

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting February 6, 2014

In the matter of the application of Ted Kinder for Site Plan Approval, Critical Impact Permit, Special Use Permit, Floodway Permit and to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Rear yard set-back, Percentage of structure width/lot width and minimum lot dimension; and section 225-58 Parking; to construct a new 3-story, wood frame, multi-family residential and commercial mixed-use building containing office tenants on Level 1 and 10 residential apartment units on Levels 1, 2 and 3 at the property addressed as 21 Fennell Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
William Eberhardt, Member (Recused)
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Douglas Sutherland, Member
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
Robert Lotkowitz, Director of Municipal Operations
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Chad Rogers, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant
Jamie Kinder, on behalf of the Applicant
Jim Messenger, attorney, on behalf of Robert Hood

Andy Wargo, Marcellus
Courtney Jones, 24 Leitch Ave., Skaneateles
James Alexander, 1740 Coon Hill Rd., Skaneateles
Tom McDonald, 3007 East Lake Rd., Skaneateles
Jo Anne Gagliano, Syracuse
Robert Eggleston, 1391 E Genesee St., Skaneateles

Chairman Kenan called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm, announcing the application of Ted Kinder for 21 Fennell Street. Member Eberhardt recused himself in this matter since he is personally involved. Mr. Rogers introduced himself and presented, "I am taking over for Mr. Kinder tonight because he is out of town. Jim Messenger is also here tonight to speak to Mr. Hood's properties." Chairman Kenan, "So the question last time around focused on adequacy of parking and the easements to serve the property. Is that right?" Mr. Rogers, "That's correct. So I can try to clarify those one-by-one and try to work our way through those issues. Starting with our property – similar to before, we haven't changed any of the quantities of parking, but we made a few changes to the layout which I can address later. We show 16 total required for our new use. We are using 13 on-site, which are these 4 and these 9, and 3 on Mr. Eberhardt's

property. So those 16 satisfy the requirements for this building. Looking at Mr. Eberhardt's property, because we are taking 3 of those for use by 21 Fennell, Mr. Eberhardt's property is currently retail on level 1. It was previously through a site plan review in 2008, and at that time it was also office on level 2, which bumped up the parking. At this time there is nothing on level 2; it is empty. Mr. Eberhardt's wish is to turn the 2nd level into a residence at some time in the future. So that would change the parking required for that building. Keeping the level 1 the same but changing the level 2 use to residential, changes the required parking on Mr. Eberhardt's property to only 4 spaces – which would be the 4 that we show on the site plan, in addition to the 3 being used by 21 Fennell. So there are 7 total; 4 for Mr. Eberhardt's and 3 for 21 Fennell. So that takes care of those 2 properties."

Mr. Rogers continued, "The question came up last time about Mr. Hood's property which is the old McLaughlin's, currently Salt Fit. That was last approved in 1998. At that time, similarly now, there are 23 parking spots required for this use; that square footage. 23 required; only 13 on-site. So we have 13 on-site and we have 6 from 21 Fennell – that equates to 19 provided, where 23 are required. So we are 4 short on Mr. Hood's property." Chairman Kenan, "Where are the 13 on-site?" Mr. Rogers, "I can show you on the old approval. This is the site plan from 1998. There are 7 up front shown and then an additional 6 in the rear, for a total of 13." Chairman Kenan, "So the access is between McLaughlin's and Creekside Offices as they are called here, not down this side of the building." Mr. Rogers, "Correct. Exactly. And there is an easement in place. I can go through the easements if you would like me to now? One thing I will say about the parking..." Chairman Kenan, "One thing you have to do is you should show all that parking on this plan, even though you are covering 3 different properties. But that's the only way, really, that you can demonstrate that there is enough for each of the 3 properties. So you are saying there are 7 and 6, 13 on-site on the McLaughlin site and another 6 here?" Mr. Rogers "Yep on the new site giving you the 19." Chairman Kenan, "And how many are required?" Mr. Rogers, "23." Chairman Kenan, "And it was approved at?" Mr. Rogers, "When it was approved there were 3 properties in the mix. That's one of the reasons Mr. Messenger is here – this is no longer owned by Mr. Hood. As I understand it there were no parking agreements attached to the sale of that property. Mr. Messenger, "Correct, it was a straight deed to that parcel to Kirby Janke."

Chairman Kenan said, "Take us through it again, would you? How many were required for McLaughlin's and how many were approved?" Mr. Rogers, "There are 23 required for McLaughlin's. There are 13 on-site. And this property was in the mix at that time, but it is no longer owned by Mr. Hood. So at the time in 1998, they aggregated what was required here and spread it across the 3 properties." Chairman Kenan, "So there were 29 or 30 required here, 23 here, a total of 42, and nothing required down here because nothing was happening down here. And how many were provided? It says 46, no it says 53." Mr. Rogers said, "This is where they were short. 'Parking not provided on site' was 7 at the time, back in 1998." Chairman Kenan, "This map is very peculiar. The numbers actually add up to 53.85, but it says 53.34. 46 were provided, and it got approved at the time for a shortfall of 7 cars. And that included 3 properties of which one is not in the package." Mr. Rogers, "Right, we are saying now, we are just looking at the total required here and here..." Chairman Kenan, "Leaving this other property 4 cars short..." Mr. Rogers, "As it exists today – however many it is short today." Chairman Kenan, "So all things being equal, they are 4 short, this property was 3 short, where do we stand today

by your calculations?" Mr. Rogers, "Today, we stand 4 short." Chairman Kenan, "Arguably one worse than what was previously approved. Does that make any sense?"

Member Sutherland, "What doesn't make sense is why you would need 23 spaces for this property. It seems extraordinarily high." Chairman Kenan, "It does." Mr. Rogers, "I don't believe you'd ever have 23 cars there." Chairman Kenan, "But the Zoning and the math would say that is what's required. So if you just drew the line here now that that is a different property, you'd be starting out with an old approval allowing 3 short, you are now coming in requesting approval for 4 short. OK, understood." Mr. Rogers, "It's a little confusing but you've got it. That's the summary on the parking. Questions? I'll move on to easements; that's a little easier. There's an existing ingress/egress between Creekside Offices and the old McLaughlin's." Chairman Kenan, "Who is the grantor and who is the grantee?" Mr. Messenger, "The grantor, the seller/owner of the old McLaughlin's building is an entity 22 Fennell St. LLC – Bob Hood." Chairman Kenan, "And who is the grantee or beneficiary of that?" Mr. Messenger, "The new project; I don't know what Kinder's entity to be formed for the project purposes is the buyer/grantee."

Mr. Rogers, "That is in existence and is shown right here. We are proposing to extend that same dimension, 12 feet, along the back of Mr. Hood's property, which would allow us ingress to the Applicant's property. That would be formulated assuming approvals and go-forward with the Village. That would get us to our property. Then the last part of it, which would be our egress, is another existing easement which we showed last time, that goes across the Kinney property. That is existing, the owner to determine, so it is not a set location but is in existence for access/egress." Chairman Kenan, "It is a floating easement. And how about the three parking spaces that are on the Eberhardt property?" Mr. Rogers, "I think that would be addressed by Mr. Eberhardt and the owner." Chairman Kenan, "Well, you need another easement for the parking, right? So if we were to approve the site plan, it would have to be subject to the Village Attorney reviewing the four easements." Mr. Rogers, "Correct. The last one is the creek walk easement. We have slightly adjusted the location of the creek walk from the previous plan and that was as a result of just some work at the site to see where the top of the bank is and where it reasonably would be able to be placed. So that's where it is shown now. And then we are proposing, at this point because details were a bit scarce on other creek walk easements, a 6 foot off the property line creek walk easement, inboard, to allow in the future for that creek walk." Chairman Kenan asked Member Sutherland if that would be adequate and received an affirmative answer.

Chairman Kenan, "And our role is site plan approval, and what else?" Attorney Galbato, "The first thing would be SEQR review and then site plan approval, recommendation or advisory opinion to the ZBA on the Variance applications and Special Use Permit they need from the ZBA, and then an advisory opinion to the Trustees on Critical Impact." Chairman Kenan, "What's the Special Permit for?" Mr. Dundon, "Change of use to multifamily in Downtown D."

Chairman Kenan, "Any questions from the Board?" Member Stokes-Cawley, "It's pretty tight in there – for some event like we had yesterday, what would you do with snow removal?" Mr. Rogers, "We've got some area in the triangular area between the creek walk and parking and that's basically our spot. And then in here, another triangular spot that this tree is covering to push in and stay on property with." Chairman Kenan, "I'm going to suggest that the creek walk

be moved onto the property in its entirety, rather than that little short stretch on the eastern side of the property where it goes off into the creek itself. It probably costs a parking spot, because you have to move the driveway over a few feet to allow that to happen, but in the interests of having some flexibility in the building of that creek walk in the future, I think it would make sense to do that rather than to pinch it in so tight that maybe it doesn't work. I would suggest for the Board to decide, maybe one less parking spot is OK to allow for that to happen. And what is that box that's sitting there? The waste recycling enclosure. Does that exist; is that there now?" Mr. Rogers, "No that is proposed for use by the residents and commercial tenants. We are going to provide a wood fence enclosure." Chairman Kenan, "It might move to the left into that one spot that we would lose in order to get room for the driveway through there." Mr. Rogers, "I think you are actually right. If we shift this on, which I think it is reasonable to suggest. We just happened to show it there because the bank does exist to allow it to physically sit in that section only." Chairman Kenan, "And then we would want an easement for the creek walk along that property line granted to the Village."

Member Sutherland, "Have you had a conversation with the City of Syracuse about being able to use that area just south of the dotted line?" Mr. Rogers, "That was a question as to if through its entirety, including through Parkside, whether or not it is always on private property, straddle the line anywhere." Member Sutherland, "But everybody thinks from the dotted line south into the water itself, that the City has control or ownership of that. Do we know who owns the water in this case? Sometimes it is the State; in this case is it the State or the City?" Mr. Messenger, "I can go through Hood's deed and survey and just see if the extension goes on historically." Member Sutherland, "What I would suggest, and I'm not voting on this -- I am involved with Ted Kinder on some other projects and probably ought to abstain -- but for the sake of the creek walk it would make sense that if you have bank that this could sit on that the City now controls, to get control of that now. It allows you to better groom the bank and maybe if it wants to be a little bit over this way versus that way, you'd have the flexibility to do it. And I wonder if that isn't something that might better happen if the Mayor wasn't to contact the water department or the Mayor of Syracuse if the water department wasn't helpful -- figure out who is in control and being able to claim that. It allows you to make a much tidier situation than just hoping the City would do a good job later on." Chairman Kenan, "So you are suggesting that it would be beneficial if the Applicant would start that conversation with the City through the Mayor." Member Sutherland, "I think municipal official to municipal official would be a better approach. In the end it is a public asset."

Chairman Kenan asked, "If there are no other questions is there a motion?" Attorney Galbato, "Mr. Chairman, can the Board start with the SEQR determination? Historically, the Planning Board would take lead agency even if there is multi-agency review, in this case with the ZBA and the Board of Trustees. The applicant did submit the most recent short environmental assessment form that came out late last year. I believe it is pretty thorough. The part that we have to fill out, if the Board chooses to act as lead agency and make a determination, is Part 2. From my reading of the 11 questions in part 2 those that have a moderate to large impact seem to be no and the small or no impact issues there are moderate improvements. The Board would be looking to declare itself lead agency under SEQR, that this is an unlisted action and we have grounds to have uncoordinated review, because other Boards within the Village will be looking at this project. We could answer every question, 1 - 11 in Part 2 'No', issue a negative

declaration and authorizing the Chairman to sign the short environmental review.” Mr. Dundon repeated the wording for the motion. **Member Hartnett said, “I move that the Planning Board declare itself lead agency for the purpose of SEQR review. We find that this is an unlisted action that will receive uncoordinated review. We find that the questions in Part 2 may all be answered in the negative; thus we make a negative declaration in this matter and authorize the chairman to sign as such.”** Member Stokes-Cawley seconded the motion. Chairman Kenan, Member Hartnett and Member Stokes-Cawley voted in favor of the motion, with Members Eberhardt and Sutherland abstaining. Chairman Kenan declared the motion passed.

Member Hartnett said, “I move that we grant site plan approval, recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals that they approve the Special Use Permit and the requested Variances and recommend to the Trustees that they approve the Critical Impact Permit conditional upon (1) moving the future creek walk path entirely onto the property, (2) granting the Village a 6 foot easement for the purposes of a future creek walk, (3) relocate the waste receptacle to the extent required by moving the creek walk path, (4) recognizing that the creek walk relocation may reduce the on-site parking provided by one space from 13 to 12 in addition to the 3 spaces on the Eberhardt property, and (5) that all easements for all parking, access, egress and the creek walk be submitted to Attorney Galbato and the Village Attorney for review and approval. These actions are taken based on drawings dated January 28, 2014.” Member Stokes-Cawley seconded the motion. Chairman Kenan, Member Hartnett and Member Stokes-Cawley voted in favor of the motion, with Members Eberhardt and Sutherland abstaining. Chairman Kenan declared the motion carried.

Mr. Rogers thanked the Board.

This portion of the meeting was concluded at 7:56 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
February 6, 2014**

In the matter of the application of Cathy McDonald for a 21 lot subdivision, called Hidden Pond Subdivision, located off East Street in the area of the Village water tower site in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
 William Eberhardt, Member
 Stephen Hartnett, Member
 Douglas Sutherland, Member
 Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member

 Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
 Robert Lotkowitz, Director of Municipal Operations
 Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

 Tom McDonald, on behalf of the Applicant
 Jo Anne Gagliano, EDR, on behalf of the Applicant

 Andy Wargo, Marcellus
 Courtney Jones, 24 Leitch Ave., Skaneateles
 James Alexander, 1740 Coon Hill Rd., Skaneateles
 Robert Eggleston, 1391 E Genesee St., Skaneateles

Chairman Kenan called the meeting to order at 7:57 pm, announcing the application of Cathy McDonald for the Hidden Pond Subdivision. Ms. Gagliano, President of EDR, introduced herself and presented, "I am here tonight to represent Cathy and Tom McDonald in the project. This project goes back to 2008 and before. Some of the members were here then. I know Tom was here last month to talk about what's going on with the project. It is a subdivision that straddles the Village and Town line, so we were before both municipalities for the subdivision. It is Tom's intent to start with the Village portion. The drawings have not been changed at all from the original approval. They were reviewed by the Planning Board, they went through Health Dept., Water and they also went before Doug Wickman for the engineering review. With the economy, the project was never acted upon, so it has been sitting idle through the years. Tonight we brought in the same set of drawings that was submitted, reviewed and approved by you. It has been updated in the revision block so it has a current title and label for date. The other thing is the long-form SEQR that was done in 2008. As you know, there is a change to the format, so we have recompleted the SEQR; we have used the same data for the questions that remain the same and we have put in new and additional data for the questions that were not originally in the previous SEQR. I think you will find everything that we have put together in the past and was approved has been brought up to date; we are hoping that you can explain to us

tonight how we can reenact our approval and answer any questions that you might have about the future first phase or the drawings.”

Chairman Kenan, “OK, good. The drawings as redated; are they identical to the drawings that were approved on the date that the subdivision was approved?” Ms. Gagliano. “They are identical, yes. We did not even go back to the original CAD drawings. We took the actual drawings that were stamped approved, and we just through pdf went back and changed the date on the drawing. They have not been changed at all. We used the pdfs that were approved so there were no changes, whatsoever.” Chairman Kenan, “For the members of this Board who were not on this Board in 2008, can you walk through the sequence was – I don’t mean every meeting – but what was the logic by which we arrived at the number of lots and approved this arrangement. Do you recall all of that?” Ms. Gagliano, “Yes, I will dig deep in my memory bank from my former partner and I working on this together. This part of the subdivision in the Village was to be more a new urbanism, a more dense development with smaller homes, closer together. The Town section was more open subdivision – much more like a rural subdivision. The rationale for this subdivision was to use the land in the best way possible. There are wetlands on the property; those would not be impacted. So we would create the open space in its natural form. The density that was created in an urban or village-like situation, so it was an extension of the Village and could provide that style of living to folks that wanted to have their residence in the Village. We went through a series of different layouts to accommodate the natural resources and also the feel of the neighborhood. We also went through a series of different storm-water approaches; the regulations had changed, the DEC regulations and this would comply with the green infrastructure. Doug Wickman did have us look at some other areas and add some storm water management. This would have a homeowners association, there are green space and some lots that contain storm water management that would be maintained by the association. Lighting was considered and worked very carefully with the Village so it would be in keeping with the Village lighting and not heavily lighted but lighted in the way that the Village street are lighted. The Village portion of it would be an extension of the sewer and water from the Village where the subdivision that’s on the Town side actually had leach fields because there isn’t sewer available at that location. So all those things were considered; we did the best to preserve the natural resources and open space but also with a trail system as well, so there would be connectivity through the Village and Town portions and connect to the sidewalks in the Village. There was a thorough process from beginning to end. Tom told you a little bit last month about this opportunity he has to build homes that have this character. What I’m seeing in other towns and Villages – this type of development where it is more closely related, smaller homes, smaller yards – seem to be desired. So this is a good time for him to develop what was designed in 2008. I can answer detailed questions if you want but that’s how the process happened.”

Member Sutherland, “With the part in the Town that’s not going to be built now, are there some things that you need to adjust in order to just build the Village part...for example the road the comes in the was to extend through? Does it stop? How do you deal with something that was seen in a larger context that’s really just dealing with the Village property now?” Ms. Gagliano, “You are right about that one area where there is a connection, even the trail that was proposed. That could be built as a loop to come back into the Village for now and then connect later. That road would have to be a turn-around. Tom, you are not thinking that it will never happen; you’re

just starting with the first phase, right?" Mr. McDonald, "Exactly." Ms. Gagliano, "And maybe if this is a very popular new style or new opportunity for people, maybe we would rethink the subdivision in the Town. At the time, that was more or less what people were thinking about building, but maybe we'd rethink not the road system but probably the density of the lots." Mr. McDonald, "We did meet, Bruce and I and Mary Sennett and Connie Brace to discuss how I would like to carry this into the Town portion of the property as well. Density is the key, because I really would like to build affordable housing. Right now these lots are not really affordable, unfortunately. But if, as part of the Comprehensive Plan they designate this site as being one that they think can qualify for a PUD-type development, then I think we can bring a lot to that portion of the property." Member Sutherland, "A similar sort of concept where you take the square-footage for traditional size, but you scrunch up a part of it and you leave part of it green?" Mr. McDonald, "I'm willing to look at any of that. The Notre Dame study on that site had a major commons in the middle and it called for apartment buildings, single-family dwellings, senior-citizen type development – all of which I'd love to do at that site. The Hidden Pond portion of it from the Town part of the property can be opened up in a way that it becomes a real focal point of the entire development, not just the Village portion. My goal is to try to get density on the Town portion. On the Village portion we're done. That's what the Village portion of the property can handle, that's what we got approved, and we're fine with that – it's just expensive. The infrastructure makes these competitive with \$100,000 lots." Ms. Gagliano, "And there's not the volume of them so hopefully the subdivision adjacent – I think the road network would still work. The alignment in density would change because who's talking about multiple use, so if you had elder housing or apartments combined with homes..." Mr. McDonald, "That's going to be taken up in the Comprehensive Plan, and how the Town and the Village figure it out." Member Sutherland, "You still have how do you deal with sewers and infrastructure support." Ms. Gagliano, "Exactly." Mr. McDonald, "We plan on having those discussions while the Village portion is being developed."

Chairman Kenan, "My recollection is that when we settled upon this arrangement – and for the new Board members it is a new application so ask any question you want to ask and don't be inhibited by what was approved earlier. When we went through the process before we asked the Applicant to lay out all of the property – as many lots as could be laid out in a real physical layout with the roads and everything that had to be – how many would fit in the land, and then decided that a maximum of 21 would fit – and then agreed to consider a more compact version with lots that otherwise don't meet the zoning, because they are smaller than required. But they would leave more land for open space and they reduced the amount of road and sewer that the developer has to put in and we settled on that arrangement. The Town, as far as I know, hasn't gotten to the point where they want to consider doing things like that and that's up to the Town." Mr. McDonald, "I think with the new Board Members and the new supervisor, the sense I get is that they really do want to do that. Enrollment is down in the school and things like that. I think density which creates affordability is a goal. I think everybody agrees that this site is a real prime site remaining in the Village. The project really did evolve into this cluster type development where we preserve more open space and get back to a small lot and a real neighborhood character that you see on streets like Leitch."

Chairman Kenan, "So with or without the little spur that would connect to the Town it is stand-alone development for the Village or it is expandable into the Town if that comes about." Mr.

McDonald, "We would like it to look like one major project when both phases are done. But that will depend on the cooperation between the Town and the Village as to what the standards are that they want to apply to the town portion." Member Stokes-Cawley, "How will this work; are these homes that you build or do people buy a lot and build what they want?" Mr. McDonald, "We are going to develop just the infrastructure right now. There may be developers out there who want to come in and buy 21 lots. I want to have some influence there because I really do want to encourage development that has Energy Star environmental type building, and I also want to try as much as possible to keep these affordable. But any developer who wants to come in and build on one of these lots is looking at an \$80,000 or \$90,000 lot cost to start with, which is unfortunate. But it's less than \$125,000 down the street. I'd still like to encourage -- even with that lot cost -- building smaller homes."

Member Stokes-Cawley, "I think you mentioned this, but it is similar to like the Orchard extension development, Parkside; similar lighting as there is in the Village, there's sidewalks, trees..." Ms. Gagliano, "The standards -- there are sidewalks standard for the Village. There's a planting plan with street trees on the road along the sidewalks and also the green in between the circular area there. If you look at this plan right here, there is a planting plan that identifies the vegetation. So it meets all of the requirements of the Village and it will look like the Village. So all of those are the new street trees, and these are all seed mixes to re-naturalize in the areas where we have storm water management. You can see where this road would end here now and just be a turn-around like you would see in a subdivision that's just beginning. That would be where it would connect to the Town eventually. And there is also a walking path that connects, so that could just loop back on itself for now." Ms. Stokes-Cawley, "And this is the pond?" Ms. Gagliano, "That's actually the storm water management; it will have some water in it." Ms. Stokes-Cawley, "You talk about wetlands..." Ms. Gagliano, "The wetlands are separate. If you look at the wetlands, there a wetland right down here. So it is in the green area of the property. Instead of impacting it -- that's what Bruce was speaking about -- we looked at a full build-out with permitting, but decided it made more sense to have a planned development that allowed our natural resource to stay in place. Even though the Zoning doesn't promote it -- to create the kind of residential layout that you would have seen many years ago before the transition to our conventional zoning."

Member Hartnett, "Will the sidewalk here connect over to the school?" Ms. Gagliano, "Yes, there are sidewalks on every bit of it." Chairman Kenan, "Did we introduce the design covenants in this subdivision?" Member Sutherland, "I honestly don't remember. One of the things that happens here is that you have a lot of houses close together that are aggressively different in style, it would be unfortunate." Member Eberhardt, "If we didn't, we ought to build that in." Chairman Kenan, "I think so too. In Parkside, those are bigger lots, but we encouraged that the houses be built closer to the street and set up some design parameters and a design review committee that I think has worked very well -- not only for the builders who are getting better prices because they are building better looking homes, but also for the community at large." Ms. Gagliano, "You asked us to actually show the buildings so the fronts of the buildings would all be located in a traditional manner. But you're speaking of design guidelines for building so the houses have..." Chairman Kenan, "We may want to adopt those same design guidelines." Ms. Gagliano, "You did not have guidelines but you asked us to show the houses aligned so that when they were built, they were built in this building envelope so that they would

all be similar in their set-backs.” Mr. McDonald, “Does that allow for a carriage house.” Mr. Sutherland, “Yes.” Ms. Gagliano, “It’s within the pocket. So this square, you can see there is multiple shapes within it. It allows for a driveway, a carriage house, so the garage is in the rear, and the house is forward with a porch. So that was the idea, but you did not attach any design review or guidelines at the time.” Chairman Kenan, “And were there any, I don’t recall it from the 2008 approval, was there a home owners association included in the package?” Ms. Gagliano, “Yes.” Member Sutherland, “Was the home owners group also maintaining the landscape?” Ms. Gagliano, “Yes the landscape and even the green, the natural resource and the storm water management.”

Mr. Lotkowitz, “Two questions. When the original approval – did Stearns & Wheeler review this?” Ms. Gagliano, “No, C&S, Doug Wickman.” Mr. Lotkowitz, “They are not the Village engineers. Did they review this?” Member Sutherland, “Was C&S brought in on a special basis for that because they were also doing the Town end?” Ms. Gagliano, “Because it was done with the Town; it was done together. But they did review it.” Mr Lotkowitz, “The reason why I ask is that I see the water system connecting to a 100 year-old 4 inch pipe. So I wondered if it was thoroughly reviewed. I think it has to be reviewed because now we have a better understanding of the water system; we have made some changes in it since then. I’d rather not see a new 8 inch pipe connect to a 100 year-old 4 inch pipe. I would like to GHD review the water system. There’s a pump station.” Ms. Gagliano, “They did have some review but it was mostly Doug.” Mr. McDonald, “Well actually the Village is rebuilding a water main on East Street, starting next month. We’d be happy to be building at the same time, so there’s only one disruption on East Street.”

Chairman Kenan, “I think what we need to do is refer it to the County Planning; that’s obligatory I think.” Attorney Galbato, “The prior approval from August 6, 2008 expired by its own terms because the map wasn’t filed and its jurisdiction says send it off to County Planning. We can work to let them know that it’s the same plan; give them what they need. If they decide they don’t need to then that’s what they decide.” Chairman Kenan, “We should refer it to GHD and the Village for any comments that they have on the water and sewer facilities. Let GHD tell us if there is a fee for reviewing the drawings. I would suggest that while that is happening, that the Planning Board should dust off those design guidelines that were established for Parkside and decide if they are applicable here as well. Presumably the County can act within a month. Do we need a Public Hearing?” Attorney Galbato, “Yes.” Chairman Kenan, “Then maybe we should schedule that for next month. Any other questions?”

Member Stokes-Cawley said, “You are talking about needing 9,400 gallons of water.” Ms. Gagliano, “Remember that SEQR needs to be done for the entire project, so that includes the Town. While that’s not actually going to happen we have to include it because it is the same project. It would be segmentation otherwise. All your acreages that are in there are greater. That’s where GHD would have to look at what’s the real consumption. The Town was originally lead agency because it was the bigger project, but now since we’re going to initiate construction in the Village first we are looking at the Village taking lead agency if that works. Just so you are aware, it includes everything and it needs to.”

Mr. Galbato said, "What I would like to do, if it pleases the Board, is to collect all of the information from the Town Planning Board that should be in the Village Files when they did the SEQR review and that this Board adopted in its resolution of August 6, 2008. When we do our conditional approval, at that point we will reaffirm that SEQR. When SEQR is done, it is done forever unless there's a significant change and there doesn't appear to be any evidence of a significant change, even though there may be some minor tweaks here and there.

Member Sutherland said, "In getting to a number to go in the escrow account from GHD, can we monitor that closely? It should be an easy process to bring it up to date." Attorney Galbato, "Yes, we should. The developer has already paid for engineering review in 2008." Member Eberhardt, "They need to know that this has already been done once." [Multiple Conversations]

Member Sutherland said, "I move that the Planning Board refer this application to SOCPA for review, refer it to GHD and the Village for comment on water and sewer facilities and the amount of the I&I fee. GHD will determine if there will be a fee to review this application to reflect prior work done. If so, the Applicant will establish an escrow account in an amount sufficient to cover the expected professional services required. The Planning Board will review its Parkside design guidelines for their appropriateness in being used for this development. The Planning Board will schedule a Public Hearing on this matter for its March 6, 2014 meeting. The Planning Board will declare itself as lead agency for SEQR purposes." Member Eberhardt seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, Chairman Kenan declared the motion passed.

Ms. Gagliano and Mr. McDonald thanked the Board.

This portion of the meeting was concluded at 8:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting February 6, 2014

In the matter of the application of Courtney Jones to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard setback, left; Both side yards combined; percentage of open area; and Section 225-69D Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion to construct a two-story addition to a two-family dwelling and to convert the dwelling to single family use at the property addressed as 24 Leitch Avenue in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
William Eberhardt, Member
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Douglas Sutherland, Member
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
Robert Lotkowitz, Director of Municipal Operations
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Date: 11/14

Andy Wargo, Donohoe Group, on behalf of the Applicant
Courtney Jones, Applicant
James Alexander, on behalf of the Applicant

James Alexander, 1740 Coon Hill Rd., Skaneateles
Robert Eggleston, 1391 E Genesee St., Skaneateles

Chairman Kenan called the meeting to order at 8:30 pm, announcing the application of Courtney Jones for 24 Leitch Avenue. Mr. Wargo introduced himself and presented, "We are here looking for the Board to approve this to send it off to Zoning for us. What it is right now is a two-family structure that is being converted to one single-family. The lot is in non-conformance but all of the lots in the area seem to fall into that. Our overall application is to keep the outside of the structure exactly the same, but to do extensive remodeling on the inside of the structure. With that said there are a couple of applications that show on the extension that are looking to increase the porch area and to decrease a deck on the back and to convert that into some interior living space. Along with that there's, because it was a two-family house and I know you don't use the driveways for density, we are eliminating some parking spaces that were there because of the two-family structure and converting it back to a single-family. So with that said, the garage out structure would be our parking *per se* and the driveway would be our overflow."

Chairman Kenan, "So it's a porch extension on the front and a two-story addition in the rear?"
Mr. Wargo, "Yes, plus the interior remodel." Chairman Kenan, "And the issues as far as the

Zoning Board are concerned are what?" Mr. Wargo, "Density Control, we have side yard setbacks. You will see there's a small entrance porch on the driveway side that's going to cause us to encroach by another foot and then the porch on the front of the structure that wraps around to the side." Chairman Kenan, "So it is 81.2% open as opposed to 85% required. And it is the left yard is not OK and combined they are not. Where is this on Leitch?" Mr. Wargo, "As you come up the hill off Genesee it is on the right-hand side." Ms. Jones, "Right next to McDowell's; the yellow."

Member Eberhardt said, "I move to recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the variances requested in the Courtney Jones application dated 1/22/14 as submitted."

Member Sutherland seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, Chairman Kenan declared the motion passed.

Mr. Wargo and Ms. Jones thanked the Board.

This portion of the meeting was concluded at 8:34 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting February 6, 2014

In the matter of the application of Katherine Burke to modify variances granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals on December 2, 2013, specifically to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Rear yard setback and percentage of Open Area to eliminate the proposed elevator and provide for necessary egress at the property addressed as 10 State Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
William Eberhardt, Member
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Douglas Sutherland, Member
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
Robert Lotkowitz, Director of Municipal Operations
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Robert Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant

Chairman Kenan called the meeting to order at 8:35 pm, announcing the application of Katherine Burke for 10 State Street. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "An approval was granted a couple of months ago for tearing down the garage and putting up a carriage house with an accessory apartment that required a special use permit which was granted by the ZBA. In working out the finer details of the drawings and a couple of things that had transpired, a couple of changes were made. They decided to not to go with an elevator inside but a wider stair inside that would accommodate a chair lift for Aunt Ginny should she need it in the future. Kathy Burke bought an antique stairway which appropriately wanted to be open, which means it would be open to the garage. In doing that I was forced to provide a legal exit other than through the garage for getting out of the apartment. You can't pass through a garage as the only legal exit out of the building. In that she had purchased this Victorian very nice stairway that will be open to the garage, the fire rating of the garage extends up to the top and we have put a metal stair that will be a nicely built metal stair on the back to provide the legal access even though they will probably be using the main access all the time. The other item is we increased the garage size to 38 feet to accommodate the stair and these changes, so as shown, the garage is 4 feet wider. We also put a 4 foot wide deck on this side, just so she had a place to go out and overlook the lawn, which is a nice lawn – the back of the Barrows art gallery. So that changed the percent coverage; we were originally at 81.9. We went to 84.3 was approved and we dropping it another percent to 83.18. The rear yard set-back will be 1.2 and we are making it a metal stairway because we are within 3 feet of the property line. Kathy is getting a letter from Legg Hall having no objections. We expect to have that for the ZBA. So it is a modification of the original approval, to make the

building 4 feet longer, have the deck on the southern side and allow us to have a metal stair on the back.”

Chairman Kenan, “So the coverage is affected by the enlargement of the garage, and the metal stair affects what, the rear yard set-back?” Mr. Eggleston, “The rear yard set-back. We were granted a 5 foot set-back and we will be 1.2 feet.” Member Eberhardt, “What are the dimensions of the metal deck?” Mr. Eggleston, “Of the second floor deck? It’s 4 feet wide and 24 feet long. What it will have is double French doors that open up and allows a place to set a chair and look out over the rear lawn area.” Chairman Kenan, “And there is a small deck in the front as well?” Mr. Eggleston, “That’s a faux deck. It’s just a railing because she wanted the French doors for the glass and appearance.” Chairman Kenan, “Are there any questions?”

Member Sutherland said, “I move that we recommend to the ZBA that they approve the required changes that are necessary.” Member Eberhardt seconded the motion.

Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, Chairman Kenan declared the motion passed.

Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board.

This portion of the meeting was concluded at 8:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting February 6, 2014

Review of traffic concepts for Village Hall site at 26 Fennell Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
William Eberhardt, Member
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Douglas Sutherland, Member
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member

Martin Hubbard, Mayor
Marc Angillilo, Village Trustee
Michael Byrne, Village Attorney
Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
Robert Lotkowitz, Director of Municipal Operations
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Robert Eggleston, 1391 E Genesee St., Skaneateles

Chairman Kenan, at 8:40 pm, announced that the Board would discuss traffic flows at the Village Hall site at the request of Mayor Hubbard. Chairman Kenan recapped the process of having met with QPK to attempt to improve the ingress and egress from Fennell Street and to provide a better presentation for landscaping and maintaining the truck access to the Post Office. He showed a picture of the existing condition, a site-specific solution and two possible options developed by QPK, describing each in turn.

One improvement that is being negotiated is the ability to exit the post office property in the rear of the building onto the Village Hall site – providing for a mail drop. Member Eberhardt asked about the Trustees' feelings about the EDR Fennell Master Plan. Mayor Hubbard suggested that the on-street parking component could be dealt with separately, but thought that a combination of the 26 Fennell site with a Fennell Street plan that reflects today's realities would be desirable – noting that the revised intersection of Jordan and Fennell has been perfected.

Mayor Hubbard and Chairman Kenan agreed that the goal should be to put together a plan for the Kelley to Jordan section of Fennell Street that can be used for obtaining grant money. Mayor Hubbard noted that the offer to the Town was for co-location, not consolidation.

The Planning Board feels that EDR might be the preferred designer for the streetscape improvements with QPK being the preferred designer for the Village Hall site.

Attorney Byrne described previous discussions in 2008 with the owners of the Harris property suggest that a wider access/egress alongside the SECNY building might be an acceptable trade-off for access/egress to the Village site from the Harris property. In his opinion, other solutions would be non-starters.

As a result, QPK will be asked to look at a third solution incorporating those parameters, while EDR will be asked to refresh their look at Fennell Street, along with the Fennell/Jordan intersection. This could be done through a change order for QPK on site specific design, and a potential proposal from EDR for the Fennell street enhancements. The Mayor will approach both firms. The Planning Board Chairman will take the lead in approaching the Village Board of Trustees for funding.

Some discussion took place about the suitability for the Town Hall. Attorney Byrne would like to have a little more certainty before approaching the Harris family. A great deal of further discussion ensued regarding possibilities for parking, traffic, postal drop box, pedestrian friendliness and appearance for Fennell Street.

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards