

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
May 17, 2016**

Mark J. Tucker, Chairman
Joseph Southern
Elizabeth Estes- absent
Donald Kasper –arrived 7:45 pm
Scott Winkelman
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel
John Camp, P.E. (C&S Engineers)
Howard Brodsky, Town Planner
Karen Barkdull, Clerk/Secretary

Chairman Tucker opened the meeting at 7:30 p.m. The meeting minutes of April 19, 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 Winkelman 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	[Absent]
Member	Scott Winkelman	[Yes]
Member	Elizabeth Estes	[Absent]

Sketch Plan-Lot Line Adjustment

Applicant: Geoffrey Pitman
4476 Vinegar Hill Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Property:
4476/4472 Vinegar Hill Road
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Tax Map #023.-03-16.2 & 023.-03-16.1

Present: Geoffrey Pitman, Applicant

The applicant's property was established in 2005 when the two acre lot was created and a variance was granted for less than the required road frontage. The applicant is proposing the expansion of the lot from 2 acres to 5 acres, and reducing the lot to the south from 10 acres to 7 acres. The proposed new lot lines would not alter the road frontage and allow the new lots to be rectangular in shape. The application is awaiting Onondaga County Planning Board review and will be continued until next month.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Southern to continue the review on *Tuesday, June 21, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.* The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Continued Review-Special Permit/Site Plan Review

Applicant: Mark Congel / 5 Fires LLC
3395 East Lake Road
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #041.-01-21.0

Present: Wayne LaFrance, Architect; John Langey, Attorney

The applicant is requesting to remove the existing garage located 4 inches from the north property line and relocate a new attached two story garage that is 799SF and located 12’9” from the north property line. The second floor of the proposed garage would be for the expansion of the master bedroom. The proposed garage is 200SF+/- larger than the existing garage to accommodate the larger vehicles, with the impermeable surface coverage maintained at 13.5%. The Zoning Board of Appeals granted the variance for the garage and driveway setbacks of 12’9” to the rear property line on May 3, 2016.

There were neighbor concerns expressed regarding a potential water line located on the property that provides water to several of the neighbors. Mr. Brillo has confirmed that the existing water line on fire lane I and fire lane H do not cross the applicant’s property, and there are no deed easements on the applicant’s property.

The profile of the addition to the dwelling is set at a lower elevation from the main house and the applicant could have built the addition and over the existing family room to the maximum height allowed, potentially blocking views of the lake. The applicant has tried to keep the elevations low.

Grading will be done at the high point of 909FT elevation to direct stormwater along the east side of the driveway swale that will turn at the northern corner and daylight onto the lawn. The temporary disturbance will be minimal, all stormwater controls will be in place, and the proposal will move cars and impermeable surface further from the lake.

Member Winkelman commented that there was a huge amount of driveway to begin with and that the proposed plan still shows a lot of driveway. Member Southern inquired on the location of six parking areas off the fire lane. Mr. LaFrance commented that there are four parking spaces in the prior western driveway cut and two spaces located off of the eastern driveway cut on part of the existing gravel drive. The majority of the existing circular driveway loop in the front of the dwelling is being removed and the driveway relocated to the rear of the dwelling. A section of the curved gravel drive on the southern portion of the dwelling is being removed. Member Southern suggested the removal of the four parking spaces and removal of the front driveway to reduce the impermeable surface coverage.

Chairman Tucker inquired on the purpose of the paved area behind the dwelling. Mr. LaFrance stated that it is an apron to the garage, and with the number of cars in the family it is needed. Chairman Tucker commented that there are six parking spaces indicated on the site plan already. Member Southern commented that there is a lot of area of impermeable surface coverage that could be removed. Mr. LaFrance stated that the applicant has five girls of which three are driving and two more to come, the applicant and his wife also own two SUVs.

Chairman Tucker stated that the Board will need to do a site visit and there may be additional areas of impervious surface that can be reduced. He continued stating the John Camp may want a cross section of how the driveway will be put in working with the elevations. Mr. Camp inquired if a topo map has been completed. Mr. LaFrance stated that a preliminary draft has been completed and presented it to Mr. Camp.

Member Southern inquire if the area around the proposed two eastern parking spaces is paved. Mr. LaFrance stated that it is existing gravel and only a portion of it will be removed. Member Southern commented that there is too much impermeable surface coverage and the four parking spaces and additional two parking spaces are excessive. He suggested that the applicant look for modifications to bring the coverage down.

Member Southern suggested that as the drawings are new to the Planning Board, it should be considered a new project and subject to the new redevelopment fees. Counsel Molnar stated that it is redevelopment in terms of the applicant changing driveways and other structures whether it is based on the preliminary application two months ago or the plans discussed today, which were approved by the ZBA at their last meeting. As it meets the definition of redevelopment, it follows under the special permit guidelines including a public hearing. The ZBA approved the variances on May 3, 2016, with the Town adopting the new figure for payment into the DRAF fund of \$1.09 per square foot on May 5, 2016, even though it was under consideration by the Town Board for months. As the ZBA approved the variances prior to the adoption of the new rate, the application vests in terms of obtaining a prerequisite to obtaining Planning Board approval. Member Southern commented that the property still could reduce the impermeable surface coverage by removing the parking areas and lining up the cars in the driveway as most people do. Chairman Tucker commented that the site visit will provide the opportunity to look for areas of reduction of impervious surface.

Member Winkelman inquire on the elevation of the new garage and upstairs as it seem to not align with the existing dwelling. Mr. LaFrance stated that it is intentionally split with the master bedroom a half story up from the main level of the existing dwelling and the garage is a half a story below the main level of the existing dwelling. The applicant is attempting to have a lower elevation to minimize the height of the addition. Mr. Langey commented that if the applicant had wanted to raise the roof of the center of the dwelling to 35FT without any additional approvals; however, the applicant does not wish to do that.

Mr. Langey stated that in terms of impermeable surface coverage, he assumes that there will be a dialog between the applicant and the Board. Member Winkelman commented that from the beginning, the Board stated that impermeable surface coverage was going to be an issue, even back when the applicant was proposing shoreline structure modifications. He continued stating that to get no improvement in impervious surface is disappointing as it is a large lot. He continued stating that it is commendable that the applicant is keeping the old house and not demolishing it and putting up a new dwelling.

Mr. Langey stated that in terms of the policy in reduction in impermeable surface coverage, what has been presented is a plan that maintains the existing coverage so no variance is required. I presume that the regulations are in place to protect the runoff and encourage drainage prior to water entering the lake. By removing some of the driveway in the front of the dwelling we are proposing a better situation for drainage on the site. In terms of reduction I hope that the Board will take into consideration that the applicant is doing everything he can to preserve the lake with these site features that he has agreed to do.

Mr. Brodsky commented that the zoning code calls for a reduction in impervious surface to the maximum extent feasible. That clarifies the difference of holding the line as the application has presented and making reasonable improvements. The latest plan has a patio that appears to be impervious and an addition to the plan since the prior plan.

Mr. LaFrance commented that the main difference between the two plans is the orientation of the driveway, garage and the addition of the patio. The footprint itself of the main structure, and the stacked garage addition with the bedroom above the garage remains the same as the prior submittal.

Mr. Camp inquired if the septic system will need to be reworked since a bedroom is being added. Mr. LaFrance stated that OCDOH had no issues with the relocated bedroom in their correspondence dated March 11, 2016.

Member Winkelman commented that there have been letters received from the neighbors concerning the massing of the garage; however, this has been addresses already as the existing structure and addition could be built higher but have chosen to sink the garage a half a story. He inquired about the potential for headlights from the vehicles impacting the neighbor to the east. Mr. LaFrance commented that there is a hedgerow that was put in between the lots and the driveway configuration proposed is similar to the neighbors. They both pull in the same lane and to the west of his house.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Winkelman to schedule a site visit on June 11, 2016 beginning at 9 am. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Kasper to schedule a public hearing, on ***Tuesday, June 21, 2016 at 7:45 p.m.*** The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Continued Review –Site Plan Review

Applicant	Theodore & Nancy Norman	Property:
	8665 Duarte Road	1992 West Lake Road
	San Gabriel, CA 91775	Skaneateles, NY 13152

Tax Map #058.-01-17.2

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

Mr. Eggleston stated that a new site plan dated May 4, 2016 was submitted that is based on the comments made at the April 30, 2016 site visit. One of the questions was whether we could pull the proposed dwelling further from the watercourse. We have rearranged the plan and put an angle to the building and it does a number of things. It gives it more a three dimensional view from the street, and it is not as broad to the street. The original building was 54FT off of the watercourse, and proposed is 65FT. We have pushed it 10FT further back from the watercourse, but we have kept in that red existing building footprint and that is what we were originally told we could work with when we met with the planning office, and that is what our whole design was based on. Some of the change in the plan is the floor area has been decrease by 646SF, and the footprint is 247SF smaller. The area within the red zone, the existing building footprint is now 1010SF smaller and the floor area is reduced by 1500SF from what the existing building footprint is versus what we are proposing to build back in the footprint. We have done some substantial reductions in that area. The building is 88FT back from the road with 75FT required. We are maintaining 32FT from the north property line where 30FT is the minimum required.

Mr. Eggleston continued stating that one of things pointed out in the site visit is the character. The character of all of West Lake Road is that you get a glimpse of the lake through the buildings. Right now there is a glimpse between the house and the garage, and once we do this project, we will open up where the garage was on the north property line, you will be given a glimpse of the lake. We are also increasing the southern glimpse where the hedgerow is, we are widening that glimpse of the lake. I think that other thing that we noted is that the neighborhood is made up of big houses and small houses next to each other. This is not the biggest house in the neighborhood and of course it is not the smallest house, possibly the dwelling on the adjacent property immediately south of this property is the smallest.

Mr. Eggleston stated that he has gone through the three criteria that the Board thought was the most important as it relates to and ties in to traditional village and hamlet. I have added to it the village and hamlet neighborhoods in Skaneateles that are a mixture of large and small houses next to each other developed over different time periods. The angle of the house from the road will offer better presentation of the front door to the approach. Most people come down from the north and you will be able to see the front door better in that regard. It will also reduce its appearance because you will be looking at it at an angle instead of flat on. We have lowered the height of the building from what it was originally. The second criteria relative to structures visible from the public road and Skaneateles Lake should be compatible with each other and traditional structures in the surrounding area in architecture, design, massing, materials and placement. I have added to that the house's architectural qualities are consistent with the neighboring properties that have been redeveloped in recent years, and the height of the house above the road has been reduced, pushing it back and all. The appropriate setbacks shall maintain and continue the existing setback pattern of the surrounding neighborhood. I have added to that response that all the front, side and lake yard setbacks conform with the proposed house as well as the impermeable surface coverage. Many of the neighboring properties have nonconforming side yards setbacks or lake yard setbacks. The watercourse setback is 65FT which is 10.5FT greater than the existing house. The distance stormwater travels to the watercourse is greater as the water travels to reach the watercourse is greater than 100FT, which is the required setback. It travels across well-maintained grass lawn as well as being enhanced by water gardens before passing into the watercourse. Unlike many watercourses that feed into the lake, this watercourse

has had significant improvements made by the applicant to control the erosion along the bank to control the sediment that flows into the property from upland sources. That should be taken into account as part of the mitigating factors relative to this application.

Mr. Eggleston continued stating that another significant character of the neighborhood is that there are glimpses of the lake that I have mentioned earlier between the houses along West Lake Road. While the area in between the existing house and garage will be filled in, the 30FT area to the north end of the house will be opened up, and the area south of the house will be 10FT better which offers a nice view of the lake over the lawn and the watercourse. We have given you this information back on May 5, 2016 so that you have had time to look at and contemplate your response.

Member Winkelman inquire on how the height has been lowered.

Mr. Eggleston stated that we have lowered the height because we pushed it back, the finished floor level is down. We have also lowered the pitch on the front so it is lower. It is well under the conforming 35FT.

Member Winkelman commented that it gets to the massing thing with the dwelling being so close to the road relative to the other big houses.

Mr. Eggleston commented that he did know how important it is. It will be seen at an angle three dimensionally.

Member Winkelman commented that the road is the west elevation.

Mr. Eggleston commented that instead of looking straight on, you are looking at it kind of towards the south, southwest.

Member Winkelman inquired that by sliding it a little closer to the lake you think you gained a foot elevation.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the dwelling has dropped a foot, the peak another foot or two. Again, just trying to keep it down and maintain the character of the house. I know the Cappuccili's older home was quite a large house close to the road, of course, it has lots of trees in front of that. I am not sure who owns it now, it is down a little further, its creamy, yellow color.

Member Winkelman inquired how much lower it is with the two changes.

Mr. Eggleston stated that it is probably two to three feet lower.

Member Kasper inquired if the first floor elevation is lower than the road elevation.

Mr. Eggleston stated that they had it higher before and now its about the same or slightly less. What we have to do is enhance the swale between the house and the road.

Chairman Tucker commented that the open space went from 83% down to 78.9%.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the open space for the entire subdivision will be maintained at 94.7%. When you are allowed 20% impermeable coverage because we have the open space reserved on

the conservation lot, obviously the individual lot open space can creep down, and the overall open space is 94.7%,

Mr. Brodsky commented that the drainage strategy was a sheet flow from the house to the lake. The stormwater from lot 1 goes across lot 2 and then back over to lot 1. You are relying on lot 2 for your drainage strategy. He inquired if you have to maintain that or protect that for the long term. Right now the applicant owns both lots.

Mr. Eggleston stated that that is correct. We have roof gutters that drain into the rain gardens to the south on lot 2 and then we have rain gardens to the east on lot 1 feeding into the larger rain garden located near the north property line behind the parking area for lot 2. Your point is that rain gardens in this area may need some sort of protection.

Mr. Brodsky commented that not just the rain gardens but the topography itself will need to be protected and maintained.

Mr. Eggleston stated that right now there is a drainage easement along the property that was given to the Town. We could put some language, this is John's area of expertise, that would protect. I understand that the Normans right now own both but they are individual lots that could be separate, and we are relying on that. We could put language in to protect the grading in this quadrant to the south of the proposed dwelling from not being altered.

Mr. Langey stated that it could be specific to the design presented and in perpetuity.

Mr. Brodsky commented that it should also include the long term maintenance of the rain gardens and who will maintain those rain gardens.

Mr. Langey commented that it could be the owner. It would be no different than a stormwater maintenance agreement.

Member Kasper inquired which owner.

Counsel Molnar inquired if the owner now volunteered to have this site plan if approved, apply to that smaller lot, so that the conditions and requirements set forth on this plan are fulfilled by the owner of that lot.

Mr. Eggleston commented both lots.

Counsel Molnar stated yes, both lots and its successors so that if the current owners sell that lot then they are nonetheless burdened by these requirements.

Mr. Eggleston stated that they would be agreeable with the right language.

Mr. Langey stated that it could be done in perpetuity with both owners being aware of it and recorded.

Member Kasper inquired if the Board's engineer commented on the drainage on this and the rain gardens.

Mr. Camp stated that the idea has been batted around a bit, the rain gardens were on, then they came off and now they are back on again now.

Chairman Tucker commented that the proposal was originally for the stormwater to sheet across the lawn.

Mr. Camp stated that sheet flow, spread out water across a relatively flat surface or smooth surface, is always the best way to clean water and protect any downstream resources. When that isn't possible or available, then collecting it in some sort of other treatment device is probably the next best step.

Mr. Eggleston stated that historically there was an earlier suggestion that was a swale that directed the stormwater from lot 1 across lot 2 then back onto lot 1 into a gain garden. When we came back it was suggested to not do that and that it was better to have sheet flow. We then got Rudy Zona involved. We did a grading plan for the previous plan, and we have not revised that grading plan though. It would be conceptually identical except for lowering it a foot. This was in the previous plan when we did the grading and Rudy Zona provided some grading plans. Nothing has changed from this that was submitted several months ago when Rudy Zona presented the drainage plans.

Chairman Tucker inquired if that was when the swale was in there.

Mr. Eggleston stated that it was after the swale. We went from the swale to sheet drainage with the rain gardens collecting the roof drainage.

Mr. Brodsky commented that the July 28, 2015 plan did not have rain gardens then. I just have a healthy skepticism about the long term viability of rain gardens and want to be cautious about them. Not to say not to do them but to be cautious.

Mr. Camp stated that rain gardens do require a lot of maintenance, and you don't have to look too far to see one that is not maintained.

Chairman Tucker inquired when the rain garden was presented because the July 28, 2015 does not have one on the plan.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the February 16, 2016 site plan before we twisted this, and the rain gardens were in there. Rudy Zona's plans were dated February 4, 2016.

Mr. Brodsky stated that his point is that his concern is whether you wish to pursue rain gardens or not is not the issue, it is a long term strategy for viability. As John pointed out, sheet flow over flat surfaces in the optimal and something less than optimal is suggesting or motivating the rain gardens. If that is the case or that is the desire, then there should be a strategy.

Mr. Eggleston stated that it was introduced from a belts and suspenders solution. The sheeting has always worked and worked well, and we were looking for more we were offering more and we are in that catch 22 so to speak.

Mr. Camp stated that the challenge of this small scale distributed stormwater management facility like this is that in the future I think its important for the Board to consider what position the Town would be in for enforcement if that is the approach. If we are collecting all of these

easements and jotting down whose responsibility it is to maintain them and if they continue to be built like this, you would need a small army of people to enforce that if that is what the Town wanted to do.

Mr. Eggleston commented that that is a more global discussion than this site specific.

Mr. Camp commented that it is, but every time you have one of these sites I think it is important to think about it.

Member Winkelman inquired if Mr. Camp had visited the site and if the sheeting of the stormwater was good enough and there is no need for the rain gardens.

Mr. Camp stated that in a general sense I am saying that sheet flow is the best way to filter and clean stormwater runoff from impervious surface, and the longer the sheet flow the better. That is the primary reason behind the setbacks of structures and parking lots from property lines and watercourses. When you can't do that the next best thing is to collect it and direct it to a water facility of some sort.

Member Kasper inquired if instead of having rain gardens, a bio-retention swale or pond could be utilized. I am just afraid that these rain gardens have failed in the past and are not being maintained, and now we are doing two or three of them on this property. I am sure the Normans will take very good care of them, but what about ten years from now if they sell out. I don't think the Town is going to go out and inspect them. Is there another type of facility that would be easier to maintain.

Mr. Camp stated that for this particular layout for this site here, I think the best chance for success is, if you are going to leave the buildings where they are, the best way to protect the stream and the lake would be the swale that would run where the rain gardens are and direct toward a more singular facility. Right now there are seven little facilities on one lot. Even one facility on one lot is a lot for the Town to enforce the maintenance. Combining seven into one would to me, be a better solution if the house would stay in this location. Still sheet flow or a long path is the best way.

Member Winkelman stated that considering the site, the lawn is lush and the slope is not terribly steep, I think it is pretty darn good the way it is.

Chairman Tucker commented that he would hate to disturb any more than has to.

Member Winkelman commented that the applicant had done a good job on the stream remediation. He continued stating that the building is still outside of the building envelope and that is definitely an issue. You have tried to mitigate that with 10Ft further away from the stream bank and the lowered the building a little bit to try to deal with the massing. You tilted it a little bit. I think the open space in the north is negligible with the trees and the hedgerow.

Chairman Tucker commented that the view is gone when you look from the north.

Member Winkelman commented that the view is based from the south, that it is a gorgeous view with a little opening to the lake.

Chairman Tucker commented that his concern is the massing of this building compared to others in this area. There are others that are larger, but they are located further from the road so you do not see them. You are really going to see the mass of the building from the road. It is also outside of the building envelope.

Counsel Molnar reminded the Board that site plan criteria section 148-18D (1) (a)(b)&(d) speak in terms of a determination that all structures in the plan shall be integrated with each other with adjacent structures, that is in section a. b), that structures that are visible from the public road or Skaneateles Lake shall be compatible with each other and with traditional structures in the surrounding area in terms of architecture, design, massing, materials and placement. 148-18D1(d) where appropriate, setbacks shall maintain and continue the existing setback pattern of surrounding properties. My recommendation to the Board is to view this application under the site plan review criteria in terms of the surrounding properties, not so much as the character of the neighborhood but the surrounding properties, that would be the guidance and requirements of site plan review criteria.

WHEREAS, at its regular meeting March 15, 2016, the Planning Board declared this Application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(9) and not subject by SEQR for further review,

Counsel Molnar recommended to the Board that in determining the application, before it hears a motion one way or the other, recall that this application has been on the Board's agenda many months, the Board has reviewed a multitude of information supplied by the applicant including memos on point addressing site plan review criteria and otherwise. The Board has had an opportunity to review the project twice based upon new information and new plans. At the site visits you have had an opportunity to discuss with the applicant and amongst yourselves. We have a broad record established. When reviewing this application under these site plan review criteria, that you would please articulate the reasons you feel one way or the other the way the application meets the site plan review criteria or fails to and why.

NOW, THEREFORE, A MOTION was made by Chairman Mark Tucker, and seconded by Member Joseph Southern, and after vote of all Members present as recorded below, it was **RESOLVED** that the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **DENIES** the Application, based on the following factors:

1. The massing of the proposed dwelling, placed close to the road, is not in character with structures on surrounding properties.
2. The proposed dwelling is located outside of the designated building envelope and the Mitigating Factors are unsatisfactory, the application is non-conforming, and the Application is inappropriate without a Variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
3. Assuming a Variance for the Application is not required for structures to be placed both inside and outside of the building envelope, the Application does not conform to Site Plan Review Criteria, in terms of the size of the dwelling on the Amended Site Plan, massing and placement of structures as compared to residences in the surrounding area; and

4. The size and massing of the proposed structure exceeds the existing structures on the surrounding lakeside properties, immediately north and south along Route 41A.

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	Absent	

Sketch Plan-Special Permit/Site Plan Review

Applicant:	John & Reve Walsh PO Box 700306 Wabasso, FL 32970	Property: 3093 East Lake Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map #039.-01-02.0
------------	---	---

Present: Andy Ramsgard, Architect; Debbie Williams, Representative

A revised site plan dated May 17, 21016 was submitted with modifications of the shoreline structures to reduce to 400SF, in compliance with Town code for a lot with the amount of shoreline. Additionally, the applicant is proposing a kitchen expansion, adding a port cochere, and reducing the impermeable surface coverage from 20.7% to 14.6%. The 918SF of existing shoreline structures is non-conforming as it over the 400SF allowed, to maintain the same amount of shoreline structures, regardless of material, would require a variance.

The application is subject to a special permit for redevelopment with the proposed impervious surface coverage over 10%. Concrete around the dwelling, a shed with patio, and various patios are being removed from the plan and being replaced with grass. The impermeable lakeside patio is being replace with a permeable patio and the open space is being brought into compliance by increasing the open space from 78.2% to 82.3%. The driveway is being narrowed and a grass strip added down the center of the drive to assist with impermeable surface reduction. The existing driveway is 8.5% of impervious surface and will be reduced. The applicant would like to expand the residence with a 460SF kitchen addition and 585SF port cochere, under the 25% floor space expansion allowed for the nonconforming lot.

The contractor has inspected the foundation of the dwelling and stated that it is substandard. The possibility of replacement of the existing dwelling may need to be required. Chairman Tucker inquired if the dwelling is located in a ground depression as it looks to be way down by the lake. Mr. Ramsgard stated that the siting of it isn't bad, but the back additions and pool were completed later and have stable foundations. The foundation in the center of the dwelling and the old garage are fine but in between there are these connected pieces of wood that are sitting on the ground and enclosed by backer board to have the appearance of a foundation. The foundation is not very far from the earth and in some places it is touching.

Member Kasper inquired if the dwelling was demolished would the layout be different. Ms. Williams stated that it would be rebuilt on the same footprint with the two additions and the second floor addition, maintaining the existing setbacks. Member Kasper inquired on the location of the septic system. The septic system is located in the southeast area of the lot, and the septic tank will be relocated for the existing location next to the old garage. The septic

system will be evaluated as it was installed in 1973 and may need to be expanded in addition to the relocation of the pump chamber and tank.

The garage addition is the port cochere for three bays and is open on three sides. Mr. Brodsky inquired on the design of the grass strip. Mr. Ramsgard stated that the strips that were designed for Scutari and Marvasti has worked very well, with the grass strip at a lower level than the tarvia and installed with drainage under the grass.

Mr. Brodsky commented that the application is subject to redevelopment and that additional reductions in impervious surface should be considered. Mr. Ramsgard commented that the coverage proposed is over a 30% reduction in coverage on the property. Chairman Tucker commented that we might be able to do better.

Chairman Tucker inquired about the structures located by the shoreline Chairman Tucker inquired what composes the 400SF of shoreline structures. Ms. Williams commented that it includes the boathouse bridge, permeable patio and shoreline steps. Ms. Williams commented that there is a seawall that they had included in the calculations and should be removed from the calculations as it is not walkable. Mr. Ramsgard stated that the existing side yard for the permeable patio was 0.00FT and it will be removed improving the side yard setback to the north side to 8.8FT; the two sheds and patio on the north side will be removed. The cement around the pool cannot be removed as the pool is a liner pool and the surround provides the stability and structure for the pool. A site visit will be conducted on June 11, 2016.

Counsel Molnar recommended that as this application has just begun to be reviewed by the Board and no approvals have been advanced, that the application be subject to the next rate of payment into the DRA fund at \$1.09/SF. The rate was increased to \$1.09 based on the vacant land sold from 2010 through 2015.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Kasper to schedule a public hearing, on *Tuesday, June 21, 2016 at 8:00 p.m.* The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Mr. Camp inquired when the applicant would know if the existing dwelling will need to be demolished or if the applicant can construct the additions. Mr. Ramsgard stated he will know more once he has a conversation with the owner as the condition of the foundation was just discovered. Mr. Camp stated that erosion control plans would be impacted by the decision.

Member Winkelman asked for clarity on the floor space, as the existing floor space is 8813SF and the proposed addition is 2120SF. Counsel Molnar commented that the total would be approximately 11,000SF. Mr. Ramsgard stated that the calculations are based on the definition of habitable and potentially habitable. Ms. Williams stated that it included the partial basement and followed the definitions and 148-12C3&12C4.

Continued Review-Special Permit/Site Plan Review

Applicant Pat Carberry
Kelly Engle
4302 Jordan Rd
Skaneateles, NY

Property:
4357 Jordan Road
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #023.-01-13.1

Present: Pat Carberry & Kelly Engle, Applicants; David Mazzeo, Owner; Robert Eggleston, Architect

The final survey has been completed which shows the property lines, with the Town of Skaneateles owning the former Short Line rails that run in front of the property. The property line encompasses the front of the stone office building, eclipses part of the frame office building and the existing shed. The lot is 125,055SF with existing 19.4% impervious coverage and a proposed 24.2% impervious coverage, under the 30% maximum impervious coverage allowed. The existing parking layout is not the most efficient layout; however, there are 18 parking spaces. The existing building is 55' from the watercourse. There are two proposed detached patios at the rear of the stone warehouse with patio A as a 591SF permeable patio and Patio B as a permeable patio, to provide outdoor space at the backside of the building.

The required parking calculations determined that for an event of 150 people that would happen after office hours and 15-20 times a year, would require 42.3 spaces. The 18 existing spaces, not including any parking on the Town property, and the proposed stone parking for 25 automobiles would provide 43 parking spots. Other events with less occupancy will require less parking. The stone parking will be located south of the buildings towards the creek.

The septic systems are being verified to determine if the existing systems will meet the needs of the property or whether it will need to be expanded, with the most recent septic system located behind the white building installed in 1986.

The frame office building is 1600SF with much of it warehouse and garage space. The stone office building is 2376SF with the building having 3FT thick stone walls that limit office space. Based on calculations to determine parking needs for office employees, 18 parking spaces for 15 employees was required; however, the office use of the buildings have not had that level of employee demand.

Mr. Brodsky stated that he would like to see some sort of analysis of the potential use of the entire site. He suggested a table together to show buildings, type of use, and type of occupancy based on use to give a sense of how the site might be used. There is a long history of low demand but with the proposed use it may draw interest to the property and increase demand. Mr. Eggleston commented that the beauty of the proposal is that the office use is more 9 to 5 and the event center would be used during off hours.

Mr. Brodsky commented that there are no contours in the proposed parking area. Mr. Eggleston stated that the area is flat with approximately a two foot drop from the proposed parking area and the watercourse. Mr. Camp expressed his concern if there will be a need for a new septic, there will potentially be a problem of running out of space outside of the flood plain. He continued that the bottom of the leach field element cannot be more than two feet below the flood plain, which basically means that the leach field has to be out of the flood plain. Mr. Camp commented that

the flood plain determination would need to be determined by taking the elevation off the flood maps and project over the topography of the site. Mr. Eggleston stating that according to Mr. Mazzeo, the flood waters have come up to the driveway in the area between the stone warehouse and stone office, but has not breached the driveway. Mr. Camp commented that there are sand bags in the area used to hold the creek back. Chairman Tucker commented that at the site visit you could see the dirt from the flooding on the driveway. Mr. Camp commented that if the flood map is correct, then there would be area for potential septic expansion. Mr. Brodsky suggested the that flood delineation be shown on the site plan.

Mr. Camp stated that there are two tight spots on the site plan relative to traffic circulation, near parking space 16 and parking space 5. He continued saying that the fire department likes to have a 24FT wide drive lane in order to get their trucks through, and there appears that the drive lane is 13FT wide by parking space 16 and 10FT wide by parking space 5. This will make backing out of the spaces tight and a fire truck would not be able to get through.

Member Winkelman inquired if the size of the property changed when the survey determine that the old rail line was Town property. Mr. Eggleston stated that it didn't change because they didn't know what the lot area was. Member Winkelman inquired if the property line has now been extended to the other side of the creek. Mr. Eggleston commented that the property line has always extended to the other side of the creek.

Mr. Brodsky inquired if there was parking outside of the property boundaries on the former short line rail road. Mr. Eggleston stated that there is existing parking on the Town property.

Chairman Tucker inquired on the establishment of the proposed parking area. Mr. Eggleston stated that the topsoil would be removed and stone placed in the area as they applicant does not want to add more black top. He continued stating that there is quite a bit of drainage on site with catch basin and pipes for drainage of the site. Mr. Eggleston commented that the site was functioning quite well and there was never any issues with drainage other than the water does come up to the edge of the driveway during a flood situation.

Chairman Tucker inquired on when the septic information will be available. Mr. Eggleston stated Eric Buck is working on it and the information should be available soon. Member Kasper inquired if there were any plans for lighting of the parking lot. Mr. Eggleston stated that there is existing site lighting that lights the area well and does not anticipate adding more. There may be low level lighting around the patio area that would be night sky compliant. The existing light is not night sky compliant.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Southern to schedule a public hearing, on ***Tuesday, June 21, 2016 at 8:15 p.m.*** The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Informal Discussion

Applicant: Rick Moscarito
1601 US Route 20
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #032.-03-17.1

Present: Rick & Debbie Moscarito, Applicants; Robert Eggleston, Architect

Mr. Eggleston stated that the wetland delineation was completed and the wetlands extend further on the property than originally anticipated. Roads, driveways, and drainage can be included in the buffer area. There is a small non-DEC wetland based on the size of the wetlands located to the southeastern end of the property which only requires a 100FT setback as it relates to zoning law. Instead of the prior 7-8 cottages being placed in the area, the new site plan reflects four cottages tucked near the wetlands and buffer zone. The new delineations forced us to rethink the phasing of the project and how the front of the property will be developed.

He continued stating that the development of the front of the property is now phase 1 of the development of a family oriented lodging facility, with an amenities building that has a number of functions in it. The existing annex building part of the motel will have adjoining units in a more traditional hotel/motel suites. There will be eleven cottages located in the location of the existing motel.

Mr. Eggleston continued saying that proposed is a total of 59 rooms, increased from the existing total of 31 rooms. The annex building would be two stories with 20 units, and with the 11 cottages encompassing 21 bedrooms. The cottages will range in size from studio to three bedrooms. The amenities building will have a swimming pool, an event room for 75-99 people, exercise room arcade, gift shop, lounge office, and a total of 8 hotel rooms.

He continued stating that the comprehensive plan has been concerned with buildings up near the road creating street line and a better definition to the gateway. We have come up with an arts and crafts styled building incorporating with stone and architectural styling. It will be a two story building, with the comprehensive plan encouraging more two story buildings in the area. The road side view of the building will have a feature fireplace and a cupola bringing light into the space. The entrance will be located on the north side facing the cottages and parking.

Mr. Eggleston continued saying that the parking will be behind the amenities building with a lobby and check in (24/7), event meeting room with separate entrance bathrooms, and with a catering kitchen. On the other side of the amenities building will be a gift shop, quiet drawing room and fitness area close to the swimming pool area. The second floor has two entrances from the main lobby and from the first floor, with 8 traditional hotel rooms. The amenities building is mixed use for the guests in the hotel with the event center for used related to special events and parties.

Member Winkelman inquired on the size of the banquet room. Mr. Eggleston stated that it is 1500SF not including the catering kitchen. Mr. Brodsky inquired if separate parking for the event center was calculated in addition to the separate hotel rooms. Mr. Eggleston commented that he does not have the parking delineated, but that for 75 people there would be a requirement of 25 parking spaces, and thought it would be 1 per bedroom for the buildings; however parking for the cottage shown on the site plan are greater than the need. Mr. Brodsky commented that

unlike the Carberry application, you could have parking demand at the same time and you will need to provide the maximum amount of parking.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the plan is still forming and they would like to get the Board's views on the project. There will be a walking path that will be developed through the area that complies with the DEC that is not shown on the site plan.

Mr. Camp inquired if the wetland was formally delineated. Mr. Eggleston stated that Brian Bear of ESN had prepared the delineation.

Mr. Brodsky inquired if there will be a snack bar or a restaurant in the amenities building. Mr. Eggleston stated that they may have vending machines, but there is no restaurant planned for the building as the applicant wants to focus on the family oriented lodging and not the business traveler. The cottages will have kitchens and the hotel rooms will have a microware, small refrigerator and coffee maker. The annex building will have small kitchens in the suites. Member Winkelman inquired if the lodging will be for short term or long term use. Mr. Moscarito commented that long term for around town is one week. Member Winkelman commented that the Bird's Nest had some long term residents that stayed for months at a time. Mr. Eggleston stated that they would not discourage that if someone wanted to rent for a long period.

Chairman Tucker stated that the application would need a variance for the front yard setback for the amenities building. Mr. Eggleston stated that in the IRO district, parking can be as close as 20FT to the lot line and right-of-ways and can be in front of buildings. Using Dimensional table 1, you also have the ability to use prevailing setbacks; however this application falls under dimensional table 2 that does not provided the application of prevailing setbacks. Parking in front of the building is contrary to the comprehensive plan. The proposed parking lot has been split up to break the solid parking lot look. Mr. Eggleston commented that the intention is to be on the ZBA agenda for June to request the variance to use the average setback instead of the required setback for the amenities building. The regulated setbacks have been impacted by the change in the wetlands delineation.

Member Winkelman commented that the second driveway located to the west has been removed. Mr. Eggleston stated that they felt it was more efficient to have it to the east and they have initiated a conversation with NYSDOT. They are also proposing to straighten the driveway so that it will be perpendicular to the highway.

Chairman Tucker commented that the wetlands has expanded over time and now the dwelling on lot 2 is partially located in the wetlands buffer. Mr. Brodsky inquired if access could be achieved through the western driveway if the NYSDOT does not approved the eastern driveway. Mr. Eggleston commented that the site plan could be modified to accommodate it on the west if necessary although they prefer it to the east.

Member Kasper inquired about the water flow as this property is off the same water line that had halted a prior project on the other side of the road. Mr. Camp stated that the Village has made some improvements that have helped on this side of town. Member Kasper inquired about fire protection especially for the cottages tucked in near the wetlands. Chairman Tucker recommended that the applicant get fire department input on the project. Mr. Eggleston stated that the applicant would have to provide sprinklers as transient buildings require it. Member Kasper expresses concern that there may not be enough water pressure for the sprinkler system.

Mr. Camp commented adding a second floor to the annex building could impact the water flow although the water pressure has improved in the area. Mr. Eggleston commented that the water line loops up Fisher Road and back around, with the land at a lower elevation than the project across the street. Mr. Moscarito stated that the motel has 31 rooms currently, and there would be 40+ rooms with the proposal. Mr. Eggleston stated that they have not talked to the water department yet but will start those conversations.

Mr. Eggleston inquired if the Planning Board was in support of placing the parking behind the amenities building. The Board stated that based on the general discussion they were in support of it.

Discussion

James and Mary Fox requested to merge their properties on Thornton Heights Road. The properties cannot be merged as Thornton Heights Road is an established lot with an assigned tax map number. It was recommended that an easement be established on 1430 Thornton Heights Road for the establishment of the septic system.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull, Secretary/Clerk