

TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
December 16, 2014

Mark J. Tucker, Chairman
Elizabeth Estes
Donald Kasper
Joseph Southern
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 November 17, 2014 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 Kasper to approve the minutes as corrected. 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	[Yes]

The meeting minutes of November 18, 2014 were previously distributed to the Board and all Members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kasper and seconded by Member Winkelman to approve the minutes as submitted. 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	[Yes]

Public Hearing –Special Permit

Applicant: Jack Gordon
680 Sheldon Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #023.-05-01.1

Present: Jack Gordon, Applicant

No one requested to have the public notice read. The Board has visited the site on November 22, 2014. Mr. Gordon is proposing a 24'x32' pole barn on the 54-acre vacant lot, which requires a special permit. The proposed barn will be located on the lot behind the existing dwelling and barn located on separate lots.

Mr. Gordon stated that he wants the proposed barn to store his tractor and lawn equipment, as he is not able to store it in the existing barn that is used for events such as weddings. Mr. Brodsky stated that the special permit for the structure is for a warehouse use and suggested that the applicant consider a lot line adjustment to add more land to the property with the dwelling that would accommodate the pole barn. He stated that there is no driveway access indicated on the plan. Mr. Gordon stated that there is an existing farm drive and that his drive would be extended from it to the proposed barn. The tax assessor suggested that a special permit may be the way to go right now and Mr. Gordon stated that down the road he would consider adjusting the lot line. Mr. Brodsky advised that board to potentially restrict that activity of the warehouse use. Member Kasper stated that restrictions could be placed on the structure's use as a part of the approving resolution as there will be no water connected to the structure. Mr. Gordon stated that there would be no water or electricity to the building.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Southern and seconded by Member Winkelman to declare this application to be a Type II action pursuant to section NYCRR617.5(c) (7) and not subject to SEQR review. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

At this time, Chairman Tucker opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor of the project. No one spoke in favor of the project. Chairman Tucker 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 Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Estes 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 by Member Donald Kasper and seconded by, Chairman Mark Tucker and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the special permit and minor site plan, with the following conditions:

1. That 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 approval is for the proposed 24'x32' storage building limited to non-commercial use; and
3. That an as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of all phases of the completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Sketch Plan-Special Permit

Applicant:

John Menapace 2487 East Lake Rd Skaneateles, NY	Property: 4022 Mill Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map #027.-01-47.1
---	--

Present: John Menapace, Chris Uyehara, Kate Menapace, Applicants

Member Kasper inquired whether the proposed use would involve the entire building. Mr. Menapace stated that the proposal is for the use of only 3000SF of the building with the office/tasting room on the first floor and the production in a portion of the basement. The Chia seed company is continuing to reside in another portion of the building. Mr. Uyehara stated that the proposal is for a grain distillery operating under a class D farm license under the state of New York.

Chairman Tucker requested that the applicant discuss the process of the business with the first step of bringing grain into the building. Mr. Uyehara stated that they would be purchasing grain from Elbridge Grain and Seed and milling it on site. The grain will be cooked in the still and fermented; the sugars are stripped from the grain and the spent grain will be given to local farmers as feed for their stock. Chairman Tucker inquired on the quantity of raw product that will be delivered. Mr. Uyehara stated that approximately 500 lbs. of corn, rye, and barley would be delivered once a week. The spent grain would be picked up once a week to be delivered to farmers, with the spent grain in the form of porridge.

Member Winkelman inquired how many truckloads is 500 lbs. of grain. Mr. Uyehara stated it is approximately 10 bags. Member Kasper inquired as to how much product would be produced. Mr. Uyehara stated that they intend to produce 40 gallons of whisky a week. Mr. Menapace stated that the product would be delivered through the loading dock and come around to be delivered to the production area.

Mr. Uyehara stated that the spent grain will be pumped into the IBC totes in preparation for delivery to the farmers, and the wastewater used for washing will be pumped into a holding tank on the premises that will be emptied monthly. Mr. Menapace stated that the holding tank that was in place prior to the septic system being installed a few years ago will be used for the

wastewater storage. Mr. Uyehara stated that they will be steam cleaning which will use a minimal amount of water.

Member Kasper inquired on the possibility of explosion with the production of alcohol. Mr. Uyehara stated that proper ventilation will be installed to minimize the risk. Mr. Menapace stated that he has met with the CEO to assist with the necessary safety precautions including the best location for the steam boiler that is similar in design to a household steam boiler. Member Southern inquired if there are government regulations with the production of alcohol. Mr. Uyehara stated that after receiving approval from the Town Planning Board, the he can acquire his State license, then the Federal license. Member Southern inquired on the flow of visitors to the establishment. Ms. Menapace stated that business hours will be limited to the weekends; the tasting room space is limited with 10-15 people at any given time for tasting and viewing production from the viewing platform. The visitors would not have access to the production floor. Member Estes inquired on the number of employees. Ms. Menapace stated that initially there are three employees with an increase to potentially 10 employees by 10 years. There are 20 designated parking places for the proposal and 8 spaces for Nature's Chemistry.

Member Southern inquired when the last time a product was sold for retail at the location. Mr. Menapace stated that he has been selling product on an ongoing basis, accessories for boats that he sells out of his office. Member Southern inquired on the expansion plans for retail. Mr. Menapace stated that there will be some sales from the tasting room; however, he is not sure of how many people it would be. The product will be also sold elsewhere by other retailers. Member Kasper inquired if the proposed business would be considered an agricultural related business. Mr. Brodsky stated that the distillery would be regulated by Ag and Markets from the standpoint of using farm materials but not as a farm operation. The use is light industrial that is permitted in the RR district by special permit.

Member Estes asked what the start up time is for this venture. Mr. Uyehara stated that it will take three to four months to get final approval from the state and federal agencies. Member Estes inquired where the raw materials will be stored. Mr. Menapace stated that the materials will be provided on an as needed basis. Member Kasper inquired on the name of the business. Mr. Uyehara replied that it will be called "Last Shot Distillery". Member Estes inquired if the neighbors have been contacted. Mr. Menapace stated that he knows the neighbors and will let them know about the project. Member Kasper inquired about any odor that might be emitted from the process. Mr. Uyehara stated that the odor is minimal and will smell like bread.

Ms. Menapace distributed a pamphlet that provides the history of whiskey production in Skaneateles. This distillery will be the first one to open since prohibition and there was a distillery in the building prior to the paper mill. The distillery will be new to the town but at the same time historic to the town.

Chairman Tucker inquired about the viewing area. Mr. Menapace stated that there will be stairs from the tasting room on the first floor that will lead to a viewing platform with no access to the production room. Mr. Brodsky inquired where the location will be for Mr. Menapace's business. Mr. Menapace stated that his business will continue and it will be located in the milfoil building. Mr. Brodsky stated that he was under the impression that in 2012 there was only the milfoil removal business and chia seed. Mr. Menapace stated that he also runs the Skaneateles Wooden Boat business and Skaneateles Timber Frames from that location. Mr. Brodsky stated that the existing business uses are unclear and may require further documentation. An updated

narrative should reflect all of the existing business that will remain and the location where they will occupy.

Member Winkelman inquired if the applicant has considered placing a bridge over the creek connecting to the walking trail. Mr. Menapace stated that there is a bridge going across the creek and he would like to fix that whole area up in the future. Solar and waterpower are considerations as improvements later. Member Winkelman inquire on the water supply for the building. Mr. Menapace stated that there is a 6" main for the Town water coming into the building. Chairman Tucker recommended that the applicant check with the Town on the increased usage of water for the proposal.

Member Southern inquired about signage for the proposal. Mr. Menapace stated that they have not considered signage yet. Member Southern stated that there are regulations in the code that the applicant can follow to develop signing for the building. Member Estes inquired when the distilling hours will be. Mr. Uyehara stated that the cooking of the batch would commence on weekends with fermentation during the week. The following weekend the batch would be stripped and stored and the process would occur again. All of the operation on the weekends would occur during normal business hours. Member Kasper stated that the board may have to limit hours for tastings.

Mr. Uyehara stated that the cooking process would take eight hours for two batches that can be completed by one person. Each batch would use 200 gallons of water, and 150 gallons to clean, with the total usage per week at 550 gallons of water. The usage is less than an individual would use in a residence. A site visit will be conducted on January 3, 2015.

Member Southern stated that he has a concern with the parking. Member Estes said that the applicant already stated that 15 people were the max for a tasting. Ms. Menapace commented that two people would travel together. Member Estes said that 3-4 people would be working. Mr. Menapace commented that the Chia business is closed on weekends, with plenty of space for expansion of parking. Mr. Brodsky requested that a plan for the parking and expansion be submitted to the Board. Ms. Menapace stated that there is parking on the other side of the building with parking along the driveway for four cars.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Winkelman to schedule a public hearing on **Tuesday, January 20, 2015 at 7:30 p.m.** The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Sketch Plan-Special Permit/Site Plan Review/Merger

Applicant: Barbara Delmonico
2430/2432 Wave Way
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #056.-02-40.2; 056.-02-47.0; & 054.-04-41.1

Present: Barbara Delmonico, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Architect

The applicant has three separate lots that will be merged into one. A variance was granted in 1996 to demolish the dwelling and rebuilding the house on the lakefront property including the merge of the small strip of property. The merge was never completed and is part of the approval requested now. Last year the applicant purchased the parcel with dwelling owned by the Kitts and located behind their lakefront parcel.

The proposal is to merge the Kitt property, demolish the Kitt dwelling, add a fourth bedroom and porch to the Delmonico dwelling, and construct a two-story garage with studio above on the former Kitt property. The proposed 16'x 37.5'garage would be used to store their boat and truck, with an artist's studio on the second floor. The second floor studio will have a half bath and a large utility sink in the studio for stretching canvases. The proposed garage will be conforming to setbacks whereas the existing dwelling does not. Variances requested are for the proposed footprint exceeding 6% of lot area, floorspace exceed 10% of lot area, north side yard setback and proposed open space under 80%.

The existing septic system located 50' from the lake line will be replaced with a septic system that will support a four bedroom dwelling located 200' from the lake line. Impermeable surface coverage will be decreased from a combined 24.8% to a proposed 18.7%; however over 10% of the lot area and requiring a special permit. The turnaround near the remaining dwelling will be reduced, and one of the existing sheds will be removed to reduce the impervious surface.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the combined lots and removal of the second dwelling is more in keeping with the neighborhood. A construction sequence has been provided that includes erosion control since the work will be done within 200' of the lake. There are steep slopes from the top of bank down where there are 40% slopes and no work is being done in this area. 6.6-10% slopes are from the top of bank to the proposed garage area.

Member Winkelman inquired whether there was consideration given to place the new garage in the exact location as the dwelling being removed and using the existing main driveway. Mr. Eggleston stated that the proposal is for the most efficient way to back a boat in. Member Estes inquired why the plan could not be restructured to attain the 80% open space. She continued saying that the driveway could be changed or the structure made smaller. Member Kasper commented that the garage could be placed at an angle and inquired why one of the dimensions is 37.5FT. Mr. Eggleston stated that if you look at the floorplan on 5 of 5 you will see that we need every inch. Member Kasper suggested that the sunroom on the dwelling could be placed where the deck is to improve open space. Mr. Eggleston stated that all it would do is help the open space.

Member Winkelman inquire on the width of the driveway and Wave Way. Mr. Eggleston stated that the width of the driveway is 10' and he would have to scale it to determine the width of Wave Way. Member Winkelman stated that you could scale it and turn it 90°. Mr. Eggleston stated that the big picture windows need to face north for the steady light for the art studio. Mr. Brodsky stated that it would eliminate a curb cut. Mr. Eggleston stated that Wave Way is a private road and the proposal is substantially reducing the frontage on Wave Way. Chairman Tucker inquired what the difference is between the 1996 approved site plan and the proposed site plan for the Delmonico lot. Mr. Eggleston stated that the 1996 site plan did not include the gravel driveway calculations, as it was not required in 1996. A site visit will be conducted on January 3, 2015.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Southern to schedule a public hearing on **Tuesday, January 20, 2015, 2014 at 7:40 p.m.** The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Sketch Plan – Hidden Estates Subdivision

Applicant: Emerald Estates Properties, LP
3394 East Lake Rd
Skaneateles, New York

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

Present: Donald Spear, Representative; Robert Eggleston, Architect; Peter Simmons, RZ Engineering

An informal discussion was held at last month's meeting to discuss the proposed eight-lot conservation subdivision. A site visit was conducted on November 22, 2014 to review possible building envelope locations for the proposed eight lots.

Drawing C-3 dated December 5, 2014 was submitted showing a 100FT radius curve rather than a 90° turn on the road based on comments from Mr. Camp relative to the drive. There are no engineering plans that will be done until after the conservation analysis and the general sketch plan of the building locations for the eight lots have been accepted by the Board.

Appel and Osborne will be completing a supplement to the 2009 conservation analysis to consider three view sheds- the view from East Lake Road at the property looking back up the hill; East Lake Road right around near the Maturevitz barn that used to be on Pork Street; and across the lake at the boat launch and West Lake Road. The supplement should be completed before the end of the year. Member Kasper stated that another view that should be analyzed should be across the lake from the Loveless Farm Development property. Member Winkelman stated that the 2009 conservation analysis did not address steep slopes. Mr. Eggleston stated that they were on the original analysis. Member Winkelman stated that the steep slopes are located in the area classified as low conservation value. Mr. Eggleston stated that they will also include the slopes in their supplemental analysis.

Mr. Brodsky suggested that the conservation analysis reflect the correct surrounding lands that have been held in conservation. Member Winkelman commented that any land that is deemed unbuildable would warrant conservation in a conservation subdivision.

Member Southern inquired whether access off Rickard Road was considered. Mr. Spear stated that to access the property from Rickard Road would make the road 5000FT long. Mr. Eggleston stated that putting a road in high conservation land is unproductive. The conservation analysis from 2009 reflects that the back half of the lot is the more important high conservation land. Member Winkelman commented that it is wet back there as it is the headwaters for the tributary there. Mr. Eggleston stated that the comprehensive plan suggests a ridgeline trail for that area, which would go across the area proposed for high conservation value.

Member Southern expressed his concern with putting in eleven lots and keep the back area available. Mr. Eggleston stated that there will be eight new lots in addition to the existing three

lots. Member Southern inquired on the total build out for the area. Mr. Eggleston stated that the maximum number of lots allowed on a conservation road is twelve. The twelfth lot is the land that has been placed in reserve that is not part of the conservation subdivision located in the back of the property. Member Southern stated that if the piece of land was sold then additional houses could be placed on it. Mr. Eggleston stated that you could not have more dwelling access off the conservation road.

Mr. Brodsky commented that a conservation subdivision requires a conservation easement. The back section may be allowed for a single-family dwelling. Chairman Tucker commented that there will be no conservation easement on that back parcel being proposed. Mr. Spear commented that the 48 acres for the 8 dwellings will include the conservation land. Mr. Eggleston stated that the twelfth lot would be the final lot of the conservation subdivision. Member Southern commented that the twelfth lot could be developed into a regular subdivision. Mr. Spear stated that if he talks to NY Ag and Markets or the USDA, he could put in a conservation easement on the twelfth lot. If the lot already has a conservation easement then he would not get any pay out from the agencies.

Counsel Molnar commented that section 131-6A states the conditions of creating a conservation subdivision states that the land is protected by conservation easement from further development. Mr. Brodsky requested further explanation of how the applicant intends to form a conservation easement. Mr. Spear stated that the state and federal government has determined that if you give up your development rights to a parcel then it is considered a charitable contribution from a federal standpoint, it is commented in section 170 of the tax code, an independent company would determine the build out value of the property and the tax advantage would be for that amount. The second way is to be cashed out through the USDA or NYS Ag & Markets, as they will pay money for a certain percentage of the value of the land. If the land is already in a conservation easement then the agencies will not pay out. Member Estes stated there are no guarantees at all. Member Southern stated that it is compulsory to place the remaining land in a conservation easement. Mr. Spear stated that it is in the remaining 40 acres of the 48 acres being developed for the 8-lot subdivision. Counsel Molnar stated that the residual lot is part of the conservation subdivision that also must be placed in a conservation easement.

Mr. Spear stated that the residual land is not part of the subdivision otherwise; the lots would be six acres each. Mr. Brodsky stated that the application for the subdivision is for the entire lot and not just the 48 acres being developed. Member Southern stated that if the lot was two separate lots, then the 48-acre front lot could be considered a conservation subdivision without involving the back lot. Member Winkelman stated that the applicant could make his case for the tax break with the conservation easement on the back part of the property. Member Estes stated that the applicant is not going for the tax break but wants to be cashed out. Member Winkelman stated that the Ag & Market buy out is for viable farmland and this property does not have viable farmland. Mr. Spear stated that the land is riparian and they would want to conserve in especially since it is in the watershed. The USDA does not have an active farm requirement to consider land for conservation. Mr. Brodsky inquired if there is a timetable for submittal for the conservation easements. Mr. Spear stated that he hopes to submit in 2015, however funding would probably take three years.

Member Kasper stated that the lot that is put into conservation could not be developed more than one house. Member Winkelman stated only off the proposed conservation road; it is part of the incentive for us to allow a smaller road and have extra land. Member Estes stated that it has to be locked in now so that it does not get further development. Mr. Eggleston stated that even if

the applicant could gain access from a different road, the conservation analysis would not support more than one house for that lot. Mr. Brodsky suggested that the applicant submit copies of the applications to the USDA and state for conservation assistance. Member Estes stated that it would not be a guarantee. Mr. Brodsky stated that there is a problem with definitions of the conservation subdivision as Mr. Spear is defining it as 48 acres and others are viewing the entire parcel as the conservation subdivision. Mr. Eggleston stated that a partial conservation subdivision is possible and will let the Town know where it is in the code. Mr. Brodsky stated that a partial open space subdivision is possible.

Member Winkelman stated that one of his other concerns is the existing road going up that is a steep slope. He inquired why the conservation subdivision was not considered at the time of the creation of the original three-lot subdivision. Mr. Spear stated the EDR designed 10% drainage on the property with huge detention ponds with the DEC requirement of each property holding its own rainwater. He continued stating that the only reason there is a steep slope is that Doug Wickman insisted on it as the natural land had a softer contour. He insisted on that first bend that created the steepness; if it is restored to original grade then the 12% grade can be maintained. Member Winkelman stated that he does not feel it is a stable or sustainable driveway. Member Kasper stated that it has not held up. Mr. Spear stated that the driveway will need a binder coat of asphalt to stabilize it.

Member Kasper commented that a complete drainage analysis should be done for the entire project. Mr. Eggleston stated that it will happen after completion of the first phase of the conservation subdivision discussion. Member Kasper stated that the pond was created for the road. Mr. Camp was in concurrence with Member Kasper's comment and individual stormwater management was to be constructed for each lot as it was built. The Board should consider whether that should be revisited. Member Kasper stated that everything runs to the north until the Pajak's property and then the stormwater comes back. He continued stating the entire drainage needs to be analyzed to resolve any issues. It may have to handle with one big drainage pond.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the conservation analysis will be submitted to the Board by the end of the year, and then the Board can develop their findings, location, and appropriate number of lots determined, and then the drainage addressed. The engineering needs to be developed after lot location determination. Mr. Eggleston stated that they are following the Arendt method of subdivision design. Member Southern stated that Arendt designs the entire parcel and not just piece meal as this application is proposing.

Member Southern stated that he would rather see the lots clustered in one area and create a village rather than the lots scattered. Member Winkelman stated that Mr. Arendt would design it that way. Member Southern stated that if the lots were located up towards the top in an eyebrow shape, the lots would still have lake views and have a village green. Mr. Spear stated that it would be a lot of clearing of land. Chairman Tucker stated that the lots should be tucked away from direct view. Member Estes stated there would be an immense amount of clearing. Member Southern stated that Mr. Arendt has stated that you will sacrifice something. Mr. Eggleston stated that Mr. Arendt was not working with the Town's zoning law and two-acre zoning. Mr. Spear stated that the goal is not to have people build an eyesore house. Member Estes stated that as you look across the lake you see the McMansions that are large houses smack there with nothing blocking them at all. Mr. Spear stated that the west side also has that issue. Member Estes stated that you can see the road from miles away and that you will see the houses too. Member Kasper stated that the existing road is a scar across the hillside and will have to be

addressed as part of the subdivision. A supplement to the conservation analysis will be submitted before the next meeting.

Sketch Plan –Site Plan Amendment

Applicant: Skaneateles Country Club
3344 West Lake Street
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #041.-01-21.0

Present: Jim Fields, Tim Ciriacione, Skaneateles Country Club; JoAnne Gagliano, Steve Breitzka, EDR

The Skaneateles Country Club was incorporated in 1915 with a 9-hole golf course developed in 1916 with an additional 9-hole course added in 1963. Golf has been declining for some years and in early 2014, the National Golfing Association reported numbers indicating that one new golf course is added for every eleven courses that close. This shift has caused country clubs to offer difference amenities to their members. Tennis courts were added in 2008 at the Skaneateles Country Club and there is more demand from its members for waterfront usage.

The total waterfront area is 2500LF with the proposed project affecting 400LF of the total encompassing from the north side of the mole to the existing beach area. The existing condition reflects an open grass area sloping away from the clubhouse to the lake. There is an existing sidewalk adjacent to the bulkhead wall and a small sidewalk leading to the clubhouse. Even with the minimal development in this area, the Club uses this area for multiple events throughout the year. It is used for picnicking and various camps during the summer. One of the design goals for this project is how to make the space safer as there is a 20% slope from the building to the walk.

There are two parking lots, the southern parking lot that was approved in 2008, and a northern parking lot that is smaller; both lots do not have stair access to the waterfront grass area. Ramps will not be possible for access due to required amount of space necessary. Proposed are stairs from the north and south parking lots. The southern stairs begin with a large viewing platform encircled with planting beds that leads to a set of stairs going north to the patio area. The walk along the bulkhead will be renovated to employ the use of pavers. Staircases will also be coming down from the clubhouse with terracing walls throughout the patio area designed at 18-24" and providing an edge to the planters with additional seating.

The existing beach area will be enlarged slightly on the north side, and new staircases to access the water will be added. To the north will be more grass area for a children's play area.

In regards to the mole, the wall has been damaged and repair is included as part of the application. Member Estes inquired about the topography of the grass area north of the clubhouse. Mr. Breitzka stated that the grass area forms a shallow bowl with a drain in the middle to slow the water down before draining to the lake. The existing conditions of the area allow for all runoff directly to the lake. Mr. Camp inquired whether the drainage will go to the existing outlet. Mr. Breitzka stated that there is an existing outlet that comes off the clubhouse; the stormwater percolates through the grass areas and permeable pavers, and then drains north of the mole into the lake.

Mr. Camp inquired about the proposed changes to the beach. Mr. Breitzka stated that there is an existing timber wall that would be expanded slightly with the beach squared off. Mr. Brodsky inquired if there will be any proposed change in use in the area. Member Estes inquired if the new patio will be an event patio. Mr. Fields stated that the existing grass area is currently used for events.

Mr. Breitzka stated that there is handicap accessibility with access provided by the elevator in the clubhouse.

Mr. Brodsky stated that the primary reason the application requires Planning Board review is that the proposal includes development of shoreline structures within 50' of the lake line. In 2010, the applicant received a variance for total shoreline structures of approximately 38,000SF, whereas 10,000SF would be allowed. Since that time, the Town has reinterpreted the code and has determined that shoreline structures beyond the mean high water are not under their purview. Those structures have been deducted from their calculations yielding it to 17,900SF with a proposal to 21,000SF. The floating docks should be removed from the past ZBA approval number to result in the net allowable shoreline structures for the property. Member Kasper stated that the ZBA gave the variance based on the floating docks. Mr. Brodsky clarify that it was on the total shoreline structures.

Counsel Molnar stated that result of a mutual mistake of the applicant, Zoning Board, the Planning Board were looking at the shoreline structures beyond the lake line as being subject to regulation. The site plan was created based on that assumption and the ZBA granted relief based on that site plan. The 38,000SF shoreline structures approval was based on the site plan approved and not on the site plan proposed. The difference will need to be reconciled. The current design would be 1239SF over that number. Mr. Brodsky stated that the approved variance would need to be amended since the proposal is exceeding what was approved. Mr. Breitzka stated that the floating dock total is 18,239SF from the TDK drawing. Mr. Breitzka inquired if there is precedence with this situation. Counsel Molnar stated that this is the first in regards to shoreline structures.

Mr. Camp inquired on the proposed lake line change. Mr. Breitzka stated that they have reached out to ACOE and are aiming to stay above the 863.27 elevation. The 30SF triangular area is not under ACOE jurisdiction for the extension of the wall. Mr. Camp stated that in the past the Board has been reluctant to pass any expansion into the lake. Counsel Molnar stated that if it is subject to the DEC to establish what has been eroded. Chairman Tucker stated that it depends on the scope of the work whether the Board had approved it in the past. The area will be reviewed at the site visit.

The existing impermeable surface coverage for the property is 9.35% and will be improved by .04% with the proposed improvements. A site visit will be conducted on January 3, 2015.

Discussion – Local Law C Abandonment

The Planning Board suggested modifications and recommends the proposed Local Law 2014-C, A Local Law Amending the Town Code of the Town of Skaneateles to define when an application before the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals will be deemed to be abandoned. The Planning Board suggested modifications (see attached) and recommends the proposed Local Law C of 2014, a Local Law Amending the Town Code of the Town of Skaneateles to define when an application before the Planning Board and Zoning Board of

Appeals will be deemed to be abandoned, with the suggested modifications incorporated, be adopted by the Town Board. Accordingly, the Planning Board adopted the following:

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Member Joseph Southern and seconded by Member Elizabeth Estes, that the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board, it was **RESOLVED** to recommend adoption of Local Law C of 2014, a Local Law Amending the Town Code of the Town of Skaneateles to define when an application before the Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals will be deemed to be abandoned, with suggested modifications incorporated, copy attached. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Discussion- Round Table Meeting

There will be a joint meeting of the Town, Planning, and Zoning Boards on Saturday, January 31, 2015 to discuss progress and priorities for 2015.

Attorney Advise Session

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Member Southern and seconded by Chairman Tucker to enter an attorney advise session. The Board having been polled resulted in favor of said motion.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Member Estes and seconded by Member Southern to return from attorney advise session. The Board having been polled resulted in favor of said motion.

The Board returned at 10:07 pm.

As there was no further business, a motion was made by Member Southern and seconded by Member Estes to adjourn the meeting. The Board was in unanimous affirmation of said motion and the meeting was adjourned at 10:08 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull

Karen Barkdull, Secretary/Clerk