

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
May 15, 2018**

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

Chairman Southern opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. The meeting minutes of April 10, 2018 were previously distributed to the Board and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Hamlin and seconded by Member Kasper to approve the minutes as submitted. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

The meeting minutes of April 17, 2018 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 Hamlin to approve the minutes as submitted. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Public Hearing – Special Permit

Applicant:	Andrew Newton	Property:
	58 East Street	East Street
	Skaneateles, NY 13152	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		Tax Map #044.-02-27.1

Present: Andrew Newton, Applicant;

The proposal is for a 40 foot x 60 foot pole barn on a vacant lot for personal storage.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Kasper to consider the proposed action as a Type II SEQR action as the construction is of a non-residential structure less than 4,000 square feet pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(7) 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. No one spoke in opposition or had any other comments.

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.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made Member Doug Hamlin and 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 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/Survey dated August 31, 2017 prepared by Paul Olszewski, Licensed Land Surveyor, be strictly followed; and
3. That the pole barn usage be limited to personal storage only.

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	Absent	

Discussion

John Camp, P.E.C&S Engineers, had provided a drafted memo regarding Small Scale Stormwater Management that includes the suggested modifications from the board. Accordingly, the Planning Board adopted the following:

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Member Donald Kasper and seconded by Member Douglas Hamlin, that the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board recommends to the Town Board that the Guidelines be adopted as policy, and made available to property owners and interested parties by posting the Guidelines on the Town’s website with other Zoning forms and guidelines. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous vote to affirm 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 Absent

Public Hearing – Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment

Applicant: Chris Graham
 Trillium Homes Inc.
 4302 Jordan Road
 Skaneateles, NY
 Property:
 4901 & 4909 Foster Road
 Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #020.-01-01.1 & 020.-01-01.2

Present: Chris Graham, Applicant; Bob Eggleston, Architect;

A plat plan prepared by Paul Olszewski has been submitted showing the proposed three lots with a single shared driveway providing access. The preliminary perc tests indicated that conventional septic systems would work for the lots. At the site visit, a concern was raised regarding the front of the lot that is wooded and steep, and after further investigation it was determined that a driveway could be installed in the area with the removal of some of the trees.

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

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

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

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.

Troy Ballard, 4882 Foster Road, commented that he had no problem with houses on the property; however, he has a concern with a third lot and the impact to the character of the neighborhood. The hamlet of Sheppard settlement and most of Skaneateles, does not have shared driveways with a third parcel on it. It is a rural community and he wants it maintained that way. Additional concern was mentioned regarding water supply in the area with wells in the area needed to be dug deeper since new construction in the area has tapped existing wells and the aquifer.

Larry Larabee, 4933 Foster Road, stated that it is a community of sparse houses and three houses seems excessive. His backyard will have views of three houses from it. Two houses are acceptable, but three houses not, and with a shared driveway with water resources, and with some of the neighbors have to drill their wells because the water supply has been diminished. He continued stating that the proposal is inappropriate for the area.

Bruce King, 4920 Foster Road, echoed the comments of the last two speakers.

Ken Scott, 4874 Foster Road, the proposal is not in character of the settlement and he would rather keep it at two lots.

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 affirmance of said motion.

Member Kasper inquired on the depth of the wells in the area. Mr. Graham commented that he had been a prior owner of Mr. Ballards house, and at that time, he verified that the well was drilled down to 140 feet, approximately the level of the aquifer in the area that also feeds the fish hatchery. Mr. Ballard stated that he does not have a water issue. Mr. Graham commented that there may be wells in the area that were too shallow and that when it gets dry it affects the ground water source. Member Kasper inquired of the neighbors present, what the depth of their wells. Mr. Ballard commented that his well is approximately 140-150 feet deep with no water issues, but Marcia Periton had to have her well re-drilled. Mr. Scott stated that his well is 164 feet deep with no water problems. Mr. Graham commented that the aquifer goes north to the Highway 5.

Member Winkelman inquired on the typical lot size in the neighborhood. The neighbors commented that the range is 4 to 37 acres. Mr. Eggleston stated that as you move toward Stump Road the lots are 1 acre, with lots on Foster Road at 2 or 3 acres and larger. Chairman Southern commented that there are several shared driveways in the town with the zoning allowing no more than four dwelling units per driveway, although they are not present in this area. Mr. Eggleston explained that it is safer to have less driveway cuts along the road. The existing driveway was installed in 2010 and a shared driveway is a preferred method for the town. Member Kasper inquired if the town highway superintendent is aware that three lots will be on the one driveway cut.

Chairman Southern commented that any potential impact to new wells in the area to the surrounding neighbors would not be evident until a well was used. Member Hamlin inquired about the referenced intensity of use and whether it is a visual issue for some of the neighbors as landscape screening could be provided. Member Winkelman said that the proposal is out of character of the neighborhood as the lots are being supersized creating three 2-acre lots out of two 3-acre lots, just meeting the minimum requirements. Mr. Graham commented that the Briggs subdivision on Stump Road were one-acre lots, there are one-acre lots on Hoyt Road.

Member Kasper recommended that the application be continued next month and that he will make calls regarding the aquifer. The application will continue at next month's meeting.

Sketch Plan- Special Permit

Applicant:	Shelley Andrade Cats Meow-Inn 21 Hannum Street Skaneateles, NY	Property: 3986 Jordan Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map #027.-03-01.4
------------	---	--

Present: Shelley Andrade, Applicant;

The application is for the establishment of a cats only motel with care provided on a daily, weekly, and monthly basis. All activities are done internally situated in 1500 square feet located upstairs in the prior Gazella Dance Studio. 500 square feet of the 1500 square feet is for office, storage and reception, 1000 square feet dedicated to the cat condos. Mr. Brodsky noted that the previous approvals do not indicate how much space is being dedicated to all of the exiting activities. The law office use is located downstairs in the rear of the building and the optometrist is located on the first floor.

Mr. Brodsky advised the board that parking needs will need to be analyzed and the board will need to also determine the type of activity classification. The property is serviced with public water and has an on-site septic system. The cat waste is collected, removed from the premises and taken to the owners home where it is hauled away by Syracuse waste.

The applicant is the only employee with additional help of up to five employees, seasonally during the holiday season in the fall/winter. The employees will be on staggered shifts. Pick up and drop off of cats is done on an appointment basis only.

There will be no work done on the exterior of the site. The board reviewed the definition of kennel and determined that the cat motel would be classified as a service business as the kennel definition references dogs.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Hamlin to schedule a public hearing on ***Tuesday, June 19, 2018 at 6:30 p.m.*** The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Sketch Plan- Major Special Permit

Applicant:	Welch Allyn, Inc. P.O. Box 220 Skaneateles Falls, NY 13153-0220	Property: 4341 State Street Skaneateles, New York Tax parcel: 022.-01-16.0
------------	---	--

Present: Mike, Sheehan, Welch Allyn; Corey Guerrette, Welch Allyn; Andrew Schuster, Ashley McGraw

The expansion from last year is completed and although there is no need for additional space, there is a need for space for a special pierce of equipment. The EMC (electromagnetic compatibility chamber) would be 22'x32'x20' and is proposed to be located in a portion of the old warehouse and with a 1,640 square foot addition to replace four received docks on the east side of the building. The addition will allow the chamber to fit properly. There will be no increase in impermeable surface coverage, as the

pbm.05.15.2018

addition will be placed over existing impermeable surface coverage. The height of the addition will match the existing height of the building at approximately two stories tall. A small sidewalk will be installed to access. There will be only one dock door remaining on the side of the building. The proposed location of the addition in the existing location of the docks is not very visible from the roads. The lighting will remove one site light and add a wall mount light. An amendment to a major special permit requires special permit review and a public hearing. The board can adopt the prior SEQR completed on the project March 18, 2008.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman to schedule a public hearing on *Tuesday, June 19, 2018 at 6:40 p.m.* The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Sketch Plan –Special Permit

Applicant

Chris & Amy Neumann	Property:
101 Ramblewood Drive	2923 East Lake Rd
Skaneateles, NY	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Tax Map #039.-01-27.0

Present: JoAnne Gagliano, EDR; Danielle Carr, EDR

The proposal is for the replacement of the waterfront stairs that are failing. The property is the summerhouse for the applicant and they own the property to the north. A NYSDEC permit application has been submitted for the repair of the area. A small portion of the seawall will be repaired where it meets with the stairs.

Access to the stairs is difficult as the septic system for this property and the northern property are located on the lot. It will be accomplished by accessing from the northern property's driveway and maneuvering around the septic fields. Small equipment will be utilized and concrete will be pumped in. The existing cheek walls along the existing stairs will be removed. The stairs will be constructed by hand due to the access by the waterfront making it difficult to pump cement from a lake barge that could potentially spill.

Mr. Camp inquired on the steps of the demolition plan. Ms. Gagliano stated that the demolition will consist of jackhammering around the stairs that are above the lake line. The existing stairs that are below the lake line will remain undisturbed. The decorative picket fence will be rebuilt with the gate; the lights located on the dock will be placed on the sides of the gate. The new stairs will be a concrete sub-structure with a stone veneer.

There will be no vehicles accessing the shoreline; they will employ the use of dingoes to carry the debris and the concrete will be pumped. Mr. Camp recommended that the septic fields be marked and protected from any traffic. Ms. Gagliano commented that one of the septic systems has not been constructed yet and it will be about a week before they begin this project. The adjacent site will have disturbed grass that will be repaired after the project is complete. Due to the time delay for approvals from the NYSDEC and ACOE, the project will be constructed in the fall with the ground possibly in a frozen state. Ms. Carr commented that the ACOE also specifies

the time when work can be performed. Member Winkelman said that there will be a slight improvement with the impermeable surface coverage.

Counsel Molnar disclosed that he had represented the applicant in the acquisition of the property. Although he does not represent the applicant for this proposal seeking site plan review, if there are any issues that needs legal counsel on either side, he would refer it to independent counsel for both the board and the applicant.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Hamlin to schedule a public hearing on *Tuesday, June 19, 2018 at 6:50 p.m.* The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Amendment Request –Site Plan Review

Applicant

Lakelawn Properties LLC	Property:
1 Winthrop Square	3384 West Lake Street
Boston, MA 02110	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Tax Map #049.-02-03.0

Present: JoAnne Gagliano, EDR; Joe Falco, EDR

The applicant is proposing modifications to the site plan that was most recently approved in March 2017. There will be no grading at the waterfront and no changes to the access road and parking area at the waterfront. The entrance to the boathouse will remain on the first floor. There is a building permit for the repair of the existing boathouse. The only structural damage to the boathouse is at the pier and the NYSDEC/ACOE has issued a permit for the repair.

The existing marine 250-gallon fuel tank will be replaced in kind; however, it will have a containment component to it to protect against any leakage into the lake. The tank will be located under a shed like roof as the existing tank is located, and the fuel tank is above ground.

Additional minor modifications include the gardens that have been reduced and modified, and located further away from the southern property line. There is a proposed grass strip drive path to the back of the existing utility garage for the tractors, and the tennis pavilion is slightly smaller.

Over the last year there has been offsite water coming onto the property during storms that floods the bridges and across the Country Club drive. They are proposing the modification of the stormwater plan so that the southern bridge will not be under water during rain events so that access can be maintained to the main dwelling. Proposed is a six foot deep wet pond in the stream and to relocate the stream to a meandering natural style rather than the straight trench line it is today to slow down the stormwater, as the existing stream is suffering from erosion of the banks due to the straight nature of the stream. A NYSDEC site visit will occur this Thursday with a pending permit for the establishment of the wet pond and the modifications to the stream. There is a planting plan, and ongoing monitoring for maintenance of the stream and wet pond. Mr. Camp commented that the maintenance plan should address cleaning of the wet pond periodically, as it will fill with sediment over time unless the pond is made deeper. He continued saying that if the pond could be made deeper than six feet without the sides getting steeper, it

pbm.05.15.2018

would help the lake. The board requested that Mr. Camp also participate in the meeting with the NYSDEC this Thursday.

Member Hamlin inquired where the off-site water is coming from. Ms. Gagliano commented that it is coming from the Village and that there may be an additional pipe installed in front of the Kenan property that will contribute more to this site. There is a water problem across the road further north from the lawns in the area that the village intends to have piped towards this creek.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Hamlin, the Planning Board adopted and ratified its prior SEQR determination for the Application, which was a determination that the Application constitutes a TYPE II single family residential Project, not subject to further SEQR review. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Member Scott Winkelman, seconded by Member Doug Hamlin, and upon an affirmative vote thereon as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the Modification and amendment of the Approving Resolutions, with the following conditions:

1. That the Site Plan C1, C-200, and C-201, with Narrative, prepared by EDR, dated May 1, 2018, be followed in all respects, and
2. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from NYSDEC and any agency having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application; and
3. That the Applicant obtain the approval of the Town Engineer in consultation with the NYSDEC and ACOE for the Modifications; and
4. That all future modifications to the approved Site Plan be submitted to the Planning Board for approval prior to commencement of construction; and
5. Except as modified hereby, the conditions set forth in the Approving Resolutions remain in full force and effect.

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	Absent	

Continued Review - Subdivision

Applicant:	Mark Aberi	Property:	
	Harmony Homes LLC		3125 Benson Road
	PO Box 782		Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Skaneateles, NY		Tax Map #051.-01-04.2

Present: Mark Aberi, Applicant; Bob Eggleston, Architect;

A revised site plan dated May 4, 2018 was submitted based on comments from the site visit that was conducted by the board. The shared driveway has been moved further south where it is at higher ground. That will allow the stormwater system placed in the southeast corner and there will likely be another stormwater retention area in the middle of the lot where the land is lower. By moving the driveway further south, it will shorten the drive and use less of the impervious coverage of the lot.

Perc test have begun for the three lots, and assuming that the preliminary plan is viable with the board, a plat plan would be presented to the board next month. The OCDOT permit is pending due to the relocation of the proposed driveway. The engineering for the stormwater plan will begin once a conceptual approval has been received by the board.

Natural vegetative features including the finger of trees on the plan will be kept in place. There is a collection of water that sits in the tree area that needs development of a stormwater management plan. Member Winkelman inquired on the proposed size of the lots. Lots 2 and 3 are approximately two acres and lot 1 will be three acres to accommodate the driveway. The shared driveway will end at the hammerhead on lot 2 where lots 2 and 3 will have their private drive begin. There will be a maintenance agreement on the driveway.

Member Kasper stated that the Onondaga County Planning Board had commented that a SPEDS permit would be required. Mr. Eggleston clarified that the driveway would disturb 9-10,000 square feet and not require a SPEDS permit as it is less than one acre. The character of the neighborhood will not be negatively impacted, as the idea is to cluster the dwellings and follow the rural siting principles. Member Winkelman commented that the proposal is just meeting the minimum lot sizes in a rural community. He continued saying that there is a shared driveway where most people on Benson Road have big lots. Mr. Eggleston offered to reduce the size of the building envelopes on the properties to provide more green space. Chairman Southern commented that any time the building envelope can be reduced would be beneficial.

The applicant has requested that conceptual approval be granted by the Planning Board so that the applicant can move forward with the application. At this time Counsel Molnar recommended to the Board that the application be an Unlisted Action and reviewed the short form SEQR with the Board. In evaluating, each of the criteria set forth in Part II:

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

drainage problems? Is being addressed with the proposed plan		
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental or human health?	X	

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

Counsel Molnar stated that the applicant is looking for conceptual approval although it will still need additional engineering review for the drainage, septic plans created and approved, and modifications to the building envelope. The Board can agree in principle that the layout could be advanced to the next week if the board so chooses.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Member Hamlin to declare conceptual approval of the proposed subdivision.. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

The application will continue at next month’s Planning Board meeting.

Sketch Plan – Major Special Permit

Applicant:	Chris Graham	Property:
	Trillium Homes Inc.	4331 Jordan Road
	4302 Jordan Road	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Skaneateles, NY	Tax Map #024.-02-01.1 & 024.-02-01.2

Present: Chris Graham, Applicant; Bob Eggleston, Architect;

This is a conceptual review of a major project that has several components including a zone change from the RR district to the HM district. The six-acre property consisting of two parcels, had received an approval for the rebuilding of the two-family home that has been constructed, certificate of occupancy receive, and units rented. Approval had been received to remove the three-car garage and construct a three-car garage with apartment above, however; the approval has expired. Erection of a construction storage/office on the triangular portion of the property had received variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals and approval from the Planning Board. The use of the office is a low traffic and impact use of the property. The building permit for the construction will be submitted in the next month.

The comprehensive plan calls for alternative housing, and there are not a lot of apartments available in Skaneateles. There is a demand for people moving into the area, and for those who would like to live here on a part time basis. The comprehensive plan does call for development along the Jordan Road corridor and this property lies along Jordan Road. The property is adjacent to the Hamlet to the south and the applicant would like for the property to have its zone changed to the Hamlet district along with the Town’s cemetery

The applicant would then establish 16 multi family dwelling unit with separate driveway access and septic system. If the property were to remain in the RR district then the maximum number of units allowed would be 8 additional dwelling units. If the property is approved to be located in the Hamlet district then the density is 4 dwelling units per acre of buildable land. Mr. Eggleston continued saying

that based on his calculations after deducting unbuildable land, they would have four acres allowing 16 dwelling units. The final determination of density would be the Planning Board decision.

The request for zone change is a concurrent application with the Town Board who will then refer it to this board for their opinion. The property has access to Town water and would have private septic systems. There is a vein of sand that runs across the property that is conducive for septic systems. The 16 units would be two bedroom units, and proposed is a septic system that could accommodate 32 bedrooms. The land requirement for a dwelling unit is ½ acre for Hamlets; for the RR district, it is 1 acre per dwelling unit based on Table 1 since the proposal is for residential dwellings and commercial buildings under 5,000SF. Mr. Brodsky's case analysis commented that it should be reviewed under Table 2; however, the proposal complies with either dimensional table. For density calculations for single family or two family, the codes does not discern buildable versus unbuildable land.

The property is 6.3 acres of total land and with the slopes greater than 12% and the City of Syracuse easement, the net buildable land is 4.04 acres. With the density allowed of 4 dwelling units per one acre of land, 16 dwelling units would be allowed on the property. Member Winkelman inquired how the calculation equates to 16 dwelling units on the property, as there is already a two family dwelling unit on the property. Mr. Eggleston commented that the code does not discern whether the property needed for the two family needs to be on buildable land. Mr. Brodsky commented that under 148-11K, multifamily dwellings are allowed with the density determined on a case-by-case basis by the Planning Board. He continued saying that the status of the property is mixed use with the existing two-family dwelling, the office building and the proposed 16 dwelling units.

Mr. Camp inquired if the density would be the same regardless of the district the property is located. Mr. Eggleston commented that if the property remained in the RR district, then the two family dwelling would require four acres leaving the density for the apartments to 5. The larger issue is that the RR district only allows 10% impermeable surface coverage and the Hamlet allowed 50-60% depending on what dimension table used. With multifamily dwellings, it is unlikely to achieve 10% impermeable surface coverage. He continued saying that the logic for this property to be located in the Hamlet district is that the property is served by public water, sandy soils are conducive for septic systems, there is reasonable topography on the property, and the 30-foot setbacks allowed in the Hamlet work with multi-family dwelling units.

Mr. Brodsky reminded that board that they will receive a separate referral from the Town board regarding the zone change, and the Town Board will need to render their decision on the zone change prior to any action on the special permit request portion of this application. Consideration of the character of the site and the appropriate density of the site should be contemplated by the board in consideration of the proposal.

Mr. Eggleston commented that one car garage will be provided for each unit with the garages facing inward, conforming with the Hamlet guidelines. Chairman Southern inquired if OCDOT has commented on the driveway opening. Mr. Graham said that the site distances are good where the driveway is being proposed. Mr. Brodsky inquired if the proposed dwelling units could have access from the existing driveway. Mr. Eggleston commented that the driveway would then cross the City of Syracuse water line. Mr. Graham commented that the existing driveway is closer to the intersection, and he would not recommend additional traffic in that location.

Member Winkelman commented that part of the Hamlet design is to include sidewalks and walking trails. Mr. Eggleston commented that sidewalks to nowhere do not make sense but they could do internal sidewalks. He continued saying the town needs to work on a sidewalk master plan. Member Kasper

commented that there could be a walkway down to Railroad Street that would connect to the Charlie Major nature trail.

Chairman Southern advised that the zone change needs to be approved by the Town Board before the Planning Board can consider the proposal and density request. Mr. Eggleston commented that engineering cannot happen until the density is determined and that could happen concurrently. Chairman Southern said that as the Planning Board has not been requested by the Town Board to give an advisory opinion concerning the zone change, and it does not behoove the board to review the project including density determination until the Town Board has made their determination.

The triangular parcel of the property is connected by deed and was treated as part of the larger parcel under a previous review. Whether or not to include it into the calculations for density will need to be discussed at a further date after the zone change determination has been made. The referral for the zone change will be on the next month's meeting.

Continued Review - Subdivision

Applicant: Emerald Estates Properties, LP
3394 East Lake Rd
Skaneateles, New York

Property:
2894 East Lake Rd
Skaneateles, New York
Tax Map #036.-01-37.1

Present: Donald Spear, Applicant; John Langey, Attorney; Robert Eggleston, Architect; Rudy Zona, RZ Engineering;

Mr. Langey: The updated plan was submitted with the proposed conservation road compliant with town code. In September 2017, there was an impasse regarding the remainder lot and the tradeoff suggested was for improvements to the road with the width expanded to 18 feet, and guardrails installed. The board had requested that the road be at 12% grade and after discussions with the fire chief, the road has been designed at a maximum of 12% grade and that they had conceded on the residual lot to be included as part of the conservation subdivision lots. The applicant is no longer pursuing the 17 lot subdivision at this time, but is submitted a revised 9 lot conservation subdivision with a road grade that will not exceed 12% at any location. The conservation density road will comply with all of the town regulations.

All of the changes were based on the following factors; We have met with the local first responders including the fire chief and we have listened to all of the input from the Planning Board members. We understand that not every member is always going to vote in favor of every project however, we are going to accommodate as many of these comments that we can. We have also listened to input from the surrounding neighbors as we have addressed the comments. The site specifics including that the lot is 80+ acres, the shared driveway would become a conservation road, the area of disturbance has been limited, and there will be extensive conservation lands preserved on this proposed plan, which is another feature the Planning Board would like to see. Should it be approved they are proposing reasonable hours of construction from 7 am to 4 pm Monday through Friday. Each lot would be required to demonstrate acceptable sewage disposal capabilities. The lots are oversized lots as they exceed the minimum acreage required under the conservation subdivision regulations. They will avoid any construction in or on high conservation areas. Under the new plan lots 3-11 to be located on approximately 79 acres of the site. An additional 1.94 acres of the site will be dedicated to the conservation road right of way. The applicant will prepare with consultation of the board's legal counsel, a conservation easement acceptable to the town pursuant to the regulations.

The proposed elements of the road include the newly designed road re-shaped to the horizontal curvature of the road that will meet and exceed the required 50 feet. The road tangents are now in excess of 100 feet required under town code. There will be a reshaping of the vertical curvature and profile of the road, which will result, is a road centerline slope not higher than 12% on any portion of the road, and in some areas as flat as 3%. Safety factors have been added to the vertical curves, now allowing design speeds greater than 25 mph, however, most of the roadway will exceed 30 mph as designed and constructed. The widening of the road will accommodate the passing of two vehicles with the road width expanded from the existing 13 feet to 18 feet of asphalt surface. An addition of guardrails along the northern side of the lowest curve near the stormwater management facility and along the western side of the road at the lowest curve and the second curve. Reconstruction of the existing turnout and the construction of two additional turnouts on the egress side of the conservation road will accommodate additional room for downhill traffic to yield to uphill traffic. This was taken directly from comments from the Planning Board and the fire department. Signs will be placed at the upper and lower ends to instruct the motorist relative to the right of way.

There will be some removal of vegetation along the lower curve softening of the curve as referenced prior to allow improved sight distance. Per the suggestion of the local fire agency, there will be the installation of a 20,000 gallon on site storage for fire protection consisting of two 10,000-gallon facilities located at the top of the hill in the proximity to two of the proposed building envelopes. The location and capacity of the storage will be determination in cooperation with the fire chief. The top of the road will be constructed for fire truck turnaround and pull off access to the water storage facility. Individually each of the improvements make for a better proposal but collectively it should address all of the concerns the Planning Board has expressed.

The next step they are recommending is the SEQR process. The lead agency notice has been mailed out, although the SEQR long form has been modified and re-submitted to the board. The applicant requests that SEQR proceed to the next meeting with a goal of completing SEQR at the June meeting with a public hearing at the June meeting.

Counsel Molnar: The request for lead agency for SEQR review of this application has been circulated and we have received two replies, one from the Town Zoning Board of Appeals and the other from NYSDOT. The notice included the long form EAF supplied by the applicant earlier this year, as well as the narrative and other materials concerning the project. A new long form EAF has been submitted which is different from that which had been circulated prior, and a new road plan has been submitted so there are differences. As there are more than 30 days between now and the June 19, 2018 regular meeting, notice to interested agencies can be re-circulated of the modified EAF and application materials and still achieve a 30 day turnaround for the board to act comfortably as lead agency in SEQR, and giving interested agencies an opportunity to review the amended documents. It is the recommendation that based on the submission of new materials, that the new material be re-circulated to the interested agencies.

Mr. Spear: The NYSDOT wanted a compliant entrance, which was a requirement of the Goldmann project but was never done.

Counsel Molnar: NYSDOT had no objections to the Planning Board as lead agency for the SEQR review, and that was the point of the correspondence.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Hamlin to charge the Board Counsel to re-circulate the request for lead agency with the revised materials to the interested parties. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Chairman Southern: At the mouth of the driveway are ten parking spaces, why.

Mr. Spear: I think there is eight and they are for parking for anybody that wanted to go to the waterfront.

Chairman Southern: There is no waterfront attached to the property.

Mr. Spear: The property has lake access rights.

Chairman Southern: Will there be a shared lakefront recreation for that many people?

Mr. Eggleston: What there is there is no shared lakefront recreation functions allowed, it is a straight access. The 100-acre parcel had lake access across a portion of the property with existing lot 1 and 2 having access across the property and have the ability to park in the spaces.

Chairman Southern: When you exceed a certain number, it would become shared lakefront.

Mr. Eggleston: That if it is shared lakefront recreation and I believe in the past there was a distinction between lake access and shared lakefront.

Mr. Brodsky: The definition does not distinguish and just says use. The Marchuska property had several easements on it already.

Chairman Southern: How many easements are on that property currently?

Mr. Spear: There is six.

Chairman Southern: You will need to do something with the shared lakefront, and meeting the requirements.

Mr. Brodsky: For every 10 feet of lakefront for each family using it.

Member Winkelman: How much lake frontage in on the easement?

Mr. Brodsky: Forty feet so it would be four families.

Mr. Eggleston: There is no shared lakefront recreation associated with this subdivision.

Chairman Southern: Why do you need eight parking spots.

Mr. Spear: The Woodruffs have two, Marchuska has one, I own two, and Nangle has one. These are all deeded rights for the parking and lake access.

Chairman Southern: This is a lot of people for a small access area to the lake.

Mr. Langey: That is a fair comment and we will look at it.

Chairman Southern: There are driveways on the plan that cross other properties. How are you handling it. In addition, is there a homeowners association to manage it.

Mr. Eggleston: They are shared driveways with up to four dwelling units on a shared driveway. Lots 3, 4, and 5 are on a shared driveway, and lots 9, 10, and 11 are on a shared driveway.

Mr. Langey: Either a homeowners association or a separate agreement amongst the homeowners.

Mr. Brodsky: A conservation road requires an HOA, not the driveways.

Member Kasper: Plus the drainage.

Member Winkelman: I am curious about the science on how you got the roadway to 12% with the switchback.

Mr. Camp: The lot lines are difficult to locate on the submitted drawings.

Mr. Eggleston: Lot one is not part of the subdivision.

Mr. Camp: I am looking at grading and footprint and who may need permission from whom.

Mr. Eggleston: I believe all of the grading is on the applicant's property.

Mr. Camp: What is the dashed line represent.

Mr. Spear: It is Goldmann's land but our easement. We have an easement to do this work.

Member Winkelman: I though the shared driveway was on the 40 foot easement.

Mr. Camp: There are a lot of lines on the plan and it is unclear as to what each represents.

Mr. Eggleston: We will clarify the lines for the next meeting.

Mr. Camp: There is grading and it is difficult to determine if it is located on lot 1 or the applicant's property.

Mr. Eggleston: That might be on lot 1 and we will double check that.

Mr. Brodsky: Whose strip of land is the access road on from Route 41?

Mr. Eggleston: That is on Goldmann's property where Emerald Estates has an easement right over it. The Weavers and Nangles also have an easement right.

Mr. Langey: Legal opinion was prepared by one of my partners that indicates that there is no additional approvals required from the Goldmanns for the proposal.

Member Winkelman: Only for the work that is in the easement.

Member Kasper: Could the engineer explain how the road grade was reduced to 12%.

Mr. Zona: The main changes in the road are the entry had to be raised, the second curve was lowered, and added extra footage. The bank will be cut at the worst 12-13 feet.

Mr. Camp: I came up with 17 feet.

Mr. Zona: I do not think we did that, it was 12-14 somewhere. We stay pretty close to where it is then raise it 5 feet at the end, which would flatten the end of the Goldmann driveway. Right now Goldmann's driveway goes down and it goes back up to meet the road steeply. There was a low point where we had to put in some drainage to alleviate some water going across Goldmann's driveway. This would further help that situation. Up at the end it is at 6% then it is at 3% and stays flat to stay with the contours in that area there. The first curve is close with it. At the beginning close to Route 41, it is at 3%, then it goes to 9%, then 12% all of the way up to the top where it flattens out to about 1-3%, then it finally goes to 6% following the natural contours. There will be a guardrail on the north side of the road for the first curve after Goldmanns. We are going to take the vegetation and soften the curve. We have widened the pavement there so that you have a turnoff and guardrail all along down there.

Member Kasper: That lower curve, when they blacktopped it they sloped it towards the drainage. That makes the bank go the wrong way when you make the curve.

Mr. Zona: Now I will not have to do that if I can do the grading. Before we had to tip the road so that the drainage got to the swale. Now if I do the grading and flatten the driveway, there is a catch basin right there. I can send everything down and catch it on that side. I can do a better job with the drainage and still get it over to the basin if I can grade this the way I have it shown. From an engineering standpoint, there are advantages to that.

Member Kasper: So will you still have the guardrail on the north side.

Me. Zona: Yes, just on the north side. The south side will be pretty flat and straight.

Member Kasper: You will need to extend Weaver's driveway to the road?

Mr. Zona: Yes, there will be a driveway easement for the extension.

Member Winkelman: That was open space you were leaving for Nangle's view.

Mr. Zona: Now you will definitely not be able to put something in that area to impede the view.

Mr. Camp: Have you thought about the phasing of the work so that access would be maintained for the existing properties.

Mr. Zona: Yes, the connection would be made before the old connection was removed.

Member Winkelman: It seems like a lot of engineering for the lake watershed.

Mr. Zona: The previous access was a driveway and we did not do vertical curves but graded it percent to percent. We did not do horizontal curves. Now all of the horizontal curves are engineered maintaining the 100-foot tangent, which makes it gentler. The vertical curves allow the estimation of the safety factor and speed limit permissibility of the road.

Mr. Camp: What is the little berm on the lot.

Mr. Zona: It was to build it up for a house that would be there to shield lights from cars coming up.

Member Kasper: Are the water tanks above ground or underground.

Mr. Zona: The tanks will be underground with a dry hydrant. The tanks will be within 500 feet of any potential dwelling. They will be maintained by the driveway agreement.

Member Kasper: It has to be an HOA, as you have to consider drainage, water tanks, and roadways.

Mr. Eggleston: Talking with the fire department, their biggest concern is water. Where you do not have hydrants, you do not have a ready supply of water. The access is much less of a concern because you do not have trucks constantly going up and down to bring water up. Providing the 20,000 gallons on top really improves the safety.

Mr. Zona: The fire chief said he would need 6-8,000 gallons up there and the proposal is for three times that.

Mr. Camp: What does the wider road do to stormwater calculations.

Mr. Zona: I have just run preliminary numbers and have not done any design on it, but I think it fits. When we were going to leave the road alone, it was going to fit code plus two lots. It will probably fit the road and maybe one lot with the new design. The preliminary numbers took the whole road and I do not think the water from the entire road will get there. It is something we need to look at.

Mr. Camp: We went around and around a few times on that ditch, whatever we had before will we be able to put that back.

Mr. Zona: Same thing, it has fabric under it and the riprap is separate from anything underneath that is all swale. The riprap will be stockpiled and reused, and then I think it will operate better because the slope will be flatter than the 14% or 17%.

Chairman Southern: Where do we want to go from here.

Counsel Molnar: The new SEQR long form provided takes into consideration the entire redesign of the roadway including the cuts and fills.

Mr. Eggleston: Yes, I have highlighted what has changed so that it is easy to find.

Counsel Molnar: This will take at least one good meeting to review the SEQR alone to make sure the board thoroughly reviews it before the board makes a determination.

Mr. Eggleston: We would not be opposed to do a preliminary review of SEQR as you have done before with other major projects.

Counsel Molnar: My recommendation is that if the board is considering doing a special meeting to review SEQR, it would be an efficient use of time as it would be one agenda item with focus, and then the board could react accordingly. That is either a June or July Special Meeting that should be done prior to the board setting a date for a public hearing.

Mr. Brodsky: Shouldn't the engineering be a little more refined before SEQR is reviewed. He said tonight that some of the calculations are not assured.

Mr. Langey: SEQR doesn't anticipate final design

Mr. Brodsky: I am saying the calculations at least.

Mr. Langey: General calculations is something we can achieve over the next several weeks as we prepare for whatever the board is willing to allow for another date to consider and drill down on SEQR. We want to give the board answers to all of the questions but we need a date set so that we have a goal to achieve.

Chairman Southern: We have enough information to do SEQR review that is what we are saying?

Counsel Molnar: We can launch a notice to interested agencies, and then given the volume of information in here, the board will want its own separate meeting to review SEQR.

Member Kasper: A special meeting and then maybe the engineering would be caught up with John having time to review it. We can discuss that and then begin SEQR. The one meeting just for questions and answers, and SEQR.

Mr. Langey: There is a fifth Tuesday this month that would be available.

Member Winkelman: There is a lot of information to digest.

Counsel Molnar: That would only be two weeks for interested agencies to comment. More likely than not the interested agencies are not going to object to the Planning Board acting as lead agency for SEQR review. We would be working under a fair assumption that the board would be acting as lead agency for completing review prior to the 30 days running.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Hamlin to schedule a special meeting to begin SEQR review on *Tuesday, May 29, 2018 at 6:30 p.m.* The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Member Winkelman: How much disturbance will be on steep slopes to re-configure this road. When they put the driveway in it was a huge scar, and it is still very visible from the lake. When it went in it was unreal.

Mr. Eggleston: Yeah, when it went in, now the grass has grown.

Mr. Langey: There are definitely temporary impacts.

Member Winkelman: Its steep slopes, an environmentally sensitive area, high conservation value, the comprehensive plan states that we should be protecting steep slopes numerous times in the plan. This is something we are engineering a road right through.

Mr. Langey: We will work on having some numbers for you.

Mr. Zona: Once I have the final grade, I can tell you how much. I have not final graded it yet.

Advisory Review –Lukins Mine Expansion

Applicant	Daniel Smith	Property:
	Lukins Mine	4847 Sheppard Rd
	4772 Sheppard Rd	

Present: Daniel Smith

The Lukins mine has a proposal to the NYSDEC for the expansion of the existing life of mine on Sheppard Road, increasing the size from 7.6 acres to 11.4 acres. The NYSDEC had requested comment from the Town of Skaneateles and in turn, the Town Board has asked for the Planning Board for comment.

Mr. Smith stated that he cannot do reclamation of the spent areas until he is able to move to the expansion area. Removal of product has been at the same pace as the last thirty years. The expansion area is located away from the road., there will be no increase in traffic or change in the operational factors. The original permit for mining was issued in 1988 and re-reviewed in 2008, and after 2008, the town no longer reviewed mines.

Lonnie Warner inquired about the reclamation of the Hanson mine. Mr. Smith said that they do not communicate, so he is unaware of their plans. Mr. Sykes commented that their concern is the reclamation of the mines, and he will work with the town board and the NYSDEC who is the agency that regulates mining.

The Planning Board reviewed the NYSDEC Notice of Complete Application, Lukins Mine/Daniel Smith, dated May 3, 2018. After thorough review, the Planning Board adopted the following:

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Member Donald Kasper and seconded by Chairman Joseph Southern that the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board has no objection to the application as presented to the DEC, or the factors and conclusions considered by the DEC and submitted to the Town Board for consideration. In finding no objection, the Planning Board observed:

1. The proposal increases acreage for the mined area, however, it moves the mining activity away from the road so that there is no setback or other barrier issues presented.
2. There will be no increase in intensity of use, additional truck traffic, nor need to manage that.
3. Control of dust and other operational factors will not change.
4. The mine has an existing and active permit dating back from the last approval in 2008 with conditions.

The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous 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	Absent	

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