

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD  
SPECIAL AND REGULAR  
MEETING MINUTES  
September 19, 2017**

Joseph Southern  
Donald Kasper  
Scott Winkelman  
Douglas Hamlin  
Anne Redmond-absent  
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. The meeting minutes of August 15, 2017 were previously distributed to the Board and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Hamlin and seconded by Member Kasper to approve the minutes as submitted. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion. Chairman Southern abstained from the vote.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Abstain]
Vice Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Anne Redmond	Absent	

**Public Hearing –Subdivision**

Applicant: RG Newton  
46 East Street  
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Property:  
East Street  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #044.-02-27.0**

Present: RG Newton, Applicant; Andrew Newton;

A site visit was conducted on September 9, 2017. The Onondaga County Department of Health approval for the septic design for the proposed two-acre lot is pending. The proposal is to subdivide the 14-acre lot on East Street, creating lot 1 at 2 acres and lot 2 with the remaining 12 acres. Lot 1 is a conforming lot along East Street, and lot 2 has an existing shared driveway that provides access to a residential lot at 46 East Street, a residence in the Village. Lot 2 contains wetlands over approximately half of the lot, and there are no plans to develop the lot.

At this time Counsel Molnar recommended to the Board that the application be an Unlisted Action and reviewed the short form SEQR with the Board.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Hamlin, the Board declared this application to be an Unlisted Action. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

In evaluating, each of the criteria set forth in Part II:

Part II	No or small impact	Moderate to Large impact
1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulation?	X	
2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land?	X	
3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community?	X	
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a CEA?	NA	
5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?	X	
6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?	X	
7. Will the proposed action impact existing public/private water supplies and/or public/ private wastewater treatment utilities?	X	
8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archeological, architectural or aesthetic resources?	X	
9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g. wetlands, water bodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)?	X	
10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?	X	
11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental or human health?	X	

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Member Winkelman, and after review of the SEQR short environmental assessment form and determined that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

At this time, Chairman Southern opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor of the project. No one spoke in favor of the project. Chairman Southern asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition, or had any other comments. No one spoke in opposition or had any other comments.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Kasper to close the public hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

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

1. The Subdivision map dated August 31, 2017 prepared by Paul Olszewski (“Map”) shall be updated to reflect the pins of the corners of the lot and submitted for the Planning Board Chairman’s review and signature within 180 days from the signing of this resolution; and
2. That the applicant shall obtain approval from the Onondaga County Department of Health for the proposed septic design, and approval from any other agency having jurisdiction over the Property or Application; and
3. The Subdivision Map and deed transferring the Property must be filed in the Onondaga County Clerk’s Office within sixty-two (62) days of the signing of said Map or the Subdivision approval shall be null and void. Proof of said filing shall be immediately forwarded to the Secretary of the Planning Board upon receipt by the Applicant and/or Applicant’s representative.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Anne Redmond	Absent	

**Continued Review –Site Plan review**

Applicant: Richard Moscarito  
120 Madison Street  
Chittenango, NY 13037

Property:  
2699 East Lake Road  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #037.-01-04.0**

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect

Since the last submission the applicant has met with Mike Ryan, from NYSDOT, to discuss a modification that would include putting in a retaining wall 3-4 feet high for a parking area off of the right of way, build up the shoulder in the right of way to a 6% grade, and add a drop inlet that would catch the water as it comes across the road from the neighbor’s ditch. The inlet would feed into the swale that will control the drainage at the site. The modification would remove a vehicle from the shoulder; a longer length of the shoulder of approximately 40-foot driveway curb cut would allow a car to pull off the road and back into the parking space. Mr. Eggleston commented that Mr. Ryan spoke favorably regarding the modification, he will do a site visit, and will be sending a note of approvability.

With the modification, the impermeable surface coverage will remain at 10.7% with the proposed grass strip driveway on the property. A contribution of \$696.51 will be made to the DRA fund to offset the overage in impermeable surface coverage. Mr. Till from the OCDOH, spoke with Mr. Eggleston and stated that he will maintain the septic approval with any modifications needed with the driveway now added to the lot, rather than approve a holding tank on the property. With the addition of the proposed driveway, the septic location is now approximately 91 feet to the lake line.

There will be 8 to 18 inch gabion rock that will be hand stacked by the existing base of the boathouse for the protected stone swale down to the lake. The technique proposed is an approved water technique to slow the water and clean the water before it enters the lake. A hand dug dirt swale with no vegetation growing in it is the existing condition. There will be seawall remediation consisting of filling grout in the existing retaining wall and putting in large rocks in front of the wall to attenuate the waves, with the rocks

partially set into the lakebed. There will be plant material and jute mesh around the existing trees to vegetate the bank.

There are variances being requested for increasing the height of the building within 50 feet of the lake line redeveloping a lot less than 20,000 SF, and for an increase in floor area. The Zoning Board of Appeals has closed the public hearing but has not made their final determination. Mr. Camp suggested that jute mesh be added to the proposed swale. The stairs to the lake will be replaced with wood and pea stone. The DEC permit request has been submitted and is pending for the proposed work in the lake.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Member Winkelman to schedule a public hearing on ***Tuesday, October 17, 2017 at 6:30 p.m.*** The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

**Sketch Plan –Site Plan Review**

Applicant: Brian Carvalho  
8 Academy Street  
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Property:  
Port Way  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #054.-05-07.0**

Present: Brian Carvalho, Applicant

The applicant is proposing a 2,979SF single-family dwelling located on a 1.14-acre vacant lot on the corner of Winding Way and Port Way, with an intermittent watercourse located on the south side of the lot. The lot has been vacant for many years, and there will be some brush removed in anticipation of site visits. Member Winkelman inquired if there are any good trees that could be saved. Mr. Carvalho stated that the lot is mostly covered in brush and buckthorn, with trees located towards the back of the property that will not be disturbed.

Port Way has not been maintained by the Homeowner’s Association and is overgrown with brush, and has been a dumping ground for brush from the neighbors. The Wave Way Homeowner’s Association has approved the use of Port Way for access to the lot, and the intention is that the area will be cleared and stone laid for the access. Perc tests have been completed and a septic system design will be sent to OCDOH for approval.

Drainage plans have been developed with a culvert designed for the driveway and a swale located in the north and west of the proposed septic fields. There will also be a swale located along Port Way, and raingarden located south of this swale and between the proposed residence and the watercourse to the south. A silt fence will be utilized during construction. Based on the contours of the property, the stormwater would flow at least 100 feet before entering the watercourse.

The proposed dwelling conforms to the two front yard setbacks and is located 82’6” to the watercourse. There is an application pending with the Zoning Board of Appeals for the variance of the watercourse setback. The dwelling will have ‘age in place’ living quarters on the first floor and deck, with two guest bedrooms and an office located on the second floor. Additional attic storage will be located over the garage. The walkout basement will have a shop and recreation area along with the mechanicals. The proposed impermeable surface coverage is 7.3% with open space proposed at 91.4%. A construction sequence was presented to the Board and was dated with the meeting date. Mr. Camp suggested that the driveway opening be slightly modified to provide a better ease of egress. A site visit was scheduled for October 14, 2017.

**Sketch Plan- Special Permit**

Applicant: John Teixeira  
2763 East Lake Road  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #037.-01-04.0**

Present: John Teixeira, Applicant

The applicant is proposing a 192 sf shed to store lawn equipment as there is no garage on the property and it is difficult to store the equipment under the cottage. The property is already at 17.5% impermeable surface coverage and the proposed shed will increase the coverage to 18.5%. The shed would be located at to the north of the parking/turn around. The applicant is seeking variances from the Zoning Board of Appeals to increase nonconforming impermeable surface coverage, reducing the open space to below 80%, and increase the building footprint to 7.7% of the lot whereas 6% is the maximum allowed.

Mr. Brodsky inquired if the applicant has considered locating the shed on the existing pavement. Mr. Teixeira commented that if the shed were located in the turnaround, it would make it difficult to turn around a vehicle so that it does not need to back onto East Lake Road. Placing it on the drive would block the view of the driveway from the kitchen in the house. Mr. Teixeira continue saying that he mows his own lawn and if he hired a service, they would park their truck along East Lake Road and diminish driver visibility of the road.

Mr. Camp inquired on the type of construction proposed. Mr. Teixeira commented that there would be a gravel base with the pre-constructed shed placed on the base.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Hamlin to schedule a public hearing on *Tuesday, October 17, 2017 at 6:40 p.m.* The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

**Sketch Plan-Subdivision**

Applicant: Banjo's Home Farm LLC  
2696 West Lake Road  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #053.-01-05.1**

Present: Andrew Leja, Representative

There was a subdivision four years ago for lot #5. The application today is for a 2.26-acre lot with lake frontage marked as lot 6. Access to the lot will be off fire lane 20, with the proposed lot being the fourth lot on the private drive. The future detention basin location has been indicated on the map that is south and southwest of the proposed lot. There will be a 22-foot wide access drive to the proposed lot.

Mr. Camp inquired what was the intent of calling out the future detention basin on the subdivision map. Member Kasper commented that the neighbors were complaining about the drainage. Chairman Southern stated that the neighbors had a genuine concern that everything was washing out to the south. Member Kasper said the water was coming down the fire lane and washing out the properties to the south. Mr. Brodsky stated that the trigger was that the drainage basin would be developed the next time there was development of another lot. Mr. Leja stated that he will have more detail on what is there now and the exact location of the basin put on the map for the next meeting.

Mr. Brodsky shared his concern that the area below proposed lot #6 could be a potential subdivided lot in the future making it a fifth lot off fire lane 20. He advised the board to look at changing the private drive up to the standards of a private road. The other concern is if the lot continued to be subdivided, the impermeable surface coverage of the farm would need to be considered to keep it in conformance of 10% coverage. An additional concern is that eventually the 22' wide driveway access would connect with the access off of Greenfield Lane, connecting Greenfield Lane with the private drive to the south. A septic design for the proposed lot 6 is in progress. A site visit will be conducted On October 14, 2017.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Hamlin to schedule a public hearing on **Tuesday, October 17, 2017 at 6:50 p.m.** The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

**Sketch Plan –Site Plan Review**

Applicant: Grace Chapel  
1674 US Route 20  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #042.-05-05.1**

Present: Lee Hudson, Applicant; Barry Sisson, Pastor

Mr. Hudson began by saying that the congregation is growing and they have found it challenging to meet the parking demands for the church. They would like to build the parking lot out to the Town easement with the addition of 84 parking spaces. During the winter, it becomes more difficult to have sufficient parking with storage of the snow. The Town could also use the parking for anyone using the Town property. Mr. Sisson stated that on the days of worship, some parishioners are leaving because they cannot find parking. Chairman Southern commented that the proposed parking is broken up. Member Winkelman inquired if there will be trees in the parking lot. Mr. Hudson commented that there are trees in the right of way that will be removed as part of the proposal, but there are no trees in the parking area. Member Winkelman said that there are no trees in the design of the parking lot expansion, it is just being designed to maximize parking. He continued saying that trees in the parking lots can help to keep down the heat of the pavement.

Mr. Camp inquired on the changes from the proposed plan to the previous plan that was approved. The impermeable surface coverage percentage has been reduced with the acquisition of the land from the Town. There will be less land disturbed as they are proposing 84 parking spaces and the prior approval was for 185 parking spaces. The prior proposal was never acted upon, as they did not have the space prior to the acquisition of the land. Mr. Sisson stated that the intent was that they were going to work with the Town to put ball fields out back, which did not come to fruition.

Mr. Brodsky inquired if a State DOT permit was obtained for the alignment of the proposed right of way with the easement. Mr. Hudson stated that they are not responsible for the development of the easement, and that they are going to continue to use the existing driveway. Mr. Brodsky said that this site sits on the boundary of the watershed, with a historical drainage pattern of the land in and out of the watershed. He suggested that board do a site visit and closely review any drainage plans created. Mr. Camp stated that there was an extensive discussion of the drainage on the other plan including installation of the culvert and detention basin that would address the road construction and drainage. Mr. Hudson commented that there is an existing detention basin to the east. Mr. Camp commented that the proposed parking would not drain into that detention basin; the drainage will need to be looked at by the town and NYSDOT, as the drainage would flow to the DOT right of way. Mr. Hudson stated that Mark Berger from Soil & Water looked at the proposal who felt that the drainage is going into the woods and meadow. Mr. Camp said

that the proposed parking lot would drain towards the road. He continued stating that when there are small weather events the water drains to the north and east to the culvert and when there are large weather events the water cannot get into the culvert and it will back up and flow over the weir to the south end of the lake.

Chairman Southern inquired if there is any topography of the location. There has been no topography that has been submitted as part of this application however there may be something on file from the prior application. Member Winkelman inquired about the detention basin on the east and which way it drains. Mr. Hudson said that it drains northward, and it rarely has water in the basin after rain events. A site visit will be conducted on October 14, 2017. Mr. Camp commented that there were drainage concerns with the prior approval, although this proposal is a smaller plan. Member Winkelman inquired if the basin was to be utilized for rain events. Mr. Hudson said that it was for use mainly for the sanctuary area on the property before the acquisition of the property.

Mr. Hudson inquired what the next step would be after the site visit, as they would like to begin construction soon. Mr. Brodsky stated that the first thing is the site visit to evaluate the plan and the drainage. He continued stating that the applicant may need to provide a contour map and drainage improvements similar to what was originally contemplated in 2010. Although the proposal is for less parking lot development, there may be a need for a drainage plan to be developed to support the parking lot expansion. Mr. Sisson commented that Soil and Water had done a site visit and they felt there was no need for it. Mr. Brodsky commented that there is still NYSDOT and the Town's opinion on the drainage patterns. He continued saying that the application is a new application and not an amendment, and that he will re-review the application as it might need a special permit.

Mr. Hudson informed the board that they would be clearing some of the brush in anticipation of the upcoming site visit. Mr. Brodsky clarified that there can be no land disturbance included with the brush clearing.

Mr. Camp commented that the old plan was going to create a better situation for the Town to come in and build a road. Member Hamlin queried if Institute of Transportation Engineers(ITE) provides parking generation for churches or public assembly since the applicant is going off of antidotal evidence. Mr. Camp commented that they do.

**Sketch Plan – Special Permit**

Applicant: Daniel Flanick  
274 Genesee St  
Auburn, NY 13021

Property:  
4022 Mill Road  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #027.-01-47.1**

Present: Daniel Flanick, Applicant;

The applicant is proposing an 800 SF personal training facility at the property located at 4022 Mill Road. The existing uses on the property area a chia seed processing operation, a distillery and office use. The training facility would be located on the lower level of unused warehouse space. Access for the customers would be through the main entrance to the stairs that lead to the lower level. Member Winkelman inquired on the parking requirements for the proposed use. Mr. Flanick stated that he would be training 3-4 people at a time, which would equate to 2-4 parking spaces needed. The hours of the operation would be between 6-8 am and 4pm – 8 pm. These times are mostly when the distillery is closed, as they are only open on Saturdays 12 pm -5 pm and Sundays 1 pm to 5 pm.

Chairman Southern commented that the only concern is the availability of parking. Member Kasper commented that he thought they were maxed out on marking with the distillery proposal. Mr. Brodsky stated that applicant is using the same site plan from the prior 2010 approval, and with the use changes it could pose parking challenges as there were approximately 20 parking spaces on site. There may be more activity at this site than can be supported by the parking. Member Hamlin commented that they are there now but that the hours for this use are different.

Mr. Brodsky said that one thought is to encourage the owner to do a proper site plan to show the proper parking allocation. Member Kasper said that there was a parking plan that was done with the last proposal with some additional parking in the grass. Chairman Southern requested a chart of the hours of operation for each of the uses, the square footage of the uses, and the number of employees for each of the business and the parking needs.

Member Winkelman inquired if bathrooms will be installed in the proposed space. Mr. Flanick stated that his customers would utilize the existing bathrooms available in the main lobby. Mr. Brodsky suggested another idea to have a plan of the full occupancy of the site, do a special permit and layout the types of uses that will occupy the space and then he would not have to come back for every tenant. The owner would lay out in advance what he would want to do in the building with allocated space designated and parking needs determined, then he would have one approval.

Member Kasper reiterated that the board would need to have the analysis of the existing uses the number of employees and the parking needs.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Hamlin to schedule a public hearing on *Tuesday, October 17, 2017 at 7:00 p.m.* The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

**Continued Review –Site Plan Review**

Applicant: Jane Cummings  
2356 West Lake Rd  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #056.-02-02.1**

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect

The variances were approved on September 5, 2017 on the application. The proposal is to construct a 24'x28' two-car garage with attic storage and extend the living space 12 feet where the existing six-foot porch is located. Impermeable surface coverage will be 9.9% on the lot with open space at 87.9%. A construction sequence is included with the narrative, and the garage will fit in seamlessly with the existing dwelling.

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

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

1. That the Site Plan Approval shall expire if the applicant fails to comply with the conditions stated within 18 months of its issuance or if its time limit expires without renewal; and
2. That the Site Plan 1-3 of 3 dated July 27, 2017, Narrative dated July 28, 2017, and Construction Sequence dated July 28, 2017, prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, licensed Architect (“Site Plan”), be strictly followed; and
3. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency having jurisdiction over the Property or Application, and
4. That all conditions required by the Skaneateles Zoning Board of Appeals in connection with its approval are fulfilled, and
5. An As-Built survey to be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of completed project within (60) days of completion of the Project.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Vice Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Anne Redmond	Absent	

**Continued Review-Site Plan Review**

Applicant: Robert & Joyce Jowaisas  
 3083 East Lake Road  
 Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #039.-01-03.0**

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect;

The shoreline was washed out due to the July 1, 2017 storms, and they have remediated the washed out area with the board’s prior verbal approval. The second phase of the project is that the existing field stone seawall needs to be repaired and they would like to have ½ to 1 ton rocks in front of the wall for wave attenuation, with an application pending with the DEC as they have jurisdiction.

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

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, upon a motion made Member Scott Winkelman and seconded by Member Douglas Hamlin, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the minor site plan, with standard conditions and the following additional conditions:

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

2. That the Site Plan 1-2 of 2 dated July 31, 2017 (“Site Plan”), and Narrative dated July 31, 2017 (“Narrative”), prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, licensed Architect, be strictly followed; and
3. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from NYSDEC and any agency having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application.

\

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Vice Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Anne Redmond	Absent	

**Continued Review –Site Plan Review**

Applicant: Raymond Poole  
 PO Box 53145  
 Sarasota, FL 34232

Property:  
 1025 The Lane  
 Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #050.-01-17.0**

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect

The proposal is to renovate the existing nonconforming dwelling with proposed alteration to the dwelling on the same footprint. There will be a basement under an existing porch and the septic system will have another line added to the field. Member Kasper inquired about the overhand being considered as a porch and the extension of the foundation. Mr. Eggleston clarified that it is considered a porch as the eave extend beyond three feet from the principal structure. Mr. Brodsky commented that the porch is already considered impermeable surface coverage, and adding the foundation under the porch does not increase the coverage. Mr. Eggleston stated that the existing impermeable surface coverage of 21.7% will be maintained.

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

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

1. That the Site Plan Approval shall expire if the applicant fails to comply with the conditions stated within 18 months of its issuance or if its time limit expires without renewal; and
2. That the Site Plan 1-6 of 6 dated July 31, 2017 (“Site Plan”), and Narrative dated July 31, 2017 (“Narrative”), prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, licensed Architect, be strictly followed; and
3. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from OCDOH and any agency having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application.

4. An as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Vice Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]
Member	Anne Redmond	Absent	

**Discussion**

Applicant:

Russel Zechman	Property:
PO Box 9	3741 Fisher Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152	Skaneateles, NY 13152
<b>Tax Map #033.-04-14.0 &amp; 12.0</b>	

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect

The applicant is requesting a further extension as he was hoping that the Village water improvement would have been completed; however, the Village is in the bidding process to contract for the work to be completed. The construction drawings have been completed by GHD out of Cazenovia.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Chairman Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman to extend the review of the application an additional six months at the request of the applicant to ***Tuesday, March 20, 2018***. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

**Informal Discussion**

Applicant:	Emerald Estates Properties, LP	Property:
	3394 East Lake Rd	2894 East Lake Rd
	Skaneateles, New York	Skaneateles, New York
		<b>Tax Map #036.-01-37.1</b>

Present: Donald Spear, Representative; Robert Eggleston, Architect;

Mr. Spear began referencing the last time the application was in front of the board, there was an impasse that was reached regarding the 40-acre conservation lot. With an approval of a conservation subdivision, there would be a compulsory conservation easement placed that would cause the valuation of the lot to be lost for the applicant. At that point, the applicant attempted to sell the 80-acre property to a buyer who might be able to put it into conservation and get a tax benefit from the IRS. Subsequently, there has been no offer on the property. Counsel Molnar queried if the applicant's plan is to have the new property owner put the one lot into conservation and then pursue the subdivision development. Mr. Spear stated no, that the thought was that it would be one home and place the remaining acreage into conservation.

Mr. Spear stated that they are back wanting to pursue the subdivision with a suggested compromise. They would concede that the 40-acre parcel would go into conservation and in return, there is a road and storm system that is stable and working that has been tested with the recent storm events. He would like

to not disturb the road that is currently running about 14% slope. He continued that he might want to redo the lots to include the 40 acres of residual land.

Member Winkelman commented that it would be good to utilize the conservation analysis that reflects the steep slopes with high conservation value, especially with lots 3 and 4. Mr. Spear stated that was accounted for with the existing design. Mr. Eggleston stated that the building envelopes for lots 3 and 4 are on level spots with conservation areas outside of the building envelopes. Mr. Brodsky clarified that the conservation area of lots 3 and 4 are not part of the conservation easement. Mr. Eggleston stated that by virtue of the designated building envelopes an area is created where you could build your structure and include the septic system, as these are bigger lots. Member Winkelman commented that the pink conservation area on the site plan would be lawn. Mr. Eggleston commented that the pink area would be kept natural. The whole hill has greened up into natural succession.

Mr. Brodsky inquired if there was site plan review requirement for each of the proposed lots. Mr. Eggleston confirmed that it was done for lots 1 and 2 and expect that for the proposed lots. Mr. Brodsky stated that a condition for site plan review for lots 3, 4, and maybe 6, the board could specify on the approved site plan that these areas are non-disturbance and steep slope areas. They are not in a conservation easement but they are still areas that are not to be disturbed. Mr. Eggleston said that there are also view easements on lot 4, 5 & 6 for the benefit of lots 1 and 2. The heights of any dwellings on proposed lots 3 through 6 are lower than the road and would not obstruct views for lots 2, 8 and 10.

Counsel Molnar commented that the conservation easement would be on the conservation lot and the rear portions of lots 9 and 10. Mr. Spear clarified that the residual lot would go away with lots 9 and 10 redesigned to include the land. Mr. Eggleston stated that the conservation land can be on a separate lot or can be on part of developed lots. Mr. Brodsky inquired if there will be a homeowner's association created. Mr. Spear stated that there will not be one. Mr. Eggleston stated that there can be 12 dwellings on a conservation road, so a new lot could replace the residual lot. He continued stating that all of the area outside of the building envelopes on the lots is part of the conservation land because it cannot be built upon.

Member Winkelman commented that the property still has limitations with the slope and with that many houses up there. Mr. Spear stated that it was originally a 98-acre site and with only twelve lots is not very dense. He continued commenting that you have to allow for some property owner rights. Member Winkelman said that the land of higher conservation value is all around the steep slopes, and he would prefer to put the houses back further. Mr. Spear commented that the front lots were dropped so that they were out the slopes and maintains the views for Nangle. Counsel Molnar stated that the lots in the back probably do not have any view anyway. Member Winkelman stated that the people on the lake cannot see them. He continued saying that we keep building on the ridgeline all around the lake. Mr. Spear stated that it is a big flat area. Mr. Eggleston stated that the ridgeline is actually back in the rear of the property, and when you are on the other side of the lake, you see the Weaver barn and it is way below the ridgeline. Mr. Spear stated that the Tucker WECS is way up on the ridgeline. Mr. Brodsky inquired if it was feasible to move lots 3 and 4 back to the conservation lot area, and is there enough elevation to see over the Nangle house. Mr. Spear stated that they would not as the area is flat.

Counsel Molnar commented that the driveway is paved. Mr. Spear stated that it is paved from East Lake Road up just past the Nangle's driveway, as it was paved by Nangle, Weaver and the applicant. Mr. Eggleston noted that they are also asked for a waiver on the pitch of 13-14% whereas 12% is the maximum for a conservation road as they do not want do cause more disturbance of the road is stabilized. Member Winkelman inquired if the stormwater facility has the capacity for the additional dwellings. Mr. Spear commented that it does, he can confirm that with Rudy Zona. Mr. Eggleston added that site plan

review would be required for each of the lots to ensure the drainage on each of the lots is managed properly to handle its own storm water.

Member Winkelman inquired about the outlet. Mr. Spear stated that he was on site right after the July 1, 2017 storms and the water does not jump; it functions as designed. Member Winkelman commented that the leach field on parcel D made you screw it up and build the weir to direct it to the south. Mr. Spear stated that he did not want to disturb the septic fields. He continued stating that NYSDOT had put two drains in wherever the road dips down in case one gets blocked. One drain is deliberately lower than the other, and with this case, it is the drain closest to the pink house. The drain further south is the higher drain, and because the people from the pink house objected, the water was to the south drain that is higher. Member Winkelman commented that the board just gave the owner of the pink house the permission to reinforce the drainage channel and their seawall.

Mr. Spear said that if this sounds like a reasonable approach then we can move forward with the details. Counsel Molnar commented that the revised idea is a reasonable approach. Member Kasper commented that it complies with the zoning code. Member Winkelman said that it is contrary to the comprehensive plan building all this stuff up on the hill in the watershed in the country, it is too much. Chairman Southern inquired whether the construction on lots 3, 4, and 5 could be staggered so that there is not one big hit on the landscape for the timing of construction. Mr. Spear stated that he could do that. Chairman Southern stated that it would take some clever planning to complete one site with stabilization before the next begins. Mr. Brodsky inquired if it was feasible to designate drainage before the lots are developed so that the red zones on the lots are not used for drainage. Mr. Spear commented that each lot would have to come in for site plan review so that board could ensure the area is not disturbed. Member Winkelman stated that he would like to see more of a buffer than having those houses right there because if trees in the red area limit their view they are going to cut them down. Mr. Brodsky commented that the building envelope size could be altered as part of the approval.

Chairman Southern requested a view of lots 3, 4,5, and 6 from East Lake Road looking east, to show what it may look like. Mr. Eggleston stated that they may have done it already as part of the visual study done before. Member Winkelman said that it would be nice for the steep slopes to go back to woods, but the property owners will want the lake view. Mr. Eggleston said that it could be planted with native species that do not get tall. Chairman Southern stated that the board can restrict the size of trees or species allowed in the area. Mr. Camp commented that you could put a limit on the number of future cuttings allowed. Member Winkelman said that the more simple the design the less the town has to police.

**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 8:50 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull, Clerk