

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
July 18, 2023**

Donald Kasper
Douglas Hamlin -absent
Scott Winkelman
Jill Marshall-absent
Jon Holbein
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel
John Camp, P.E. (C&S Engineers)
Howard Brodsky, Town Planner
Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Chair Kasper opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. The meeting minutes of June 20, 2023 were previously distributed to the Board and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Holbein to approve the minutes as submitted. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Cochair	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Absent	
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Present	[Yes]

Public Hearing-3 Lot Subdivision

Applicant: Travis Bradley
Alexander Liu
3743 Fisher Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #033.-04-12.1

Present: Travis Bradley, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

The property was formerly owned by Mr. Zechman who had proposed a three lot subdivision and lot line adjustment, with the Planning Board approval lapsing. Mr. Zechman's daughter had merged the two properties as part of a sale of the prior existing two lots. The current owner is proposing a three lot subdivision with Lot 1 being 2.5 acres with the existing dwelling and hanger that includes an accessory apartment, Lot 2 at 3.7 acres with an existing pond, and Lot 3 with an existing shed, gas line easement, and pond and that would also have most of the shared driveway. The shared driveway would be partially on Lot 1, continuing on lot 3, and providing access for all three lots. The pond on lot 2 has had comments from the neighbors that the pond is more of a nuisance, and the applicant is willing to fill it in and creating a grading plan when the lot is developed.

The shared driveway serving the three lots and four dwelling units, begins to the north and then shifts southerly. The utilities will come in over to the north to easily be accessible to Lot 2 and 3. There is a fire access hammerhead turnaround for fire trucks. The right of way will be 40 feet wide to accommodate

two separate water lines coming in for lots 2 and 3 and for other utilities. There will be a ditch on lot 2 along the north side of the right of way that would follow the road west along the natural slope area and draining to the southern pond located on the Bird's Nest lot. No stormwater would be drained into the pond located on Lot 2. The southern pond located on proposed lot 3 would drain to the west as well. A draft for the driveway easement was prepared and submitted to the town.

Chair Kasper inquired if the existing drainage goes to the south and if there will be a proposed swale to maintain the stormwater drainage to the south. Mr. Eggleston explained that the road ditch along the right of way will direct the stormwater to the west with a berm proposed to direct the water to the west and not towards the pond on lot 2. Mr. Camp commented that the drainage plan was developed and analyzed with the last subdivision application and that this application appears to propose the same drainage plan that was approved as part of that subdivision approval.

Mr. Eggleston added that the two proposed lots are located in the IRO district that would require site plan review when they are developed. The development of the lots would require a drainage plan to address the proposed development. Member Winkelman inquired if the pond would be filled in with the material excavated from the development of the road and Mr. Eggleston responded affirmatively.

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

1.

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 Small	
4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a CEA?	X	
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? It will be improved with the proposal.	X	

11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental or human health?	X	
--	---	--

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Winkelman, the Planning Board classified this application an Unlisted Action and reviewed the Applicant’s Short Environmental Assessment Form under SEQR, evaluating each of the criteria set forth in Part II, upon which the board determined that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

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

Devin Bartolo, 1640 New Seneca Turnpike, said that his yard floods all of the time and they have to pump the septic system once a year because the ground is so saturated. As his lot is located northwest of the applicant’s lot, is moving the water west making his situation worse as well as other houses in that area. His lot is the property west of the gas line. Chair Kasper commented that based on the topography, the stormwater heads south towards the pond on the Bird’s Nest property. Mr. Camp said that some of the water could be diverted away from those properties as part of the last approval. Mr. Bartolo said that water funnels on his property and it is a swamp in the back corner of his lot. He continued saying that there are underground springs in that area. Mr. Camp commented that a lot of the water in that area is coming from underground. Mr. Bartolo said it will become more of a problem if the water is being collected and diverted to that side.

Don Buff, 3749 Fisher Rd, said that the pond that is proposed to be filled in is over 50 years old and that his son used to swim in it. He asked where the water would go as it is spring fed and the water would go towards Seneca Turnpike. The last proposal was going to take water that came down the road and take it to the gas line. This would fill in the yards behind.

Brian Buff, 780 Sheldon Rd, reiterated what his father said. The pond on proposed lot 2 is the lowest point on the property that is being proposed to be filled in. I do not know where you are coming up with these things. When you stand by the gas line it is 10 feet above the lowest point and there is no way you can take the water to the west. It has never run that way and has always come to the east of the two ponds. I have fished the pond, mowed the lot for Ned Brown when he had the airport there. It was always the airplane’s take off point because it was the highest point of the property. There is no way that the water can flow down the driveway; it always floods those lots. That is why Don Trabold tried to put the pond in after it was getting filled in from lack of care. You need to review the drainage part of this to make sure you get it right before there is a problem because those people are the ones that are going to suffer on Onondaga. Mr. Camp stated that as each lot is developed if the subdivision were approved, the lots would require site plan review, and drainage and potential pond filling would be addressed. Member Winkelman added and additional stormwater controls could be addressed. Mr. Eggleston said that there are two drainage areas. One is by the road that they are addressing now where the topography works. They will be creating a ditch along the north side of the right of way and a berm to direct the water down 10 feet and away from lot 2. Following the existing slopes there is a ditch at the western end.

Devin Bartolo, 1640 New Seneca Tpke, inquired if a section of the property will be put into conservation as it was proposed with the prior application. Mr. Eggleston said that what is being proposed is a conventional subdivision with the likelihood that that a portion of proposed lot 3 would remain undeveloped.

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

Chair Kasper recommended that the drainage should be considered now as part of the subdivision application with a drainage plan created, A drainage pond could be proposed to the east to collect the stormwater and slowly release it to offset filling in the existing pond. Mr. Eggleston said that the prospective buyer for lot 2 is here and it will be lot 2's developer to produce a drainage plan based on what they may build. They can have 15% impermeable surface coverage and can design a bioswale that would basically turn the pond into a bioswale. The NYS requirement is that they do not increase the amount of water leaving the property that exists today. It would be nice to decrease the water, but it is not a requirement. Chair Kasper said that there will need to be a drainage easement between lot 2 and 3. Mr. Eggleston said that they wouldn't need the easement because the water wont flow onto lot 2 as it drains into that pond then north across Seneca Turnpike. There is potential water coming off the potential building site to the east end that would be picked up in the road ditch and to the west, traveling over the gas easement.

Chair Kasper said that listening to the neighbors, there is a drainage problem there now. If we can solve some of that now before we consider approving the subdivision with most of the issues involving the spring fed pond on proposed lot 2. At the site visit the pond did not seem to overflow, and you are proposing the possibility of filling the pond, the water will need to be directed somewhere. Member Winkelman said he would also line to see the drainage plan to direct the water to the southwest pond. The water likes to drain north and across New Seneca Tpke through the ditch, it all wants to go north. Mr. Barolo said the water comes across his driveway next to the gas line and through the culvert under the road.

Mr. Camp said that they could look at it again although the review last time was done, and the drainage plan was approved with that proposed subdivision. Mr. Eggleston commented that the drainage plan has not changed from the previous application. Member Winkelman added that there are new houses in the area and the Brown property. Mr. Camp said that the New Seneca Tpke area has been wet for a long time. Member Winkelman noted that there is no outlet for the existing pond on lot 2 and the pond may need to have an outlet created to direct the stormwater. Mr. Bartolo said that the stormwater has been draining into the neighborhood for over 20 years. Mr. Camp added that there is a high water table in the area. Mr. Eggleston said that it appears that lot 2 is the main concern with drainage.

Don Buff, 3749 Fisher Rd, said that he has very little water pressure on Fisher Road and now there will be two great big lines and Chair Kasper said that the water fire flows were increased with the village improvement of their water lines. Mr. Buff said that if he takes a shower and if his wife goes to the bathroom, then he would get scalded. Chair Kasper reiterated that the water pressure has improved and meets the OCDOH standards. Mr. Eggleston commented that the age of a waterline from the street into a home should also be considered in its effect to water pressure.

Ray Gillen, 3809 Knightsbridge Rd, said that he has the same problem as Mr. Buff with the water pressure in his house. The water pressure has been bad for over 56 years.

Public Hearing-2-lot Subdivision

<p>Applicant: Dan Goetzmann Eric Goetzmann 1677 Lancelot Place Skaneateles, NY 13152</p>	<p>Property: Gully Rd Skaneateles, NY 13152</p>
--	---

Tax Map #032.-01-01.0

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

The application is for a two lot subdivision of a vacant 15 acre agricultural lot. Lot 1 would become 10.4 acres and continued to be farmed with lot 2 at 4.6 acres planned for a residential lot in the future. Lot 2 consists of a wooded lot with hedgerows running north/south and a 30 foot strip running east/west. The 30 foot strip and north/south hedgerow would have an agricultural easement to maintain the hedgerows. A septic system is being designed for Lot 2 in the southwest corner of proposed lot 2. Access to the lot will be provided by a 40 foot wide access easement over Dan Goetzman’s lot to the south. The driveway will be 20 feet off the property line to the east.

Member Winkelman inquired why there is a proposed panhandle going east/west and Mr. Eggleston explained that it was part of the negotiation with the Richards in an attempt to achieve five acres for this lot. Chair Kasper inquired if any water pressure reading had been taken in the area and Mr. Eggleston replied that they have not.

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. 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?	X	
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 small	

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	

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Holbein, the Planning Board classified this application an Unlisted Action and reviewed the Applicant’s Short Environmental Assessment Form under SEQR, evaluating each of the criteria set forth in Part II, upon which the board determined that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

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

Mr. Camardo Jr., attorney for Mrs. Huther, submitted a letter to the board outlining objections to aspects of part 1 of the SEQR form that was submitted by the client. He expressed his wish that the board had heard from him and his client prior to completing the SEQR determination. Indiana Bats and Monarch Butterflies are protected species and there are no plans in place to protect these endangered species. Paragraph 13 indicated that there are no wetlands however this should be verified by NYSDEC. Paragraph 17 indicates that that storm water will not flow on adjacent properties and the NYSDEC requires stormwater analysis. Possible deforestation could impact stormwater flow and the paving of the driveway located to the east of his client’s property could also increase stormwater flow. The questions was checked off yes, then the sub questions were no, and you can not do that. Paragraph 3 indicates that less than one acre will be physically disturbed, however, the town ordinance states that important natural and scenic trees shall be preserved. The applicant needs to show mitigation for the lot line relocation for the driveway access and that all property owners that will be affected by the lot line adjustment have to sign consent. His client’s lot will be affected as there is no vegetation or fencing to separate her property from the driveway and there will be dust during construction and use of the driveway. There needs to be plans to mitigate the issues. He said that he does not want to initiate Article 78, however, he is putting the board on notice of his client’s concerns. An EIS should be done to mitigate the impacts. Member Holbein inquired if the bats and butterflies are known to be on the property and Mr. Camardo replied yes.

Chris Bruna, 1711 Lancelot Place, said that his property directly borders the panhandle. He stated that the panhandle is some sort of gateway drug. He asked if the property is deeded so that it would only be one house or will there be future subdivisions off this. It seems to him that the panhandle will be a 30 foot wide road down to Gully Road. That tells him that there are other plans in place. If they are really looking for a subdivision for their mother to build a house then the lot lines would be drawn dramatically different. You all can see that. Regarding water pressure, his water pressure is horrible. You are adding two more houses on Fisher Road and there could be 1-4 houses on this lot. Chair Kasper clarified that this district requires two acre lots so the most they could have would be two houses. He continues saying that the application is for one lot with a potential future single family dwelling and the board has to take them at

their word. Mr. Bruna said that the water pressure needs to be studied. He said that he knows that the board said that it has been turned up but there is no increase in pressure for him. He also has environmental concerns as the proposed lot is wooded and there is a tremendous amount of wetness out there even though it is one of the highest points there it is still half swamp. The DEC needs to take a walk out there to make sure it is not classified a wetland. Member Winkelman commented that the applicants said that their mother really loves woods and currently lives in a heavily wooded area now and would want to preserve as much of the woods as possible.

Pat Meyers, 3840 Knightsbridge Rd, inquired if the subdivision would be better suited as a conservation subdivision. With a conventional subdivision you do not need to leave anything, and they could remove all of the trees. Chair Kasper explained that it is only a one lot subdivision and conservation subdivisions are considered with larger subdivision proposals.

Member Winkelman commented that they could not find the property stake during the site visit and inquired if the telephone pole was a demarcation of the property line. Mr. Eggleston said that it is in the right of way and that the utility pole is in line with the property line. Chair Kasper commented that the code dictates that the driveway will need to be 20 feet from the property line. Mr. Eggleston said that the original proposal with a strip of land was to actually have the driveway 8 feet to the property line. He shared photos with the board where the driveway will be located in relationship to the adjoining property. There is some arborvitae between the properties and the neighbor has a nonconforming portion of their driveway about 2 feet from the property line. Member Winkelman said that with the twenty foot setback to the property line for the driveway there is plenty of room to plant more vegetation. Mr. Eggleston commented that there is no lot line adjustment being proposed with this current application. Mr. Eggleston shared a site plan for the driveway to maneuver around Dan Goetzman's property and away for the eastern property line as was suggested by a neighbor, however, it does not make sense.

Mr. Camardo commented that the board has not discussed the concerns addressed in his letter and Chair Kasper commented that they had just received the letter and will need time to review it. Mr. Camardo said he did not understand why they could not use Mr. Goetzman's driveway and not have a driveway next to his client's property. Chair Kasper said that the driveway would be 20 feet from the property line and that the applicant did show a proposal; however it did not work. Mr. Camp said that the driveway 20 feet from the property line meets the town code. An unidentified neighbor said that they could put the driveway somewhere else and not to tell her it did not work. Chair Kasper inquired if the utilities would be underground, and Mr. Eggleston said yes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Winkelman to continue the public hearing on **Tuesday, August 15, 2023**. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Chair Kasper said that as the public hearing will be left open there will another opportunity for comments and time for the board to review the submitted materials.

Continued Review-Site Plan Review

Applicant: Deborah Bradbury-Duniec
2870 West Lake Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #052.-01-03.1

Present: Deborah & Vic Duniec, Applicants; Jo Anne Gagliano, Joe Falco, EDR; Leif Kalquist, Holmes, King, Kalquist & Associates.

The site plans have not changed since last month's meeting. The board visited the site and had no issues with the proposal. Mr. Camp said that the town had received the combined site plan reflecting the existing and proposed modifications together. Chair Kasper said that there was some brush clearing by the lake and had suggested a silt fence at the site visit. Mr. Duniec said that it has been rectified and a silt fence was added. Chair Kasper also noted that the foot path was mulched and about eight feet wide and cautioned the applicant to maintain it as a walking path only. Ms. Gagliano said that it is the applicant's intent to have vegetation grown back into the area where the brush was cleared. They had removed invasive species and was looking to have native species planted in the area.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Holbein, the Planning Board declared this application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(11) and not subject by SEQR for further review. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made Chair Donald Kasper and seconded by Member Jonathan Holbein, and after an affirmative vote of the Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board hereby **APPROVES** the Application for minor site plan approval, with the following 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.
2. That Site Plan X-001,C-002- through C-005 dated June 1, 2023, with narrative dated June 1, 2023 prepared by Environmental Desing and Research DR, Licensed Architects be followed in all respects; and
3. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application; and
4. That Site Plan approval reflected herein does not permit or approve any improvements to the boathouse, lakefront alterations, garages, or other accessory buildings, all of which shall require separate Planning Board review and approval after full application therefore by the Applicant; and
5. 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	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Cochair	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]

Member	Jill Marshall	Absent	
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Present	[Yes]

Informal Discussion-8-lot Subdivision

Applicant: Josh LaGrow
Property:
Franklin Street Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #047.-01-16.1

Present: Josh LaGrow; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

Mr. LaGrow is considering a possible 8 lot subdivision on a vacant lot on Franklin Street Road. He is looking to create a neighborhood for midsize family homes with 3 car garages and have considered various subdivision options including conservation subdivisions. What is being contemplated right now is a conventional 8 lot subdivision with the existing 60 foot access strip widening up to a 66 foot wide dedicated street, a cul-de-sac, and a paper street to connect for any future development on the adjacent lot. The lots would be two acre lots that could accommodate homes of 2,500-3,500 square feet in a family friendly neighborhood with sidewalks. The sidewalks would continue along the access road to connect to Franklin Street Road.

Drainage is a concern along Franklin Street Road and the engineer is waiting for topography of the site. There is an existing swale that runs across potential lots 2 through 4 and there is a natural watercourse that runs along the 60 foot access area. There is also a culvert at the road and the drainage plan would take into consideration all of this in addition to topography of the land to develop a drainage plan.

With a dedicated road, they understand that it would require town board approval. The property is served by public water, and they would be doing dedicated water line, fire hydrants, etc. Additionally, the proposal would need to receive a waiver from the Planning Board regarding the 60 foot width of the entry of the subdivision. The septic systems would be raised bed septic systems that do take up some land and this was a factor in keeping the lots at 2 acres rather than a conservation subdivision where the lots could be under an acre.

Chair Kasper inquired if the area's water pressure has been investigated. Mr. Eggleston said that need to investigate that and understand that the town is actively pursuing a water tower for the west side of Skaneateles that would positively benefit this area. Chair Kasper asked if there is an elevation change from Genesee Street up towards this property. Mr. Eggleston explained that there is a very gradual elevation change and that there may be some 12% slopes on the property. Mr. Camp added that once the topography is completed they will be able to tell how the elevations may impact the water pressure.

Chair Kasper suggested that the fire department provide their opinion on the potential road design with the cul-de-sac. Mr. Camp commented that regarding the road width, there are plenty of municipalities that use 60 feet as the road width. Mr. Brodsky inquired if the 60 foot portion of the road is wide enough to include side a sidewalk. Mr. Eggleston said that there is a drainage ditch in that area to be considered and they are awaiting the survey to determine how this would function. Mr. Camp said that in a 60 foot road there is usually a 12-13 foot tarvia drive on both sides with drainage, and there still would be space

for a sidewalk. Member Winkelman inquired on the slope to Franklin Street and Mr. LaGrow said that they had the engineer walk it.

Mr. LaGrow stated that he is taking the design of the area personally as he would like to have his own house there. Their focus is meeting town code and managing the stormwater on the property. The water coming from the hill will not change much unless they go up there and have a plan. If they do their job right, the neighbors will see improvement on the stormwater coming down. Mr. Fields said that every time Mr. Eggleston discussed stormwater, it was being directed right to his house. Mr. LaGrow said that there are no ponds up there now and the soil is concrete, and if things could be put in place to deter the water. Mr. Fields said that when the access road used to be a farm road, the water ran right through his yard and flooded right up to the front door of the Carlberg property. His biggest concerns are stormwater that rushes off that farm field and every time there is a storm there are issues. The roadway coming down to Franklin is not 66 feet wide and Mr. LaGrow said that it appears that the neighboring properties go right to the ditch, but they do not.

Mr. Fields said another issue is that Franklin is posted as a 30mph zone and autos and trucks are driving much faster on that road; you cannot see the vehicles until they are almost on top of the knoll. With the development of the road, a four way stop would be created with the exit drive from the doctor's office being located directly across the street. Mr. LaGrow said that there are two streets that have stop signs at the intersection with Franklin that are located only a tenth of a mile away. Chair Kasper suggested that the applicant and his engineer meet with the neighbors to walk the properties and look at the issues together.

Mr. Lincoln said that he had the town supervisor back there, and DPW to try and help maintain the ditch as the ditch was installed over 30 years ago. There are underground springs in the area and the Greenfields have redone the pipes so that the stormwater is going into the ditch. Member Winkelman suggested that the drainage plans show where the culverts are located and where they connect.

Mr. Fields said that there are a lot of trucks that used Franklin Street, including the Vitale trucks and trailers from the stables. Mr. Lincoln said that there are no shoulders on Franklin Road, and it would be difficult to place sidewalks. Mrs. Lincoln commented that several years ago the owner of the property was not allowed to put more than two houses on the property. Member Winkelman commented that technology has changed and that how septic systems area designed can allow for more dwellings. Mrs. Lincoln said she has a concern with drainage and Mr. LaGrow said that the area behind their house is wet and they would help to control the stormwater. Mr. Camp commented that with a project like this, if it is designed well, can help to improve the stormwater issues.

Mr. Fields asked where the snow would be plowed to and Mr. LaGrow said that the snow would be pushed into the cul-de-sac, as the cul-de-sac will not be a solid cul-de-sac. Mr. Eggleston added that they would be plowing to the center. Member Winkelman said that if the subdivision is designed right the existing conditions can be improved. Mr. Fields said that the end of Franklin Street Road and County Line Road is the five way stop that needs to be fixed. Chair Kasper commented that it involves two counties and two towns to resolve.

Merger Request

Applicant: Sigmund and Chantal Rogalia
Shamrock Rd

Skaneateles, New York
Tax Map #036.-02-06.0 and 035.-03-05.1

The applicants are requesting the merger of the two adjoining properties with both lots consisting of vacant land.

WHEREFORE, a motion by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Winkelman to notify the Town of Skaneateles Tax Assessor that this Board has no objection to the request of Sigmund and Chantal Rogalia to merge tax parcels 036.-02-01.00 and 035.-03-05.1 into one tax parcel.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Cochair	Douglas Hamlin	Absent	
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jill Marshall	Absent	
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Present	[Yes]

Discussion

The board review the surface tablets that will be distributed to the board in the coming weeks.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Holbein adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Additional Meeting Attendees:

Robert Eggleston	Leif Kalquist	Jo Anne Gagliano	Joe Falco
Vic Duniec	Donald Buff	Devin Bartolo	Ray Dillon
Chris Bruna	Pat Meyers	Josh LaGrow	Jim fields
Don Lincoln	Mrs. Lincoln	Carol Huther	Joseph Camardo Jr.
Travis Bradley			

Additional Meeting Attendees (Zoom):

Deb Duniec	Mark Tucker	Jim Fields	Liz
Mike Lasell	Brian Buff		