

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
December 21, 2021**

Donald Kasper
Douglas Hamlin
Scott Winkelman
Jill Marshall
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 November 16, 2021 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 Marshall 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] |
| Vice Chair | Douglas Hamlin | Present | [Yes] |
| Member | Scott Winkelman | Present | [Yes] |
| Member | Jill Marshall | Present | [Yes] |
| Member | Jon Holbein | Present | [Yes] |

Public Hearing -2 Lot Subdivision

Applicant: Scott & Mary Ellen Winkelman
3415 Kane Ave
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #048.-01-23.1

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

Member Winkelman recused himself from the discussion as he is the property owner and co-applicant.

The site plan submitted last month has not changed. The applicants would like to create a 3.8 acre lot that includes their dwelling from the remainder of the parcel. A plat plan has been prepared by Paul Olszewski that reflects that the 3.8 acre parcel will have access to Kane Avenue from lot A. An easement agreement will be drafted and submitted for final review by the Chair and the board attorney.

Chair Kasper commented that on his site visit he noted that the markings for lot A that connects to County Line Road appeared to provide a wide access for any future development of lot A. The existing trail in the area is located close to the property line and any access road would need to comply with the appropriate setback. The property is not served by public water and will require a well for lot A with any future development, and lot B has an existing well.

Member Marshall inquired if the proposed legs on lot A were designed for future roads and Mr. Eggleston responded saying that they are both under the 66 foot wide requirement; any future developer would need to obtain a waiver from the Planning Board for a private road(s). He continued saying that the narrative

provides a potential rational plan of development with two driveways each supporting up to four lots and a total of six dwelling units. A conservation density subdivision could support up to 12 total dwelling units.

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; **WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Marshall and seconded by Chair Kasper to classify the action and an Unlisted Action. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

| 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 | |
| 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 Hamlin and seconded by Chair Kasper to declare this application to be an Unlisted action, 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 unanimous affirmance of said motion.

At this time, Chairman Kasper opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor of the project. No one spoke in favor of the project. Chairman Kasper 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 Hamlin and seconded by Member Marshall 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 Chair Donald Kasper, duly seconded by Member Douglas Hamlin, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board hereby **APPROVES** the two-lot Subdivision, with the following conditions:

1. The Final Plan subdivision of the Wink Subdivision, dated November 9, 2021 prepared by Paul Olszewski, Land Surveying, PC be 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 prepare and submit a draft Access Easement, as reflected in the Application (the “Access Easement”), for Planning Board Chair and the Planning Board Attorney approval, and that once approved, the Access Easement shall be recorded by the Applicant in the Onondaga County Clerk’s Office contemporaneously with the filing of the Subdivision Map; and
3. That Lot B be pinned at the corners points to reflect the boundaries of that newly created lot; and
4. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or Application; and
5. The Subdivision Map and Deed transferring the property(ies) 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 | Donald Kasper | Present | [Yes] |
| Vice Chair | Douglas Hamlin | Present | [Yes] |
| Member | Scott Winkelman | Present | [Recused] |
| Member | Jill Marshall | Present | [Yes] |
| Member | Jonathan Holbein | Present | [Yes] |

Member Winkelman returned to the board.

Continued Review-Site Plan Review

Applicant: Thomas & Mellissa Zell
 1265 Oak Bluff
 Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #054.-02-04.1

Present: Jo Anne Gagliano, EDR; Ryan Fogg, EDR

The application is for a one car garage addition with a reduction in impervious coverage, no change to the site plan from August, and a grading plan has been prepared. The updated site plan includes a small scale stormwater management plan, with the bioswale located to the north of the proposed driveway and garage with an outlet that leads to an existing swale between this property and the property to the north. The topography indicates that the stormwater flow from the street and the two properties goes towards this existing swale.

Chair Kasper commented that he thought there was a structure on the north property that is close to the property line, and the stormwater would run right into this building. Ms. Gagliano said that the swale runs

between the two buildings based on a visual assessment. She continued saying that they are not trying to excavate more area to create another swale as it is a sloping site. Chair Kasper inquired if it would be better for the outlet was moved to allow a sheeting action over the lawn before it enters the existing swale, and Ms. Gagliano said that it could although the swale is at a lower elevation. The swale is on their property and is a vegetated swale. Member Marshall inquired if there are any erosion issues on the bank and Ms. Gagliano responded that the bank is steep along the side, but she did not observe any disturbance or falling out of the slope.

Ms. Gagliano stated that the waterfront is developed, and that the swale does run down to the patio/firepit area before reaching the lake. Chair Kasper suggested that the board could do another site visit independently, and that Mr. Camp's observation would be important. Mr. Camp commented that the pipe is pointed at the neighbor's property. It will head off between the building based on the topography. There have been discussion on whether to omit the drain at the bottom of the retaining area. He continued saying that he had not spent time looking at the north side of the property as the original site plan from August did not reflect the stormwater facility. He would like to take another look as stormwater systems work well when there is a safe outlet and there may not be a safe outlet on this property.

Mr. Brodsky inquired about the 20 foot right-of-way that is located on the north side of the property, and the impact of the drainage plan that is being proposed. There is power in the area, but it is unknown what the 20 foot easement is for, and the proposed outlet pipe would encroach in the right of way. Mr. Camp commented that this site may not be suitable for the small scale management system as placing it closer to the shoreline could be problematic. The board determined that more research is needed regarding the right of way and for Mr. Camp to revisit the site to determine what is the best method to control stormwater.

Amendment Request-Special Permit/Site Plan Review

Applicant: Eileen Murphy
3259 East Lake Rd
Skaneateles, NY
Tax Map #040.-01-03.0

Present: JoAnne Gagliano, EDR; Ryan Fogg, EDR.

The project was approved in 2019 for redevelopment of the lot with a ribboned driveway for access on the log narrow lot. It included a fire truck turnout to allow for emergency vehicles to pass. The project is almost complete with some small modifications made to the project to conserve impermeable surface coverage with the reduction of the driveway turnaround, and the removal of some of the steps and retaining walls. The driveway has not been completed and the applicant would like to have a solid driveway rather than a ribbon driveway. This would increase the impervious surface by 682 square feet, increasing it from the approved 16.7% impermeable surface coverage to 17.7%. About half of the driveway grass strip could be replaced with a solid surface without increasing the impervious coverage due to modifications to the site plan. They would like to have all the grass strip removed as the topography of the land causes vehicles to veer from the path.

Chair Kasper inquired if the asphalt has already been placed and Ms. Gagliano stated that the asphalt has been laid and the next step would be to cut away the center strip of the driveway for the grass strip. Mr. Brodsky inquired on the topography of the driveway from East Lake Road to the truck turnout, and Ms. Gagliano stated that it is straighter and less steep than the other half from the turnout west to the dwelling. The driveway does have a bend with a stormwater structure at the end of the driveway. The lot does take on the stormwater from the neighbor's property to the north and they have added bioswales to control the stormwater. Mr. Brodsky suggested that the portion of the driveway from East Lake Road to the turnout

could be ribboned with the portion from the turnout to the dwelling solid, which would not increase the coverage. Ms. Gagliano said that that option could be done, or the grass strip could be one foot narrower. Chair Kasper inquired about the width of the proposed grass strip and Ms. Gagliano said it was approved at two feet, and we could reduce it to one foot in width.

Member Hamlin commented that his grass strip driveway has worked well, although it is shorter and straighter than the applicants. They have eight boxes that are two feet wide by twenty feet long. The plow does not tear it up on the winter and the lawn mower keeps it clipped to the height of the driveway. Ms. Gagliano commented that cells could be placed inside of the grass strip to provide stability. She continued saying that it is difficult to irrigate the grass strip in the summer as there are no irrigation heads in the strip. The applicant has been diligent at reducing where she could be able to remove the grass strip from the driveway. Chair Kasper recommended that Mr. Camp take another visit of the site. Mr. Camp responded that grass strip driveways can work if they are driven on with care and are designed well. If the grass center is cut below the driving strips and the drainage is engineered properly, although it does not mean that they are not tedious and require maintenance. He continued saying that the driveway on the plan does not indicate that it is a big curve. Chair Kasper commented that he would hate to give up the impermeable surface coverage after the board and the applicant worked so diligently on reducing it. Member Winkelman commented that he is fine giving it up since they put in the emergency pullout and reduced the coverage from 25%. He continued saying that there is a concern for safety with the long driveway. Members Marshall and Holbein agreed with member Winkelman's assessment. The total driveway width is nine feet and Member Hamlin commented that his driveway is nine feet as well and has worked out; he is also amenable to granting the higher coverage. Mr. Camp said that there is a property in the area that replaced their driveway and that he could get a picture to share with the board. He recommended that in the future the board not consider the ribbon driveway as a solution to control impermeable surface coverage. Site visits will be conducted independently.

Extension Request-Special Permit

Applicant: Chris and Amy Neumann

5044 Brittany Lane
Syracuse, New York 13215

Property: 2923 East Lake Road

Tax Map #039.-01-27.0

Present: JoAnne Gagliano, EDR;

The special permit was originally approved for this project in 2018. The proposed plan is the same as the prior approval from 2018. The work on the waterfront involves the replacement of the shoreline steps due to parging that has occurred. Due to Covid-19, construction was not started to replace the stairs. There is a septic system on the south side of the house and access for the structure will be provided by the lot to the south that is also under the applicant's ownership. The existing ACOE and NYSDEC approvals have not expired for the work. The proposed steps will be replaced with the same footprint.

Mr. Camp suggested that the septic area and components be marked to protect the system from construction vehicles. The board determined that the approval could be extended to the end of the time of the agency approvals due to Covid-19 delays. .

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Chair Kasper, the Planning Board adopted and ratified its prior SEQRA determination for the Application, which was a determination that the Application constitutes a TYPE II single family residential project action, not subject to further SEQRA review. The board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Chair Donald Kasper and seconded by Member Douglas Hamlin and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, the Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** the Extension Application to October 1, 2022, with the following conditions:

1. That the original Site Plan and Construction Narrative approved for the Project shall be followed in all respects for the construction of buildings and improvements on the Property not otherwise completed to the date hereof, and that the Approving Resolutions of the Planning Board be followed in all respects, extended hereby through the expiration date of the NYSDEC permit of October 1, 2022 with the conditions of the Approving Resolution remaining in full force and effect.

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Sketch Plan –Subdivision

| | | |
|------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Applicant: | Paul Fallon | Property: |
| | 7026 Highfield Rd | 1725 Coon Hill Rd |
| | Fayetteville, NY 13066 | Skaneateles, NY 13152 |
| | | Tax Map #035.-01-19.0 |

Present: Aaron LaSala, Representative

The applicant has an existing 61.7 acre parcel with an existing dwelling and barn. Proposed is a two lot subdivision with lot 1 at 57.6 acres with the existing dwelling and barn, and lot 2 at 3.2 acres of vacant land. Lot 2 will be located at the northwest corner of the parcel and have 300 feet of road frontage along Coon Hill Road. The intent is for lot 2 to be sold to a friend of the applicant's so that it could be developed with a single family dwelling in the future.

Chair Kasper inquired if any perc tests have been completed and Mr. LaSala stated that it has not been done; they intend to do the perc tests before the eventual sale. Chair Kasper commented that there is a portion of woods located on the property and inquired if the area is rocky or wet as farmers usually leave an area wooded if it is deemed difficult to till. Member Winkelman commented that Sucker Brook is in the rear of the property, and it does get wet there. He inquired if a curb cut approval has been obtained. Chair Kasper recommended that the applicant contact the OCDOT for a potential driveway location, and that conceptual septic approval will need to be obtained from OCDOH before the subdivision map can be filed. A building envelope could be indicated to show the area that would be considered buildable on proposed lot 2. Site visits will be conducted independently.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Marshall to schedule a public hearing on **Tuesday, January 18, 2022 at 6:30 pm**. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Sketch Plan –Special Permit

Applicant: Hobbit Hollow Farm LLC
333 W Washington
Suite 600
Syracuse, NY 13202
Property:
3061 West Lake Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #051.-02-08.2

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

The applicant has owned the property for some time and had received approvals for a bed & breakfast use for the main dwelling and horse boarding use. There are three other single family dwellings on the property and part of the barn is used for wine production. Instead of a bed and breakfast the applicants have been renting out the main dwelling in conjunction with the events that have been occurring on the property, with outdoor weddings being held in a tent on the property. There are two areas where tents can be installed, one north of the main house and then west of the lawn area near the end of the paddocks.

The site plan reflects the location of the port-a-johns and where parking is available. The main house has an 8 car parking lot, 13 spaces north of the barn for people working the farm and the area behind the barn where they would have valet parking with staff parking cars on the west and south side of the barn. The event center is seasonal, May through October with 6-7 events a year. Events are limited to 200 people with events ending by 11 pm. The wedding events have been occurring for the last fifteen years.

There is a watercourse that crosses the property west of the barn that has two small ponds, and a lot of work has been done to improve the stormwater management of the property. The board will review the watercourse for proximity to the structures. The existing exterior lights can be turned on as needed with various locations on the property including the parking areas and the entrance. Mr. Brodsky inquired on the number of parking spaces being provided for the events themselves, and Mr. Eggleston said that they have 66 parking spaces based on one parking space for every three feet, which is in addition to the vendor parking and guests that are also staying at the main house. Mr. Brodsky suggested that a schedule for the parking calculation be provided to the town and Mr. Eggleston responded that it is in the narrative. He explained that there is a total of more than 87 parking spaces available. Mr. Brodsky inquired about how noise has been managed including music and Mr. Eggleston said that there have not been any problems in the past ten years. Mr. Brodsky inquired about the two tent locations on the plan and Mr. Eggleston explained that the plan shows two locations where a tent can be located. Mr. Camp inquired if there are any proposed changes and Mr. Eggleston stated that it is just to formalize the existing use. Member Winkelman asked if the tents have been used in the two locations shown for prior events and Mr. Eggleston responded affirmatively. Site visits will be conducted independently.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Hamlin to schedule a public hearing on *Tuesday, January 18, 2022 at 6:40 pm*. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Sketch Plan –Special Permit/Site Plan Review

Applicant Lawty88 LLC
Sara Recktenwald
3371 East Lake Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #041.-01-33.0

Present: Sara Recktenwald, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects

The property has been in the family since the 1970s and was part of the original Smith estate. Improvements have been made internally to the dwelling to make it more comfortable for the 21st century while keeping the charm of the original estate. The property is nonconforming as it has less than 75 feet of lake frontage; a variance is required for any improvements on the property.

There are three proposed components to the property. By the lakefront, there is an original gazebo, concrete dock, and a set of stairs on the south side of the gazebo that connects to the shoreline. The north side of the shoreline needs some erosion control and proposed is a double boulder layer of stone beyond the lake line to establish the bottom of the bank and put plantings on the steep bank. Kayaks are stored on hooks on the north side of the gazebo and proposed is a set of stairs made from 6x6 timbers and stone for safe access.

The second item is that the original house had a grand staircase and screened in porch on the lakeside of the dwelling, with a proposed re-establishment of the staircase. The third item is to construct a detached garage as there is no garage on the property. Proposed is a two car garage placed at the south end of the exiting driveway with storage above, and with a parking area next to the garage. There are two variances they are pursuing with the ZBA; the lake frontage being less than 75 feet, and for a side yard setback for the steps proposed on the north side of the gazebo. The project will need a special permit for redevelopment of the lot with nonconforming impermeable surface coverage. The existing impermeable surface coverage is at 17.1% with a proposed 14.6% with some of the loop driveway being removed.

The driveway portion being removed continues across another property and the remnants that remain going up to the Mercurio's property and up to the road that collects the water from the Mercurios. Proposed was a bioswale to capture the water, treat it and release it beyond the garage. In further discussion with the property owner to the south, the Mannas, they are also receiving stormwater off this road and from the neighbor across the way. There is an existing drainage system at the northwest corner of the proposed garage that is a commercial grade catch basin with the pipe going north past the entrance porch to another catch basin then along the property line down catching on the driveway below, heading south then down to the lake. There is some consideration on whether having French drains along the road on the Manna property and this property might be a better solution for collecting and treating the water and tying into the existing system. A site meeting with Mr. Camp and Eric Brillo may be warranted to discuss the best solution to manage the stormwater. Chair Kasper concurred that the meeting is necessary. A site visit will be conducted on January 8, 2022 at 8 am, weather permitting, with the afternoon of January 9th as a backup option.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Marshall to schedule a public hearing on ***Tuesday, January 18, 2022 at 6:50 pm***. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Sketch Plan – Special Permit/Site Plan Review

Applicant: Patricia Ford
41 Academy Street
Skaneateles, New York

Property:
2797 East Lake Rd
Skaneateles, New York
Tax Map #038.-01-20.0

Present: Patricia, Ford, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Architect

The applicant had received prior approval from the Planning Board for construction of a single family dwelling and associated accessory structures. The shoreline was reinforced with a couple of truckloads of gabion baskets to control the erosions prior to that approval and it is now failing.

Proposed is a continuous double layer of boulders that are 1.5 to 2 ton in size stacked back from the lake line to provide protection of the lake. The base of the first course will be set one foot into the ground to provide stability of the wall. Vegetation on the banks will be established. At the south of the property line there will be a double row of retaining walls with plantings established between.

The grade will be reduced a couple of feet in a 20 foot x 30 foot area near the lake line that will be leveled with a curved retaining wall added and grassed for a grass patio area for seating. The shoreline structures calculation will be maintained. Chair Kasper commented that the septic area should be protected during construction.

Mr. Brodsky had noted a change in shoreline structures from the 2014 review to what is existing now, and Mr. Eggleston explained that the dock was extended during the period when the town did not have jurisdiction of the lake. Site visits will be conducted independently.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Hamlin to schedule a public hearing on *Tuesday, January 18, 2022 at 7:00 pm*. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Amendment Request – Special Permit

| | | |
|------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| Applicant: | T-Mobile | Property: |
| | 103 Monarch Drive | 2255 Weeks Rd |
| | Liverpool, NY 13088 | Skaneateles, NY 13152 |
| | | Tax Map #059.-01-07.2 |

Present: Jennille Smith, T-Mobile representative

Proposed is the placement of additional antennas on the existing telecommunication tower on Weeks Road. The antennas will be located at the 179 foot height on the 198 foot high tower. A 10 foot by 15 foot equipment slab will be added inside the fenced compound. The utilities will come from the existing underground portals and the existing access road will be used. The footprint of the compound will not be changed. The location of the existing tower is towards the rear of the agricultural lot and the improvements will be on the rear of the tower. The fenced in area is irregularly shaped and is approximately 50 feet by 50 feet. The original telecommunications tower and compound was approved by the town in 2007. The board determined that the proposal is not a substantial change to the prior existing approval.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Member Hamlin and seconded by Member Marshall, the Planning Board adopted and ratified the prior SEQRA determination, last reviewed October 16, 2007 for the Property, which was a determination that the Application constituted an Unlisted Action resulting in a negative declaration after review of the SEQRA forms submitted by the Applicant. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Chair Donald Kasper and duly seconded by Member Douglas Hamlin, and after an affirmative vote of all Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **DETERMINED** that the proposed modifications are a non-substantial change to the prior existing approval under Town Code Section 148-10-8C.11, and **THEREFORE** the Application does not require a special permit, instead the Applicant can proceed to obtain a building permit for construction of the proposed modifications.

RECORD OF VOTE

| | | | |
|------------|------------------|---------|-------|
| Chair | Donald Kasper | Present | [Yes] |
| Vice Chair | Douglas Hamlin | Present | [Yes] |
| Member | Scott Winkelman | Present | [Yes] |
| Member | Jill Marshall | Present | [Yes] |
| Member | Jonathan Holbein | Present | [Yes] |

Sketch Plan- Major Special Permit

| | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| Applicant | Norman Swanson Woodbine Group 505 E Lafayette St Syracuse, NY 13202 | Property: 813 W Genesee St Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map #047.-01-46.0 |
|-----------|--|--|

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects; Mike Lasell, MBL Consulting

The existing Cedar House and Hilltop Restaurant property is a mixed use property that has a barrel vaulted block wall bowling alley, mid-century restaurant, and kitchen area. There is existing parking on three sides for the building. A lot line relocation occurred several years ago with the Town of Skaneateles Highway Department property with land parity swap so that the parking was kept on each of the respective properties. The existing property is 92,000 square feet with over 300 feet of road frontage and is outside of the LWOD. Public water and sewer is utilized for the property. The 17,682 square foot mixed use building has been used for the bowling alley, restaurant, and the former bottle redemption center. The road frontage had been improved as part of the western gateway improvements with the existing driveway clarified. This property also has right-of-way access on Transportation Drive that borders the western side of the property. The existing impermeable surface coverage is 63.8%.

Proposed is the removal of the restaurant structure on the south side of the building and to maintain the bowling alley building. A two story 20 foot wide addition that will be located on the west and south sides of the bowling alley building. The comprehensive plan encourages two story buildings in the highway commercial district. Four of the existing bowling alley lanes will be maintained as demand for the sport is waning. The remaining area of the bowling alley area will be converted to recreational gaming. There will be a 100 seat restaurant in the southeast corner and the back portion of the original building on the east side will be developed as a kitchen. The remainder of the existing building will have a coffee bar and a galley kitchen that serves the coffee bar. The hotel lobby and gift shop will occupy the front of the building with the southwest corner of the building providing stairs and an elevator to the hotel rooms on the second floor. The twelve first floor rooms will have outside entrances along the west side. The second floor will have twelve rooms on the west side and six rooms above the hotel lobby. The proposed building will be slightly larger than the existing building.

The proposed parking area will be broken up with landscaping and the areas improved with vegetation in front of the building. The existing building does not have a safe area for pedestrians to walk and the proposed plan shows a permeable brick walk to the west, south and to the restaurant entrance on the east side. There will also be a curbed area to protect the pedestrian walkway. There will be an outdoor patio area on the east side of the restaurant for outdoor dining post pandemic. The restaurant entrance is on the east side of the building with the main entrance to the hotel on the south side directly across the driveway entrance. The existing parking area and eastern gateway sidewalks do not provide an obvious walking path to the hotel. Proposed is an island between the divided entrance/exit for pedestrian traffic.

For vehicle and pedestrian safety, the proposal includes a delivery entrance at the north end of the property with access from Transportation Drive. Trucks would back into the loading area that has access to the kitchen and trash dumpster. There are five parking spaces for employees located in this area. The impermeable surface coverage will be maintained at 63.8% and they are asking for a special permit for redevelopment as well as the added use of hotel. The overage in impervious coverage is needed to provide adequate parking. The hotel has 26 room with a required parking of 26 spaces; there will be 10 employees per shift at the hotel with a required parking of 5 spaces; the shop requires 1200 square feet per one car, requiring 8 cars for the shop; the 100 seat restaurant would require 33 parking spaces; the four lanes of bowling required 4 spaces; and the recreation area would require parking for 25 vehicles for a total of 101 vehicle spaces required. 85% of the peak demand would require 86 parking spaces, which is what is proposed.

The hotel will be offering moderate accommodation for businesspeople who would be gone during the day and for visitors to Skaneateles that would be out seeing the sights and partaking in the activities. The restaurant would have the three main dining peaks with the recreation having most of the activity during the evenings and weekends. The guests at the hotel will more than likely use the restaurant providing some overlap in usage and parking needs. The 86 available parking spaces should provide more than adequate parking for the property.

There are two area variances that will be required for the project and application has been made to the ZBA. The rear delivery entrance driveway will be 5.9 feet from the north property line whereas 20 feet is required. This setback will allow for safer egress for trucks and would be five feet from the Town property. The second variance is for total lot coverage of 69.2% to allow for the permeable walkways and patio, whereas 60% is the maximum allowed.

The elevation drawings reflect traditional architectural forms with a clock tower that has a third floor to accommodate the elevator height clearance. Whether the design reflects the village architecture or something similar, it was important that the entrance to the hotel is visible. Something on the west side, whether it is a village downtown look or industrial look, working with something that is more traditional than coming in with something modern or typical in a suburban commercial zone.

The stormwater management plan has been developed by Mike Lasell, who will be reviewing what is being proposed for stormwater control. Mr. Lasell stated that a lot of the property drains towards the building. There are two existing catch basins at the front of the building close to where there will be proposed two new ones at the front corners of the islands. The proposal should improve the water controls than what exists today. The existing catch basins collect the stormwater and take it towards the back of the building sheet flowing to the north. There is an existing eight inch pipe that drains to the catch basin on the town property at the northwest corner of the property. The only stormwater that is being collected is from the front of the building and the rest of the stormwater is sheeting onto the town property behind the building. The roof drains go onto the ground. The proposed stormwater system will be collected through vegetated swales and collect into the northeast bioretention area. Drainage from the west and from the front of the building will be collected into islands and directed to the bioretention area. The collector system will also garner any storm water from the roof drains. Most of the impervious surfaces are being collected and directing the stormwater to the bioswale. Any stormwater leaving imperious surface directly will be directed to a pea gravel strip for water quality improvement, then across the grass draining into the bioretention. The same thing will occur along the service drive as the stormwater flows north to the town property to pretreat the water before it continues. The stormwater plan is designed beyond what is required as it will be under an acre of disturbance and the property is not located in the LWOD. Based on the modeling that has been done, the stormwater flows have been reduced and the existing flows for a 100-year storm event can be managed. The bioretention area will be ponding up to one foot, with an underdrain that will connect to the

existing pipe on the town property. The stormwater from this property used to flow directly onto the town property parking lot, and this situation that will be eliminated as the water will be sent to the west to tie into the same system but excluding the overland flow onto the town parking lot. A one year storm would be held in the bioretention area, and they are collecting the entire stormwater flow in that area.

Chair Kasper commented that he had some observations he would like to share. Heading west from the village, Mirbeau, Rosalie's and the Lodge motel all appear as one story buildings with landscaping that obscures some of the structures and parking. This may be the only two story structure other than houses in the area, and it will stand out. The existing lot is all black top with a wide established entranceway. The proposed drawing of the entranceway looks narrower. It is difficult to determine where the existing and proposed building is located now. as there not a lot of dimensions for the depth of the parking spaces and the travel way; the parking lot appears very tight. There is an island at the entranceway, and he is assuming it is a raised brick island. With the island and design of the parking lot, any driver would have to make sharp turns. With the restaurant on the east side of the building, there will be the most traffic activity, will only have access from the driveway off Route 20 and intercepting with the traffic on Route 20. With the handicap parking directly across the entrance, it will cause those vehicles to back out and add to the congestion. Then entrance to the hotel and the handicap parking could be moved to the west and away from the entrance driveway. The board should know what the existing water usage is and the fire flow pressure. The narrative indicates that the water usage will be the same however there will be 26 hotel rooms that are being added. Also, can a fire truck maneuver the driveway and parking areas to access the building in case of an event. The narrative gives a description of the interior uses of the building, but he suggested that there be some visuals to demonstrate what a 100 seat restaurant would look like. Would that bowling and games room area be open to the public and guests of the hotel? The last thing is impermeable surface coverage. The board is tasked with reducing the impermeable surface coverage as much as possible and the applicant is asking the board to accept no change in the coverage and increasing the total lot coverage.

Mr. Eggleston said that the variance requested is for the increase in permeable surface coverage to allow for the permeable walkways and the outdoor dining area. The code allows for payment into the Development Rights Acquisition Fund to offset the overage in impermeable surface coverage, and this lot is 25,000 square feet short of land to offset the existing impervious coverage. Chair Kasper commented that the applicant would need an additional half acre of land, and the board's job is to reduce the impermeable surface coverage to the maximum extent possible.

Chair Kasper commented that when a review of the project for Araflections/Dr. LaDuca next door, there was an agreement that they could use some of the parking on this property to support their business. There were five cars that parked in the lot today.

Member Hamlin commented that he would like more information provided regarding the traffic flow in the hotel and entertainment areas. You would need to walk through the hotel to reach the bowling and gaming areas. He continued saying that the parking is tight, and no dimensions have been provided for the space sizes. He continued saying that it does not seem appropriate to place a handicap parking space next to the dumpster. Mr. Eggleston explained that the handicap spot at the back of the building would be for any handicapped employee of the facility. He continued saying that they have provided more handicap parking spots that is required by code, as they have five spots and are only required to have four. Member Hamlin inquired if the second floor hotel rooms will have interior windows facing the bowling roof and Mr. Eggleston explained that on the second floor the hall will be alongside the bowling alley building with windows for the rooms facing out to the street.

Member Marshall commented that she likes that the parking is scaled down to slow down people down although she also agrees with the congestion comments that have been made. She inquired if the green areas

on the plan will be mowed grass. Mr. Eggleston clarified that it will be a combination of mowed grass and landscaping. Around the building itself will be vegetation and landscaping as opposed to grass. Member Marshall commented that she knows that people park in this lot and walk over to the dermatologist, although she does not know if there is any formal agreement. She continued saying that she likes the aesthetic of the two story building shown on the elevation drawings and likes how the parking has been hidden, especially Mirbeau, and is curious on the interior design flow. Mr. Brodsky recommended that the applicant consider off-site parking potentially with the property to the west. Member Marshall suggested that there could be a potential walkway from that property across Transportation Drive to this property.

Mr. Eggleston thanked the board for their comments on the site plan. He continued saying that the intent is to have a free flow between all the uses proposed. He continued saying that restaurants are calculated at fifteen square feet per person, and there is 1700 square feet allocated to the dining area. Allowing 200 square feet for service areas. Water usage is approved by the Village of Skaneateles for any change of use in addition to any change of use affected the sewer. The engineers have reviewed the five year history of this building, and with the replacement of the existing inefficient water fixtures, they will impact the water usage. They will be using data from similar facilities that Woodbine has. They are preparing an engineering report that will be provided to the village and the town. They are aware that the west side of town have fire flow pressure issues and Woodbine has similar facilities with the same issue. There will be basements underneath the additions that will house storage tanks, pumps, and generators. The building will be a sprinklered building and with the storage tanks, pumps, and generators, they should be able to provide the appropriate water pressure. There will be a liquor license associated with the restaurant in the recreation area not unlike what is there now. The parking areas are designed with landscaping and islands to calm the traffic to reduce the potential for speeding in the area. With the western gateway improvement with curbed entrances, it does slow down traffic in the area. The larger delivery trucks would utilize Transportation Drive and not enter the parking areas. They will evaluate the usage by UPS trucks and the like.

There is an informal arrangement with Araflections to the east for parking. Mr. Swanson has allowed them to continue to park up until there is construction when it is not safe to be there. The applicant will investigate the arrangement to see if there is a mutual benefit to both property owners. The highway commercial district tries to encourage two-story buildings and there are a lot of older one story buildings in the area. They are trying to improve the gateway area with this proposal. Member Hamlin commented that the parking feels to be heavily weighted to the east, with most people entering from the eastern access unless they are hotel guests. The instinct for most people will be to turn right when they enter off Roue 20. It would be frustrating for someone who enters that way and find out that the parking is full and then they would need to back up and out. Consideration should be given for a small turnaround at the end of the lot. Mr. Eggleston stated that the eleven parking spaces to the west correlate to the hotel rooms on the first floor on that side.

Mr. Camp commented that Mr. Lasell had walked through the stormwater plan which makes sense and reminded the board that this is an area where there is existing flooding concerns. He will work with Mr. Lasell on some ideas he has that could improve the situation. There is a bit of work being done in the right of way of Transportation Drive that should be cleared with the town highway superintendent. Everyone is aware of the water situation at this side of town, and with what was being suggested to augment the pressure issues, the Onondaga County Department of Health will be involved. Mr. Eggleston recommended that Mr. Lasell and Mr. Camp should do a site visit together to review the stormwater plan.

Mr. Eggleston inquired if the application would be considered an Unlisted Action and Counsel Molnar recommended that it would be considered an Unlisted action due to the size of the project; however, the size of the project relative to the size of the community, he recommended that it be done on a coordinated basis. He continued saying that the board should consider this as a coordinated review under the SEQR regulations and declare themselves as lead agency to collect information from interested parties. He

continued saying that based on today's discussion, it is not timely yet to circulate the notice to potentially interested parties for SEQR. You will want to complete the analyses of water usage and requirements for fire flow, and sewer estimates for purposes of presenting to the village. That information will be added to your long form EAF. After accumulation of the information and adjustments are made to the EAF as needed, the Planning Board can circulate notices of their intent for lead agency with the updated EAF, narrative and site plan. Mr. Lasell commented that they do have the base of design of the sewer flows and the stormwater, for the NYSDEC for the proposed use with the five year history. The EAF should not have a lot of changes based on the studies they have completed. Counsel Molnar reiterated that the board should wait at least a month for any modification and supplemental information that may be submitted to the board. There is a standard list of interested parties that the town uses. It was determined that escrow is not required to be established at this point of review.

Chair Kasper inquired if there is a type of engineer that reviews traffic and parking lot flows. Mr. Camp said that they would usually look at circulation, size of the parking spaces and size of the parking lot. Mr. Eggleston stated that the size of the parking spaces is designed at a standard 10 feet by 20 feet as required by code. Mr. Camp commented that that is a generous size and if the aisles are designed properly, the flow should not be an issue and that is what they would look at in their review. Chair Kasper suggested that the narrative be broken down to address each of the uses separately to provide more clarity. Mr. Camp inquired if the board has the authority to review the internal workings of the business. Counsel Molnar replied that the board has the authority when considering a special permit for the use and the internal workings are a part of that to inform the decision. Mr. Brodsky added that the use determines the parking demand that the code requires.

Chair Kasper thanked everyone for their dedication to the board and wished them a prosperous new year.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Chair Kasper to adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 9:42 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,
Karen Barkdull, Clerk

Additional Meeting Attendees:

| | | |
|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Robert Eggleston | Mark Tucker | Janet Aaron |
| JoAnne Gagliano | Ryan Fogg | Mike Lasell |
| Thomas Hernandez | Michael Falcone | Sara Recktenwald |
| Aaron Lasala | Michael Drake | Chris Buff |
| Amelia Musso | Jennille Smith | Patricia Ford |
| Bell | 970-488-0976 | 315-5697421 |
| Brogan | iPhone | |