

TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
February 16, 2016

Mark J. Tucker, Chairman
Joseph Southern
Elizabeth Estes -Absent
Donald Kasper
Scott Winkelman
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel
John Camp, P.E. (C&S Engineers)
Howard Brodsky, Town Planner
Karen Barkdull, Clerk/Secretary

Chairman Tucker opened the meeting at 7:30 p.m. Member Southern was appointed Vice Chair for the 2016 calendar year. Member Estes will not be present tonight due to the weather causing delays in her air travel plans. The meeting minutes of January 19, 2016 were previously distributed to the Board and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Chairman Tucker to approve the minutes as corrected. The minutes were not approved as the Board will approve the minutes at next month's meeting when a quorum of members present at last month's meeting will be present to vote.

Amendment –Site Plan Review

Applicant	Paul Garrett	Property:
	Jane Garrett	2160 West Lake Rd
	8155 West Ivy Trail	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Baldwinsville, NY	Tax Map #057.-04-18.0

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect

The Zoning Board of Appeals has granted the requested variances for the 69' lake yard setback to the proposed deck and 71' lake yard setback to the proposed relocation of the dwelling. The revised site plan dated January 28, 2016 reflects the temporary access drive to the site, located next to the north property line, the location of the dirt stockpile, and extension of the proposed sidewalk to the parking area. The construction sequence included in the narrative has been revised. The neighbor to the north has signed a letter of support for the project, and the lot to the south is an undeveloped lake access lot.

Chairman Tucker inquired where the end of the access road would be. Mr. Eggleston stated that the dirt stockpile and access drive is in an area that is relatively flat; east of the stockpile is the top of the bank. Member Kasper inquired as to the outcome of the dirt excavated for the basement of the dwelling. Mr. Eggleston stated that the dirt will be used to backfill around the house, and the removed gravel from part of the driveway will be used around the house as well. Chairman Tucker inquired of Mr. Camp if the plan reflects the grading needs for the project. Mr.

Camp stated that a cut off swale was discussed last month and requested that it be included on the plan. Mr. Eggleston stated that a cut off swale that will curve to the south could be shown on the plan installed above the dry wells so that the lawn is not disturbed. The swale would be installed before any work is done.

Member Winkelman inquired about the OCDOH review of the septic system. Mr. Eggleston stated that the OCDOH has reviewed the plan for the dwelling to remain a two-bedroom seasonal dwelling and it is on file. Mr. Brodsky inquired what the shaded area on the driveway indicated. Mr. Eggleston stated that the shaded area is the part of the driveway that will be added for a turn-around. Mr. Brodsky commented about the narrative referenced an increase in the elevation of the basement and inquired if there will be more excavation. Mr. Eggleston stated that they would be excavating less than the original plan, as they are not going down four feet. The revised plan will have a full walk out basement. Mr. Eggleston stated that he would amend the narrative and plan to reflect the cut off swale.

Wherefore, a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Kasper to adopt and ratify its prior SEQRA determination for the Application, which was a determination that the Application constitutes a TYPE II single-family residential project, not subject to further SEQRA review. The Board had an affirmative vote of all members present.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Member Donald Kasper, seconded by Member Scott Winkelman and upon a vote thereon as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** amendment of the Approving Resolution, with the following conditions:

1. That the Site Plan 1 of 3 dated January 28, 2016, prepared by Robert O. Eggleston be updated to reflect the location of the cut off swale, and that the Site Plan 1 of 3 as modified, together with the Plans and Elevations page 2 of 3 and 3 of 3, and revised Narrative dated January 28, 2016 prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, be followed in all respects; and
2. That all conditions imposed by the Skaneateles Zoning Board of Appeals, in connection with its approved variance, be fulfilled; and
3. Except as modified hereby, the conditions set forth in the Approving Resolution remain in full force and effect.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Mark J. Tucker	[Yes]
Member	Joseph Southern	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	[Yes]
Member	Elizabeth Estes	[Absent]

Continued Review –Site Plan Review

Applicant	Theodore & Nancy Norman	Property:
	8665 Duarte Road	1992 West Lake Road
	San Gabriel, CA 91775	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		Tax Map #058.-01-17.2

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect; Bob Smith, Legal Representative

Mr. Eggleston began by recapping the application from the summer of 2015 to date. He reiterated that the application required variances for the relocation of the driveway and site plan review for the location and size of the dwelling. The variances for the location of the driveway were denied by the Zoning Board of Appeals in September of 2015, and a new designed relocated driveway that conforms to the required setback was submitted to the Planning Board that September. The OCDOH has approved the relocation of the proposed septic system located 100' from the watercourse where as the existing septic system is located 50' from the watercourse. NYSDOT has approved the relocation of the driveway in their letter dated January 25, 2016. Drainage and water quality plans have been produced by Rudy Zona. Rainwater coming off the roof will be directed to raingardens located in the lawns and water off the driveway will go into a stormwater structure using best management practices before going into the watercourse. The watercourse remediation plan that had received prior Planning Board approval has been completed. Stormwater calculations have been submitted to John Camp for his review. A SPDES permit is not required as there is less than one acre of land disturbance. The Onondaga County Planning Board commented that the NYSDOT would require a permit for any proposed driveways and prior to any work within the State right-of-way in the resolution dated July 29, 2015. The City of Syracuse Department of Water had no comments on the proposal in their correspondence dated July 2, 2015. The house was adjusted slightly after the relocation of the driveway but remains essentially the same. He continued stating that the narrative includes a list of properties with large houses to show that it is not out of character along the lake on West Lake Road. Site plan standards and criteria from section 148-18D have been responded as well as section 148-25 Rural Siting Principles.

Member Kasper inquired on the changes to the new site plan submitted. Mr. Eggleston stated that the site plan was revised to reflect the drainage plan with a swale coming off the house that was removed to allow the stormwater to sheet across the lawn to the rain gardens. The location and size of the house has not changed. Also included is an updated grading plan. Mr. Brodsky inquired on the strategy that will be used for the long-term maintenance of the raingardens. Mr. Eggleston stated that the Normans are in the nursery business and are very sensitive to it. All of the gardens will be maintains and they will follow best management practices for maintaining the raingardens.

Chairman Tucker commented that the proposed dwelling is partially located outside of the designated building envelope and the Board has concerns with it. Mr. Eggleston stated that they appreciate the Board's concern and have address legal papers regarding it. Mr. Smith stated that John Langey had submitted a letter to the Board and attorney Scott Molnar on January 27, 2016, taking the legal position that we have conformed to all of the requirements given the work that was performed. Prior to this Board taking this up, we believe that this site plan should be approved.

Counsel Molnar stated that he had received the legal correspondence from Mr. Langey, his correspondence pointed out that this Board is obliged to review the application under site plan review criteria only versus reviewing under site plan review and special permit criteria. We had acknowledged back in December on the record at the last Planning Board meeting that the Planning Board concedes that point that the application shall be reviewed under site plan review criteria only, which is an easier burden for the applicant to achieve. The reason for it was twofold; the Planning Board has a limited window in which to challenge a determination by the

codes enforcement office of 60 days under state law, but more importantly the Planning Board and the codes enforcement office in the first instance determined that the 1.39 acre lot upon which the proposed residence is to be constructed is a conforming lot. It was created as part of an open space subdivision in 2010, and at the time of creation became conforming, as the Planning Board is not at liberty to create a nonconforming lot. At that time in 2010 as now, we do not review the conforming lot under the nonconforming section of code but reviewed under conforming criteria. In 2010 when the subdivision was approved, a building envelope was established for a new residence to be constructed on the property, which conforms to all required dimensional limitations. Right now, the application far exceeds the building envelope, and that is the problem the Board voiced to the applicant in December and is still the issue. Now the Board is trying to determine what is acceptable, building within the building envelope that was part of the 2010 approval, or is it something greater than that such as what the applicant has presented.

Mr. Eggleston stated that it is their position that they presented the plan to the codes enforcement office who reviewed it for all criteria of the zoning law and it was his determination that four things were needed. The variances for driveway setbacks were not received which have been modified to make conforming. He only required site plan review for the two items that were addressed in the narrative. This was not found to be nonconforming to other elements –this Board is questioning but it is the codes enforcement job to make that determination and not the Planning Board. Based on the denial we require site plan review.

Counsel Molnar stated that it is site plan review is required and this Board is addressing it under site plan review in terms of the applicant placing the proposed new residence beyond the building envelope versus within and beyond.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the codes enforcement officer by not finding any requirements for variances for using the existing footprint and the new building envelope and we proceeded accordingly.

Chairman Tucker stated that there was a question at the site visit, which was within 60 days, you were questioned about it by the ZBA and the Planning Board regarding the proposed dwelling being partially located outside of the new building envelope.

Mr. Eggleston commented that there have been a number of discussions about this.

Chairman Tucker commented that it was brought up then and there was a discussion about it there at that time.

Counsel Molnar stated that if the existing home stayed where it is it would not need a variance to rehabilitate it. Nevertheless, it is a demolition of the existing structure and replacement of that structure beyond the building envelope that was approved on the map.

Mr. Eggleston commented that that was presented to the codes enforcement officer back in June or July when we made application.

Mr. Smith stated that they believe that the board is limited in its powers right now and what it is doing is supplanting what the codes enforcement officer did. Instead of doing its limited right it has under site plan review.

Member Kasper inquired if the codes officer is allowed to build outside of the buildable area. He does not have that right that is why it is in front of us for a site plan review.

Mr. Eggleston commented that that was not why it was sent to the Planning Board for site plan review. It is requiring site plan review because it is disturbing more than 200SF within 200FT of the watercourse and constructing a house greater than 2500SF within 1500FT of the lake line.

Member Southern commented that he would never constrict site plan approval to just specific items. Site plan approval has always been the entire site.

Mr. Eggleston stated correct, and I have gone through the site plan criteria and have addressed those issues in the criteria.

Counsel Molnar stated that in terms of site plan review criteria, the board would review if this an acceptable re-build of the new residence, in its size and mass and its other components.

Chairman Tucker requested that Mr. Eggleston review his responses to the site plan criteria.

Mr. Eggleston reviewed the criteria:

(1) Layout and design.

- (a) All structures in the plan shall be integrated with each other and with adjacent structures and shall, wherever practical, be laid out in the pattern of a traditional village or hamlet.

The proposed house and garage are located 76.9FT on West Lake Road similar to other homes on each side of it establishing a common setback line. The garage will be relocated to a conforming 50FT off the north property line without the garage doors facing the street. The house has a front porch across it, which is traditional in village and hamlet neighborhoods.

- (b) Structures that are visible from public roads or Skaneateles Lake shall be compatible with each other and with traditional structures in the surrounding area in architecture, design, massing, materials and placement and shall harmonize with traditional elements in the architectural fabric of the area.

The dwelling has traditional architectural features with steeper roofs, flared at the eaves, double hung windows with trim and shutters, round tapered columns and a mixture of bevel siding, shingles and stone on the exterior. The façade is broken up with porches, dormers and stone chimneys. This is similar to other larger homes redeveloped along the lake and on West Lake Road.

- (c) Architectural design shall be in keeping with the small-town architectural character of the Skaneateles area. In general, the design shall avoid flat roofs, large expanses of undifferentiated facades and long plain wall sections.

See comment to 1(b) above. There are no flat roofs, no large expanses of undifferentiated facades nor long plain wall sections.

- (d) Where appropriate, setbacks shall maintain and continue the existing setback pattern of surrounding properties.

A portion of the house is built on the existing footprint of the current home and the setback from the road is consistent with neighboring properties. The house is about 300FT from the lake.

- (e) The Planning Board shall encourage the creation of landscaped parks or squares easily accessible by pedestrians.

The south and east sides of the house will have extensive lawns and maintain existing trees along the watercourse. Appropriate buffers will be created along the north property line where the garage is removed. A stormwater BMP will be established along the north side of the property before the watercourse. Rain gardens will treat stormwater from the house. This is a private residence.

- (f) Trademarked architecture which identifies a specific company by building design features shall be prohibited.

This is a custom designed house in keeping with the traditional styles found around the lake.

- (g) The rural siting principles in § 148-25 shall be taken into consideration in all reviews, and compliance with them shall be mandatory if required by this chapter.

See the following criteria for Rural Siting Principles from Section 148-25.

(2) Landscaping.

- (a) Landscape buffers shall be provided between uses that may be incompatible, such as large-scale commercial uses and residences. Such buffers may include planted trees and shrubs, hedgerows, berms, existing forestland or forest created through natural succession. The width of such buffer areas will depend upon the topography, scale of the uses and their location on the property but shall normally be between 50 feet and 200 feet.

This is a single-family dwelling in a residential neighborhood. Existing vegetation will remain along the property lines and the watercourse. Landscaping will be added around the new dwelling.

- (b) Landscaping shall be an integral part of the entire project area and shall buffer the site from and/or integrate the site with the surrounding area, as appropriate.

See comments in 2(a) above.

- (c) Primary landscape treatment shall consist of shrubs, ground cover and shade trees and shall combine with appropriate walks and street surfaces to provide an attractive development pattern. Landscape plants selected should generally be native to the region and appropriate to the growing conditions of the Town's environment.

This is a single-family dwelling and will maintain existing trees on the property especially along the property lines and watercourse. A rain garden will be added to help control stormwater using appropriate native plants.

- (d) Insofar as practical, existing trees and other vegetation shall be conserved and integrated into the landscape design plan.

Existing trees and vegetation will be retained along the property lines and watercourse.

- (e) If deemed appropriate for the site by the reviewing board, shade trees at least six feet tall shall be planted and maintained at twenty- to forty-foot intervals

along roads, at a setback distance acceptable to the Highway Superintendent.

A landscape plan appropriate for this single-family dwelling will be developed that will enhance existing vegetation that will remain.

- (f) For landscaping parking lots, see § 148-32A(4)(d).

This is a single-family dwelling and will have trees added along the north property line to screen the driveway of the north neighbor.

- (g) Landscaping shall not be planted in a manner that will result in blocking significant views identified in the Comprehensive Plan's SAVIT Report.

Landscaping will not be placed to block existing views of the lake from the house.

(3) Parking, circulation and loading.

- (a) Roads, driveways, sidewalks, off-street parking and loading space shall be safe and shall encourage pedestrian movement.

This is a single-family dwelling with a shared driveway for lot 2. Visitors cars on lot 1 will be able to park near the front entrance or in front of the garage doors without blocking the driveway to lot 2. The shared driveway will be 20FT off the north property line. Walkways connect the drive and parking areas with the front and side entrances.

- (b) Vehicular and pedestrian connections between adjacent sites shall be provided to encourage pedestrian use and to minimize traffic entering existing roads. The construction of connected parking lots, service roads, alleys, footpaths, bike paths and new public streets to connect adjoining properties shall be required where appropriate.

This is a single-family dwelling with a shared driveway for lot 2. A pedestrian bridge crosses the watercourse at two locations to provide access to the neighboring properties. The north neighbor's driveway is only a couple feet off the common property line.

- (c) Off-street parking and loading requirements of § 148-32 shall be fulfilled, and parking areas shall be located behind buildings as required therein.

This is a single-family dwelling with the garage doors facing the side property line.

- (d) Access from and egress to public highways shall be approved by the appropriate highway department, including Town, county and state.

The existing driveway is relocated to the south to accommodate the new septic system. This will be set it further away from the north property line hedgerow and has the required sight lines for the State highway.

- (e) All buildings shall be accessible by emergency vehicles.

A 10FT wide driveway provides access for emergency vehicles for both lots 1 and 2. Lot 2 parking area provides reasonable turning around space.

- (4) Reservation of parkland. For any site plan containing residential units, the Planning Board may require the reservation of parkland or payment of a recreation fee pursuant to Town Law § 274-a, Subdivision 6.

This is the redevelopment of an existing single-family dwelling.

(5) Miscellaneous standards.

- (a) Buildings and other facilities shall be designed, located and operated to avoid causing excessive noise on a frequent or continuous basis.

This is a single-family dwelling. The back porch and terrace are located on the southeast side of the house way from adjacent neighbors and looking towards the watercourse and lake with natural buffers for privacy.

- (b) Exterior lighting fixtures shall be shielded to prevent light from shining directly onto neighboring properties or public ways. Light standards shall be restricted to a maximum of 20 feet in height. No use shall produce glare so as to cause illumination beyond the boundaries of the property on which it is located in excess of 0.5-foot candle. All exterior lighting, including security lighting, in connection with all buildings, signs or other uses shall be directed away from adjoining streets and properties.

Chairman Tucker stated that Mr. Eggleston can stop reading. He continued stating that he is doing well on the rural siting principles but that it is still out of the building envelope. With a tear down, you have a chance to put it in the building envelope.

Mr. Eggleston stated that that was the responsibility of the code enforcement officer in doing his determination.

Member Southern inquired if Mr. Eggleston was aware of the building envelope when he worked with your clients on this.

Mr. Eggleston stated yes.

Mr. Southern inquired if Mr. Eggleston was aware of the intent of the building envelope.

Mr. Eggleston stated to use a phrase used by Scott Molnar, the rub is, we came in with a pre-application meeting with the zoning officer because we didn't know what we were allowed based on the sections of the code. We did an examination and it was reviewed internally, a response back was the plan that we produced would be acceptable. We then presented the plan, made application, the zoning codes enforcement officer made a determination and that determination is the responsibility of the codes enforcement officer.

Member Winkelman commented that we are having difficulty with consistency, as you were involved with the subdivision when it was designed to begin with. You knew the intent of it back in 2010 and that is where the rub is for us.

Chairman Tucker inquired if there was a way to have a determination from the ZBA on an interpretation.

Counsel Molnar stated that his thoughts are that the building envelope exists for a reason and was part of the approval process in 2010. Despite the building envelope, that applicant came in with a much larger application including a request for the codes enforcement officer to make a preliminary review of the application. The codes enforcement officer did that denying it on the basis of needed site plan approval, variances and framing it in that way. Now the applicant is identifying that there is case law and according to State law, that once that determination is made. For instance, if the Planning Board has made for the application to be built both within and beyond the building envelope is something they are finding troublesome, suggest that a variance be obtained for such excess building beyond the building envelope, the applicant is saying no it is not permissible. The Planning Board cannot require the applicant to obtain a

variance when the codes enforcement officer did not require it on the onset. They are identifying that the codes enforcement officer is essentially makes decisions for and on behalf of the Planning Board. That is precisely what is being advised. According to site plan review, the required information, 148-18B The original signed application and other required application materials shall be submitted in multiple copies as required by the Planning Board, at such time as required by the Planning Board. Copies of the application form and Applicant's Guide may be obtained from the Town Clerk's office. Applications shall not be deemed submitted until the reviewing board's meeting. It is the Planning Board that determines the completeness of the application even though the codes enforcement officer assists in framing the application with the applicant and requesting information. If we take the case that, the Planning Board may not request that the ZBA provide additional variances, may not task the applicant with the obligation to obtain additional variances because they are exempt from that under their memorandum. It comes down to site plan review and whether or not the Planning Board's determines that, this application as submitted is acceptable under the site plan review criteria. As Mr. Eggleston pointed out in his revised narrative, offered for consideration similar projects with square footage of the actual completed projects versus the lot size in the near area and I think I'd like to review with the Board what those are to determine whether or not the Board concedes or even agrees that they're applicable similar projects for purposed in consideration under site plan review, in terms of whether or not this application is in character, in size, in mass, etc.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the process is set up, the law doesn't allow the Board to keep going back, you need site plan approval for watercourse setback, you go through the process and get the watercourse setback. Now you need a site plan approval for building a bigger house more than 2500SF and now you have to start over and get that. Now you need to get this, now you need to get that. Five years have gone by because you went through the process ten times. The process is you go the codes enforcement officer, he makes a determination, he either gives you a building permit or he denies it and tells you what it is denied for. I do not want to say that, I want to say that for the due process, it is inappropriate to keep going back and make you do this or do that. We came full open book saying we do not know how to deal with this, would you help us. We would like to do this, can we do this. You took it, you looked at it, you consulted amongst yourselves, we designed a house based on that information. The determination as made.

Member Kasper stated that the buildable area is the issue.

Mr. Eggleston stated then we go get those four items. The variances were denied and we corrected the site plan to make those not required. We are now going on for the other two.

Mr. Smith stated the they believe it is a jurisdictional argument, jurisdictional framework and due process that the applicant has been laid out and is jurisdictionally created by what the codes enforcement officer does and what the Board is trying to do now to take that jurisdictional limitation and say that it does not apply to us, we have greater rights than that using site plan approval add something to the process that isn't properly in the process from our perspective.

Counsel Molnar stated that he disagrees with that classification. Is this the same application that was before the Board at the time the Board reviewed it and deferred it to the ZBA for its determination of the variances.

Chairman Tucker commented that it would have been a different application.

Counsel Molnar inquired if it was the same house.

Mr. Eggleston stated that in essence it is, it changed with adjustments with the garage that has shifted a little bit so that the driveway fits without a variance. It is basically, the house itself is

exactly the same house, the garage got shifted a little bit in the process which is not uncommon as you go through site plan review.

Member Southern stated that the first time this house was proposed outside of the building envelope, you were made aware of it.

Mr. Eggleston stated that he was aware of it and when they met with the codes enforcement office, it was a map with red and green on it from our pre-application meeting.

Counsel Molnar stated that it is still subject to site plan review for compliance.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the ZBA cannot now play codes enforcement officer and say now you need a variance.

Counsel Molnar stated that there is not anyone asking the ZBA to do that.

Member Southern commented that the applicant can ask to do that and you do not need to be the codes enforcement officer.

Mr. Eggleston stated and we do not choose to do that.

Member Southern commented that the applicant has that alternative available at his choice.

Counsel Molnar stated that the applicant is asking for a determination, is it approved.

Mr. Eggleston stated site plan review based on the criteria of more than 200SF of disturbance within 200Ft of the watercourse and a house larger than 2500SF within 1500FT of the lake.

Chairman Tucker added and outside of the building envelope if it is a tear down.

Member Kasper commented so close to the watercourse.

Counsel Molnar stated substantially outside of the building envelope. My recommendation to the Planning Board is have the Board task me to review in detail the memorandum submitted by Bob and his partner John, because as I sit here right now I disagree with the way it was characterized that the Planning Board does not have the authority it needs to review this under site plan review in terms of what is in and outside of the building envelope. Second and more important is for the Board to review and detail the narrative provided by Bob, and in particular, the revised narrative February 4th, the similar properties on West Lake Road and whether these are accurate in the Board's mind. Whether you agree or disagree that these 4,400SF house on a 1.4-acre parcel is equivalent to a 5,88SF house on a 1.30-acre parcel. I think that needs to be taken into consideration as the site plan review criteria tasks the Board interpreting whether or not whether this project fits in the site plan review criteria.

Mr. Eggleston stated that this information was provided for you based on a comment made by the Planning Board that this is too big a house and that there are not houses this big in the neighborhood. That was a comment that was made at the site plan review, at a site visit.

Counsel Molnar stated that he sees one house on this list that would exceed this one, the others are much smaller, but that is on 3.11 acres.

Mr. Eggleston stated that this information was derived from the tax assessment rolls from the building permits.

Counsel Molnar stated that the Board should take time to consider whether or not these are similar projects, and if they are how so, and if they are not how so, in terms of making their decision under the site plan review criteria.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Member Southern and seconded by Chairman Tucker, with unanimous affirmation of said motion, the Planning Board adopted the SEQR findings of June 15, 2010 determined with a Full Environmental Assessment Form and a negative declaration determined at that time, which prior determination was adopted by the Planning Board in consideration of this Extension Application; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Member Donald Kasper and seconded by Chairman Mark Tucker, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, the Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the Extension Application for an additional eighteen (18) months with the following conditions:

1. That the original Site Plan and Construction Narrative approved for the Project shall be followed in all respects for the construction of buildings and improvements not otherwise completed to the date hereof, and that prior resolutions of the Planning Board be followed in all respects, except as extended hereby for a period of eighteen (18) months from the date hereof.
2. Escrow of \$5000 be established for engineering review, payable by the Applicant at time of issuance of a building permit.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Mark J. Tucker	[Yes]
Member	Joseph Southern	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	[Yes]
Member	Elizabeth Estes	[Absent]

Extension Request- Major Special Permit

Applicant: Marc Pietropaoli
791 W. Genesee Street
Skaneateles, New York
Tax Map #047.-01-13.1

Present: Lance Wardell, Victory Sports Medicine: Kevin Bernstein, Attorney

The applicant is seeking an extension for the existing two trailers that are used at the site as part of the Victory Sports Medicine ongoing business. Mr. Bernstein stated that the reason there has not been much communication from them on the status of the relocation of the business is that New York State has been moving glacially regarding the site in Sennett. The site in Sennett is being revisited by the State to determine whether they want to sell the site, as they may want to re-use it. It used to be the site of a juvenile retention center. In the meantime, the applicant is needed to run their business at the existing site. The existing business employs over 30 employees and the additional space from the trailers is needed.

Chairman Tucker commented that you have the plan to move to Sennett and there is a plan in the Town for development in the eastern gateway, and the Board would also like an update on that proposal. Mr. Bernstein stated that the property is up for sale and otherwise the application is being held in abeyance; it has not been determined what will transpire.

Member Southern inquired if the applicant is pursuing other avenues other than the eastern gateway and the site in the Town of Sennett. Mr. Wardell stated that they are in the situation now where they are out of space at their existing facility and are actively looking for a new home. He continued stating that the Sennett property has existing buildings including a gymnasium and backup generator that meets the needs of the business.

Chairman Tucker stated that the trailers have been going on for six years now. Member Winkelman inquired to the exact location of Victory Sports Medicine in the current location. Chairman Tucker stated that Auburn clinic is on the norther end, the gas station is on the southern end, and the rest of the building is Victory Sports. Chairman Tucker inquired if the applicant has considered expanding at the site rather than maintaining the trailers. Mr. Wardell stated that an expansion at the site would still not accommodate their needs, and it would be expensive to do for a temporary fix. If you go back in history, the applicant tried to purchase the building and applied for an expansion of the building; however, those were under different circumstances and a different plan.

Chairman Tucker stated that the trailers are temporary and the Board has not heard anything regarding the eastern gateway, and as such, suggested a six-month extension so that the Board would get a report of what is transpiring. Mr. Bernstein apologized to the Board for not providing updates and will do a better job of providing the updates. He had not provided updates, as there was no new information. He continued requesting a longer extension that six months and he will guarantee that he will provide updates every six months.

Member Southern inquired if a finite extension could be created by the Board, saying that the Board would give them a year and then the trailers would be removed. Counsel Molnar stated that yes, because right now there is a special permit for temporary structures, and the very process here the applicant is seeking to extend the time. They are temporary structures that will time out. Mr. Wardell commented that the six years of use of the trailers was not for a lack of effort. The eastern gateway and the Sennett proposal is not going as they had planned. Mr. Bernstein stated that it is not an optimal situation for the company and the company does not wish to keep the company under these conditions permanently. To say that the applicant would only have one year on the trailers and remove them would have a significant adverse impact to the business .

Member Winkelman inquired if there has been any complaints from the neighbors. Mr. Wardell responded no. Member Winkelman stated that the Board has always been in favor of keeping the business in the Town, it was just the extra stuff that had been thrown in. Mr. Wardell stated that the extras were always part of the original plan. Member Winkelman stated that he was fine with the one-year extension but if you want to communicate with us, it is up to you. Mr. Brodsky stated that communication is essential ingredient that is missing and the applicant has provided the communication to the Board regarding the open project. Mr. Bernstein stated that they will do a better job of communicating. Chairman Tucker commented that he had heard that before. Mr. Wardell stated that there is a little bit of a misnomer that there has been zero communication as we met with the former Town Supervisor at her request and had a discussion about what our plans were and where we stood. Mr. Bernstein requested that the Board allow them to continue

the business with the use of the trailers. They are motivated and would like to keep the good business going in Skaneateles while they are pursuing other opportunities for the move. Member Southern inquired if they feel that in two years they would have a resolution to the issue. Mr. Wardell stated yes, as the existing conditions are impeding the growth of the business. Member Southern inquired on how long the applicant should be given to update the Board on their progress. Member Kasper stated the applicant should get a six-month extension and come back to the Board. Mr. Wardell stated that they are actively pursuing other properties. Mr. Bernstein stated that even if that is the case, we would still need additional extensions. Member Kasper stated that in six months we will have an update from the applicant. Mr. Bernstein stated that we can push the State on this site but there are no guarantees that it would be finalized. Mr. Wardell requested more than six months for the extension.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Southern the Planning Board adopted its prior negative declaration SEQR findings of October 17, 2002 and January 19, 2010. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Mr. Wardell commented that they would need more than six months and the comment made that if the application was pull for the eastern project then the Board would give them more time is not fair. Chairman Tucker stated that if it was taken out they would get more time. Mr. Wardell inquired if that was based on a couple of select individuals. Chairman Tucker stated no, it is his concern that there has been no communication from the applicant in a while, and the reason the applicant has the trailers was in anticipation of a move. Mr. Bernstein stated that the reason there are trailers is because they have run out of space at their present location. He continued stating that the eastern gateway was one avenue the applicant has explored for relocation and they also explored the opportunity in Sennett. Counsel Molnar stated that the Chair and the Board's comments are that the existing temporary trailers permission has been extended, including the last extension from 2014, which included a two-year extension through February 2016 conditioned upon the applicant providing written status reports to the Planning Board advising the current status of its relocation wherever that might be. I do not believe those updates have been received, and that is the frustration of the Board.

Mr. Brodsky stated that the application was for the continuance of occupying the trailers while they pursue a new facility, so the status of their effort is crucial for wherever they are looking. It goes back to the reliability of your reporting of the status. Mr. Bernstein requested that the extension be for a year and if you do not get a status report from us in six months then you can take whatever action you think is appropriate. It forces us to provide a written update if we do not come before you and clog up your agenda. That way you are still motivating us to provide the update but not limiting the extension. Chairman Tucker stated that the Board never received a written update from the previous extension granted. Mr. Bernstein stated that he had provided the written update last Friday to Counsel Molnar. Chairman Tucker stated that we have had our attorney request updates and have not received response. Mr. Bernstein stated that was a result of miscommunication because there was not anything further to report from the last request. The only addition thing is that now the State is interested in that facility and may decide that it will not sell it. That is the nuance of how things have changed since 2014.

Member Southern stated that he would like to have the extension for one year and if at the conclusion of one ;year the conditional use of the trailers has not been resolved that we not extend again. Counsel Molnar recommended that the resolution would be for one year and that it

expires. Member Kasper stated that he likes the idea of the applicant reporting to us at six months, as the residents look to the Planning Board for updates.

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

1. That all conditions of the January 19, 2010 resolution remain in full effect except as amended hereby; and
2. That the approved Minor Special Permit use of the Trailers is extended for twelve (12) months conditioned upon the Applicant or his/it's representative appearance at a regular meeting of the Planning Board in six (6) months for an update advising on the status of Relocation.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Mark J. Tucker	[Yes]
Member	Joseph Southern	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	[Yes]
Member	Elizabeth Estes	[Absent]

Informal Discussion-Subdivision

Applicant: Russell Zechman
3741/3743 Fisher Road
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #033.-04-14.0/12.0

Present: Russell Zechman, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Architect

The applicant has two parcels on Fisher Road. Lot A is a .87 acre with a two bedroom dwelling, and driveway access off Fisher Road with the lot located in the RR district. Lot B is an 11.4-acre flag lot with a 15FT access road from Fisher Road. The lot is mostly located in the IRO district with the right of way located in the RR district. On lot B is a repair shop with one bedroom accessory apartment and a storage building. There is one section of slopes that are from 12% to 30%, three ponds created when an airstrip was located on the property, and a gas easement that runs through the lot. There is just under an acre of non-buildable area.

The applicant is considering a two-step approach for a potential open space subdivision that would consist of a lot line adjustment between lot A increasing it to 3.69 acres (3.28 net buildable acres) and lot B with vacant land of 8.61 acres(7.86 net buildable acres) . A 30' shared driveway would be created with 15FT on Lot A and 15FT on lot B.

The next step would be the creation of a four-lot open space subdivision on lot B. The lot is served by Town water, the proposed lots range from 1.0 acres to 1.2 acres. 60% of the total area is required to be preserved in conservation and proposed is 5.21-acre conservation lot which is 60.5% of lot B. 25% of the preserved conservation area can be unbuildable land, and the proposed conservation lot as 15% unbuildable land consisting of steep slopes, ponds, the gas

easement and part of the shared driveway and turnaround. The shared driveway will served as access for the three proposed new lots and the accessory apartment located on lot A.

Building envelopes had been established with hamlet setbacks and including watercourse setbacks for lots B2 and B3. Mr. Eggleston inquired if an informal or formal conservation analysis would be required. The conservation area is not fragmented and has all potential building development away from the gas easement and steep slopes. Mr. Brodsky inquired if the driveway turnaround is included in the open space. Mr. Eggleston stated that it is part of the conservation area open space calculation and is classified as part of the unbuildable area.

Mr. Brodsky inquired about the long-term ownership of the conservation lot. Mr. Eggleston stated that the conservation lot would be owned by one of the proposed property owners of the three developable lots proposed. Mr. Eggleston continued stating that the applicant has people interested in the lots and would probably deed the conservation lot to lot B3.

Mr. Camp inquired if the property is in a water district. Mr. Eggleston stated that he believes that it is in a district and will verify that. If necessary wells would be used on the three lots and the lot sizes of 1+ acre will still work with well and septic. He continued stating that the County requires new lots to connect to public water if the lots are located in a water district.

Mr. Brodsky requested clarity on the double access for lot A, and the possibility of having a single access off a common driveway. Mr. Eggleston stated that there can only be four dwellings and/or accessory apartments on a private driveway and the proposed private driveway would have the three lots and the accessory apartment meeting the maximum allowed. Mr. Brodsky stated that if it could be on the common access way it would reduce the number of access points on Fisher Road. Mr. Eggleston stated that Fisher Road is an appropriate residential road and is a Town road. Member Kasper inquired if the accessory apartment access could cut into lot A's driveway so that it does not connect to the common driveway. Mr. Eggleston stated that it would allow the applicant to have another lot. Member Kasper commented that the access off the common driveway would need to be eliminated to the side of the garage on lot A. Mr. Eggleston stated that he had connected the access to the garage off the existing driveway directly off Fisher Road and eliminated that access off the common driveway. Member Kasper commented that it will be difficult to access the garage door as it faces north on the garage.

Mr. Camp inquired if there were any stormwater management plans developed. Mr. Eggleston commented that plans will be developed as the application is presented and moves forward.

Mr. Eggleston stated it that the impermeable surface coverage for an open space subdivision in the RR district is 15% overall. Each lot will have a maximum of 30% impermeable surface coverage with 11,923SF left for the conservation lot; 2331SF of the 11,923SF would be dedicated to the driveway turnaround.

Mr. Brodsky commented that at the last site visit in May of 2015 is was more of an exploratory view and suggested that another site visit may be helpful now that there are some formulated plans. The conservation analysis will need to be developed to show how the land is used and protected. Mr. Eggleston stated that in a minor subdivision the conservation analysis is requirement is at the discretion of the Planning Board. Mr. Eggleston stated that he would need to know the extent of the conservation analysis required and the Planning Board's view of the shared driveway plan. A site visit will be conducted on February 27, 2016.

Sketch Plan-Site Plan Review

Applicant: Gennaro Bruni
Kathleen McCarthy
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Property:
West Lake Rd
Skaneateles, NY
Tax Map #054.-01-08.3

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect

Last year there was a two-lot subdivision of the property. The lot is bordered by West Lake Road and fire lane 24, a private road. There was a building envelope created to reflect the 100FT setback to the wetlands, 175FT setback to the State road and 30FT setbacks to the east side and front yard of the property. Proposed is a 3,727SF two story 5 bedroom dwelling. The house placement was determined to take advantage of the low area for a walk out basement. The garage is placed in a higher area with grading to occur along the side. The septic system for the dwelling was approved by the OCDOH on July 9, 2014. The City of Syracuse comments from February 2, 2016 correspondence reference that the tax map number on the approval is incorrect. The septic plan was approved as part of the original two-lot subdivision and referenced the giving parcel's tax map number.

Chairman Tucker queried Mr. Camp in regards to the proposed grading plan. Mr. Camp stated that looking at the topography it is unclear if there is any culvert under the fire lane, partly because there is a low area on the south side of it. Mr. Eggleston stated that the proposed driveway is on the backside of the low area that naturally collects water that slowly seeps out. Mr. Camp stated that this area should be evaluated as part of the site visit on February 27, 2016 to determine if a driveway culvert would be necessary. Chairman Tucker commented that with a heavy rain it does flood across the roads. Mr. Camp commented that according to Doug Wickman's notes there was a plan to widen the area between the driveway and the road. Chairman Tucker confirmed that that was his understanding and that it was supposed to be upgraded. Mr. Eggleston stated that they were going to upgrade the road before when the two fire lanes were to be joined. He continued stating that that fell through and the Board decided to leave it the way it was. The final approval did not require the widening. Counsel Molnar stated that it was removed and allowed to maintain, as it exists. Mr. Brodsky commented that he thought the improvement was deferred until the property was developed with a dwelling. Mr. Brodsky commented that minimally the applicant needs to address what the plans are improvement to the fire lane. Mr. Camp commented that the fire lane should be widened to allow two cars to pass each other in opposite directions. Member Kasper stated that the Board's concern was the safe ingress/egress from West Lake Road. Mr. Eggleston stated that the bigger concern was the number of houses on the fire lane. He continued stating that there are two year round houses and the proposed dwelling would be three year round dwellings on the fire lane and three seasonal cottages. Mr. Brodsky commented that the fire lane should be brought up to Town standards. Mr. Eggleston stated that it was established that the Board would accept this as an undersized road. The Board will review the prior resolutions. Mr. Eggleston stated that at the most that was discussed was a double lane at the entry point of 41A in case there was a car waiting to pull out that another car could pull in. Mr. Camp stated that it was going to be 40FT or so. Chairman Tucker stated that it was to be widened to the driveway of the first residence. Mr. Brodsky stated that the improvement may need to be done sooner than later. Mr. Eggleston stated that it could be a condition of this approval.

Sketch Plan – Special Permit/Site Plan Review

Applicant:	John Walsh	Property:
	Address	3259/3267 East Lake Rd
	Skaneateles, NY 13152	Skaneateles, NY
		Tax Map #040.-01-02.0&040.-01-03.0

Present: Andy Ramsgard, Architect; Debbie Williams, Representative

The applicant has a contract to acquire two properties that are in tandem to each other. The proposal is for a phased process where the existing nonconforming lakeside dwelling would be demolished and construction of a new dwelling that will conform to all setbacks. The roadside dwelling would remain through construction with the applicant having full use of the roadside dwelling through the summer, and then demolish the roadside dwelling and finalize the driveway to the lakeside dwelling. The final phase would be for the merger of the two-nonconforming lots into one lot of 76,416SF. A new septic system would be installed and the existing tennis court would be converted to Har-Tru permeable surface. Impermeable surface coverage would decrease from the existing 25.1% to 13.9% for the merged lots. Open space will increase from the existing 72.9% to a conforming 85.6%.

Mr. Brodsky recommended that the merger be completed first before the demolition and construction of the lakeside dwelling. Ms. Williams commented that then the Board would be accepting of two noncompliant dwellings on a lot rather than two noncompliant lots with dwellings. Mr. Brodsky commented that it would eliminate a potential to keep the two lots after the construction of the lakeside dwelling. Mr. Brodsky continued stated that it would have nonconforming density and the density would not be altered. 148-11K limits the ability to have more than one dwelling on a property unless the lot has at least twice the minimum lot size. Ms. Williams suggested that a C of O not be issued until the roadside dwelling is removed and the lots merged. Ms. Williams stated that construction of the lakeside dwelling would occur in the fall at which the roadside dwelling could be demolished, as the applicant would not reside there in the winter.

Ms. Williams stated that the proposed lakeside residence would be located 100' from the lake line whereas the existing dwelling is 63.3' to the lake line. The new septic system, currently under design, will be located uphill from the existing tennis court. No shoreline improvements are being proposed. The lot is a very long lot with a long driveway that contributes to the impermeable surface coverage. Mr. Brodsky inquired on the location of the neighboring dwellings. Ms. Williams stated that the dwelling to the north is located 100' from the lake line and the dwelling to the south is located closer to the lake line. She continued stating that if you move the dwelling further back then the applicants would be looking into the neighbors' dwellings. The elevations will need to be revised to reflect the proposed windows on the west side. A site visit will be conducted on February 27, 2016.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Southern to schedule a public hearing, on ***Tuesday, March 15, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.*** The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Chairman Tucker recused himself as he has an easement right on the applicant's property.

Sketch Plan - Site Plan Review

Applicant: John Teixeira
Address 2763 East Lake Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152 Skaneateles, NY
Tax Map #038.-01-25.0

Present: Andy Ramsgard, Architect; Debbie Williams, Representative

The existing nonconforming lot is 19,984SF with 65.7' of lake frontage and has two seasonal residences on the property. The applicant proposes to construct a 174SF second floor addition to the lakeside dwelling to provide a larger bedroom on the second floor. There will be no increase in the footprint of the dwelling or increase in the number of bedrooms. The lakeside dwelling has two bedrooms and the eastern cottage has one bedroom.

The Zoning Board of Appeals will be holding a public hearing on the requested variances for modification of a structure on a lot with less than 20,000SF of lot area. The Zoning Board of Appeals had also requested that the impermeable surface coverage should be reduced although this application is not considered redevelopment as the footprint of the building is not being enlarged. The site plan dated February 10, 2016 reflects modifications to the driveway to reduce the existing impermeable surface coverage of 20.3% to the proposed impermeable surface coverage to 17.7%, and the open space calculation will increase to 82%. Member Southern commented that there are three parking spaces in the driveway and that it would be an area that could be reduced. Member Winkelman inquired if the driveway will connect to the dwellings. Ms. Williams stated that the driveway would not connect to the dwellings. Mr. Ramsgard stated that the area is grass and that the dwellings are for seasonal use.

The applicant has remodeled the eastern camp and the septic system has been repaired including replacement of the leach lines and septic tank, which the OCDOH has approved. The existing septic system has been updated to support both of the seasonal dwellings.

The Planning Board is reviewing the site plan for any construction or expansion of any structure within 200 feet of the lake line. A site visit will be conducted on February 27, 2016.

Chairman Tucker returned to the Board.

Sketch Plan – Site Plan Review

Applicant: Patrick Danial
3285 East Lake Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #041.-01-47.1

Present: JoAnn Gagliano, Diane Burkard, EDR

The applicant is proposing the replacement of the existing driveway with a new alignment. The site is a 5.79-acre parcel that extends from East Lake Road to the lake. The existing driveway aligns with Pork street causing confusion with drivers expecting that Pork Street continues to the lake. The proposed new driveway cut would be relocated with the driveway meandering through the landscaped lot to paver motor court. There will be sculptures in various areas that can be viewed as an automobile drives to the dwelling. A small shed on the property would be removed. The permeable walkways to the tennis court will be re-configured and remain permeable. In addition, there will be a decorative stonewall and gate along the eastern end of the property and

driveway entrance. Impermeable surface coverage will remain at 9.76% with open space remaining at 89.9%. There will be some disturbance within 200FT of the lake line, with the total disturbance over 1 acre, which will require a SPDES permit. Also proposed is a berm on the east side of the existing Har-Tru tennis court.

Most of the grading will occur when the driveway would be pulled back to 10% slope rather than the 15% slope. Member Winkelman inquired on the plan for the stormwater coming down the driveway. Ms. Burkard stated that most of the stormwater is sheet flow heading towards the lake and a swale on the north side to pick up water coming from the area. In the existing conditions there are two spurs left from the original circular driveway. The existing inlets will remain to manage some of the stormwater, and there is an existing inlet by the dwelling that would remain. Mr. Camp inquired if every storm inlet would remain. Ms. Gagliano stated that they would keep every one to use with the new driveway.

Mr. Camp inquired if the cut and fill balance for the proposed project. Ms. Gagliano stated that they have not completed a balance, and it would depend on what is there when the work has commenced. If it is good material, they will use it for the berm to balance it. If it is not good material then it would be removed offsite. Mr. Camp inquired about the grade. Ms. Gagliano stated that they can get a full size of the plan to him.

There will be mass plantings in front of the proposed columns and gate at the entry with a paver apron at the gate area. At the motor court, there will be a small wall and columns leading the driveway into the paver motor court. Member Winkelman inquired on the width of the proposed driveway. Ms. Burkard stated that it would be 10FT, the same as the existing driveway. A site visit will be conducted on February 27, 2016.

Chairman Tucker requested Mr. Camp's comments regarding the storm drains. Mr. Camp stated that it makes sense to keep them in place and they are located inside of the grass swales. Ms. Gagliano stated that there will be putting a lot of planting beds in because there is a lot of trees on site. It is more of a successional forest with the whole canopy covering the lawn. Mr. Camp stated that the maximum disturbed area may be over one acre. Mr. Brodsky inquired on how much re-grading was calculated. Mr. Camp stated that the amount of disturbance may not be fully calculated. Ms. Gagliano inquired if he thought that the planting disturbance should be considered. Mr. Camp stated that he does not know the existing conditions. Ms. Gagliano stated it is like a forest floor. Mr. Camp stated that if you are turning over the soil, it is disturbed. Ms. Gagliano stated that the soil cannot be turned over because the roots cannot be changed and that all that is being proposed is planting or seeding on top of the grade around the existing trees.

Mr. Brodsky commented that there needs to be distinguished what is disturbance. Ms. Gagliano stated that they have as anything that they are digging up such as the road is on the plan. She continued stated that it does trigger a SWPP that includes a sedimentation and erosion control plan. Mr. Brodsky stated that primary concern will be the land disturbance areas of excavation and new driveway. Mr. Brodsky stated that the Town has a requirement for an erosion and stormwater control plan that is required for disturbance of greater than 5,000SF within the lake watershed within a year. Mr. Camp stated that there is a limit on how much disturbance that can be done at one time. Ms. Gagliano stated that with the Miron project, the work was done in phases and that this project would be done in phases as well. Mr. Brodsky stated that Mr. Camp would need the full-scale plans before he can comment. Mr. Camp stated that when the driveway cut has occurred it will create one long scar, and inquired on how it would be protected. Ms. Gagliano stated that there would be a silt fence. Member Winkelman stated that

it would be addressed in the SWPP. Ms. Gagliano stated that they will address it and that the project would probably be done in two phases. Mr. Camp stated that he has not seen any of the detail yet. Ms. Gagliano stated that they would give Mr. Camp a digital copy of the erosion and sedimentation control plan and a grading plan. She continued stating that they will have to determine how much disturbance is there with relocating a driveway versus excavation for a dwelling. Mr. Brodsky stated there is a lot of proposed disturbance in proximity to the lake.

Ms. Gagliano stated that at the site visit they can look at it together, She continued stating that near the house, the stormwater will be trapped by the house and the stormwater will need to be moved away from the house. Mr. Camp stated that the way the grade is proposed there is a problem in the corner where there is no swale shown and it gets flat there; where will the water go once it gets down there. Ms. Gagliano stated that they could work on the motor court first and work their way back doing the work in phases. Mr. Camp stated that you are talking about a 4-inch swale to the north of the driveway just before it hits the motor court and it will have a hard time as it comes down the driveway getting out and around there as it is flat in there. Ms. Gagliano stated that it could be made deeper to keep that access way. A pipe could always be put in there if needed.

Mr. Camp inquired about the location of the pipe outlets on the plan. Ms. Gagliano stated they are shown on the site plan and the survey and they know where the inlets and out falls are but not necessarily where the pipes are.

Discussion

Applicant: Brad Wirth
2590 Nunnery Road
Skaneateles, New York

Property:
1382 East Genesee St
Skaneateles, New York

Tax Map #042.-01-08.1

The applicant requests the Board to consider the move of his existing automobile service station located at 1321 East Genesee Street to be relocated at 1382 East Genesee St. The Board recommended that the applicant consider a use variance as the automobile service station use would be a new use for this property and it is prohibited in the lake watershed overlay district.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Kasper to adjourn the Planning Board Meeting as there being no further business. The Board having been polled resulted in favor of said motion.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull, Secretary/Clerk