

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
May 29, 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.

Preliminary SEQR 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;

The board determined that as part of the review of the submitted SEQR form they would also address the memo provided by the town engineer, John Camp. Counsel Molnar recommended that the board begin by reviewing part 1 of the submitted form to verify that the project is accurately described and represented, and a workshop/run through in part 2 to allow time for the board to contemplate the questions and at the least, form preliminary conclusions on where the board would like to be in its assessment of impact on any of the questioned items. The applicant will correct or add any additional information required by the board. Accordingly, the board conducted a preliminary review of the submitted Full Environmental Assessment Form and noted the following:

Part 1- Project and Setting:

A; Project and Sponsor Information brief description needs to be revised to include the lead agency request description. The average lot size should be corrected to 8.7 acres.

D. Project Details

D.1. Proposed and Potential Development

D.1.a. Counsel Molnar queried if the 9 should be changed to a 12-lot subdivision. Mr. Eggleston clarified that this is a re-subdivision of lot 3 into 9 lots. He continued stating that lots 1 and 2 were part of a conventional subdivision completed prior to this re-subdivision. Mr. Langey stated that the question is to give the reader a brief description of what the application is. Counsel Molnar commented that with the description in section A providing a fuller description of the project, it allows the section to be listed as it is currently stated.

D.1.c. The percentage of the proposed expansion should be based on the existing 4 lots being expanded to 12 lots or a 300% expansion.

- D.1.d.iv.: Minimum proposed lot sizes, the word acres should be added behind 2 and 48
- D.1.e.: multiple phases change to yes; number of phases to 2; phases, phase one 1 month for the road; phase two- 5 years for 9 units
- D.1.h.i.: purpose of impoundment is for fire protection, remove stormwater
- D.1.h.ii.: check other and specify storage of water obtained from
- D.1.h.iv.: volume of water stored should be listed

D.2. Project Operations

- D.2.a.ii.: change from 6 months to 1 month;
Mr. Camp commented that in his memo he noted that there would be a substantial amount of earthwork to attain the proposed road at 12% or less slope. The plan did not show what the intent was with the material and there ought to be a plan as to where the excavation material will go. Mr. Zona commented that they could do that plan once they have completed the final engineering.
- D.2.c.iv. The answer should be no to the unanswered question, Is a new water supply district or service area proposed to be formed to serve the project site.
- D.2.e.i.: include in calculation for 10% impermeable surface coverage for each lot in addition to the road calculation.
- D.2.3.ii. There will be no new point source discharge.

E. Site and Setting of Proposed Action

- E.2. Natural Resources On or Near Project site
- E.2.d.: average depth should indicate greater than six feet
Mr. Zona commented that deep hole tests have not been performed for perc tests. He recommended that they could list greater than six feet, based on the prior subdivided lots.
- E.2.q.: Indicate yes, personal hunting only

E.3. Designated Public Resources On or Near Project

- E.3.b.: check no to are agricultural lands consisting of highly productive soils present.

Member Winkelman commented that there is no mention of a HOA or lake access. He inquired if there was an estimate of the anticipated exaction of material moved off site. Mr. Zona said that no material is being removed off site, and the amount of material that will be removed but kept on site will be shown on the plans as requested by Mr. Camp. Chairman Southern commented that the board would need to know the volume of earth movement when they do a final review of the SEQR.

Part 2 – Identification of Potential Project Impacts:

1. Impact on Land: Yes

- 1.a. No, based on the information provided, the water table is in excess of six feet.
- 1.b. The proposed action may involve construction on slopes of 15% or greater. Moderate to large impact for the road construction. There will be some areas on the high side of the road anywhere from 15-30% grade that will be disturbed based on the grading plan. They are anywhere from 10-30 feet in width on the uphill side that might be disturbed at the site of the existing shared driveway
- 1.c. No, based on the information provided
- 1.d. No, according to the applicant there will be nothing removed from the site, with an unknown amount that will be reallocated to the site. It is unlikely that the amount would achieve 1,000 tons of material.
- 1.e. Yes, the road construction would be large; based on submission small impact
- 1.f. Yes, moderate to large, as the property is in the watershed, the road construction may result in erosion. Preliminary comment
- 1.g. No

1.h The preliminary grading plan shows several areas that will be very steep. Under Mr. Camps submitted review of the grading plan memo, items 3 a. There are multiple areas of proposed 30% to 50% slopes on the downhill side of the proposed road. 3b There are multiple areas of proposed 100% slopes on the uphill side of the proposed road. 3c. These proposed steep areas are generally in a strip 10 to 30 feet wide along both sides of the road. The existing slopes on the uphill side are anywhere from 15 to 30 % and there will be areas that will be substantially steeper. There will be erosion protection in that area and typically, they are hard but could be vegetative. Mr. Zona commented that they are sensitive to not disturb the downhill slope and trying to stay in a smaller footprint. Mr. Camp commented that the plan to achieve a wider road at the angle of the slope, the private road plan makes sense although there will be steep areas.

2. Impact on Geological Features: No

3. Impact on Surface Water: Yes

3.a No

3.b No

3.c No

3.d. No:

3.e. Moderate to large as there is a high possibility for upland erosion causing turbidity in a waterbody.

3.f No

3.g No

3.h. Moderate to large impact due to construction activity, steep slopes, heavy storms.

3. i. Moderate to large impact due to construction activity, steep slopes, heavy storms.

3.j No

3.k No

3.l None

The existing stormwater treatment facility was designed to manage the existing road and the proposed road will be wider and longer. Mr. Zona stated that the existing stormwater facility should be able to manage the proposed road and one lot. Member Winkelman said that he would like to be provided information explaining the existing stormwater system and how it functions in addition to the on-site stormwater treatment facilities. Mr. Camp said that this project would allow the board to request some modifications to manage the more frequent storms in a different manner. Right now, there is a relatively large low orifice on the facility, and the behavior could be changed quite a bit without an undue burden on the applicant. The existing structure could have some modifications for it to behave differently. Chairman Southern commented that the structures need to handle the turbidity and is one of the primary concerns of the water going into the lake. Member Winkelman said that another concern is the long-term maintenance of the stormwater structure. Mr. Zona stated that the SWPPP has that requirement and there will be an agreement with the HOA established. He continued saying that what will also be important are the controls as each lot is developed through site plan review.

4. Impact on groundwater: Unanswered.

4.a 9 new wells and the impact depends by the location of any aquifer. The board needs more information regarding the depth of wells in the area and the quantity of water available.

4.b Need more information

4.c No or small. Mr. Zona commented that the perc tests have not been completed; however, the lots will more likely have raised bed systems.

4.d No

4.e No

4.f No

4.g No

4.h none

5. Impact on Flooding: No

6. Impact on Air: No

7. Impact on Plants and Animals: No

8. Impact on Agricultural Resources: No

8.a No

8.b No

8.c No

8.d No

8.e No

8.f No

8.g No

8.H None

9. Impact on Aesthetic Resources: Unanswered

9.a Small, it will be seen from the west side of the lake and the lake for a portion of the lots.

9.b No

9.c Small impact

9.d Small impact for recreational or tourism based activities

9.e Small

9.f No or small

9.g Small impact, change in the character of the setting from the existing open land.

10. Impact on Historic and Archaeological Resources: No

11. Impact on Open Space and Recreation: No

12. Impact on Critical Environmental Areas: No

13. Impact on Transportation: No

14. Impact on Energy: No

15: Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light; No

16. Impact on Human Health: No

17. Consistency with Community Plans: Unanswered

17.a Small impact. Although there will be 9 new lots and dwellings , it will be in a conservation subdivision reserving 71 acres into conservation.

17.b No

17.c No, a conservation subdivision is within the zoning code, although alteration of steep slopes is being impacted.

17.d No. Member Winkelman commented that the County plan discourages residential development in the watershed. Skaneateles Lake is a source of unfiltered drinking water.

17.e No

17.f No
17.g No

18. Consistency with Community character: Unanswered

18.a. No
18.b Small increase in demand for services.
18.c No
18.d No
18.e No
18.f Small, the road is inconsistent although the housing is consistent.
18.g None

Mr. Eggleston commented that they need to develop the SWPPP and address other issues presented today, so they would like to return on the July 17, 2018 meeting agenda.

Member Winkelman inquired on the lakefront access and if all of the proposed lots will have lake access rights. Mr. Eggleston stated that there will be no shared lakefront access to the lake. Chairman Southern inquired if the lots will have deeded access to the lake. Mr. Eggleston said yes, but that it is a different question. Member Winkelman inquired if the deeded lake access is in addition to the existing lake access owners. There will be an additional nine more that will have lake access over the 40-foot wide easement. Chairman Southern requested an explanation of how the lake access will be used and what activities it will entail.

Member Kasper inquired on the HOA agreement for the road maintenance. Mr. Brodsky commented that there will be two important documents that will need to be provided to the board to review the HOA establishment and the conservation easement.

Mr. Camp commented that as the grading plans are being developed, the grading for the first access driveway to the right shows a substantial cross slope at 13-15%. Mr. Zona said that they are adding a foot to the centerline of the road and then that is it. Mr. Camp suggested that he look at the grading as it shows a substantial cross slope that he would not recommend.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Chairman Southern to adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull, Clerk