will be at a higher elevation than the house and driveway. Mr. Brodsky inquired if contours and elevations could be shown on the plan. Mr. Eggleston commented that he has already requested the topography and grading plan to be prepared for the Board. Mr. Camp inquired if the garage will be a three bay garage. Mr. Eggleston stated that it is going to be a three bays, a double and a single, and with room for man door access and storage. Mr. Camp commented that if the garage were turned 90°, there would be less earthwork. Mr. Eggleston commented that then it would require a retaining wall and they would have to bank it. The second floor is an attic truss and will be used for storage.

Member Hamlin inquired if the DOT permit has been obtained. Mr. Eggleston commented that it is in the works, as it was sent in last week. The driveway is extremely narrow and difficult to back out. The existing house is being renovated and the poorly constructed fireplace removed. Member Kasper noted that there must have been some porches as there is a second story door to nowhere. Mr. Eggleston stated that the dwelling was a two family dwelling and is being

converted back to a single-family dwelling and the door will be removed. The proposed impermeable surface coverage will increase for 3.9% to 7.3%.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Kasper to adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull, Secretary/Clerk