

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
April 19, 2016**

Mark J. Tucker, Chairman  
Joseph Southern  
Elizabeth Estes arrived 7:35 pm  
Donald Kasper  
Scott Winkelman arrived 7:33 pm  
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. The meeting minutes of March 15, 2016 were previously distributed to the Board and all Members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

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

**RECORD OF VOTE**

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

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

**Public Hearing-Special Permit**

Applicant:	John Teixeira	Property:
	3029 East Lake Rd	2763 East Lake Rd
	Skaneateles, NY 13152	Skaneateles, NY
		<b>Tax Map #038.-01-25.0</b>

Present: John Teixeira, Applicant; Debbie Williams, Representative

No one wished to have the public notice read. A site visit was conducted on February 27, 2016. The Onondaga County Planning Board stated that the proposal would have no adverse implication in their resolution dated February 3, 2016. The City of Syracuse Department of Water deferred comment pending DOH approval in their correspondence dated January 14, 2016. The Zoning Board of Appeals had approved the variances for the project including a driveway setback to the south property line on March 1, 2016.

Ms. Williams stated that nothing has changed from the site plan that was approved by the Zoning Board of Appeals. She continued stating that the ZBA had triggered redevelopment on the property with their request to reduce the impermeable surface coverage on the property by reducing and reconfigured the existing driveway.

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

**RECORD OF VOTE**

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

At this time, Vice Chair Southern opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor of the project. No one spoke in favor of the project. Vice Chair Southern asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition, or had any other comments. Mark Tucker, easement owner on the property, inquired on the proposed size of the gate that will be across the easement, as he would like to be able to drive through the gate. He continued recommending that the gate be ten feet in width to allow trailer access. Mr. Teixeira stated that he was amenable to have the gate be large enough to accommodate a large pick-up truck or trailer.

**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 affirmance of said motion.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

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

Member Kasper recommended that the size of the proposed gate be placed on record. Mr. Teixeira and Mr. Tucker agreed that the width should be ten feet. Member Kasper inquired about the ZBA condition of bollards. Ms. Williams commented that the ZBA wanted bollards to restrict a vehicle from driving over the septic system. She continued stating that the fence with gate that will extend over the easement will be restricted so that only Mr. Teixeira and Mr. Tucker will have access keys. Mr. Teixeira stated that the fence would also extend more north across to the first cottage. There will be a pedestrian gate or gap in the fence to allow someone to walk across the grass to the lakeside cottage.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, upon a motion made Member Donald Kasper, 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/site plan review, with the following conditions:

1. That Special Permit 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.
2. That \$3,527.28 be submitted to the Town of Skaneateles Land and Development Rights Acquisition Fund prior to issuance of a building permit; and
3. That the Site Plan Z-1.1 dated February 10, 2016, site plan Z-1.2,Z-1.3 and Z-1.4 dated January 8, 2016,, and Narrative dated January 8, 2016, prepared by Andrew Ramsgard, Licensed Architect, be followed in all respects; and
4. That all conditions imposed by the Skaneateles Zoning Board of Appeals, in connection with its approved variances, be fulfilled; and
5. That a locking access gate at a minimum of ten feet in width be installed to protect the existing septic system with access provided to the easement owner; and
6. That an as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of the completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

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

Chairman Tucker returned to the Board.

**Continued Review-Site Plan Review**

Applicant:

David & Beth Conley  
270 Locust Ave  
Rye, NY 10580

Property:

2591 East Lake Rd  
Skaneateles, NY  
**Tax Map #037.-01-24.0**

Present: Christy Conley, JoAnn Gagliano, Architects

A site visit was conducted on April 16, 2016. The Onondaga County Planning Board commented that approval needs to be obtained from the City of Syracuse Department of Water and the NYSDEC, and that the Town is advised to require an updated Agricultural Data Statement prior to approving the proposed application in the resolution dated March 16, 2016.

A revised site plan dated April 19, 2016 was submitted in response to the site visit to further address erosion control. Ms. Gagliano addressed the two comments from the Onondaga County Planning Board. The applicant will submit the application to the City of Syracuse Department of Water after the NYSDEC has issued a work permit for the pending dock (NYS jurisdiction). In regards to the agricultural statement, they have prepared a response to the project proximity to

NYS agriculture district #2, the properties located 500FT from the applicant's property are considered residential properties and that there is no active agricultural activity occurring in the general vicinity that will be impacted by the proposed replacement of lake access stairs.

Ms. Conley stated that the construction of the replacement stairs will be done from a barge on the lake, working from the bottom to the top of the stairs so that no materials will be brought from the top of the hill down to the project. A turbidity curtain will also be employed at the shoreline. Mr. Camp commented that the contractor working from the bottom up to the top makes sense, the contractor would construct the footings on the bottom and build the platform and then work that way. That would keep the contractor off the slope.

Member Winkelman inquired on the status of the DEC application for the permanent dock. Ms. Gagliano stated that the contractor is in process of obtaining the permit for the dock that will be beyond the mean high water mark.

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

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, upon a motion made Member Donald Kasper, seconded by Member Joseph Southern, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board APPROVES the minor special permit/site plan review, with the following conditions:

1. That Special Permit shall expire if the applicant fails to comply with the conditions stated within 18 months of its issuance or if it's time limit expires without renewal.
2. That the updated Site Plan C102 dated April 19, 2016, site plan C-001 and C-101, and narrative dated March 1, 2016 prepared by Environmental Design & Research, with the Memorandum regarding the Agricultural Statement dated April 8, 2016, be followed in all respects; and
3. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from the City of Syracuse Department of Water, and any other approval needed for the Application; and
4. That an as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

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

**Continued Review –Site Plan Review**

Applicant Theodore & Nancy Norman  
8665 Duarte Road  
San Gabriel, CA 91775

Property:  
1992 West Lake Road  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #058.-01-17.2**

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect; John Langey, Legal Representative

Mr. Eggleston stated that he had prepared a response to the comments that were made by Mr. Molnar.

Chairman Tucker stated that by presenting the information at the meeting that the Board had not had a chance to review this new information, and reminded Mr. Eggleston that the deadline for submission of additional information is 10 days before the meeting.

Mr. Eggleston commented that he agreed and said the same thing last month. There is a question about the footprint back on June 22, 2015 versus the current plan dated December 1, 2015. I did a chart on the back, a real simple chart. I think what happened was when the June 22, 2015 meeting, the footprint, which was 3179SF, that was not the full square footage of the house but just the first floor footprint. I have broken down and gone through the June 22, 2015, July 28, 2015, December 1, 2015, first floor second floor, garage and porches, all the living space and totaled up what all the living space was including porches and garages. Bottom-line, the June 22, 2015, it was 6,561SF where now it is actually decreased from 4790SF to 4637SF. We are basically saying that while the plan changed slightly as it was being developed and not receiving the variance, any changes were really de minimis. It is basically the same plan that was submitted originally.

Mr. Eggleston continued commenting that there was also a question of what was in the area of the 100FT watercourse setback and/or what was in the 30FT north line that is any of the red areas outlined on the plans. I have broken that down for you as to what was existing, and the existing house had 3412SF in floor space in the non-conforming areas, or 2257SF in footprint in the non-conforming areas. The December 1, 2015 plan has about 1000SF less than the existing with 2451SF living area and 1591SF footprint.

Mr. Eggleston continued commenting that the chart that was presented by Scott, looking at the property in the surrounding area as 10 properties to the north and 8 properties to the south with information pulled from the Onondaga County tax assessment. I know it is reliable, however, it is not always accurate. I personally know that 1998 West Lake Road has their basement finished with a walk out basement and a finished room above that is not characterized there; 1960 has 676SF of a second floor over the garage that does not reflect in the tax rolls; 1946 West Lake Road has a partial walk out basement on the lake. For me, what this chart does is it characterizes the surrounding neighborhood. There are small houses set amongst large houses, and there is no consistent size in the area. The proposed Norman house will not be the largest nor the smallest house in the surrounding neighborhood as defined by those 19 or 20 properties. The properties are constantly changing and being improved and/or being redeveloped with a third of the properties having work done on them in the past 10-15 years.

Mr. Eggleston continued commenting that in Scott's suggestions to you, he suggested three areas in the site plan review criteria to look at. It was 1a, 1b, and 1d. I have copied my response to 1a, 1b and 1d in bold, enhancing my original comments. In addition to what I spelled out before, I have stated that the village and hamlet neighborhoods in Skaneateles are a mixture of large and small houses next to each other developed over different time periods. It is not a suburban neighborhood where all of the houses are very similar of style and size and setback and all that. This is just one more step in the history of this neighborhood and we are not the largest nor the smallest house in the area. 1b), that the structures that are visible from the 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. I just added to my original comments that this house's architectural quality is consistent with neighboring properties that have been redeveloped in recent years. Again, you have a variety of different periods and different styles and I do not think this is out of character at all with a very anomalies along the way, not to mention the blue roof with concrete walls. 1d), where appropriate, setbacks shall maintain and continue the existing setback pattern of surrounding properties. I added, all the front, side and lake yard setbacks conform with the proposed house as well and the impermeable surface coverage. Many of the neighboring properties have nonconforming side yard setback or lake yard setbacks. While the watercourse setback is 57.6FT, which is 3.1FT greater than the existing house, the distance storm water travels to reach the watercourse is greater than the required 100FT and travels across a well-maintained grass lawn and will be enhanced with water gardens before passing into the watercourse. Unlike many other watercourses, that feed into the lake, this watercourse has had significant improvements made to it by this applicant to control the erosion along its banks and control the sediment that flows onto the property from upland sources. Mr. Eggleston continued commenting that in recent site plan review applications for residential structures greater than 2,500SF within 1,500FT of the lake this Board has not been as attentive to the above criteria to the extent it has on this application. Many of these properties are developed with large homes in a surrounding area with a mixture of large and small homes and in different architectural styles.

Mr. Eggleston continued stating that Mark Tucker did raise a question of other year round homes that have been built within 100FT of a watercourse. Again, it is somewhat hard to go through without good statistical data easily available so recalling some of the properties that I have actually worked on over the last 10 years or so, on Winding Way there is the LaGrow house that is closer than 50FT to the watercourse to the north. The Ehle house, 2395 Wave Way was built 40FT from the watercourse just above the referenced Jackson house that was a seasonal house that Mark referred. On the east side I can think of the Filicia and Curtin homes, 3133 and 3153 East Lake Road are only 10FT from a watercourse and have been redeveloped over the recent years. You'll find that there are lots of homes that by the nature of Skaneateles Lake and the fact that there are a lot of small watercourses than run into the lake, that have year round homes within 50FT of a watercourse. It is not the distance to the watercourse but the situation and circumstance. Does the developed area run directly into the watercourse or is it running parallel to the watercourse. What is the erosion control methods taken place during construction and construction sequence to mitigate any disturbance during construction. What is the end result when you are done. I think this property uniquely has a very flat area and not a steep area where water is going to run fast. It has a mature lawn, it has nice mature trees along the watercourse and the watercourse has had significant improvement. Those are things that you need to take into account as you review this unique situation. I just summarize by saying look at the mitigating factors of this application, it's part of an open space subdivision with 3.8 acres with high conservation value put into permanent conservation, the applicant has rehabilitated the erosion

control along the watercourse that has been neglected for many years, the property has large flat lawn areas that provide good absorptions for stormwater draining into the watercourse, it has rain gardens that will be added to help filter stormwater. Trees along the watercourse have been saved and the redevelopment of the property will maintain and improve an important property that abuts a watercourse to be consistent with the surrounding area.

Mr. Langey commented that he suspects tonight, with the Board's attorney assistance, that a decision may be rendered. Prior to that decision, I would like to point out to the Board is that what you are here for tonight is a site plan approval, and I know you know that. What I tell my Boards is that with a site plan, we know that the use is an allowed use. In this instance, it is a residential use occurring on a residential lot, that part we are fine with. It seems that certain members of the Board are concerned that a portion of the building is going to, is being requested to exist outside of a previously established building envelope. However, the main question is what is wrong with that from the standpoint of the zoning law, nothing wrong from the zoning law, no variance necessary. Mr. Eggleston has carefully designed the project to avoid requesting numerous variances. What is wrong with the project other than potentially that a portion of it happens to exist outside of the building envelope, but reminding the Board that at the time that building envelope was established a notation was placed upon the map that it was for informational purposes only. Then we must ask ourselves that if it goes outside that it is for informational purposes only, what is the harm to the environment from this particular project. We know there is no harm to the environment because we had a type II action that means that there is no harm to the environment. We are not harming the lake, in fact, Bob has explained how the drainage has been carefully designed to take care of any issue with runoff to the lake, and we know that the height of the building is fine, we know that the building placement does not impact neighboring properties. There have been no claims that it would impact the value of the neighboring properties. What has been mentioned is the character of the neighborhood, the character of area, the character of Skaneateles. Bob has also pointed is what your code and your comprehensive plan talks about is achieving orderly development. That is his job. His job is to design projects that will achieve orderly development. In this case I believe he has put a record in front of you that shows that the Norman proposed house would achieve orderly development in the Town, in that area, next to those properties, in that corridor.

Mr. Langey continued saying that he does understand that some members sensibilities are offended by perhaps the size of the home, perhaps the orientation of the home, the fact that the home does exist partially outside of the building envelope. I appreciate personal preferences by the board; however, I would urge the board not to allow those personal preferences to command a denial of this site plan but rather work with the applicant to approve the site plan as they proposed it given the record that has been submitted. Do not hold my client's at bay on this approval because they presented a plan that is not your personal preference. It is site plan approval, it is an allowed use, Bob has designed it in a way that achieves orderly development in the Town and we urge you to consider it particularly in light of the new information that Bob has presented with you tonight.

Member Winkelman inquired on the history of the open space subdivision, was there a conservation analysis done? The thing about the big house and the orientation on the small lot so close to the road and lake, where is the open space. I know you compensated for it on the other side of the road and out of the way. I was wondering if the building envelope was designated that way because to preserve a little view of the lake and green space. We have talked a lot about the setback from the creek and I know it is a healthy lawn and all. That extra stuff outside of the building envelope will block the view from the road.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the open space subdivision was done with a full conservation analysis prepared by EDR. You have to understand that this was a little unique because the proposed residential lots were already developed. There were already two dwellings on there, an accessory apartment and this single-family primary home. It was anticipated that there would be redevelopment because the primary home had environmental issues that the owner was very sensitive and could not live in it, and it did not meet the standards for most people to live in it. The conservation value of the lot that was put into conservation was focused on the fact that it was adjacent to the watercourse further up so that it protected that area; it was farmland and protected the farmland, so it did have high conservation value from that standpoint relative to stormwater, drainage, agricultural land. It was the 3.8 acres of virgin undeveloped land that would remain.

Member Winkelman inquired if there was any conservation value assigned to the eastern property because of the building envelope.

Mr. Eggleston stated that because it was an already developed property, there was less value there, and what it achieved was the ability to subdivide these properties without any further development that would be added. We were not going to make five or six homes here, it would remain two residential lots.

Member Winkelman commented to answer Mr. Langey's question about the character, the proposed house is much bigger, blocking views from the road that is one thing for sure.

Mr. Eggleston commented which the trees do a pretty good job of.

Member Winkelman commented that you are blocking the view of the trees by the creek. It is a big broad house, like a billboard.

Member Kasper commented that he would like to make an observation that the Normans were not the people who did the subdivision, they bought the property after it was subdivided. I was on the Planning Board when it was subdivided, and the building envelope was set to meet all of the requirements. Our zoning laws keep structures back from the creek, and the side property lines, and that was why it was created. Just because it is an open space subdivision does not mean that you can build in the critical areas and the stream is a critical area. Mr. Eggleston talked about all of these other properties that were built close to the creek, and each of those areas probably had a reason to approve it because there was no other way to solve that issue. This subdivision was created to meet all of the standards. That is what the building envelope was. I do not think it is right to come back and ask us to change that, he was not the original subdivider.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the record reflects how we got here at this point and we have the Codes Enforcement Officer who determined that here were driveway variances required, and it needed site plan review for the disturbance and building a dwelling larger than 2500SF.

Counsel Molnar stated that to get back to Member Kasper's point, the open space subdivision occurred with a conservation easement with 3.8 acres across the street to capture what was farmland and preserve that and remove its development rights in exchange for creating two lots on the lakeside with one at one acre and the other at 1.39 acres, substantially less than the minimum required of two acres. The open space subdivision occurred to make this one lot into two. That is the only reason the subdivision ever occurred. At that time it was an open space

subdivision that close to the water and it required a building envelope. Mr. Eggleston presented to the Board after the approval occurred, to define the dimensional limitations of where the new structure, if any, would go. It was marked in the resolution itself I circulated to the Board for informational purposes only, so that it would not imply that site plan approval was granted right then and there, rather it reserved site plan approval from the Planning Board later. That was the reason it was marked for informational purposes not on the resolution or otherwise to ignore the building envelope. That is important in terms of site plan review. I remind the Board that the site plan review criteria that Bob reflected in his memo is accurate with the three criteria being the most important for this Board in determining whether or not this application is approvable. What it comes down to is massing and placement if I read the Board comments and questions. Whether or not this project as proposed in both the building envelope and well beyond it is approvable in terms of massing and placement, and conforming with the surrounding area.

Counsel Molnar continued stating that Bob has also presented great information advocating that the application is similar to other projects in the community, in the character, etc. What is also important to the Board and for the applicant is that we narrow the focus to the site plan criteria, which requires the surrounding community. To the extent that Bob reflects on and provides similar situations that are either across the lake or half a mile away, the Board has to make a determination if that is in the surrounding area, which is what the site plan criteria focus is on to make sure that this project fits within the character areas of the immediately adjacent homes going both ways on the lake. That is how I would read the site plan criteria section, not the character of the community at large but the character of the surround area. Whether or not it is in compliance and/or it integrates well into the area. To the extent that Bob has raised and pointed out a number of examples, it is up to the Board discretion, but my recommendation is if we would like to make sure this is thorough analysis, you may want to take a look at some of the examples with the additional square footage that Bob has reflected appears within some of the houses next door to make sure we have all of the facts correct before the Board makes a decision. I would recommend that the Board decision be either moved up to the next meeting so that we can review this information Bob submitted, or if the Board thinks it is well versed in this information now, it can move forward with a decision.

Mr. Brodsky stated that he had two points to discuss. The open space subdivision created a conservation lot and those development rights were transferred to these two residential lots. It is why these two residential lots are small, as Scott has pointed out, and have much higher impermeable surface coverage. The Board examined the character of these lots as they were developing them and I would suggest that the establishment of setting the building envelope was to achieve an overall character plan or long-term plan for this property. That was the intent of the Board, this is where we want new development to go if and when it ever occurs. That is why it was established, and that envelope complied with all of the setbacks., it reflects the setbacks the Board wished to achieve.

Member Kasper stated that like Scott said, we should probably do a site visit and look at these addresses, as I do not know where these houses are and look at the structures.

Counsel Molnar commented or at least pull up the information and determining whether the Board agrees with the applicant's analysis or has other thoughts.

Member Kasper stated that he is not familiar with the addresses and do not know what they look like.

Member Estes stated that following the information that we received earlier, and I am looking at it in front of me here, it was at the request of Mr. Eggleston on behalf of the applicant at the time that the building envelope that was put in place was put in place as it is. So now we have that same architect and professional on behalf of a different applicant now, wanting to change that. That is a bit confusing to me at this point in time.

Member Southern stated no matter how we talk about what this house looks like, and that is what we are talking about what it looks like to the rest of the surrounding area, the immediate area, not three miles away, does not impact the fact that this house is outside of the envelope. It exceeds the setbacks from the watercourse. No matter whether you think the house is a beautiful house or whether the house fits in with the character of the neighborhood, it does not matter. It still does not meet the setback. It is not going to change my thinking on it, and as far as I am concerned I think we should move ahead on this right now. If there was a way that that could change on the one fact then I would be willing to go further on and do the research. From my viewpoint it is not necessary.

Chairman Tucker stated that it is part of his thought that it is outside of the building envelope and we have not had any help to move this forward. I understand we are looking at different things. We had that building envelope there for a purpose and now we are trying to use outside the building envelope.

Counsel Molnar stated that his recommendation to the Board is to sift that down a little more. In determining and using the site plan criteria, which includes the mass and placement of this house in relationship to the surrounding area that the Board is observing that the applicant is proposing to build within and outside of the building envelope. In totality the Board is looking at the massing and placement of the house and structures on the property.

Member Southern commented that the placement is what, in my view, what is in question as it is outside of those parameters.

Chairman Tucker inquired of the Board whether they felt they would like to make a decision this evening.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Winkelman to continue the application, on *Tuesday, May 17, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.*. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmation of said motion.

Member Kasper commented that if it was continued, what the Board would be considering.

Member Winkelman commented that he would like to review the submitted memo from Bob and take another site visit to see the massing in the neighborhood.

Member Kasper commented that if that was the reason then yes.

Member Estes commented that to give it fair consideration she agrees to it. If there will be a site visit and to look at it, I agree that we should go and take a look at it. I do agree with Don's comment that we have not seen any changes and I am concerned about the building envelope, but will look at the plan in relation to the data Bob has provided.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Mark J. Tucker	Present	[Yes]
Member	Joseph Southern	Present	[No]
Member	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Elizabeth Estes	Present	[Yes]

A site visit was scheduled for April 30, 2016.

**Continued Review- Site Plan Review**

Applicant	Mark & Theresa Potenza	Property:
	4822 Manor Hill Drive	3125 East Lake Road
	Syracuse, NY 13215	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		<b>Tax Map #040.-01-32.0</b>

Present: Mark & Theresa Potenza, Applicants; Robert Eggleston, Architect

The Onondaga County Planning Board had commented that City of Syracuse Department of Water approval be obtained in their resolution dated March 16, 2016. The City of Syracuse Department of Water had no comments in their correspondence dated March 7, 2016. The Onondaga County Department of Health has approved the septic plan for a six bedroom dwelling maximum on September 25, 2014. A site visit was conducted on February 27, 2016.

The applicant will be redeveloping the property on East Lake Road and they would like to tear down the existing six bedroom dwelling and rebuild a new six bedroom dwelling located over 100' from the lake line. The existing dwelling is nonconforming to setbacks and the proposed dwelling will conform to all setback requirements. The proposed dwelling will be in approximately the same location and the septic system has been approved for a six-bedroom dwelling located further from the lake.. The applications requires site plan review for reconstruction of a house greater than 2500SF within 1500FT of the lake line. The dwelling is also 200FT from the watercourse on the north side.

Mr. Brodsky inquired about the character and size of the dwellings located on either side of the proposed dwelling. Mr. Eggleston stated that the Hawkins house is quite large, the Filicia house is medium sized, the Curtin house is a very small house on a tiny lot, the Bright house is a huge expansive house, the Bitz house was a reconstruction of a house further up and then we are into some camps. He continued stating that as you go further south you do have some larger houses. Mr. Brodsky inquired where the proposed house fits in with the neighborhood. Mr. Eggleston stated it is in the medium being developed in the area, and is smaller than the Parkes and Ford houses approved down the road.

Member Estes commented that the house is being torn down, the proposed large dwelling is meeting the setbacks but the property is not meeting the 10% impermeable surface coverage allowed. Mr. Eggleston stated that the client had already purchased conservation land through the Town's land rights development acquisition fund in 2014 to satisfy the impermeable surface coverage and followed the rules. He continued stating the he also wanted to point out that on that application, when we did the necessary repairs to the sea wall, included a 10-foot planting

berm so the water coming down goes through a planted area before draining into the lake. There has been mitigation down to the property in addition to paying into the fund to help mitigate the impermeable surface coverage on the lot. He continued saying that these lots would never be subdivided today being a 100 foot wide lot. Just the driveway takes up 10% of the area. This is a common percentage coverage for houses along East Lake Road in this situation so it is not out of character.

Member Winkelman stated that you are paying into the fund because you have no other way to reduce impermeable surface coverage at the time. Now years later the opportunity presents itself. Member Estes stated that it might be by the rules but ethically and intently it is not good practice. Chairman Tucker stated that this topic is something we have been looking at for a long time now and should discuss if we have time at the end of the meeting. Member Kasper commented that the applicant is entitled to it so let us move on to something else.

Mr. Camp commented that he had requested that the roof leaders be redirected to the lawn instead of going into subsurface drains as shown on the plans. Member Kasper inquired on the existing elevation of the existing house first floor. Mr. Eggleston stated that the proposed dwelling will be at the same elevation as the existing dwelling.

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

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

1. That Special Permit shall expire if the applicant fails to comply with the conditions stated within 18 months of its issuance or if it's time limit expires without renewal.
2. That the Site Plan 1 of 1 dated February 25, 2016 prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be modified with a note added to reflect that the roof leaders be directed to sheet out to the lawn instead of into subsurface drains; and
3. That the elevation and floor plans 1 of 4 through 4 of 4 dated February 29, 2016 and narrative dated February 25, 2016 prepared by Robert O. Eggleston be prepared in all respects; and
4. That an as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of the completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Mark J. Tucker	Present	[Yes]
Member	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]

Member Scott Winkelman Present [No]  
Member Elizabeth Estes Present [No]

Mr. Eggleston commented that the Board does not see all of the plans that his client wanted to do that we did not do to comply with the zoning code as best as possible.

**Continued Review-Site Plan Review**

Applicant Christopher Graham  
4302 Jordan Rd  
Skaneateles, NY  
Property:  
4331 Jordan Road  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #024.-02-01.2**

Present: Chris Graham, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Architect

The Onondaga County Planning Board had no comments in their resolution dated March 16, 2016. The Onondaga County Department of Health has approved the septic plan for a six bedroom dwelling maximum on March 3, 2016. A site visit was conducted on February 27, 2016.

The applicant has acquired the property since the last Planning Board meeting. In reviewing the structure it was determined that sections of the dwelling would need to be replaced due to the substandard condition of the two wings. Proposed is the conversion of the existing single family dwelling to a two family dwelling providing two potential rental units. The total living space would be 3500SF, for two three-bedroom homes. Parking in front of the garage will be delineated.

Mr. Brodsky inquired why the abandoned driveway off Railroad Street is being retained. Mr. Eggleston stated that it will be grassed over and it was reflected on the site plan as it was reflected as an abandoned driveway on the survey. Member Kasper inquired if it could be blocked off so there would be no access available. Mr. Eggleston commented that rocks could be placed at the bottom of the driveway.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Southern and seconded by Chairman Tucker to consider the proposed action as a Type II SEQR action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(9) and not subject to SEQR review. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, upon a motion made Member Scott Winkelman and seconded by Member Joseph Southern, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the minor site plan approval, with the following 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 it's time limit expires without renewal; and
2. That the Site Plan 1-3 of 3 dated April 7, 2016, and Narrative dated April 7, 2016, prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be followed in all respects; and

3. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from the OCDOH, and any other approval needed for the Application; and
4. The Applicant shall install a barricade at the Railroad Street entrance of the abandoned driveway; and
5. An as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

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

**Amendment-Major Special Permit/Site Plan Review**

Applicant	Alan Briggs	
	Alabar, LLC	Property:
	PO Box 66	Lauder Lane
	Elbridge, NY	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		<b>Tax Map #018.-02-29.2</b>

Present: Alan Briggs, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Architect

A site visit was conducted on April 16, 2016. The applicant is proposing to construct a 16'x20' permeable patio and walkway with 10'x12' gazebo to be located in the common area of the complex. An amendment to the special permit for 24 condominium homes is being requested to allow for the patio and gazebo addition. Four of the units are occupied and four units are under construction with two sold and two pending at the second building. The impermeable surface coverage will not change. The location of the gazebo is located on open land that is not encumbered by any septic systems. There is a dry pond located to the west of the area.

**WHEREAS**, a motion was made by Member Southern and seconded by Member Kasper, the Planning Board adopted and ratified the prior SEQRA determination, last reviewed for the Application, which was a determination that the Application constituted an Type 1 Action with a negative declaration after review of the SEQRA forms submitted by the Applicant. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, upon a motion made Member Scott Winkelman, seconded by Member Elizabeth Estes, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the Application with the following conditions:

1. That the Site Plan Approval of the Application shall expire if the applicant fails to comply with the conditions stated within 18 months of its issuance or if its time limit expires without renewal; and

2. That the Site Plan 1 of 1 dated Mar 31, 2016, prepared by Robert O. Eggleston., be followed in all respects; and
3. An as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project; and
4. That all other conditions and requirements of the Major Special Permit remain in full force and effect.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

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

Chairman Tucker recused himself as he farms a portion of the applicant’s property.

**Informal Discussion**

Applicant: Nelda Amidon  
 1939 Coon Hill Rd  
 Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #035.-02-09.1**

Present: Richard Schmidt, Representative; Dale Amidon, George Tydefil

A site visit was conducted on April 16, 2016. The property owner has a 15 +/- acre lot on Coon Hill Road, a County road. There is an access easement drive located on the far west part of the property to allow access to two neighbor lots. The property owner is considering a two-lot subdivision with lot 1 being two acres and including the existing dwelling. Lot 2 would be the remaining vacant land with the easement. The owner is seeking opinion from the Planning Board regarding two potential layouts for the subdivision. The preferred subdivision would allow each lot to have 200FT of road frontage, which is less than the 300FT required for a County road. The second option is for lot 1 having 300FT of road frontage and lot 2 becoming a flag lot with 100FT of road frontage and would remain agricultural. Variances would be required for both lots if the road frontage was 200FT for each.

A recommendation was made to place a conservation easement on the area of the property that would remain farmed to ensure that it would continue to be farmed. Member Winkelman commented that the 200FT road frontage is more consistent for the area and seems to make the most sense, and inquired on the speed limit on the road. The speed limit on the road is 55mph; however, no new driveway cuts would be required as there is an existing driveway to the dwelling and the existing driveway easement. Mr. Brodsky commented that if the applicant desires to have 200FT of road frontage for each lot, then variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals would need to be obtained for both of the lots before obtaining subdivision approval from the Planning Board.

Counsel Molnar commented that Member Winkelman suggested a possible open space subdivision where the dimensional limitations could be adjusted by the Planning Board. It is a

different form of subdivision. If you are considering a conservation easement on the rear portion anyway, that would be one of the elements of an open space subdivision, and then the Board can address the subdivision application and reduce the dimensional requirements. The 200FT road frontage for both of the lots might become acceptable to the Board if the application is an open space subdivision. There might be additional rules that may apply. Mr. Brodsky stated that a conservation analysis would be required and a professional to work with you to get through the process.

Mr. Schmidt stated that this is a discussion now, as they did not know what they wanted to do once they found out that 300FT road frontage requirement. Mr. Brodsky stated that there are three options. You can go to the ZBA and request variances for the 200FT of road frontage and then get subdivision approval from the Planning Board; you could proposed a conforming subdivision and get subdivision approval from the Planning Board; or you could do an open space subdivision that is more flexible but more complex a process to get through. Member Kasper commented that any future house placement on the flag lot would place the dwelling behind the other dwelling and eat up some of the farmland. Mr. Camp commented that the open space subdivision would require a design professional that could cost the applicant more money.

Mr. Schmidt inquired if the open space subdivision had additional requirements. Counsel Molnar stated that the open space subdivision would require a conservation analysis on the back portion that would be dedicated so that it substantiates that it has value in conservation worth preserving. It would be preserved by way of a conservation easement and the dimensional limitations can be reduced. Member Winkelman commented that the conservation analysis does not have to be in any great detail as the property is pretty straightforward.

Mr. Schmidt inquired on how long the process could take. The process could take from three to four months realistically if variances are required or an open space subdivision was pursued.

Chairman Tucker returned to the Board.

**Amendment Request-Major Special Permit**

Applicant	Jim Nocek	Property:
	2318 Skillet Rd	2433 West Lake Rd
	Auburn, NY	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		<b>Tax Map #055.-03-13.2</b>

Present: Jim Nocek, Applicant

A site visit was conducted on April 16, 2016. Mr. Nocek stated that a major part of why they are proposing a modification to the winery building is to make the operation more efficient. The vertical tanks would be switched out to mobile horizontal tanks to be more efficient with wine handling. The other component that goes on in that particular area is storage and an overflow of customers during the year. During inclement weather a temporary bar is set up for tastings for the customers. Proposed is a mezzanine level with access stairs to provide better space utilization. The operation begins with harvest in October and finish bottling in April. The tasting season begins in May and runs through September. During overflow periods the storage tanks would be located under the mezzanine with customer on the mezzanine and in the center of the winery floor. The proposed mezzanine complies with NYS building and occupancy code for size. The door on the north side is a 16FT door and the inside the building is a regular man door.

Chairman Tucker confirmed that there is one access stairs to the mezzanine with customers being able to walk to the other side. Mr. Nocek stated that there is a utility room and a kitchen room for the employees located on the bottom on the east side that would stay. Member Winkelman inquired if there will be an increase in the number of people using the building and bathrooms with respect to the septic system. Member Kasper expressed his concern for the mezzanine providing space for larger parties and functions up there. Mr. Nocek stated that functions are using tents (with restroom trailer service) and that he is not looking to expand the breadth of the events. He continued stating that it is hard to manage over 150 people at an event. Member Kasper inquired on the building capacity for the existing building. Mr. Nocek stated that the fire code is up to 300 people. The SkanFest will be a different program and there will be restroom trailer service there.

Counsel Molnar stated that there were limitations set in the prior resolutions that limited the number of people(350) and parking(194) for SkanFest. Mr. Brodsky commented that the applicant is keeping the equipment in the space under the mezzanine that he used to have to move out, and now the equipment will be able to remain in the building. The same amount of floor space for customers that was used on the main floor will be used on the mezzanine above with the equipment storage staying in the building on the main floor. There will not be much of an increase in capacity in the building. Mr. Nocek stated that it will be used seasonally. Member Kasper inquired if sprinklers were required on the mezzanine. Mr. Nocek stated that based on the Codes Enforcement Officer’s calculations it was not necessary. Member Winkelman commented that the septic system should be alarmed and monitored to ensure that the system does not become over taxed during events. Mr. Nocek stated that there is an existing alarm and when they have parties of more than 125 people, they require restroom trailer service to be on the premises.

**WHEREAS**, a motion was made by Member Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman, the Planning Board adopted and ratified the prior SEQRA determination, last reviewed for the Application, which was a determination that the Application constituted an Type 1 with a negative declaration after review of the SEQRA forms submitted by the Applicant. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion, with Member Estes abstaining from the vote.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

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

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, upon a motion made by Member Scott Winkelman and seconded by Member Joseph Southern, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board hereby **APPROVES** the Current Amendment Application with the following conditions:

1. That except as modified hereby, the terms and conditions of the Major Special Permit, as heretofore amended, shall be strictly complied with; and

2. The drawings prepared by James Nocek, dated February 18, 2016 and Narrative dated April 17, 2016 be followed in all respects.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

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

**Informal Discussion-Site Plan Review**

Applicant     Pat Carberry  
                   Kelly Engle  
                   4302 Jordan Rd  
                   Skaneateles, NY

Property:  
 4331 Jordan Road  
 Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #024.-02-01.2**

Present: Pat Carberry & Kelly Engle , Applicants; David Mazzeo, Owner; Robert Eggleston & Janice Miller, Architects

A site visit was conducted on April 16, 2016. The 1989 map with the three existing commercial buildings, creek, the Skaneateles Shortline Railroad right-of-way, has been superimposed over a photo of the property. The survey is being prepared that will have more detail on coverage and setbacks. In addition, it will be presented at the next Planning Board meeting.

The historic property was the original location of the Sinclair Union Chair Factory, then owned by the Wikstroms, and now David Mazzeo. 4361 Jordan Road is a two-story stone office building. 4357 Jordan is a two-story office building with garage and storage. 4359 Jordan Road is a three-story stone building with a stone facade garage attached. The building has been used for storage and the applicants are proposing a change in use to an event center. The first floor space would be for groups up to 150 people with bathrooms and a catering kitchen. The second floor mezzanine would be for smaller groups open to below and the third floor would be used for offices and storage. A 600SF patio is proposed on the west side of the garage. The patio will be for passive use and will not be an entertainment venue.

The proposed use would be an event center for 10-150 people for celebrations, meetings, etc. Large events would occur on Friday and Saturday evenings, and Sunday afternoons, with small events throughout the week. Events would end by 11 pm on Fridays and Saturdays, and 10 pm the other days of the week. Most events would start after 5pm Monday through Friday and would not interfere with the office parking.

Parking for a 150-person event would require 42.5 parking spaces, and it is anticipated that the property would be able to support that number although this will be verified once the survey is completed. There will be no on-street parking. Most likely there will be smaller events that will have less cars. The existing security lights and any additional proposed lighting for the entrances and patio will be night sky compliant. The septic systems are being reviewed to determine the conditions and any needs the proposal would bring.

Although event center is not a listed use on the use table, the use could fall under service business which includes catering and business services, or recreational business which includes a business for compensation for recreational services including but not limited to places for public or private entertainment, which are both approved uses in the IRO district.

Member Kasper inquired what Frog Pond is classified as. Mr. Eggleston stated that Frog Pond is a bed and breakfast and he was unsure they had any other approvals beyond that. Member Kasper commented that wedding events are held there frequently. Member Estes commented that it is a beautiful old building. Ms. Miller commented that the applicants do not want to change the character of the building. Member Winkelman inquired if the property is subject to flooding and shown as a flood zone on the FEMA maps. Mr. Eggleston stated that historically it has never flooded beyond the driveway, but a little bit of the northwest corner of the driveway there have been sand bags placed, but have never had anything beyond that. Member Winkelman inquired if the Board could see the map. Mr. Eggleston stated that he thinks the zone is based on the bridge location. Mr. Camp commented that there will be new floodplain maps adopted in the next year or two. Member Estes inquired on the location of the single-family residences in the area. Mr. Eggleston indicated that there are some across Railroad Street, and also on Sheldon Road. A letter of support for the project was submitted that has been signed by a contiguous neighbor, neighbor across the street, and other neighbors in the community.

Member Estes inquired if the long white building has existing offices. Mr. Eggleston stated that the building currently has offices occupied and in use. Mr. Brodsky commented that rough floor plans of the entire site be submitted to the Board for a sense of the magnitude of the parking and use of the entire site. He continued stating that the applicant will have daytime use, which would be fine. Member Southern shared an old photo of the building when it was a chair factory. Ms. Miller commented that there used to be a connecting building between the two stone buildings.

Member Estes commented that the area would be great for an event center; however has a concern as it does not have a clear definition of use. Mr. Brodsky commented that it very common for use tables not to address every use specifically and it is reasonable for the Board to determine a use that fits closely to an existing use defined in the code. Member Estes stated she thinks the Board should do that and document it well. She continued that she does not think an event center easily fits a service business or recreational business. Counsel Molnar stated that if the Board is in doubt, then it could request an interpretation from the Zoning Board through the Codes Enforcement Office. Member Estes stated that she thinks it is a great use of the property. Mr. Eggleston stated that when you look at recreation business and public or private entertainment, a wedding party is entertainment. A band is there, there is dancing, I can think of a better way to entertain commented Mr. Eggleston. Mr. Brodsky stated that recreation is an excellent candidate and raised the issue to have the discussion.

Member Estes inquired if the capacity is limited to 150 people. Ms. Miller stated that it is dependent on the layout and the code. Member Estes stated that the event centers in Skaneateles all seem to stop at about 150 people. Mr. Eggleston stated that the code states 15SF per person, the space has to be sprinklers if over 100 people, and the available on-site and off-site parking is a consideration. Member Winkelman commented that the septic system could be a limiting factor. He also inquired on the OCDOH requirements for the septic system evaluation. Mr. Eggleston commented that Eric Buff will be preparing the documents. He continued stating that the proposal is not for a restaurant and the events would occur sporadically. Mr. Brodsky stated that the updated site plan including a full set of floor plans on the buildings would address many of the questions. Mr. Eggleston commented that he would like to do reverse engineering to

address the needs of the various uses. He continued saying that there were 4 employees for Mr. Mazzeo, 3 for Ms. Miller and 5 for himself, so a 2400SF building was being actively used by 6-7 people. If you calculate it out including visitors, you could have 45 parking spaces for 35 employees. He continued stating that this property has never seen this kind of volume. Mr. Brodsky stated that it should be calculated for documentation for the file. Ms. Miller commented that the long building has a number of garage spaces that are used for storage and not all offices.

Chairman Tucker commented that there are three entrances onto the property and inquired what entrance would be used for events. Ms. Miller stated that the entrance could be at the lower area, with parking diagonally, and exiting one way. There is additional parking available in front of the small stone building that is only one lane wide. Mr. Brodsky commented that the front of the small stone building is the beginning of the County road and the applicant should be mindful of that.

Mr. Eggleston requested that the Board make a determination on whether the event center could be classified as a recreational business- public or private entertainment. Mr. Brodsky commented that the term has been used very broadly as in the case of the Skaneateles Country Club, the Skaneateles Aerodrome, as the airport is not a specified use in the code. He continued that it is more of a place of assembly. Member Estes stated that they are providing a space and not actually providing entertainment, the people who would be renting the space would be bringing it. Mr. Brodsky commented that ideally there should be a better term, but this has worked in other situations. The other time we used something different was the conference center for Welch Allyn, which was tacked on to the whole operation as an accessory use, prior to the code change in 2012. The 2012 revision limits the interpretation of the uses. If the Board is uncomfortable with the definitions, then a code change could be pursued which would take time to pursue; if you feel it is a reasonable interpretation, then the code could be updated at a later date.

Mr. Eggleston stated that he is prepared to classify that the application falls under recreational business, and if the Board feels the same then the application could process with the site plan review next month when the survey would be available. Member Kasper suggested that the Board review the code more thoroughly before they make the decision. Ms. Miller commented that there are enough examples between Hobbit Hollow and Welch Allyn that demonstrate the classification. Mr. Eggleston stated that the applicant is asking for approval and there are other properties that are operating without approval. He continued stating that the purchase offer is contingent upon getting zoning approval for an event center, and as of August 1<sup>st</sup>, the contract disappears. Chairman Tucker stated that the application seems to fit under recreational business when you read the definition.

**WHEREFORE** a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Chairman Tucker to classify this application requested use as a recreational business after having read the definition, and Board analysis and discussion. The Board having been polled resulted in favor of said motion.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

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

**Discussion**

The Board discussed areas of the zoning and subdivision code that may need to be revised based on the last few years of applications. They include redevelopment, view sheds, horse stable versus riding academies, non-conformity section of the code, definitions, conservation analysis, to name a few. Also discussed was the need for legislation regarding solar and intent of districts. A possible Skaneateles based long form EAF, the pre-application process and roads was discussed as well.

**WHEREFORE** a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Southern 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