

TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
April 21, 2020

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

Chairman Southern opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Continued Review-Special Permit

Applicant:

Bruce & Patricia Texeira
17 Ridgeview Place
Mt. Sinai, NY 11766

Property:

2141 Terrace Lane South
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #057.-03-02.0

Present: Bruce & Patricia Texeira, Applicants; Bill Murphy, Space Architectural Studio;

Since the last time the application was in front of the board the site plan has been modified to include four rock weirs located in the proposed conservation easement, and the shed has been relocated further back from the front yard. Also included in the modifications is for the vestibule area having a cover over existing impermeable surface coverage. The existing topography is shown and the proposed conservation easement is to address 148-12G6a. The conservation is typically off premise and they are requesting a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals for the conservation easement to be located on the same lot that will be 2152.5 square feet.

They would built a two foot high rock weir at four locations in the existing drainage channel with fill areas upstream with soils that are more absorptive in nature to control road runoff. Some of the landscaping proposed for the area is burning bush, switch grass, creeping juniper to stabilize the bank, and varied perennials in the rock area.

The revised plans seen today were presented at the last Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. The updated grading plan reflects the four weirs to control the stormwater. They had contemplated bio-swales, which took up more area, and there would be more land disturbance. Mr. Camp inquired about the weir detail. Mr. Murphy stated that the weirs are shaped like a backwards C at the existing grade with the area trenched out in front of the C, 12 inches of gravel, and filter fabric to the back of it, soils, and then plants for the water to come through. Mr. Camp requested that the detail be provided on the plans. Mr. Camp suggested that the weirs have a lower point in the center so that the water can flow over the areas rather than creating an area for erosion on the edges of the weirs.

The application will have additional variances requested for 148-12G(6)(a). The code section reads "The use of mitigation measures that result in the permanent protection by conservation easement of 10 square feet of land in the same general area for each square foot of impervious surface coverage greater than the area required to bring the lot into compliance with applicable coverage limitations for conforming lots sufficient to offset any drainage or environmental

impact that might occur as a result of the lot exceeding the applicable coverage limitations. The determination as to the appropriate location of such protected land shall be made by the Planning Board in consultation with the Planning Board Engineer.” Counsel Molnar explained that this is an accepted alternative to paying directly into the DRA fund as outlined in subsection b of this section.

The applicant is requesting a variance from 148-12G(6)(a) to allow the location of the conservation easement on the same lot and for the conservation area to be less than 10 square feet to one square foot of impervious coverage. The proposal would be in lieu of contribution to the DRA fund or the protection of land in the general area. Chairman Southern commented that he does not see how this would protect what needs to be protected. Member Marshall said that at the site visit, the comment was made that instead of paying into the fund they were willing to do this improvement on site that they technically do not have to do. Chairman Southern inquired on the acreage and Member Hamlin said that it was 2100 square feet. Chairman Southern said that no one would build on it. Member Winkelman said that it is a problem area with severe washing down the street a couple of years ago. The applicant is trying to do their part to solve a bigger problem. It might be more effective to do something on site to solve a bigger problem.

Mr. Camp clarified that what has been drawn is a great benefit to the overall lake watershed; however, during a severe event the proposed weirs will not slow the water down. Mr. Murphy said the severe event is a hundred year storm and the proposal will assist in most storm situations. This would prevent a great deal of runoff from entering the lake in the normal storms. Currently the drainage ditch allows water from very large uphill area to run roughshod into the lake. These types of structures are similar to what the Country Club proposed, to create these check dams to slow down and filter the nutrients. They are trying to put in an infrastructure that will benefit the total watershed. Mr. Camp said that Member Winkelman was drawing a parallel to a problem further down the lake and that the proposal will not help that problem.

Chairman Southern commented that the proposal is a good small scale stormwater prevention plan and continued saying that the purpose of the conservation easement on the land is to prevent further construction of homes and to prevent contamination of the lake. Chairman Southern continued saying that the proposal does not meet the requirements of the section. Counsel Molnar stated that it is not 10 to 1. Chairman Southern stated that it is not 10 to 1 as needed for the amount of land that needs to be conserved. Member Kasper said that the cost to construct the proposal would probably be more than the fund. Mr. Murphy said that the cost is very similar, and that the applicants are moving here and hopes to join the SLA. The contribution to the DRA fund is \$1.09 per square foot. Mr. Brodsky commented that the proposal has additional variances being requested that were not requested previously. He continued saying that the board could debate the proposed mitigation measures as improvements to the site with a potential for the board to consider giving credit for a portion of the impermeable surface coverage on the lot. He expressed his concern with attacking the code section with the 10 to 1 ratio. Mr. Murphy said that the proposed drainage structure could offset the entire impermeable surface coverage. He continued saying that this is the right thing to do for the lake, and if all of the properties would take an approach like the proposed. Mr. Brodsky commented that he agreed that it would improve the lake but commented that there are no measures on how much it may offset in impervious coverage. There needs to be a calculation of the water quality value and how it translates into how much impermeable surface coverage the proposal may manage.

Chairman Southern stated that the proposal feels like an end run around contribution to the fund whose purpose is to reduce density in the lake watershed. He continued saying that what is being proposed is akin to the small-scale stormwater management system. Member Marshall said that the proposal came from the discussion at the site visit to problem solve the drainage issues. Mr. Brodsky said that the proposal brings to issue how to protect the structures and how the proposal could be addressed as a

mitigation measure while still fitting into the code. Member Hamlin commented that the small-scale stormwater management guidelines developed by Mr. Camp have the way to calculate the impermeable surface coverage and inquired if the calculation had been applied to the proposal. Mr. Camp commented that he has not seen any calculations. Member Kasper expressed his concern with the maintenance of the structures in the event of a large storm damaging the weirs. Chairman Southern reiterated that with a conservation easement that protects the full amount of land required, the proposal excludes the human impact on the land and lake, and the installation of these weirs on the existing property does not provide the same benefit. Counsel Molnar stated that the code is plain in its statement of the requirements and the applicant will need to obtain variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals for it to be located on the same parcel and for a reduction in size of the conservation easement. The Zoning Board of Appeals cannot do that without Planning Board approving the location and amount of land to be preserved. The variance would not waive the approval of this by the board. Mr. Camp commented that approval of the size and location of the conservation easement would not protect any additional land. Member Kasper said that it would protect the lake.

Chairman Southern stated that other properties are protecting the lake with their small-scale stormwater systems and without any quid pro quo. Member Marshall commented that they are not required to install the stormwater system. Mr. Brodsky commented that the board could require mitigation measures to assist with the stormwater issues on the property. Mr. Murphy reiterated that the application is for a deck and small shed. Chairman Southern said that the same would be true for anyone else in the watershed. He continued saying that what is permitted on this property would need to be applied on future similar applications in the watershed, and that there are no provisions to allow that, as people have wanted that for driveways for years. Counsel Molnar stated that the Planning Board has clearly stated their opinion and there is no further action the board needs to do. It is up to the applicant to determine whether to re-design or adapt the project to meet the code. Mr. Murphy inquired what the board would consider appropriate. Chairman Southern commented that it would be through meeting the code whether it is acquiring a conservation easement on land to offset the impervious coverage or contributing to the DRA fund. Member Marshall inquired that if they pay into the DRA fund would they need to construct the stormwater system. Chairman Southern said that the application would still be reviewed for stormwater improvements.

Member Marshall inquired what the recommendation would be for a stormwater system for the lot. Mr. Camp commented that he has not seen the calculations but if they would prove out, the proposed stormwater system seems like it would be appropriate. The calculation of the volume of water that would need to be retained is determined by the coverage, size of lot, etc.; the proposed system may be oversized.

Counsel Molnar stated that this recommendation is going to land on the Zoning Board of Appeals desk, as an amended variance request is impossible to consider. The applicant will need to redesign the project to meet the code. Member Winkelman said that the stormwater systems are good but he does like the simplicity of contributing to the DRA fund and buying property elsewhere. Mr. Murphy said that it is an expensive project to build the deck and the stormwater system and pay into the fund. He continued saying that they will go back and update a plan that meets the code more stringently.

Sketch Plan- Site Plan Review

Applicant:

Michael Shende
5197 Point East Dr
Jamesville, NY 13078

Property:

2346 Thorton Grove North
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #056.-03-16.2

Present: Tom Trytek, TDK Engineering Associates;

The property has had a history for shoreline improvements requests including sixteen years ago, an approval for shoreline improvements of large boulder rocks at the toe of the embankment by the lake. The embankment itself is eighteen feet high, and densely vegetated with the exception of the shoreline area. The project had gone through several approvals and iterations over the years and in 2012, a two-foot tall timber wall system was constructed. This wall has now failed and proposed is a three to four foot high steel pile wall system that will be placed in front of the existing wall. Steel piles will be set into the exposed bedrock and grouted, then the steel sheet walls are welded to the set beams. The wall will be backfilled and there will be riprap placed in front of the wall for wave attenuation. The NYSDEC has commented back on the proposed wall and in response, the timber will be removed is certain locations and replaced with the steel pile wall. In doing so, a portion of the wall will be located outside of the mean high water mark. The wall is approximately 205 feet in length. The proposal is for the seawall with no other improvements proposed. Construction will be done from the lake rather than from the land side and the construction of the wall would occur in twenty-foot sections at a time. Revised drawings will be prepared and submitted once there is a final agreement and approval from the NYSDEC.

Member Kasper inquired if the lake bottom was composed of shale and Mr. Trytek stated that it is mostly shale. Member Kasper inquired about the composition of the steel. Mr. Trytek commented that it is plain steel that will rust which will produce almost a protective coating to the steel and not bleed out into the lake. The wall once rusted will blend in with the surroundings. Mr. Camp said that with the steep bank, there are not a lot of solutions that would stay put, but the proposal is one that would. He continued saying that many bridges being built now is constructed with steel that is allowed to rust. Mr. Brodsky inquired out the construction of the wall itself. Mr. Trytek stated that it will be constructed similarly to a fence with a post, cross beams and then the steel sheeting attached to the cross beams. Mr. Trytek said that he will be overseeing the project and can provide reports to the Town and City of Syracuse if desired.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Marshall to schedule a public hearing on *Tuesday, May 12, 2020 at 6:40 p.m.* The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

As the May 19, 2020 Planning Board meeting was re-scheduled to May 12, 2020, the public hearing for WV Properties One LLC was rescheduled for May 12, 2020.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Marshall and seconded by Member Kasper to schedule a public hearing on *Tuesday, May 19, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.* The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Sketch Plan-Major Special Permit

Applicant: James Tracy
2833 Shamrock Rd
Skaneateles, New York 13152
Tax Map #036.-02-02.0

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

Jim Tracy had received a special permit in 2011 for the construction service business on the mixed-use lot. A lot line relocation was approved last month in anticipation of this application. The proposal is for a 10,500 square foot building for storage of his construction equipment. A variance request with the Zoning Board of Appeals is pending for the project, which is similar to the Brillo expansion approved a few years ago.

They had looked at other options other than granting an area variance with the consideration of a three-lot subdivision where the applicant would be allowed to have two additional 6,000 square foot buildings on each of the two newly created lots; however, this would not be the best use of the land as it is actively farmed. The proposed location of the building is conforming to setbacks and would allow the rest of the lot to the north to continue to be farmed. Two bio-swales have been proposed that run under the eaves of the proposed building. Member Kasper inquired if the barn is just for storage and Mr. Eggleston stated that it would be for storage of equipment as he already has an office in the existing barn. The building will be in character of the area as it is similar in style to barns in the area.

Member Winkelman stated that he likes the barn style and keeping the farming active. He inquired if the berm with trees and trees along the road are existing and Mr. Eggleston stated that the berm and all of the trees are in place already, which creates a shield the view of the commercial end of property. Member Hamlin inquired if power would be in the barn and Mr. Eggleston stated that it would have power and motion sensor lighting outdoors. Member Kasper inquired if the driveway is already in place and inquired if he would be backing into the barn from the road. Mr. Eggleston stated that the owner has a tractor-trailer that he uses to move some of his equipment and the driveway is wide enough to accommodate the back into the barn. Chairman Southern inquired if there is a driveway by the existing donkey barn. Mr. Eggleston stated that the proposed barn has a door at each end for access to the equipment stored inside of the proposed building. The door will connect to the existing gravel drive. Mr. Brodsky inquired if there is any long-term protection for the farm space on the lot. Mr. Eggleston stated that as the proposal will increase the impermeable surface coverage to 9.9%, it controls development as the lot is allowed a maximum 10% impermeable coverage.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman to schedule a public hearing on ***Tuesday, May 26, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.*** The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Sketch Plan- Site Plan Review

Applicant:

Jacalyn Falter
1644 Chinaberry Way
Naples, FL 34101

Property:

3101 East Lake Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #039.-01-01.0

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects;

The applicant's lot is the former Barrett property that has an existing lake access easement for the Byrnes. The existing property has 12.1% impermeable surface coverage with an existing dwelling. Proposed is the removal of the existing dwelling and deck and construction of a deck and house located further than 100 feet from the lake. The new septic system will be located more than 300 feet from the lake. Two bio swales are proposed for the lot to control stormwater. The swale along the north property will pick up the driveway water and any other water coming onto the property. The south bio swale will collect the stormwater from the dwelling. The roof gutters will collect into the drain around the perimeter of the building, which will be daylighted to the swale. An underdrain collects the water after treatment that delivers it to the shoreline along the steps into the lake. The Onondaga County Planning Board had requested modifications to the application to ensure that the applicant receives approvals from the City of Syracuse Department of Water, OCDOH, and NYSDOT in their resolution dated March 18, 2020.

Mr. Camp inquired about the catch basin to the south and Mr. Eggleston confirmed that it is a proposed improvement, which is tied into the bio swales. Mr. Camp inquired on the size of the pipes and Mr.

Eggleston responded that they would be six-inch pipes that drain around the southwest corner of the swale. He continued saying that some of the stormwater could be directed to the north bio swale and Mr. Camp agreed. Mr. Eggleston noted that there are two patriarch trees in the lake yard that will remain.

Member Hamlin inquired where the porch stairs lead and Mr. Eggleston said that they come out to the lawn. There are two levels to the porch as the proposed dwelling is a single story with walk out basement style dwelling. The proposal requires no variances and the proposed impermeable surface coverage would be 9.9%. It was determined that the board will do independent site visits and continue the application next month.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman to continue the application on ***Tuesday, May 12, 2020***. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Sketch Plan- Major Subdivision

Applicant	Chris Graham	Property:
	4302 Jordan Rd	County Line Rd
	Skaneateles, NY 13152	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		Tax Map #018.-02-29.1

Present: Chris Graham, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

The property is located in the Hamlet district off County Line Road between Phillips Street and Visions Drive. Using the Hamlet design guidelines to develop two streets coming perpendicular to County Line Road (Streets A and B) in with a connector street parallel to County Line Road (Street C). There will be 34 proposed lots and no lots will have access off County Line Road directly. Lots 21, 22, 23 will have a shared driveway from street C to the south and lots 32 and 33 share a driveway off the north.

Based on the existing contours of the property, the area between lots 4 and 5 will be a stormwater management facility B and between lots, 12 and 13 will be stormwater management facility A, which is to the south and closer to Lauder Lane. There is a hammerhead end to street C that ends at this facility. Streets A, and C have hammerheads that are sized for fire equipment turnaround. The Town of Sennett highway department submitted a letter approving the curb cut locations. Once the streets are out of the County Line Road right of way, the town highway department has jurisdiction, and Mr. Wellington requested that the hammerheads be enlarged between lots 6 and 7 and they will be enlarged between lots 12 and 13. An updated site plan will be provided.

They are looking for the board's nod that the board is satisfied with the sketch plan, which would allow the engineering and grading plans to be developed. Lots 33 and 32 would be flag lots with each lot owning half of the driveway. Lot 22 would own a 30-foot flagpole strip of land and access easements provided for lots 21 and 23. Mr. Camp commented that when residents wanted swimming pools in Butter Farm, the lot size become somewhat of an issue and suggested that the board make a statement regarding lot size. Mr. Eggleston said that it could be examined when the septic plans are designed. The challenge at Butters Farm is that the lots had raised mound and larger systems and this lot has had very good perc tests. The intent of this subdivision is smaller homes at 2,000 square feet and not the 3,000 to 4,000 square foot Butters Farm homes. Mr. Brodsky inquired on whether lots 1 and 19 should be larger sized lots to provide more buffers from County Line Road. Mr. Eggleston said that it could be considered. He continued saying lots 5 and 4 might change their shape dependent on the stormwater management facility needs. Mr. Brodsky asked if there has been any consideration of townhomes for the lots with the shared driveway. Mr. Eggleston commented that they have given it consideration that lots 21, 22 and 23 could be

townhomes or apartments, and they are trying to determine what the right mixture would be for dwellings. Member Hamlin agreed that they would be appropriate for the area. Member Kasper commented that the townhouses are more in keeping with the hamlet design. Mr. Brodsky suggested that elimination of the shared driveways would make for a cleaner design as well.

Member Hamlin inquired where the stormwater would be directed, as there are existing dwellings along Phillips Road. Mr. Eggleston explained that the existing water goes across the fifth undeveloped lot down on Philips Road. He continued saying that the requirements for development is to improve or maintain the existing drainage conditions of a lot post development and it would be up to the lot owners to resolve any drainage issues they may have.

Mr. Camp inquired if they have considered the road specifications and drainage for the roads. Mr. Eggleston that they would follow the town specifications, and they have had a conversation with Mr. Wellington regarding drainage. Mr. Wellington is not opposed to a concrete gutter as the gutters work better with the plows than the curbs. Mr. Eggleston stated what they would develop the streets with the use of concrete gutters and the drainage systems that goes along with it.

Mr. Graham commented that there is a 30-foot drainage easement along the north side of the property that drains to the Welch Allyn property that could be a good solution. Mr. Camp inquired on its proximity to the stream on the Welch Allyn property and Mr. Graham believes it is close although he does not have a definitive answer today. Mr. Eggleston stated that there would be drainage easements on the north, south and east property lines for handling stormwater. The ;stormwater plans are in process by the engineer and they are waiting with the board's opinion of the sketch plan.

Member Marshall stated that she likes the grid plan and inquired about the appropriateness of sidewalks. Mr. Eggleston said that there was talk of sidewalks and they will be considered while bearing in mind trying to keep infrastructure costs down. Member Winkelman commented that it would be nice if the sidewalks connected with the hamlet Mr. Eggleston said that they are looking to have a direct path that would connect to the Lauder Lane development path. Lot A would be the logical connection to the Welch Allyn and DeMarco properties, with the DeMarco property the most logical connection. There are no sidewalks on Phillips Road. The connection to Visions Drive would be a valuable connection for walking. Member Kasper commented that there was supposed to be a connection with the Lauder Lane development.

Chairman Southern inquired if there is any consideration for commercial activity. Mr. Eggleston stated that there is a lot to the south of this lot, and the owner was thinking of some hamlet type commercial activity. The board has no stated objection to the sketch plan presented.

Public Hearing Continuance- Special Permit

Applicant	Woodbine Group	Property:
	505E Fayette St #100	1046 Old Seneca Tpke
	Syracuse, NY 13202	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		Tax Map #028.-01-03.0

Present: Tom Fernandez, Woodbine Group; Brian Bouchard, CHA Consulting; Mike Lasell, MBL Engineering; Norm Swanson, Woodbine Group; Wayne LaFrance, Lake Architectural
OCDOT has approved the driveway cut after receiving an additional traffic study. They looked at three different driveways and had met with Ed Frank, Guy Donahoe, and Bob Eggleston. Consideration was given to the alternative alignment of the driveway and it was determined that it was not viable as it bisects the field and would require greater excavation for the drive (some areas upwards of twenty feet).

The hill does drain towards the property on Mottville Road and with the central driveway option, that does not improve runoff, and there would be future development area next to the neighbors. The originally proposed driveway provides a 100-foot hedgerow and there would be a line of evergreen trees. This placement would allow an undisturbed buffer between the drive and the neighbors. The driveway will also be set down from the existing grade that would capture the noise and light from vehicles. The drainage will be captured in the proposed roadside ditch, which will improve the drainage flowing to the neighbors.

Member Winkelman inquired if Mr. Frank and Ms. Eberle are in approval of the driveway location. Mr. Bouchard stated that they had addressed the driveway options with Mr. Frank and they had discussed the location of the septic. The proposed septic fields are located on a hill and the fact that there is a significant amount of drainage going down the hill that they will be capturing in the stormwater facility, the drainage coming down the hill towards the residences will be decreased. He continued saying that based on the conversation at the meeting and comments that were made, Mr. Frank was satisfied from the meeting.

Lake Architectural developed three-dimensional drawings of the appearance of the proposed hotel with landscaping. Stone base on the building with post and beam construction details under a shingled roof, and modifications to the fenestration provide a rural feel to the proposed building. The shape and functionality of the building is addressed in an H shape to break up the layout with a covered walkway into the courtyard entrance. The rear of the building has a recessed area for the deck and patio. The inside of the building provides a quieter setting for the individual units, with the louder areas in the center.

SEQR has been completed and a summary resolution was prepared. Counsel Molnar recommended that the board review the summary resolution for accuracy of the discussion and then approve the resolution. Member Kasper commented that he would like to ask some questions on the building before addressing the resolution.

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

Bob Eggleston, appreciated the Woodbine Group on taking the extra effort for a meeting and responding to the public comments. Looking at the driveway options he can live with the driveway proposed that offers visual and drainage benefits. The visual appearance of the building has been improved and is an appropriate building for the gateway to the village and Mottville. The improvements to the parking with the addition of landscaping while still providing ease of snow plowing is appreciated. The town can be proud of the improvements proposed by the Woodbine Group.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Member Hamlin to close the public hearing, as there are no additional comments. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Chairman Southern commented that the board will now have 62 days to make their decision on the project and extended the written public comment period for an additional ten days. Member Kasper inquired about the snow plowing and the perimeter of the parking lot. Mr. Bouchard said that they looked at the backside of the curb through the swale provided and the grading beyond it, and determined that there is upwards of 25 feet from the edge of the pavement and where they would be capturing the runoff. Mr. Lasell stated that the key thing is to push the snow removal to the lower parking lot area. It could be pushed even further south. There is 25 feet in the dry swale that should be able to support snow removal

and drainage. There is a high point of 35 feet from the edge of the parking to the top of the swale to hold the snow.

Mr. Brodsky inquired about the plantings around the driveway with native species. Mr. Bouchard stated that there are evergreens along the driveway, white spruce and smaller perennials and shrubs. Member Winkelman recommended that the Norway spruce trees should be changed out to a native species Mr. Bouchard said the red maples are proposed to line the driveway. Member Winkelman commented that the planting plans depicted in the design are nice. Member Marshall commented that there is no walking connection to Mottville Road. Mr. Bouchard stated that they would take a walking path to Mottville Road but that they cannot oblige Hill Rom to allow access to their walking train. Connection to Old Seneca Turnpike has not been discussed as they have been discussing a farm to table use of the fields. If there would be a walking path to the fields, it would not connect to Old Seneca Turnpike. Member Kasper commented that it is a long distance to Old Seneca Turnpike and that there is nothing to go to on Old Seneca Turnpike. Mr. Bouchard stated that the guests would be able to walk around the hotel.

Mr. Brodsky inquired about drainage in the pre-contact area. Mr. Lasell stated that the area would not take runoff from the hotel, as stormwater will be captured with roof drains. The parking lot is graded to drain southwest and should not affect that area. The area will be protected during construction. They do not want any gullying, there so they have directed the water away from the area. Member Hamlin commented that meeting with the neighbors to advance the project, should be commended. He inquired if the town engineer approves of the drainage plans and what the restaurant hours would be. Mr. Camp stated that he had reviewed the plans and found them acceptable. Mr. Bouchard Hernandez stated the restaurant hours would be for three meal periods probably 7 am to 10 or 11 pm. It will be a destination restaurant open to the public. Member Winkelman commented that the woods should be protected between the neighbors and the parking lot. Mr. Bouchard stated that the corner of the land to the west of the driveway entrance will return to a natural state over time and that the 300 feet of woods will be untouched.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman to continue the application on May 12, 2020 with a 10 day written comment period. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Counsel Molnar recommended that the board review the summary SEQR resolution. Member Winkelman said that it is very organized and well written. The board agreed with Member Winkelman.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Marshall to accept the SEQR summary resolution. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Member Winkelman stated that the Skaneateles Country Club project for the pump house has been completed. The Dowling Creek project has been postponed.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Hamlin to adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Barkdull, Clerk