Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
October 3, 2013

Continued discussion regarding the tree planting plan in the matter of the application of Parkside Development for final subdivision approval of Phase IV (Section 4) of the Parkside Village Subdivision in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Douglas Sutherland, Member
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Planning Board
Ann Neibert, Chairman, Tree Advisory Board

Corinne Knupp, for the Applicant

Absent: William Eberhardt, Member
Mark Roney, Member

Chairman Kenan called the meeting to order at 7:38 pm, saying, "We have one item on the agenda, and that is finalizing the approval of the Parkside Village Subdivision, Section 4. When the resolution was passed in July, one item was outstanding; which was that the species of trees to be planted was to be approved by the Planning Board, upon recommendation of the Village Tree Committee. That was July, and in the interim we have received a recommendation of 7 species to pick from…" Ms. Neibert, "And the developer just recently got back with 3 choices…" Chairman Kenan, "Three choices out of the 7 – little leaf linden, red sunset and October glory." Ms. Neibert, "So we went back and revised the plan [presented drawing to the Chairman] and just replaced the trees that were not selected with the trees that were selected. So that plan works for us. As I state in my cover letter we would still like to see more diversity down there, but this is a good compromise and we are happy with it."

Chairman Kenan said, "Let me just read this into the record. What Ann has handed me is a letter dated October 3rd – Revised Tree Plan for Parkside. It says 'The Tree Advisory Board revised the tree plan for Parkside based on the 3 trees selected by the developer based on 7 species preferred by our Board. We would still like to see more diversity in the development, but we accept their choices from our selections as a good compromise to have lovely hardy trees on the development streetscape. We present this second plan for the developer and the Planning Board to consider.' So what you did was to take a plan and mark up with numbers where you think the little leaf lindens, the red sunsets and the October glories ought to be planted." Ms. Neibert, "Previously we had given you a plan with a different set of numbers; I didn't have time to get a copy…" Ms. Knupp, "We have time. My only question; did you just take a copy of exactly – so

is the quantity of trees; is that right off of our plan before? We had; Dunn & Sgromo had put a little bush thing; is… [Multiple conversations began concerning both the processes used by the Tree Advisory Board and the comparison of tree quantities between the developer's final plat map and the Tree Advisory Board submission.] The Board concluded that there were more trees shown on the TAB sketch than were on the plat map. The Chairman counted a total of 43 trees suggested for the 18 lots suggested vs. the engineer's count of 33 trees.

Attorney Galbato said, "Cori, there's a good number of trees missing." Member Sutherland said, "We came up with a count of 33 trees; Ann's plan has 43. We think she missed a couple of spots." Ms. Knupp, "And their bid had more than that to be quite honest. Wasn't there some; there was electric. There was an issue with a utility easement that National Grid would not allow them." Chairman Kenan, "Could the trees be planted on the resident's side of the easement?" Ms. Knupp, "I don't know the answer to that." Ms. Neibert, "Those to me look like really deep lots and we were wondering who would want their house staring at that pole. This map had 33 and this one had 43?" Ms. Knupp, "Did you add some." Ms. Neibert, "I think it was the easement. I think there's a lot along here that they said we couldn't plant, but we decided to go ahead and make the plan in case in the middle of the night the homeowner might plant a tree." Chairman Kenan, "The issue is here and here." Ms. Knupp, "And I think those were intentionally taken out because of the utility." Chairman Kenan, "I think that if you planted them on the north side of the utility it would probably be OK. They are further back from the street."

Member Sutherland, "What I wonder; if you were looking at a more ornamental tree – going up Solar Street in the Franklin Square area there were some cherries and some crabs that were planted that didn't grow up into the…" Ms. Neibert, "That's why we had the lilac and the red spire pear…" Ms. Knupp, "I don't think National Grid had an issue with the type of tree…" Ms. Neibert, "we originally had those types of trees in there…" Member Sutherland, "I think National Grid needs to modify its thinking." Ms. Knupp, "Agreed. But if that can be done great. Our plan when we put all this together was to have two trees per lot and we are fine with that." [Multiple conversations.] Member Sutherland, "I think their real concern is getting something that doesn't grow too high. Their immediate response is to say 'No' to anything. If you can demonstrate that you've got a tree that matures out at 15 feet and the lines are 25 feet in the air, I think you can probably get through that." Ms. Knupp, "We would be happy to go ahead and try to do that. I don't want to hold up the plans for that but we will go to National Grid." Member Sutherland said, "There's probably a way to approve this with an asterisk saying that that needs to be done. To the extent that…" [Multiple conversations.]

Chairman Kenan, "Hang on here, hang on…" Ms. Neibert, "…these trees all along here and these, there are like four or five poles along here which I guess is this section – and they are so high up into the air; the poles…" Chairman Kenan, "I would just put the trees inside the power line. Set them back further from the road." [Multiple speakers.] Chairman Kenan, "Let me just stop everybody, stop…" Member Sutherland, "You really want them along this edge." Chairman Kenan, gaveling for order, "You mean under the power lines? So that somebody is going to come along in the future and take a bite out of the tree?" Member Sutherland, "If you select a tree that's natural maturity is 15 to 20 feet and you've got a pole that's -- a power line is 30 or 40 feet in the air – there's no reason to cut a V out of it." Ms. Neibert, "The problem is that the trees that were selected by the developer nixed our shorter-growing trees." Member

Sutherland, "Which I think in this case… [Multiple speakers.] …if you go back to that lower-growing tree you demonstrate clearly to National Grid that 'what we have here is a 15-footer at maturity and your line is 30 or more feet in the air – it's not an issue.'"

Chairman Kenan said, "I would just plant it. I mean really. Just come back later…" Member Sutherland said, "It's tough for us to tell them to them to just plant it." Ms. Knupp, "It's kind of hard for us to just plant it, because we have the legal; especially when National Grid is saying 'well if it gets planted there's nothing we can do about it.'" Chairman Kenan said, "I think the theory is that there are 2 trees per lot." Ms. Knupp, "Correct. It should be based on 2 per lot." Ms. Neibert, "There's one lot there that I think had 3…" Chairman Kenan, "Ann, just let me talk. I think on corner lots of necessity it is 4. So I am just going to suggest that as a basic rule it is 2 per lot, except the corner where it is 4 trees. Which is sort of what's done here. I'm going to suggest then that whatever that count is – they should be equally spaced along here. Not 2 here because the lot is narrow, and 2 spread apart because the lot is wide – but equally spaced; done in such a way that they don't counter to that power line there. So if it is 16 trees, then 16 trees equally spaced."

Ms. Knupp asked, "Can I clarify that? If you wanted that as the case, would there end up being a case where there might be 1 on one lot and 3 on another?" Chairman Kenan said, "It might. I think it is how they look along the street that's important." Ms. Neibert, "Well that does happen because this lot up here there's only room for 1, but on this lot, number 36, we felt there was room for 3." Chairman Kenan said, "So I'm going to say 16 trees equally spaced [on the west side of Orchard Road]. I'm going to say 2 trees here [south side of lot 30], because you really do want them on this corner. 14 trees equally spaced on this side [the east side of Orchard Road]; it is obviously a longer distance. 7 trees on here [north side of Sinclair] and 6 trees here [south side of Sinclair]. So I wind up with 45 trees on 18 lots. The reason I have got more is there's 6 of them right there, because of the corner lots. I guess I have come up with 3 trees. That's what would look right." Ms. Neibert said, "These are the two that are different from mine; these 2 that you added here."

Chairman Kenan, "Now let me ask you this. Types 1, 4 and 5. What would you prefer they be? Do you care what they are from a cost standpoint? Are they all the same?" Ms, Knupp, "Tobin is taking care of all of them and when I gave him the list, that's what he said we could do." Ms. Neibert suggested, "We can just stick to the same thing and just do two more 5s." Ms. Knupp reported, "A total of 45 trees is fine." Chairman Kenan asked that copies be made of the plan that he had annotated during the discussion. Copies were made and distributed to the Board members and the others in attendance."

Ms. Knupp asked, "So your signature is already on the plans that are being held?" Chairman Kenan, "It is on the plans, yes." Attorney Galbato said, "But now we would have to show these new trees on there." Ms. Knupp, "So the new trees that we would have to show; that has to go back to the Health Department? Because we had to go to the Health Department to get them to sign off on the plans. So if the plans are redone, we have to redo the signature thing all over again. And I really don't want to do that." Chairman Kenan, "Why can't there just be a supplemental drawing? Is it critical that the tree planting plan be filed with the County?" Ms. Knupp, "Last time we didn't file a tree plan; we just had an extra drawing that we gave to our

contractor and said 'this is the trees.' And we had a tree plan. And it was something similar to what…" Member Sutherland, "It seems more like that's a courtesy rather than a requirement. Filing that with the county seems totally unnecessary." Ms. Knupp, "You have it already in the resolution that the tree plan is to be submitted to and approved by the Board. So as long as it is approved by the Board and we have a plan, it's done." Attorney Galbato said, "We'll be OK. It talks about no Building Permit issued until all the infrastructure, which includes street lights and trees are completed and accepted by the Village. We'll be OK."

There was continued general discussion about the possibility of using different species near the National Grid power lines with Member Sutherland recommending a smaller tree for that area.

Chairman Kenan asked Attorney Galbato how to proceed with the planting plan. Mr. Galbato, "I think we'll just keep the signed plan as presented, and supplement it with a resolution." Chairman Kenan said, **"Let me propose a resolution then:**

Whereas Ann Neibert presented this evening a proposed revised tree planting plan for the Parkside Subdivision dated today, October 3, 2013;

And Whereas this proposed plan indicated where the Tree Advisory Board felt the different species should be planted on the plan;

And Whereas the Planning Board made certain revisions and additional notes to the plan at the meeting;

And Whereas these additional notes and revisions were reflected on a marked-up drawing dated October 3, 2013 attached to this resolution;

Now therefore be it Resolved that the Planning Board approves the tree planting plan as marked-up at the meeting and attached herewith." Member Sutherland seconded the resolution.

Upon the unanimous vote of the Members present in favor of the resolution, the resolution was declared adopted.

Member Stokes-Cawley asked about the sick trees. Chairman Kenan said that the Board is awaiting further communication from Bartlett Tree, the Village's arborist, for advice on what should be done with any trees that aren't performing well. Ms. Knupp reported that even though the developer had engaged someone to do post-planting care, the trees have been in longer than two years and are beyond the warranty period.

Upon motion of Member Stokes-Cawley, seconded by Member Sutherland, the meeting was unanimously adjourned at 8:06 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards