

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
June 24, 2025**

Donald Kasper
Jon Holbein
Samantha Parker-Fann
David Lee
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel
John Camp (C&S Engineers)
Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Chair Kasper opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

SEQR Review -Special Permit, Lot Line Adjustment

Applicant	SUNN 1017 LLC/Stauffer	Property:
	700 West Metro Park	4516 Jordan Rd
	Rochester, NY 14623	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		Tax Parcels #018.-04-31.1 & 018.-04-29.1

Present: Matt McGreggor, Abundant Solar, Andrew VanDoorn, Solar Bank;, Ryan Dunbar. Rebecca Minas, Barton & Luduidice; Bartolo Morales Jimenez;

Counsel Molnar queried the board to determine if the board would like to do a dry run review of the EAF or would like to do the formal review of the EAF. The board determined that they have fully reviewed the submissions and listened to the public during the public hearing; they were ready to proceed with the formal review of the EAF. Counsel Molnar noted that the application is for two solar installations on two contiguous parcels that comprise 117.4 acres, located in the IRO and RR districts. Parcel 018.-04-31.1 had 20 acres that underwent remediation activity between 1983 and 2013 to eliminate potential exposure to hazardous materials associated with a former manufacturing operation pursuant to ordinance consent indices management by the DEC, site management plan prepared by Envirospec Engineering PLLC dated March 2015, final engineering report prepared by Envirospec Engineering PLLC dated May of 2015, and as monitored by the New York State Department of Conservation site number 7-34-010.

Counsel Molnar stated that the applicant has submitted the full EAF long form including part 1 that has been completed by the applicant. He continued saying that the board could evaluate part 2 in draft review, and the board agreed that they were prepared to review Part 2.

The board reviewed **Part 2 EAF**:

1 Impact on Land - ☒ No ☐ Yes

- a. **No to Small**, the water table is located 2-4 feet; The conductors to the poles would be the only land disturbance. The creek will not be crossed with any conductors.
- b. **No**
- c. **No**
- d. **No**
- e. **No**
- f. **No**

g. None

2 Impacts on Geological Features - ☒ No ☐ Yes

3 Impacts on Surface Water - ☒ No ☐ Yes

- a. No
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. No
- f. No
- g. No, they will be mitigating any stormwater.
- h. No
- i. No
- j. No
- k. No
- l. none

4 Impacts on Groundwater - ☒ No ☐

They will be employing a ballast system array which will mitigate any risk to the site. The DEC is monitoring the site 7-34-010, and they have given preliminary approval for the placement of the solar arrays on this site.

5 Impact on Flooding - ☒ No ☐ Yes

6 Impacts on Air - ☒ No ☐ Yes

7 Impacts on Plants and Animals - ☒ No ☐ Yes

- a. No, none identified.
- b. No, no trees will be removed during April through October.
- c. No to Small, tree clearing will occur between November through March.
- d. No to Small, there will be enhanced screening, and the applicant will be adding trees to the property.
- e. No
- f. No
- g. No to Small, agricultural fencing will be utilized that will allow small creatures to access. There is also similar habitat around the installations and neighboring properties during construction for the wildlife.
- h. No
- i. No
- j. None

8 Impacts on Agricultural Resources - ☒ No ☐ Yes

9 Impacts on Aesthetic Resources - ☒ No ☐ Yes

- a. No
- b. No
- c. No to Small, mitigated by proposed screening

- d. **No to Small**, the site will be visible by commuters going to and from work. There has been a lot of change over the years with the remediation at the site, and the site will continued to be classified as a commercial activity.
- e. **No**, the adjoining neighbors view the parcels as an aesthetic resource although it is not designated as an aesthetic resource.
- f. **No**
- g. **None**

10 Impacts on Historic and Archeological Resources - ☒ No ☐ Yes

- a. **No to Small**, the Glenside Woolen Mill/Waterbury Felt Complex is a property that has been identified as a property that is an eligible property for listing for historic preservation. The applicants are substantially increasing the screening.
- b. **No to Small**, impact to creek is limited.
- c. **No**, it is an industrial site already.
- d. **None**
- e. **Not Applicable**

11 Impacts on Open Space and Recreation - ☒ No ☐ Yes

- a. **No**
- b. **No**, This remediated property cannot be used for recreation.
- c. **No**
- d. **No**
- e. **None**

12 Impacts on Critical Environmental Areas - ☒ No ☐ Yes

13 Impacts on Transportation - ☒ No ☐ Yes

14 Impacts on Energy - ☒ No ☐ Yes The proposal will become an energy source.

15 Impacts on Noise, Odor, and Light - ☒ No ☐ Yes

- a. **No** The applicant provided a sound study, and any sound will emit from the center of the arrays and not impact the neighbors.
- b. **No**
- c. **No**
- d. **No**, there is no proposed lighting; glare from panels would be minimal
- e. **No**
- f. **No to Small**, There may be noise during construction; however, minimal impact.

16 Impacts on Human Health - ☒ No ☐ Yes

- a. **No**
- b. **No**, remediation is complete; monitoring occurring on the remediated site.
- c. **No to Small**, they will be utilizing a ballast system for arrays that will not disturb remediated site.
- d. **No to Small**, no dwellings or recreation can occur at site.
- e. **No to Small**, DEC continues monitoring of the remediated site.
- f. **No to Small**
- g. **No**

- h. No
- i. No
- j. No, there is no proposed excavation.
- k. No
- l. No

m. The property is being monitored by NYSDEC, and construction of the proposal will employ a SWPPP and design plans that will be closed followed.

17 Consistency with Community Plans - ☒ No ☐ Yes The town has adopted a section of zoning code for solar projects. This proposal is also in keeping with the comprehensive plan.

- a. No to Small, commercial industry has been in that area, with some in operation today..
- b. No to Small, the property is not suitable for housing.
- c. No
- d. N, No county wide impact determined by the Onondaga County Planning Board dated March 19, 2025.
- e. No
- f. No
- g. No
- h. none

18 Consistency with Community Character - ☒ No ☐ Yes

- a. No
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. No
- f. No to Small, The applicant is providing screening, and the site has been an industrial site for many years.
- g. None

Counsel Molnar said that based upon the board's deliberation, the answers to the questions presented in the FEAF as well as these comments, all as part of the record, he recommended that the board check box A in Part 3 that the project will have no significant adverse impact on the environment, and therefore an environmental impact statement need not be prepared. Accordingly, a negative declaration is issued. Counsel Molnar said that he will complete the paperwork for signature by the Chair and publish in an environmental news bulletin for the negative declaration for a type 1 action.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Parker-Fann declare that this project will result in no significant adverse impacts on the environment, and therefore, an environmental impact statement need not be prepared, with a negative declaration issued. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

The Planning Board has held the public hearing open, and now with the SEQR complete, the board can recommend back to the Zoning Board of Appeals for their continuance of the public hearing and rendering their decision on the variances requested. If the variances are approved then the application would return to the board for final determination on the special permit and lot line adjustment request.

Member Holbein commented that he has a concern with the road and if the county has been contacted regarding the access off Jordan Road. Mr. McGreggor said that the county right of way extends 33 feet from the centerline of the road. In regard to the potential easement with the town for the walking path, we would respect the county right of way. Chair Kasper said that the walking trail easement would be on their property arranged with the town and be adjacent to the right of way. Mr. VanDoorn commented that there is an existing driveway that will make sure that conforms to OCDOT standards.

Counsel Molnar commented that the Zoning Board of Appeals will probably take two more months before rendering their decision on the variances, although it is possible that they could make their determination at their July meeting. Chair Kasper inquired if there were any details of a potential resolution should this application move forward. Counsel Molnar noted that the decommissioning plan that was submitted will need to be reviewed and then circulated to the board and engineering for comment. Although the resolution would not be ready for the July meeting, Counsel Molnar commented that he could have a draft for the board to review.

Chair Kasper said that the maintenance plan will need to be reviewed to ensure that trees are replaced if they die. Counsel Molnar said that the plan including landscaping needs to be maintained so that the project is always compliant to the plan. Chair Kasper said that the town should be able to go after the letter of credit if they ignore enforcement of the approval. Counsel Molnar explained that if the applicant did not comply then the codes officer would cite them and required compliance with the approved plan and resolution. In the absence of any remediation of what was wrong, then it could come back to the board and the board could rescind approval.

Chair Kasper said that in regard to the potential relocation of the fence and easement for the trail, the applicant would need to have answers on those issues before approval can be granted. Mr. McGreggor said that they are willing to move the fence if they are allowed to by the DEC. Mr. Van Doorn said that they gave a commitment to replace the fence if the property owner does not. He continued saying that there are two scenarios where the board can approval the special permit with conditions for the a) if the DEC approves moving the fence then it is moved or, b) If the DEC does not approve moving the fence then it would be replaced where it is currently located. In terms of the easement, they are not party to the easement, but they can ensure communication between both parties of the town and Stauffer. Their goal was to get the openness to it, the commitment to the replacement fence, and they have already reached out to the DEC to begin the discussion. They are hoping to move forward with those conditions. Counsel Molnar said that the recommendation would be difficult to work with. When the board is considering applications, providing flexibility is one thing but having a pivotable component in an either or scenario would be frowned upon. The DEC confirmation could be obtained now so the board can make an informed decision. Chair Kasper asked if there is one person at the DEC who is responsible for this site. Mr. McGreggor said that there was a discussion and a willingness to work towards the request, however there is no definitive answer. If the monitoring wells near the fence can be protected from the public then the DEC would be open to it. Mr. Van Doorn said that they will work with the DEC for an answer, and if it is a yes to moving the fence then it would be up to the town to work with Stauffer regarding the easement agreement for the walking trail. Counsel Molnar commented that he can easily put together an easement agreement to be part of the resolution and executed by the landowner with the Town of Skaneateles. Mr. McGreggor said that including the easement agreement as part of the approving resolution, they ask that it not be included as a condition. Counsel Molnar stated that the board routinely included it on applications for a conservation subdivision and that they be recorded at the county clerk's office. Member

Holbein said that with this application the applicant does not have any control over the landowner. Mr. VanDoorn said that they do not want to hold up the project because of negotiations taking a longer period of time to resolve over the easement. Counsel Molnar said that it is a material concern that the Planning Board would be overlooking if it granted approval for an either or.

Chair Kasper explained that the town is doing their hamlet plan for the Falls with one of the items being the extension of the Charlie Major nature trail from Mottville through the Falls. The town already owns the tracks and land where the old railroad was located, however skipped the Stauffer property as it was not along the road. It is important for the town to obtain the easement. Mr. VanDoorn said that is why they are working with Stauffer to agree. If they are able to get the DEC to agree with the relocation of the fence, then they would like to have the project move forward. Chair Kasper suggested that Counsel Molnar could send a letter to the DEC, John Armitage, to explain the importance of moving the fence to accommodate a future trail on behalf of the town Planning Board. Mr. McGreggor commented that once the language of the easement is prepared they will have Stauffer look at it.

Member Parker-Fann commented that the applicant could provide a yearly assessment of the visual screening maintenance, the fence integrity, and site maintenance plan to the board. The report could reflect the number of trees replaced from a storm, etc. Counsel Molnar noted that the town has required that in the past with green roofs with an annual compliance certification. Mr. VanDoorn said that they do that with their existing projects and that it could be easily supplied to the town. He continued saying that the solar installations have long term debt and the debt provider would have these requirements in place and would be notified if there were issues as a default on the loan agreement.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Holbein to adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 7:47 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Additional Meeting Attendees:

Andrew Van Dorn	Rebecca Minas
Matt McGreggor	Bryan Dunbar
Bartolo Morales Jimenez	

Additional Meeting Attendees (Zoom):

Lori Milne	Kathleen Dec
------------	--------------