

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
September 8, 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-SEQR- Major Subdivision**

Applicant	Chris Graham	Property:
	4302 Jordan Rd	County Line Rd
	Skaneateles, NY 13152	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		<b>Tax Parcel #018.-02-29.1</b>

Present: Chris Graham, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects;  
John Frazee, GZA Engineering

Counsel Molnar recommended that the board do a preliminary review of parts 1 and 2 of the submitted EAF Long Form. Part 1 of the EAF was submitted for the project, Chairman Southern recommended that part 1 of the EAF be reviewed to correct any errors.

The Board reviewed **part 1 of the submitted EAF** and noted the following corrections needed:

**B(g):** Include that the DEC permit will be obtained post approval.

Mr. Camp stated that it is highly unlikely that the DEC will have any questions that may be relevant to the board decision. The SPEDS permit is mostly administrative when you fill out the NOI, as they usually do not have any comments regarding the nature of the project.

**C(4)(d):** add Skaneateles Falls Park and Charlie Major Nature Trail

Member Winkelman recommended that the Skaneateles Falls Park should be listed as it is within walking distance. Mr. Eggleston said that the Charlie Major Nature Trail will be included also.

**D(1)(d)(ii):** Answer the question No as it is a conventional subdivision.

**D(1)(e):** 18 months was shown, and Mr. Eggleston commented that 18 months may be overstated.

**D(1)(f):** No change with the form reflecting 33 single family lots: Mr. Brodsky commented that any potential multi-family lots would be subject to a special permit if they were later proposed.

**D(1)(h(i)):** No change. Mr. Eggleston stated that the stormwater management facilities may or may not be on separate lots, depending on how the Town Board may want to proceed.

**D(2)(b):** Answer question No

**D(2)(c):** No change. The property is in an existing water district. Member Kasper inquired if the water is plentiful in the area and Mr. Camp responded that the town has no concern with water supply in the area. The department must bleed water out of the system in this area to maintain fresh water.

**D(2)(e)(iii):** Member Kasper commented that the answer should be modified to Yes and the stormwater will flow into the creek that is located on a different parcel. Mr. Frazee stated that the stormwater would be treated and that there would be no additional stormwater runoff than what exists today. Mr. Camp said that the question could be checked either way as it would not materially affect how the board would review the project overall.

**D(2)(e)(iv):** Change answer to No. Counsel Molnar recommended that it should be No as there are no proposals for green technology being used and there is no re-use of stormwater.

**D(2)(j):** A traffic count for Vision Drive may be warranted. Mr. Eggleston stated that usually when the DEC is discussing what traffic is considered a substantial increase, it is usually 5%. Mr. Brodsky said that a 33-lot subdivision is a substantial subdivision for the town. Mr. Camp said that for a point of context, when the board discussed the hotel project, the County and/or the State would not review the traffic unless there were 100 cars a day. Mr. Brodsky said that the proposal subdivision would probably not generate 100 cars a day and that the applicant could provide something that substantiates that. Mr. Eggleston said that when Visions Drive is at peak capacity, there are a tremendous number of cars at one time coming or going. The number of vehicles is a lot more than a 33 residences would produce. Member Kasper said that there could be peak demand when people go to work in the morning and come home in the evening although he does not believe it is an issue. Chairman Southern commented that as Mottville Road is a County road designed to handle more traffic and that County Line Road is a town road. Mr. Eggleston said that he has not seen a traffic study for this size subdivision but is confident it is below any thresholds. Mr. Brodsky reiterated that some documentation to substantiate that conclusion would be helpful to the board. Mr. Camp commented that what is being asked for is more of a traffic study. Member Marshall said that she would like to have a little bit more information. Mr. Eggleston commented that it is the percentage increase of the use of the road and not the capacity of the road that should be considered. Member Hamlin said that his concern is the capacity of the County Line Road intersection during peak times although this may add a negligible increase. He continued saying that the place where there will be any impact is at the Visions Drive intersection. Member Kasper commented that the intersection at Sheldon and possibly Seneca Turnpike may be impacted. He continued saying that the applicant could find out about where the factory people are going. Mr. Camp said that when you are looking at traffic at a residential subdivision, the peaking factor is dramatically less than a place of employment or commercial space. He agreed with Mr. Eggleston that traffic on County Line Road existing traffic conditions should be looked at because that is where the project ties in. Counsel Molnar referenced the question D(2)(j) in the DEC workbook table a starting place for new vehicle trips made during peak traffic hours to determine if there will be a substantial increase in traffic likely to occur from the proposed activity. It then lists single family homes with 95 units or greater. The handbook goes on to say that if these thresholds are exceeded, there is likely to be an impact, then you should consider the answer to be yes and a traffic impact analysis may be needed. Even if the development does not meet the level of volume indicated in the workbook, a traffic analysis may need to be obtained under the conditions of high traffic volumes around the area may affect movement, ties into Member Hamlin's comment on potential traffic from the factory is pertinent; inadequate sight distance, proximity of the proposed driveway from other driveways, and a

development with a drive through operation may cause other traffic related issues, which is not relevant. Mr. Eggleston said that the proposal is for 33 dwellings that is under the 95 listed on the table, and a traffic analysis with the surrounding uses should be considered.

**D(2)(m)(ii):** yes, Member Winkelman said that there are woods in the northeast corner that will be totally taken down for the stormwater between the neighborhood to the north. Mr. Eggleston said that there are a couple of residents on Philips Street and the applicant has proposed the existing hedgerow to remain. The property to the south is vacant and wooded already. He continued saying that there are a couple of houses on Philips Street that may be impacted. The answer should be changed to yes, with a description.

**D(2)(n)(i):** The answer should be yes, as there will be streetlights at the intersections with County Line Road. The property is in an existing lighting district.

**D(2)(n)(ii):** The questions should be answered no.

**E(1)(g):** A phase 1 environmental survey will be supplied to the town.

**E(2)(c):** A classified soils drain well; C classified soil moderately drain, and D classified soil poorly drain. Mr. Brodsky requested that soil names and types be provided to the board. Mr. Frazee commented that they will provide soil mapping for this lot with the soils named.

**E(2)(f):** Member Kasper inquired if the percentage slopes are pre-construction and Mr. Eggleston said yes, and that with construction they will improve.

**E(2)(h)(iv):** Approximate size needed; stream on the eastern side of the property should have the name listed if there is one.

**E(3)(a):** Peters Farm is located across County line Road in Cayuga County and should be noted.

**E(3)(f):** Letter from SHPO has been provided to the town.

The board preliminarily reviewed **part 2 of the EAF** to determine if additional information is warranted, and noted the following comments:

**1 Impact on Land -  No  Yes**

Small,

- a. No
- b. Small
- c. No
- d. No. The cut and fill will be balanced on the site.
- e. No. This question is reviewed in terms of the subdivision filing and the installation of the road and the stormwater systems that will be less than a year in construction duration. It is unlikely that it would take 18 months to complete.
- f. No
- g. No
- h. No to small. Stormwater B excavation will have a small but important impact on the land.

**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
- h. No
- i. No
- j. No
- k. No
- l. No

**4 Impacts on Groundwater -  No  Yes**

The proposed subdivision will utilize public water.

**5 Impact on Flooding -  No  Yes**

**6 Impacts on Air -  No  Yes**

**7 Impacts on Plants and Animals -  No  Yes**

**8 Impacts on Agricultural Resources -  No  Yes**

- a. Moderate to Large – Classification of soils should be submitted. Although the lot is in a Hamlet, it is farmland.
- b. No
- c. Moderate to Large – existing farmland
- d. Moderate to Large – existing farmland.
- e. No Current zoning of the land property location is in the Hamlet district. Land is not noted as agricultural land in the open space plan.
- f. No
- g. No

**9 Impacts on Aesthetic Resources -  No  Yes**

**10 Impacts on Historic and Archeological Resources -  No  Yes**

**11 Impacts on Open Space and Recreation -  No  Yes**

**12 Impacts on Critical Environmental Areas -  No  Yes**

**13 Impacts on Transportation -  No  Yes**

The Board is awaiting additional information regarding traffic on Visions Drive.

- a. No
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. No.
- f. No

**14 Impacts on Energy -  No  Yes**

- a. No
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. none

**15 Impacts on Noise, Odor, and Light -  No  Yes**

- a. No There are no noise regulations in the Town.
- b. No
- c. No
- d. No
- e. No
- f. none

**16 Impacts on Human Health -  No  Yes**

**17 Consistency with Community Plans -  No  Yes**

- a. No
- b. No

**18 Consistency with Community Character -  No  Yes**

Counsel Molnar suggested that the board await additional information from the applicant regarding soils, traffic report and a revised part 1 to be submitted. Subsequently the board can review part 2 formally with the additional supplied information. Mr. Eggleston recommended that a public information meeting could be scheduled in early October. Counsel Molnar supported the recommendation as it would allow the board to hear public comment prior to the completion of SEQ. A public information meeting will be scheduled for October 6, 2020 at 6:30 p.m.

Member Winkelman commented that stormwater B location is not a natural location for a stormwater facility. The stormwater facility had been moved to the location in the northeast corner of the property where the stormwater naturally runs into the creek. The prior location, although lower in elevation, would drain onto other properties. Member Winkelman said that the northeast corner is a highly wooded hill that would require removal of trees and excavation of land. He continued saying that it could go to lot 6 where the topography is lower. Mr. Camp said that there was a desire to allow street A to continue through the property to connect to a potential future right of way. He continued saying that if the basin were located where lot 5 and 7 are, it would not make a difference. Mr. Eggleston said that the northeast location does have a rise in elevation, but it is not a hill; a hill is lot 4 and lot 29. Mr. Camp commented that there are two contours that cross over the gray path, that indicates a low area or a nob as you follow street A towards the east, and it appears that the proposed basin location is at the same elevation as lot 6. Mr. Eggleston said that they are knocking down about 4 feet of "hill". Mr. Frazee stated that the elevation of the proposed pond is 710 feet and lot 6 is 706 feet elevation. Member Winkelman said that the bottom of the proposed ponds is 694 feet elevation and 692 feet elevation. He continued saying that there is a wood line in the area as well. Mr. Camp commented if the pond were moved then there would not be a continuation of the road right of way that was a recommendation of this board. Member Marshall inquired why it would need to be removed and Mr. Camp said that Member Winkelman is recommending that the stormwater basin be in the area.

Member Marshall inquired if houses were placed in the northeast corner, would the wooded area be eliminated, and Mr. Eggleston replied that not all the wooded area would be removed. Member Winkelman commented that if street A were to connect going east, it would have to cross the creek and go through the existing walking path on the Kohilo property. Chairman Southern said that it does not make sense to have connectivity there. Mr. Camp stated that it could be done in the future as it is vacant property in the area. He continued saying that if the continuation of the street is not the wish of the board, then there would be more flexibility for the location of the pond. Member Kasper commented that it may be better to leave the pond in the northeast corner as it would become a natural area where the deer come through, and there will be overgrowth along the edges. If some of the hedgerow was left it would protect the corner rather than a house being placed there with trees removed. He continued saying that the ponds become a natural habitat for all kinds of animals with the shrubbery growing wild. Member Winkelman commented that the ditch is closer to the property to the south and Member Kasper commented that that spillway could be move closer to the pond. Mr. Camp said that there are still details that need to be finalized and consideration could be given to that suggestion.

Mr. Brodsky inquired about where the road would be connected to if it were extended. Mr. Camp said that it could be connected to street C rather than crossing Skaneateles creek. Mr. Brodsky said that it would cross a tributary to Skaneateles Creek but could stay on the west side and connect to Stump Road, potentially. Mr. Eggleston said that where it would go would be the development of the DeMarco property. Mr. Camp said that it would be development of the Kohilo parcel and the DeMarco parcel; with the DeMarco parcel already having a developed driveway there. He continued saying these discussions boil down to what you see as good planning and what could possibly never happen. Chairman Southern stated that he does not see that area being developed. Member Kasper said that it would be a perfect place for apartments. Mr. Camp said that crossing the creek would not require a large culvert to cross. Chairman Southern commented that the Kohilo property also has access to Philips Street and that would not require crossing the creek. Member Marshall said that the goal is to create a grid and not just to have access to one location by leaving these potential future connections. Mr. Eggleston said that street A has the most potential for a future connection. Mr. Camp commented that it is difficult to determine what will happen with the future of a road and the goal of any Planning Board is create opportunity for the future. He continued saying whether it is sliding a pond 50 feet over is up to the Planning Board to make that decision. Mr. Brodsky commented that the board needs to consider whether the potential for a future road is reasonable by taking a trip out to the property and see the surrounding properties to see if it is feasible to extend the road over. Mr. Camp said that the only road to consider is one that is from an engineering perspective and it is easy to leave these stub streets there as they do not cause harm. Chairman Southern said it probably makes the most sense to leave the road design as proposed. In a few years, the pond will be heavily overgrown. Member Marshall inquired if the board could require plantings and Mr. Brodsky commented that the board can request that. Member Winkelman said that the hedgerow will be kept on the north side and he agrees with Member Kasper that the area will be a new type of open space. The applicant is continuing to discuss this issue with the Town Board in addition to other approvals they will need.

Member Marshall inquired where the applicant stands with proposed sidewalks for the development. Mr. Eggleston said that the town has heard the discussions regarding sidewalks and walkways, and the Town Board needs to put together some policies. They will be installing the walkway between this property and the Lauder Lane property. They have provided an easement for a walkway along County Line Road. The applicant does not have any permission with Kohilo for connectivity that would be through street A if the Kohilo walking trail were to be part of a connected network. He continued saying that there are no proposed concrete sidewalks in this subdivision. Member Marshall inquired about street trees. Mr. Eggleston said that Alan Wellington prefers to not see street trees in the road right of way because they become his problem. He continued saying that what they have proposed is that there will be one tree for every 50 feet of road frontage planted in the front yard between the front of the house and the road line. That would take

away the responsibility of Alan taking care of the maintenance of the trees. Member Marshall said that it is possible that the Hamlet committee may recommend that sidewalks are in this community and that she would prefer to not design them out of this subdivision. Mr. Eggleston said that with a 66 foot right of way there would be room for sidewalks. Member Marshall recommended that language be placed on the map and Mr. Camp said that it would not be required as the town owns the road. Mr. Eggleston said that the village has sidewalks with dedicated funds to do first clearing of sidewalks; they now charge \$75 yearly on every tax parcel in the village for maintenance of the sidewalks. The town does not have this policy, and he continued saying that he believes that walkways and trails are more appropriate for the town than concrete sidewalks. Member Kasper commented that the blacktop of the road is 24 feet wide, and Butters Farm is only 20 feet wide. He continued saying that 24 feet would make it safer to walk.

**Discussion – 9 Lot Subdivision**

Applicant: Emerald Estates Properties, LP  
Skaneateles, New York

Property:  
2894 East Lake Rd  
Skaneateles, New York  
**Tax Map #036.-01-37.1**

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects;

The re-submitted DEIS will be placed on the agenda for the September 15, 2020 Planning Board meeting. The board will review the document for prior requested modifications, as the board works towards a final EIS before a scheduled public hearing.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Hamlin and seconded by Member Marshall to adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 8:44 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Karen Barkdull, Clerk

**Additional Meeting Attendees:**

Robert Eggleston  
Chris Graham  
John Frazee  
David Ketchum  
Susan Scheunemann  
Alan Briggs  
Gail Van der Linde