

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

Public Hearing 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: Douglas Sutherland, Acting Chairman
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member

Michael Byrne, Village Attorney
Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
John Crompt, Code Enforcement Officer
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

Brian Carvalho, Skaneateles
Chad Rogers, Skaneateles
Ted Kinder, Skaneateles
Robert Eggleston, Skaneateles

Chairman Sutherland called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm, announcing the Public Hearing for Hidden Pond subdivision. Ms. Gagliano introduced herself and mentioned that there would be a graphic displayed for the Board, and presented, "You know from our last meeting, that I am here representing a project that was approved in 2008; it was the Hidden Pond subdivision. The drawing that I am showing you I think will help to clarify the project. This graphic actually shows the portion that's in the Village and the portion that's in the Town. You are looking at East Street here and you're actually seeing the Village Water Treatment facility and the school. That will orient you as to where this is. The entrance road, right here, is across from the school drive, and this section right through here is the Village property. This entire portion here is the Town. When this subdivision was first discussed, it was looked at for the property as a whole. Because of the natural features – there's a great hidden pond here, hence the name – and a lot of forested area, it would make more sense to try to bring the development into the area where there is mostly ag field and also to have a similar feel as the homes that are in the Village. So it is more of a small scale, new urban development. The street would have sidewalks in this area here that draw you out to the main road."

Ms. Gagliano continued, "So throughout this sort of conservation approach; where this area was left as open space, there is also a trail system that connected you from the more suburban component than was in the village at the time. If you think back to when this was started in the early 2000s, it seemed like there was a need for both types of housing. I think Tom's feeling today is that this kind of style housing may yet continue into this property, instead of the larger lots. But at the same time, this area will be Phase 1, so that's why we are here with you in the Village first."

Ms. Gagliano continued, "The process back between 2006 and 2008 was that we were working with both the Town and Village to develop plans that would be approved. And both plans were approved in both Village and Town; however they did not go forward due to the economic issues that we all know about. This parcel itself is available to start with. He is ready and he could get going on it, although we recognize that time has passed and we needed to come back and have the Planning Board look at it and look to see if there are any changes that have happened in the municipality since this was developed. So last time I was here we talked about how we would go forward. You had asked us to update the SEQR, because the form had changed, so we have done that and submitted that as part of the set. We have submitted all the drawings that were originally submitted to date; if you look at the dates on the plans, they go back to 2008. We have redated that exact same plan and brought it up to current for your records. It has gone to SOCPA is my understanding, so we will be expecting comments."

Ms. Gagliano continued, "I just received a letter that I quickly scanned – I haven't read it all – an email message that Dennis just gave me, having to do with engineering review. The recollection was from years gone by is that we definitely got a review from both Town and Village engineer, but they were different in that, for example, the Village services – we were connecting to Village water and sewer; on the town side, each house would have its own leach field system. It came up at the Planning Board that there might be changes as to where we would make connections, where pipes had been upgraded. That seems to be referenced in this email. There are some things here that it looks like aren't able to be found or they don't remember; I do have a lot of those things on the list that off the top of my head I can see. So I will have to go back to the office and get these things out so I can forward them to Dennis, so they will have them for review. I haven't read this completely; I just gave it a quick look. I can make separate copies if need be. And I'll look for the C&S letter, since we are here in the Village. The regulatory approval letters, I'll pull those out. I think it's just a matter of resurrecting the things we did a few years ago. This is a Public Hearing so I'm willing to take any questions that you have or that anyone else has."

DMO Lotkowitz said, "I have a question. When you first proposed this it was two sites but they were connected. The way you have connected now. Can the storm water and all that you are going to do for Phase 1, is that going to be affected if you don't do Phase 2? Do you know what I'm saying? Can you do Phase 1 as a stand-alone project and not affect any of the storm water in the town, storm water in the village?" Ms. Gagliano, "I'll have to go back and pull those plans." DMO Lotkowitz, "It was a consolidated well-thought-out project." Ms. Gagliano, "They were actually treated completely separately from the approvals. But this area would not be disturbed when we are doing this work. That's why I want to go back and see if there's a paving plan for storm water at that time. I know they were treated as two completely separate projects with the

reviews. The regulations are slightly different now; that's when the regulations just changed, so that's one of the questions in here is to go back and look at the storm water management."

Member Stokes-Cawley, "I have a question about the wetlands. I don't know if this diagram is from 2008 or... I heard there might be some changes in the wetlands. I think it's a good idea to check on where the wetlands are now." Ms. Gagliano, "The problem is right now, we started this just a month ago, the weather right now we can't actually do any wetland delineation until we have a growing season. Even if we didn't have snow, we can't do it. So we'll have to look at the mapping and see... Can you tell me where you got the information of change, so at least we could talk to the source?" Member Stokes-Cawley, "The person who told me; it might have been second-hand. Somebody who lives across the street." Ms. Gagliano, "Do they have the original delineations so they could see the difference? So it's something to check into."

Member Stokes-Cawley, "And my only other question is where the driveway is; coming in? And that's right across from where the driveway goes into the middle school?" Ms. Gagliano, "Correct. I noticed on this plan from the school, like today I see changes. There's new construction, so that's something that should be looked at." Member Stokes-Cawley, "Should be looked at. And also the population has changed in that probably ten years ago everybody took the bus. That's not happening anymore, So there's a lot of cars that drop their children off and pick their children up."

Chairman Sutherland, "Are we handling street lighting in the same manner as we are doing Parkside now?" Ms. Gagliano, "There was a separate lighting plan that was submitted at the time. We had designed it at the request of the Electric Dept. I can't tell you if it's the same as what you have done now, but we can ask the question." Chairman Sutherland, "If we can, I think that works fairly well." DMO Lotkowitz, "You probably want the same fixtures; pole and base. We'll check that." Ms. Gagliano, "I am sure he can give us the detail if it is not the same. So this is the lighting that you just put in?" DMO Lotkowitz, "Yes, the Village has a standard for non-downtown lighting." Ms. Gagliano, "Do you think it has changed since 2008?" DMO Lotkowitz, "I don't think so; I'll double-check that. I haven't looked at the plans; they were just put away when I first came here. We just got the plans again. We will review them with GHD on that."

Chairman Sutherland, "Any comments at all? Questions? I will open the public comment portion of the hearing." Mr. Eggleston, "Bob Eggleston, 1391 East Genesee Street. While I have nothing directly to do with this project, I do want to comment as a member of the Comprehensive Plan Review Board for the Village and the Town, we had asked Notre Dame to do some imaging of what appropriate development for both the Village and the Town would be. They applied New Urbanism, which is now substituting the 1960s, 1970s sprawl zoning which our code currently is. This is exactly the kind of project that they were suggesting for this area. I think we need to get back to small lots, tight lots, where you have that sense of neighborhood; where you have that sense of front porches kind of delineating the zones going forward. I think Parkside was a nice attempt at trying to do that; my feeling is this may have a better success. Notre Dame used the image of Griffin Street as what the ideal standard is. And it seems like these are similar sized lots to that. Also having being a practicing architect that has worked in the Parkside, where the village tried to put together some architectural standards, I know that at the last meeting you talked about reviewing what the architectural standards would be – to make sure you get a village vernacular architecture in there. I think the real challenge is the market

builder wants to do suburban architecture and it's too easy for them to try to put lipstick on that cow and call it Village. As time has gone on, and I know the Planning Board has set up a review committee to look at these things, they have gotten a little better with time. Something I would strongly suggest, especially on these Griffin Street-sized lots is to make it mandatory that there be detached garages. I think this is the biggest fight we have with the suburgatory clientele that comes in and wants that attached garage; and then they do all kinds of contortions to try to get around – to the side-loaded or back-loaded garage. I think it needs to be no option. In talking to clients and working with developers, this is the biggest challenge I have as a design professional is getting around that detached garage type thing. It will be important to put a good standard in place. I think Parkside has a good beginning of that standard but I would recommend detached garages. I think having space above the garage is excellent; that's what a lot of the carriage barns in the Village that we've been doing have. Making sure that you allow a reasonable density in light of the fact that there is so much land into conservation. You have designed your storm water to make sure that you have a reasonable density."

Chairman Sutherland, "Thank you, Bob. Any other comments?" Mr. McDonald, "Tom McDonald. That's precisely the type of development that I want to do. And Doug you had a lot of input in that back in '07 and '08. Exactly what I want to build. And I hope it gets carried over into the Town portion because Phase 2 of that project on that map is not going to be built. I am not going to build it. 14 2-acre lots doesn't make sense. I can sell them all, but I have no desire to do that. If we can continue this into the town and make it part of the Comprehensive Plan and maybe even make a PUD [Planned Urban Development] to combine the town and village aspect, that would be optimal. I think we would do the entire project in the context that Bob has described – in small lots, small homes; carriage houses on all the properties. Density is the key from my standpoint, because I want to build affordable housing. We can't do it; we could do it if we get density. That's the key and it's really that simple. I have plenty of acreage there to allow 4 or 5 lots per acre and have it be in keeping with the Village portion as you see there and still conserve an awful lot of green and open space. If I can get to a 5 per acre building lot parameter, we can do affordable. We can get down to the \$250,000 home range. When we started that project in 2000, we could have done it; as time moved on and costs marched up, I hope we can avoid it this time around. As Notre Dame pointed out, they selected this site as the northeast neighborhood. The new urban development. And they designated this site as the best site because it has the village piece. It is one big piece in my mind, and if we can develop it that way I think everybody wins."

Member Stokes-Cawley, "Would there be restrictions on the property so that somebody couldn't come in and buy two lots and put a big home on it?" Mr. McDonald, "I would have no objection to allowing those restrictions; I'm in favor of everything that Bob said with regards to setting this up to be the form and design that we are looking for. I'm all for it and would be happy to have those covenants in a plan." Mr. Eggleston, "You may want to have a maximum-size house. You don't want 3,000 SF, 4,000 SF houses." Mr. McDonald, "I have no objection to that; I'm looking at 1,750 with maybe an 800 SF carriage house." Mr. Kinder, "I would echo what these guys are saying. Right now we have a situation where it is very difficult for young people to move back here. Having had a daughter who just moved back to the area after having been out of the area for a long time; it is hard to find housing that's decent, that's under \$250 - \$300,000. This is the perfect location for younger families and empty nesters. It's kind of the same

market...they both want smaller houses. It is the perfect location for that. Is my understanding correct that the line between the big lots and the smaller lots; that's the village line? I would be all for extending that same type of density into the town. It just makes a ton of sense."

Chairman Sutherland, "If you knew that the Town was going to buy in to smaller lots with more open space, would you do anything different on the village side in terms of kind of organizing. If you knew that you were essentially working with one large lot rather than a village section and then a town section?" Ms. Gagliano, "I don't think we would because a lot of it was based on the natural resources. I wouldn't want to venture into more of the green space. We were trying to stay out of wetlands as much as possible and have no impact." Chairman Sutherland, "One of the New Urbanism principles is more of a grid of streets and multiple choices to go through." Ms. Gagliano, "What I think we could do is use that as our basis and bring the grid off of it into the town, that's what I was thinking more like a neighborhood grid with this as the cross-connection." Mr. Eggleston, "I think the problem of putting a road connection at the south end is that you tempt people to use it as short cuts. I think your main road wants to be more of a feeder road. I think the walking connection is extremely important. And gosh, Tom, if there is anything you can do – even before the subdivision is done – get a trail so that people from Highland can walk to the schools. I think that's a lot of what the Comprehensive Plan is focusing on is sustainability, walkable neighborhoods, that kind of thing. To get Highland connected up to the Village should be a high priority."

DMO LOTkowitz, "I have been reading this book with Peter moffa about *The Third Industrial Revolution* where solar is going to be huge and is going to add a lot of value to homes. If we can build these homes and design them so you can put solar on them; they could be like a small micro-grid in the area that could feed into the village; they would offset some of the additional purchased power that the village would have to buy because of the additional load on the system. Is that a consideration at all? When you started, sustainability, this concept, has come to the fore." Mr. McDonald, "I'd love to be part of all of it. I like geothermal. But there is a big front-end cost to that. We can do a lot of things if we get the economies, and that comes from density. That's a highly desirable location with a; right across from one of the best, still notable school districts in New York State – with declining enrollment. If all of a sudden I had density so I was going to build 120 homes on this entire property then we can talk about things like that because then the front-end load isn't so great. You can throw an extra few thousand dollars per home to get the economy for the homeowner in the future. So solar, geothermal and all those things come into play. I have been talking to people about the Star project, Energy Star, for efficiencies in these homes. All of those should be in play. We need to build the village as it is, because we've got \$400,000 worth of drawings. We can't start playing around with that. But the rest of the site is wide open to all those things. The only thing that holds me back from doing all those things is the density. I do believe that right now the timing is right. I believe the new Town Board; Mary Sennett is wanting to do this Comprehensive Plan. If they are prepared to look at this site, maybe this project can be individualized. Make it a PUD where the town and the village sit down, everybody sits down – engineers, architects, people from the town – and develop that site as a stand-alone; it doesn't have to be part of the overall town plan if you so choose."

DMO Lotkowitz, "What's a PUD?" Chairman Sutherland, "Planned Urban Development." DMO Lotkowitz, "You'd essentially annex that into the Village?" Mr. McDonald, "Whatever the town and the village can agree on. Certainly this could be – annexation either way." Mr. Eggleston, "What a PUD does is it takes an area of land and it sets up its own special rules." [Multiple conversations]

Chairman Sutherland, "Is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor of the application?" Hearing no one, "Anyone have any comments against the application? Hearing none should we..." Attorney Galbato, "Mr. Chairman I would recommend that you keep the Public Hearing open since you are going to be receiving information from County Planning as well as the village engineer, which I think might be a subsequent resolution." **Member Stokes-Cawley said, I make the motion that we table action on this matter and continue the Public Hearing to April 3, 2014 at 7:30 pm.** **Member Hartnett seconded the motion.** Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, Chairman Sutherland declared, "The Ayes have it."

Attorney Galbato said, "The other item would be the proposal from the village engineer for this particular project review. If that's acceptable to the Board then to ask the applicant to put the money in escrow for the village engineer's review." Chairman Sutherland, "Tom, are you aware of the proposal from Jon Putnam?" Mr. McDonald, "I just saw it." Ms. Gagliano, "It's not exactly a proposal but it's an email." Chairman Sutherland, "The recommendation was to put \$5,000 aside to draw on for his review of this package." Mr. McDonald, "I think it is excessive, based on prior history. Nobody follows the money was my experience the first time around. So I would want some control on the reporting by the engineer. I want to know what the money is going for. I'm going to have EDR inspecting this site, and I'll have a bank's engineer inspecting this site. I'm not sure that kind of expense for the village engineer to do the same thing that I necessarily have to do myself." Ms. Gagliano, "This is for your review of the drawings? Currently they want to make another review." Mr. McDonald, "I've already spent \$5,000 with the village to review these drawings; that's my recollection." Ms. Gagliano, "I don't know about that. Do you have a record of that?" Mr. McDonald, "I think I could find it. That was the number back then."

Chairman Sutherland, "I think that Jon's saying it is not a fixed fee, but it is setting aside, drawing against that. Bob, do you have any thoughts?" DMO Lotkowitz, "Well what we have done lately with Parkside is we have accounted for and asked for all their reports; their hours that they have used. It is not going to be a free-for-all with these guys because I'm going to have specific questions that I'm going to want to have them review as far as connections to the water, the sanitary and whatever. I know they had a list of things on there but..." Mr. McDonald, "I have no objection to it in general, but I do believe that this money has already been spent once." DMO Lotkowitz, "They had a list of questions; if those questions were answered." Ms. Gagliano, "It looks like they were missing the last letters before this got approved. So once they got that..." DMO Lotkowitz, "But things didn't change on the drawings themselves, like the water connection issue – that was not changed. So there was some review on that and didn't get implemented on the drawings." Ms. Gagliano, "I don't remember it has been so long but I do recall us making the changes and having to submit them, but when I went through the files these drawings that I submitted were the last distribution. I'll double check. Some of these I might be

able to help him with; it might be simple for their review.” DMO Lotkowitz, “It can’t be more than a day or two of review.” Ms. Gagliano, “I don’t know if he didn’t get records in the past. But I do know that in both the village and the town I think there were multiple draws. All he’s saying is he wants to know what they are spending it on. We know they have to review.” DMO Lotkowitz, “I could go to their offices when they review the drawings and find out what they are saying and make sure they are not camping out on it for a week.”

Attorney Galbato, “Aside from you, this Planning Board needs to get the village engineer’s comments on the proposal before they can issue a conditional approval.” DMO Lotkowitz, “I’d like to have their comments on water and sanitary.” Attorney Galbato, “They have to review the entire subdivision application.” DMO Lotkowitz, “But I have specific infrastructure questions.” Attorney Galbato, “My client is the Board and they have to get comment from the village engineer on the entire subdivision, including, but not limited to, your concerns.” Ms. Gagliano, “So Rick what you are saying is they are going to give it that look; go up through that last letter to make sure things were taken care of. If it’s the same person reviewing it, it should go pretty quickly. But there are things that have changed that you may want revised, so those would be new things.” Attorney Galbato, “I think in fairness to the developer this Board has requested when dealing with this engineering firm in situations like this, is that the engineer provide itemized billing for their time. What would happen is the developer places the money in escrow and the village sets up an account. And then the village actually pays the bills that come in monthly out of that money in escrow. This Board, as part of their approval of the proposal could ask for itemized billing and your client could review that.” Mr. McDonald, “I’d like that. I do want to make sure that the water connection that you brought to our attention is made properly.” DMO Lotkowitz, “I think it would be an improvement.”

Member Hartnett said, “I move that we ask the developer to establish an escrow account in the amount of \$5,000 as suggested in the email from Jon Putnam of GHD dated 3/4/14 and provide itemized bills for draws against that account, subject to Trustee review.” Member Stokes-Cawley seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, it was declared Passed.

This matter was concluded at 8:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

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

Discussion of possible revisions to the Site Plan approved by the Board on February 6, 2014 allowing for revised traffic circulation at a new mixed-use building on the property addressed as 21 Fennell Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Douglas Sutherland, Acting Chairman
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member

Michael Byrne, Village Attorney
Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
John Crompt, Code Enforcement Officer
Robert Lotkowitz, Director of Municipal Operations
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Chad Rogers, Architect, on behalf of the applicant
Ted Kinder, Applicant
Robert Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the Feldmanns

Brian Carvalho, Skaneateles
Jo Anne Gagliano, Fayetteville

Chairman Sutherland introduced this matter at 8:06 pm stating the he was altering the order of items on the agenda. Mr. Rogers introduced himself and presented, "Thank you for changing the order for me. We were last before your Board about a month ago where we received a recommendation to go to the ZBA. At that time there was one outstanding question which was related to adjusting the creek walk easement so that it was completely on our site. At that time, there was also a statement from this Board that if we had to lose one parking space, it would be acceptable. We did make that change and in the process of making that change did not lose a parking spot we were able to keep what we had before. We went forward to ZBA about a week and a half ago and had a good meeting but had one comment in particular that we have looked at in the latest plan. That is related to the circulation direction through the site."

Mr. Rogers continued, "If you remember before, our circulation was in from Fennell Street at the edge of Bob Hood's property just to the east of Salt Pit, and it was kind of a clockwise direction through the site – back out through Kinney where there is also an easement back to Fennell. A comment from Curt Coville at the ZBA asked if we had considered switching the direction of traffic flow through the site. That was mainly because of this intersection right here which is directly opposite the Post Office. It can be a fairly busy intersection depending on the time of

day. So the idea being that our traffic coming out of Kinney and having to exit there could possibly provide a little more traffic congestion than just coming in. So we looked at it and that's what is shown on this plan. Everything else essentially remains the same. The only difference is, in the process of flipping this angled parking to accommodate the new traffic flow, the geometry is just right that made us lose a space there. So we went from 9 + 6 on that edge to 8 + 6 or 14 spaces. We wanted to come back to the Planning Board, present that and see if you need a new vote on that change or what your recommendation was."

Chairman Sutherland, "Your thought there is that really hits what the ZBA was suggesting?" Mr. Rogers, "It was a specific question related to this intersection. A second part of that was a question about access if a tractor-trailer is parked at Kinney's dock, so we popped that on the plan as well – to show that really either way the traffic flows we've got room for a car to come in or come out there." Mr. Kinder, "It really made sense for all three stakeholders: the village being one, Kinney being another and us being the third – to have less congestion in that parking lot makes a whole lot of sense for all of us. And we think that by reversing it, that's what will happen. It's a lot easier to get out farther down Fennell Street. It gets it farther away from the entrance to this facility."

Chairman Sutherland, "So how does the traffic flow?" Mr. Rogers, "We come in through Kinney, through our site and out the edge of Mr. Hood's property to Fennell Street, between Dr. Kirby's [Janke's] offices and Salt Pit." Mr. Kinder, "Other than that there is no change to the plan. We actually left the parking on the west side the same so you'll back into those spots. A lot of municipalities are going that way now so it seems like the way to go." Charman Sutherland, "Any comments Steve or Carol?"

Member Hartnett, "Have there been any discussions with the Kinney people – you're already using spaces from the Eberhardt property – of using space behind there in a long-term lease setup to alleviate the parking issues?" Mr. Kinder, "No, not really behind Kinney."

CEO Crompton asked, "Have you asked the fire department about clearances?" Mr. Rogers, "We have designed the sidewalk to be flush with the parking and driving areas so that it reached 21 feet wide."

Member Stokes-Cawley said, "I move that we grant site plan approval to the modified site plan, and recommend again 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 revised drawings dated February 26, 2014." Member Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, it was declared Passed.

This matter was concluded at 8:18 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

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

Mayor's request for review of traffic concepts for Village Hall site at 26 Fennell Street and possible additional changes along Fennell Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Douglas Sutherland, Acting Chairman
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member

Michael Byrne, Village Attorney
Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
John Crompt, Code Enforcement Officer
Robert Lotkowitz, Director of Municipal Operations
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Robert Eggleston, Skaneateles
Jo Anne Gagliano, Fayetteville
Brian Carvalho, Skaneateles

Chairman Sutherland, at 8:17 pm, announced that the Board would discuss traffic flows at the Village Hall site at the request of Mayor Hubbard. Mr. Dundon 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 a new design concept developed by QPK as a result of the suggestions made during the discussion at the February 6 Planning Board meeting.

The concept involves the widening of the existing driveway alongside the SECNY building on the Harris property adjacent to the Village Hall property. By widening this to 33 feet (11 feet being on Village land) two lanes of egress and one lane of access can be accommodated. This then would allow for access and egress from the Village Hall property from this same driveway. 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. This arrangement results in the preservation of turning lanes for the trucks that service the Post Office. The concept also envisions the ability to exit the Village Hall property into the Tops parking lot from the rear, behind the former SAVES building where the guardrail is currently. This arrangement would require the negotiation of an easement across the Harris property. Attorney Byrne will be contacting the Harris family.

The concept provides considerably more green space in front of the Village Hall and along Fennell Street. Mr. Dundon noted that if the Commercial Mixed-Use C District parking

requirements were to be applied to this property (albeit being located in the Downtown D District) 27 spaces would be required whereas the plan provides for a total of 40 spaces on site. Chairman Sutherland suggested that the revised circulation from the Post Office might allow for a letter drop to be provided for the convenience of residents.

Attorney Byrne explained the Harris family situation and recapped the discussion that took place previously in 2008. The driveways on the Village Hall site are planned to be sufficient for two-way traffic. Although the concept could be subject to some minor changes if the collocation of Village hall and Town Hall were to proceed, this represents a solid design for implementation. Member Stokes-Cawley applauded the provision of green space and Member Hartnett observed that it meets what the Planning Board had suggested in its previous meeting.

Member Hartnett asked if the Post Office property owners were on board. Attorney Byrne explained that the Village has some flexibility in how it provides for the access under the easement and that this plan preserves the necessary requirements. Their prior approval is not required. Member Hartnett suggested that the possible exit to the Tops parking lot should be designed to be large enough to accommodate an emergency vehicle.

Member Hartnett said, "The Planning Board hereby acknowledges that the changes reflected in the current QPK design concept are consistent with the Board's suggestions and supports these changes which will provide improved pedestrian access and vehicular access to the site. The Board further encourages the continued pursuit of the implementation for this concept." Member Stokes-Cawley seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the motion was carried.

Mr. Dundon then introduced the fact that EDR has been asked to revisit its previous suggestions made in the Fennell Street Master Plan and to consider changes necessary to reflect the current state of development along Fennell Street. DMO Lotkowitz said that the Mayor had asked him to speak on his behalf. EDR was requested to prepare a quick overview so the Board could continue its discussion of Fennell Street. EDR had previously finalized a plan for the intersection of Jordan and Fennell Streets, and we wanted to incorporate the plan being developed by QPK for the Village Hall. The essence is how can we take what we have on Fennell Street and enhance it to provide traffic calming, make it more pedestrian friendly and to make it bicycle friendly, so that riders can enjoy the amenities of downtown.

DMO Lotkowitz reviewed the concepts of turning radius for successful navigation. The plan reflects modifications of the curbing and adding two bike lanes and street trees. The ability to add parking along Fennell does not seem practical, due to the numbers of curb cuts on Fennell. In addition to the streetscape changes, some initial steps will be taken toward undergrounding utilities. It appears that by retaining current curb lines, that storm water management would not be affected. Member Hartnett asked if any of the cost of undergrounding would be passed on to homeowners. Attorney Byrne said that is to be determined. DMO Lotkowitz held out the hope of grants to offset some of the costs, and that by using Village crews, substantial savings could be realized. Chairman Sutherland observed that the key to the project is to do it in a way that the work can be programmed into the Village's seasonal work and just focus on this project for a

year or two. The financing is yet to be determined. With undergrounding, new light fixtures would likely be required.

Mr. Eggleston observed that with incorporation into the comprehensive plan and displaying master planning, the Village becomes more likely to achieve grants. Member Hartnett suggested that attention be given to a cross walk on the north side of the Jordan-Fennell intersection.

There being no more business to come before the Board, on motion of Member Stokes-Cawley, seconded by Member Hartnett, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

