

**Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 5, 2016**

---

Area Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Dana Dries to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Front yard set-back; Side yard set-back, left; and Percentage of open area; and Section 225-69D Nonconforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion to remove the existing front porch and to construct an 8 by 20 foot front porch, remove existing back porch, construct a two-story addition at rear of house and construct a second-story addition over existing 1-story house at the property addressed as 10 Orchard Road in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

**Present:**        Bruce Kenan, Chairman  
                     Brian Carvalho, Member  
                     William Eberhardt, Member  
                     Stephen Hartnett, Member  
                     Doug Sutherland, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board  
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Bob Eggleston, architect, representing the applicant  
Dana Dries, applicant  
Bonnie Dries, on behalf of the applicant

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee  
Doc Huston, Skaneateles  
Steve Moore, 5 E. Genesee Street  
Jennifer Ahrens, 96 E. Genesee Street  
Leif Kallquist, Syracuse  
Jack Pascal, 43 Griffin Street  
Linda Roche, 39 W Lake Street  
Craig Froelich, 100 W Lake Street  
Rick & Deb Moscarito, Chittenango  
Patricia Carroll, 7 E Elizabeth Street  
Jo Anne Gagliano, Syracuse  
Molly Elliott, Skaneateles  
Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Avenue  
Kevin Rich, Crow Hill Road  
Kim Weitsman, 45 W Lake Street

Chairman Kenan called the Cinco de Mayo meeting to order at 7:30 pm. There was no one representing this application, so it was deferred. This matter was reintroduced at 7:42 pm.

Eggleston – Dana is in the process of purchasing this nonconforming house – it’s only 890 SF where 1200 is required – from his mother. He plans on putting a second floor on it and putting a 16 foot addition on the back. He’d like to take off the front, half-enclosed, porch and put a traditional 8 foot deep porch on the front and give it a traditional turn-of-the-century village house appearance. The existing property is nonconforming in that it has 82.5% open space. It has a front yard of 27.1 where the street average is 27.8, and it has a left side dimension of 8.3, and 890 SF where 1200 is required. The proposed work will decrease the open area to 79.0%, the front set-back will get 1 foot smaller and the left side remains the same at 8.3 because we are going up. We get rid of the nonconformity because it will now be 2024 SF. So basically we are going straight up, we are going out a little bit and the porch gets improved a little bit. Are there any questions you have relative to this application?

Kenan – Looks like there was something on the back end that was removed?

Eggleston – Yeah, there was a little porch. This porch came down because it was in really bad shape.

Sutherland – Is it real shingle?

Eggleston – It will not be a wood shingle. I am showing him the Hardie board shingle which I used on my house.

Eberhardt – Nice if there was a sidewalk.

Sutherland – Talking about it’s a shame that there aren’t sidewalks that go down that street.

Eggleston – I couldn’t disagree with you at all on that.

**Member Sutherland, “I move that we recommend that the ZBA approve the application for the 3 variances that are required with the understanding that it’s a Hardie board shingle product that’s the primary cladding.” Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion it was carried 5 – 0.**

This matter was concluded at 7:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 5, 2016

---

Review of concerns from both Parkside residents and Director of Municipal Operations Harty as to the adequacy of the drainage plans in Section 4 of the Parkside Village Subdivision in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman  
Brian Carvalho, Member  
William Eberhardt, Member  
Stephen Hartnett, Member  
Doug Sutherland, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board  
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee  
Doc Huston, Skaneateles  
Bob Eggleston, 1391 E. Genesee Street  
Jennifer Ahrens, 96 E. Genesee Street  
Patricia Carroll, 7 E Elizabeth Street  
Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Avenue

Chairman Kenan called for the Parkside matter at 9:00 pm. Attorney Galbato noted that there had been an email report of status at 5:13 pm today.

This matter was closed at 9:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards



**Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 5, 2016**

---

Downtown D Design Standards review and Critical Impact Permit recommendation in the matter of the application of Steven Moore to use currently vacant space behind an existing retail jewelry store; the proposed use is as a retail art store and gallery at the property addressed as 5 East Genesee Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

**Present:** Bruce Kenan, Chairman  
Brian Carvalho, Member  
William Eberhardt, Member  
Stephen Hartnett, Member  
Doug Sutherland, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board  
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Steve Moore, Applicant

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee  
Doc Huston, Skaneateles  
Jennifer Ahrens, 96 E. Genesee Street  
Leif Kallquist, Syracuse  
Jack Pascal, 43 Griffin Street  
Linda Roche, 39 W Lake Street  
Craig Froelich, 100 W Lake Street  
Rick & Deb Moscarito, Chittenango  
Patricia Carroll, 7 E Elizabeth Street  
Jo Anne Gagliano, Syracuse  
Molly Elliott, Skaneateles  
Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Avenue  
Kevin Rich, Crow Hill Road  
Kim Weitsman, 45 W Lake Street

Chairman Kenan called the matter of Steven Moore for 5 East Genesee Street at 7:32 pm.

Moore – The space that we are going to utilize is in the north section of that particular retail facility. It has always been for the most part retail. A couple of years ago I rented it from Chris (next door at Kindergarten) for storage. This year I decided we were going to put some artwork in there and open it as an art gallery. So John Crompt said that perhaps we should reestablish the

fact that it is a separate retail; a separate facility with its own entrance. It will have its own signage but it is something that I will be running.

Kenan – So it will be entered from the rear?

Moore – From the parking lot.

Sutherland – A customer coming in the front doesn't go all the way through?

Moore – No. I have no interest in opening the whole thing. You have a copy of the architectural drawing that shows the entrance up onto the porch; they just built a new porch there. We have a sign permit prepared.

Eberhardt – So you are going to show that to John? Historic district?

Moore – No, they have no interest in that. It's on the back side of the building. This has already been approved; there is plenty of square footage for the signage.

Kenan – Is there any exterior work being done on the building?

Moore – I'm just going to do a little painting, where there was some funny artwork there. I'm just going to paint the walls. They just rebuilt the porch and they have yet to repaint the walls. I'm going to trim that up a little bit. I've got a little stucco-ish stuff to fix; there are some patches that need to be made, and then we'll just paint that section of the wall. Then we'll attach the sign where it was.

Eberhardt – Is that the existing door on the porch?

Moore – Yes sir; yes. New porch, new stairs; it's a nice little facility.

Kenan – So with regard to the Downtown D Design Standards; other than painting there is nothing being done to the outside of the building?

Moore – No, nothing. It has always been that type of a structure.

Kenan – What's the history of the space?

Moore – I have been there since about 1995. I have had my jewelry store in there. Prior to that my ex-wife Debbie had a restaurant in there, Framboise. There's a little section where it is partitioned off now was a little soup kitchen and sandwich shop. After that we rented it to Rick with the cigar shop, and then he moved over into Herb's. Then after that Kebbie and Ken had a little paint your own pottery shop in there. Various things – tee shirt shop and other things. It's a convenient little space. I have so many paintings now that I'd like to facilitate a nice space for it. I have some IT guys coming up with some web sites; we'll do some tie-ins with that. It should be fun.

Eberhardt – I think it's nice.

Moore – Thanks.

Kenan – So in our case, we would review compliance with Downtown D design standards if there was anything happening; sounds like there's not in that regard. We will make a recommendation to the Trustees for critical impact permit. Does this constitute site plan approval?

Galbato – No. John didn't make any determination on that. Because it is a Critical Impact, Mr. Chairman, the first motion would be the SEQRA review. The Applicant did fill out Part 1 of the short form EAF. We are all familiar with Part 2 of the EAF. Given the limited scope of this change, when the Board is ready we'd look for a motion on that issue.

**Member Eberhardt, "I'd like to make a motion. I move to declare the Planning Board lead agency under SEQRA, and to consider this an unlisted action that will receive uncoordinated review. Based on consideration of Part 2 of the SEAF, the Board makes a negative declaration and authorizes the Chairman to sign. Further, we recommend that the Board of Trustees grant a Critical Impact Permit for the change of use. Both actions are contingent upon the applicant's providing a statement from the building owner, in writing or by email, that he consents to the change." Member Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, it was passed 5 – 0.**

This matter was concluded at 7:41 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards



Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 5, 2016

---

Consideration of a recommendation to the Trustees on the matter of expanding metered parking zones to West Genesee Street west of Hannum Street and to the north end of West Lake Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman  
Brian Carvalho, Member  
William Eberhardt, Member  
Stephen Hartnett, Member  
Doug Sutherland, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board  
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee  
Doc Huston, Skaneateles  
Bob Eggleston, 1391 E. Genesee Street  
Jennifer Ahrens, 96 E. Genesee Street  
Patricia Carroll, 7 E Elizabeth Street  
Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Avenue

Chairman Kenan called for the Parking matter at 9:01 pm. Mr. Dundon explained that while the Local Law draft is largely the same it now incorporates several recommendations made by the Planning Board.

**Member Carvalho, "The Planning Board recommends the adoption of draft Local Law #5 as amended." Member Sutherland seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion it was carried 5 – 0.**

Attorney Galbato explained that there was another parking matter that had been separated from the Local Law permitting a nursery school in the Public Lands District. That proposed text would have imposed certain parking requirements on restaurants in Downtown D District. An alternate proposal was made to extend the requirements of the C District to also be applicable to the Downtown D District. Earlier, the Board discussed a parking study and it was the sense of the Board that any further consideration of specific changes should be done in light of the results of such a study.

**Member Sutherland, "I think we should formalize that idea; I move that we accept Chairman Kenan's recommendation that the Planning Board should seek competent**

**consulting assistance on a parking study that would look at both the municipal lot and on-street parking near there, and also consider private lots that are in that immediate area, to get a better sense for how many spaces we have, what is the demand on those spaces, and how much more capacity we have. Both what exists and the usage of what exists so we can better understand what our parking challenges are and how to go at them. We will get proposals and ask the Trustees to fund it. We recommend that no further action be taken on D District parking requirements until the study results are available.” Member Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, the motion was carried 5 – 0.**

This matter was closed at 9:08 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 5, 2016**

---

Area Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Jack Pascal to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Both side yards combined; and Percentage of open area; to construct an 8 by 10 foot storage shed and to construct a 2 by 16 foot addition with a new door on the front of an existing garage at the property addressed as 43 Griffin Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman  
Brian Carvalho, Member  
William Eberhardt, Member  
Stephen Hartnett, Member  
Doug Sutherland, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board  
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Jack Pascal, applicant

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee  
Doc Huston, Skaneateles  
Bob Eggleston, 1391 E. Genesee Street  
Jennifer Ahrens, 96 E. Genesee Street  
Leif Kallquist, Syracuse  
Jack Pascal, 43 Griffin Street  
Linda Roche, 39 W Lake Street  
Craig Froelich, 100 W Lake Street  
Rick & Deb Moscarito, Chittenango  
Patricia Carroll, 7 E Elizabeth Street  
Jo Anne Gagliano, Syracuse  
Molly Elliott, Skaneateles  
Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Avenue  
Kevin Rich, Crow Hill Road  
Kim Weitsman, 45 W Lake Street

Chairman Kenan called for the application of Jack Pascal for 43 Griffin Street at 7:48 pm.

Pascal – I want to put an overhead door on my garage; it was built in 1875 and it is kind of short to get my truck into it. So I wanted to put a 2 foot bump out on the front and an overhead door on it. And also John helped me out with it. I want to put a little utility shed out back there too.

Kenan – So what's impacted from a variance point of view is the, to a minor degree, open area and the combined side yards. Is that it?

Pascal – Exactly.

Carvalho – The shed; the materials on the siding is that going to match your garage?

Pascal – Exactly. I want everything to be exactly alike. That's why; I made a rough drawing of the shed. The other thing is, I was going to ask you folks. I've got it as 8x10; I'd like to go 8x12 if I could. I can hold it at 8x10 if that's going to be a problem. It's supposed to be 10 foot away from any existing building.

Kenan – So whether it's a 10 foot dimension or a 12 foot dimension doesn't impact the setbacks but it would impact the calculation of the open space, right?

Pascal – John did tell me did say that he didn't think it would be a problem because it is just a matter of so many feet. I can comply with whatever you want but the 12 foot would be a little bit better for me because it would give me a 2 foot workbench inside and 10 foot floor space, or 9-6.

Eberhardt – Brian you were there, what do you think?

Carvalho – Which way would you go with the 12? Make it longer this way?

Pascal – Exactly.

Carvalho – I don't think it makes a difference.

Hartnett – So do you want to amend your application to request 12 feet. It's going to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals; they are the final say on that.

Kenan – Who calculated the lot coverage, you or John Cromp?

Pascal – John, I had copies of the survey and he did all that.

Kenan – My guess is that it's a rounding area, but you should have John recalculate it before you go to the Zoning Board just so they are looking at the right number.

Pascal – I will do that.

**Member Hartnett, "I recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals to approve, modifying the application by consent of the applicant to an 8 by 12 storage shed; and the materials to be the same materials as the garage." Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion it was carried 5 – 0.**

Pascal – It will be the same as the garage. There's vinyl on the house. The garage is T 111. I want to match the garage with the shed.

This matter was concluded at 7:51 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards



Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 5, 2016

---

Preliminary review of site plan for renovations at St. James' Episcopal Church at 96 East Genesee Street as requested by the applicant.

---

Present:        Bruce Kenan, Chairman  
                  Brian Carvalho, Member  
                  William Eberhardt, Member  
                  Stephen Hartnett, Member  
                  Doug Sutherland, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board  
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Jennifer Ahrens, Architect, on behalf of the applicant

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee  
Bob Eggleston, 1391 E. Genesee Street  
Patricia Carroll, 7 E Elizabeth Street  
Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Avenue

Chairman Kenan called for the St. James' matter at 9:09 pm.

Ms. Ahrens introduced herself as being with Bero Architects. She furnished the Board with a packet of preliminary designs, based on current discussions with the owner. She had met with CEO Crompt and DMO Harty regarding storm water management. This is the third project at St. James' – they replaced the roofing and made improvements to the worship spaces previously. They would like to get any feedback or suggestions or concerns as they start the design process; they will be seeking site plan approval and will have to go before the Zoning Board.

All the members complimented Ms. Ahrens on the roof project. She said Bero started working with the church in 2008 on a condition report that turned into their understanding that a master plan process was beneficial. That defined the goals and set up 4 different projects; the last one being, as a welcoming institution, to have an accessible and welcoming entrance into the parish hall, with an addition to create accessibility to both floors.

We are trying to be respectful to the historic fabric of the church and trying to minimize the changes to the building. We are looking to creating a retaining wall with a sidewalk that comes in at the Parish Hall level. Currently, you can come in to the church itself or you can go down a fairly steep slope and come in at a half level, with stairs up and down.

Our proposed entry comes in at the first floor level; we do have a LULA (limited use, limited access) elevator that is positioned here. It does not have the electrical or structural requirements of a commercial elevator.

Right now there's two catch basins that capture the water, though water comes here and we had to do some wall and flooring repairs. So Scott Harter, civil engineer, suggested that because we are putting a raised walk here, there are downspouts and window wells that have floor drains that would come out to a new system with grade pitched to direct water to the side between the rectory and the parish hall with 2 new catch basins and a new line that runs to the infiltration system along the back of the seawall. Both Rich Abbott and Shannon Harty have approved the change.

Ms. Ahrens said the church is going before the HLPC on May 18<sup>th</sup>. We will need a variance for the open space adjustment, since we are existing nonconforming, but we are adding space.

At Member Eberhardt's request, Ms. Ahrens reviewed the elevation drawings describing the proposed changes – the second-level entry, with a small roof that is completely reversible and won't affect the church itself. It brings you into the parish hall and the LULA which gets you down a level. Members Hartnett and Eberhardt acknowledged that it is a steep drop.

Chairman Kenan said that at some point the church will be looking for variances from the Zoning Board. The Planning Board will perform a Site Plan review, make recommendations to the ZBA on variances and will refer the matter to SOCPA for its review. Hayner-Hoyt will be doing the work. The members acknowledged that it represents a good solution.

Ms. Ahrens said that the design team understands that the building is important to the community and is trying to be very sensitive to that. Ms. Ahrens thanked the Board.

This matter was closed at 9:22 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 5, 2016**

---

Site plan review, Downtown D Design Standards review and Critical Impact Review recommendation in the matter of the application of Kim Weitsman to change the use from Office, licensed professional to Restaurant (having 116 seats) at the property addressed as 9 East Genesee Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman  
Brian Carvalho, Member  
*William Eberhardt, Member (Recused)*  
Stephen Hartnett, Member  
Doug Sutherland, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board  
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Bob Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the applicant  
Doreen Simmons, Esq., on behalf of the applicant  
Kim Weitsman, Applicant

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee  
Doc Huston, Skaneateles  
Jennifer Ahrens, 96 E. Genesee Street  
Leif Kallquist, Syracuse  
Jack Pascal, 43 Griffin Street  
Linda Roche, 39 W Lake Street  
Craig Froelich, 100 W Lake Street  
Rick & Deb Moscarito, Chittenango  
Patricia Carroll, 7 E Elizabeth Street  
Jo Anne Gagliano, Syracuse  
Molly Elliott, Skaneateles  
Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Avenue  
Kevin Rich, Crow Hill Road

Chairman Kenan called for the application of Kim Weitsman for 9 East Genesee Street at 7:52 pm.

Eggleston – It was just 20 years ago we got permission to put in a restaurant for Framboise. The building has had a number of uses through the years, it was a office and then it was a retail and

office, and then it was converted to the restaurant. It then was converted back to office space. It has been professional office. Now what we'd like to do is convert it back to restaurant. I know this is information that's been going around town since February when it was announced that the Weitsmans were purchasing this with the intent of turning it into a restaurant that will have a Mexican cuisine to it and it will be a mid-priced restaurant. The lot is 24 by 100 foot. The building basically; there's about a foot of space on the side of the building. Otherwise it is almost a zero-lot-line building. What we are proposing to do is to have the kitchen in the basement, the trash room will be inside – there will be no outside dumpster. They will do the primary prep in the kitchen down below. They will have some dumbwaiters that will serve a pantry on each floor. The main floor will have 2 dining areas; a private dining area for 8 people in the back and then a dining area in the front off the street with a very small bar. They will have a total of 44 seats and 4 bar seats on the main level. Upstairs, there will be two dining areas, the front and the back, with a larger bar area. There will be 12 bar seats and 56 seats, for a total of 100 seats dining and 16 seats for the bar. The restaurant will be open Tuesday through Friday from 11 am to 10 pm; Saturday and Sunday from 10 to 10. It is intended to have a lunch menu and a dinner menu. It will be closed on Monday. There will be no live entertainment, there will be no loud music, there will be a full bar service – it is a mid-priced Mexican cuisine offering another option to the people in the Village. The trash which will be stored in the basement will be picked up 3 times per week. Deliveries, like the other restaurants, are serviced by a lot of the same vendors that come in the morning to most of the restaurants and then leave. Deliveries will be through the back. They will have up to 15 employees at a shift. While currently commercial on-site parking is not a requirement in the Downtown D District, it is something we need to look at very carefully. The standard for parking is one car per 100 SF or one car per 4 seats, whichever is greater. Typically the square footage wins out; we have 5592 gross SF in the building, we have 116 seats – so that's 56 cars based on square footage and 29 cars based on seats. Back in 1996 for the Framboise restaurant it was actually 131 seats. The actual parking demand is probably something between 29 and 56 cars. If we look at the current professional office use, that has 1 car per 300 SF, or 18.6 parking spaces. So the impact on this change is 11 to 26 cars because it already has an impact with the current use and previous uses in the Downtown area. Typical of the Downtown D area, most restaurant patrons in the village center are there shopping, working or conducting other business. So this really isn't a destination restaurant, per se, it is people who are already there anyways. The other consideration, especially for Critical Impact, the design standards for water usage for a restaurant are 35 GPD per seat for a full-service restaurant. A typical restaurant serving 3 meals per day operates 120 hours per week; this restaurant will be open 68 hours per week, which is 56% of what a typical restaurant would be. Doing the calculations we come up with a projected water usage of 4,060 GPD for a full-time restaurant; at 56% would be 2,274 GPD. The design water usage for an office building this size would be 19 employees, 15 gallons per employee; that would be 285 GPD. So the impact is 1,989 GPD. Since 1996, the village has had a local law that says you pay \$12 per gallon if you exceed 400 GPD increase in change of use. So based on these calculations, that would require a \$23,868 one-time payment to the Village for inflow and infiltration (I&I). that goes to supplement the Village budget for doing projects that impact the Village system. There is a grease trap that exists that will continue to be used and it will meet all the Health Dept. regulations. When this building was converted into the restaurant in 1996, it was a sprinklered building and a second means of egress was put in. Also it was made universal access through the north entrance; one can come in at grade level, there is a lift that brings you up so the first floor

is entirely accessible. Everything that's available on the upper floor is available on that floor also. There is one parking space on-site, that's a handicapped parking space, and it is adjacent to the entrance. I have gone through the critical impact criterias; I don't know if you wanted to review those specifically; also I did add the site plan review criteria, addressing the 5 questions that you should consider. Do you have any questions based on this information?

Kenan – Are you making any alterations to the exterior of the building?

Eggleston – No. We will put back the exhaust systems; hoods on the roof. That's something we will take to the Historic Board if this is approved. There will be signage, and we'll be taking that to them. But at this point, there's no change to the exterior.

Kenan – You going to leave the back looking...

Eggleston – There will probably be some cleaning up and painting. We are not adding porches or physical things to it.

Sutherland – Do you have the signage thought through yet?

Eggleston – We really haven't gotten that far yet.

Sutherland – What's the name?

Weitsman – The Elephant and the Dove.

Kenan – In the building plan, what are all these notches?

Eggleston – I think they are addressing the recessed windows. The exterior has a number of windows that were original...

Carvalho – Window recesses; they are actually blocked in. What are handicapped code requirements as far as parking?

Eggleston – I believe it is 1 per 25 parking spaces.

Carvalho – So how's that being addressed?

Eggleston – Well, we have 100% of what's on site is handicapped parking. We don't have any more space for handicapped parking on site. The municipal lot does have handicapped parking worked into that. So right around the corner, just on the north side of Doug's, I believe all of that is handicapped parking. The Village in their municipal lot design configuration has addressed it.

Kenan – I did read over the Framboise action from 20 years ago. I thought there was reference to 3 floors in that?

Eggleston – Basement, is the kitchen; the main floor and then the second floor above grade. It's almost identical in concept to what Framboise's was.

Kenan – As far as Downtown D Standards goes, there really isn't anything to review. You are not making changes to the exterior of the building. This becomes just a Site Plan approval?

Eggleston – It's a site plan approval and recommendation...

Kenan – To the Trustees with Critical Impact recommendation.

Eggleston – And there will be SEQR.

Kenan – I would like to talk about parking for a minute. I think parking is a big consideration. I think it's a big consideration on anything we do in the downtown area, simply because, it would appear, that we have a demand for parking that exceeds the spaces that are there. That's a very unscientific statement – it would appear. I have given it a lot of thought and I believe the other Board members have as well. It seems to come to the fore and brings it to everybody's attention again. My suggestion is that we conduct a study – the Planning Board conduct a study, but not impact this application because of the study. The timing would be all out of sequence. It might be appropriate functionally, but I don't think it would be the appropriate thing to do. My recommendation is that I think the Village could use a good analysis of just what is available in terms of the parking stock, whatever you want to call it. So I'm going to suggest that if the Planning Board is in agreement, that the Planning Board find a worthy consultant to make a good analysis. And since there has been a lot of conversation lately about any number of different parking issues – all kind of small but they all add up to a big issue – that if we do this study and do it within a two to three month period of time, then the Village will have a basis for deciding what to do about parking meters and parking standards and so on. Anyway, that's my recommendation.

Eggleston – I think the premise was when they eliminated the requirement for Downtown D, they had redone the municipal lot and did an incredible job of getting rid of a lot of cars that didn't belong there. It kind of freed things up.

Kenan -- How'd they get rid of cars that didn't belong?

Eggleston – There used to be Park and Ride. There were cars there all day with people from Auburn going to Syracuse. They found a good solution for that. I totally endorse the Board's doing a study.

Kenan – That's the advantage of charging for parking.

Carvalho – I do want to make the comment that this particular owner came before this Board and filled the room of a Public Hearing with handicapped people begging for more handicapped parking at their other restaurant. And now you are opening a restaurant with one handicapped parking space. It doesn't seem logical to me.

Eggleston – The difference here is that the municipal lot does have about 8 or 9 handicapped parking spaces right around the corner and it's kind of the whole downtown fabric for providing the whole downtown with parking. I totally appreciate your comments.

Carvalho – I want to ask a question about the water. I did a little research on design standards for restaurants and came up with the same 35 gallons for a standard restaurant. But I am questioning how you then go on to discount this restaurant from that 35 gallons – especially in light of the fact that the Village Board has increased all of the Village taxpayers' sewer rate by 40% and now you are proposing to give this application a discount.

Eggleston – I don't; I totally disagree with the word discount. They are following the procedures of paying a \$12 per gallon increased use for going out and allowing the Village to have more funds to decrease the I&I. Again, in the 35 years that I've been here, I have seen a number of projects that the Village has done to significantly reduce – rain gutters, sump pumps – to keep up and do that. So I can't see where this is a free ride; just like when Parkside went in and they added 50 homes, there was a substantial payment made.

Carvalho – I understand that they are paying the \$12, but you reduced the rate of usage to 56% of a standard restaurant. In my eyes this is a standard restaurant open for 2 meals per day, 6 days per week.

Eggleston – Sure. Right. And again the health dept. standards are looking at worst case scenario. When they look at a full-service restaurant they are looking at breakfast, lunch and dinner; they are looking at 7 days per week. I mean the other thing we could do is to look at the Krebs restaurant – I mean it is similar in size and discount that for the number of days and see what is the actual usage on it, and; I was looking at it, I'm not sure I completed the analysis, but they did 54,000 gallons in a 12 month period. When you break that down by number of days open and all that to see how that compares with what the design standard is.

Kenan – Isn't our concern the adequacy of the water supply and the sewage disposal? And the decision on what to charge is a function of the Trustees?

Sutherland – I'm not sure we're capable; is that something that Shannon would do?

Eggleston – On every Critical Impact that I do, I run the numbers on water. It's an important consideration for the Trustees.

Carvalho – I reread the application from 20 years ago and it talked about NYS Code variances that you were applying for -- they were all received?

Eggleston – Yes, they were all received and that work has all been done. I had a preapplication meeting with John Crompton and he agrees that variances go with the property. Basically the mitigation has all been done, the same state building codes are in place now that were in place then [remainder unintelligible].

Member Sutherland, "I would move that we refer the application to SOCPA for their standard review that they do on projects that are within 500 feet of a state highway. I would also recommend that we go through the SEQR review and perhaps Rick can lead the way on that. I think it is appropriate to stop at that point and just work our way through SEQR.

Galbato – Thank you. SOCPA, in their application does want to know the status of SEQR. This is a redevelopment within Downtown D and change of use. We would be looking for a recommendation that the Planning Board declare itself lead agency for this unlisted action under SEQRA that will receive uncoordinated review. The applicant has presented a completed SEAF Part 1 as part of the application.

1. *Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulation?*  
PB – No or small impact. The requested use is a permitted use subject to a site plan review and Critical Impact Permit.
2. *Would the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use in the land?*  
PB – Moderate impact. There is no question that there is going to be a change in the intensity, the question is the degree of the impact. This property has been a restaurant in the past.
3. *Would the proposed use impair the character or quality of the existing community?*  
PB – No or small impact.
4. *Would the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area?*  
PB – No impact. Not aware of any.
5. *Would the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway?*  
PB – No or small impact.
6. *Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities?*  
RE – It will use more energy, but it has been a restaurant in the past.  
PB – No or small impact.
7. *Will the proposed action impact existing (a) public/private water supplies and (b) public/private wastewater treatment utilities?*  
PB – No or small impact. Public water and sewer are available. Will be addressed by the Trustees in I&I.
8. *Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic archeological, architectural or esthetic resources?*  
PB – No or small impact. Applicant stated little to no changes to the exterior of the building.

9. *Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources, for example wetlands, water bodies ground water, air quality, flora and fauna?*  
PB – No or small impact.
10. *Will the proposed project result in an increase of the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems?*  
PB – No or small impact. No change from the existing.
11. *Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?*  
PB – No or small impact.

Attorney Galbato, “If the Board agrees with those answers, noting that all the answers were no, except for #2 which was moderate; it would be my recommendation that the Board entertain the following motion – to declare themselves lead agency for this uncoordinated action under SEQRA that will receive no coordinated review. That the PB issues a negative declaration in that the proposed action as proposed will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts and authorizes the Chairman to sign Part 3 of the SEAF as completed by the applicant and now Part 2 by the Planning Board.”

Kenan – Is that part of your motion?

Sutherland – That is part of my motion.

**Member Sutherland, “I would move that the Planning Board declares itself lead agency for this uncoordinated action under SEQRA that will receive uncoordinated review. That the Planning Board issues a negative declaration in that the proposed action as proposed will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts and authorizes the Chairman to sign Part 3 of the SEAF as completed by the applicant and now Part 2 by the Planning Board.” Member Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present for this action in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0 (Member Eberhardt recused).**

**Member Sutherland, “I make a motion that we refer the application to Syracuse Onondaga County Planning Agency for the review that they must do on site plan review actions within 500 feet of a state highway.” Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present for this action in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0 (Member Eberhardt recused).**

**Member Sutherland, “I move that we approve the Site Plan as presented, conditioned on SOCPA raising no issues regarding this action, i.e. a clean recommendation, and that the approval also be subject to a review of the calculations for water and sewer usage and I&I fee by the Director of Municipal Operations.” Member Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present for this action in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0 (Member Eberhardt recused).**

**Member Sutherland, “Lastly, subject to the SOCPA review and Director of Municipal Operations’ review of water, sewer and I&I calculations, that we recommend, as an advisory opinion to the Village Board of Trustees, that they approve the Critical Impact Permit application. Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present for this action in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0 (Member Eberhardt recused).**

Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board. This matter was concluded at 8:23 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 5, 2016

---

Consideration of designating two Planning Board members to Trustee Eriksen's working group that will consider commercial signs.

---

Present:        Bruce Kenan, Chairman  
                  Brian Carvalho, Member  
                  William Eberhardt, Member  
                  Stephen Hartnett, Member  
                  Doug Sutherland, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board  
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee  
Bob Eggleston, 1391 E. Genesee Street

Chairman Kenan called for appointing designees at 9:22 pm.

Trustee Eriksen said that he will be announcing the group's formation at the May 11 meeting of the Trustees.

Chairman Kenan asked if there were any volunteers. Member Hartnett said he would do it but was concerned about his work schedule interfering. Chairman Kenan suggested that Members Carvalho and Sutherland would be good choices.

**Chairman Kenan, "I will make that motion to appoint Members Brian Carvalho and Doug Sutherland to represent the Planning Board." Member Eberhardt seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion it was carried 5 – 0.**

Member Carvalho asked Trustee Eriksen if he could expand on the scope of the group. Trustee Eriksen, "Basically we are going back to the drawing board with the Local Law that was up for a hearing at the last Village Board meeting. At that public hearing there were a lot of pretty valid criticisms raised that convinced everyone on the Village Board. That Board and others are pretty much of the opinion that that Local Law as it was drafted was biting off a little more than we should be chewing at this point, so the thought is to go back to the drawing board and form a working group with 2 Planning Board members, 2 Zoning Board members, 2 HLPC members, 2 representatives from the Chamber and me as a tie-breaker since I am liaison to most of those organizations. They would be able to reach out to the community, and come up with some recommendations to the Boards. I believe at this point the scope would be limited to only

commercial signs and will try to come up with something that will work for everyone; phasing out sandwich boards and looking at phasing in some of the wooden signs that would hang perpendicularly to storefronts that the HLPC had recommended. There will be opportunity for public comment and public feedback.”

This matter was closed at 9:25 pm, and on motion of Chairman Kenan, seconded by Member Sutherland, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 5, 2016**

---

Downtown D Design Standards Review Update in the matter of the application of Guy Donahoe (Goode) to construct a carriage house consisting of a dwelling unit above a 3-car garage at the property addressed as 43 Fennell Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

**Present:** Bruce Kenan, Chairman  
Brian Carvalho, Member  
William Eberhardt, Member  
Stephen Hartnett, Member  
Doug Sutherland, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board  
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee  
Doc Huston, Skaneateles  
Bob Eggleston, 1391 E. Genesee Street  
Jennifer Ahrens, 96 E. Genesee Street  
Leif Kallquist, Syracuse  
Craig Froelich, 100 W Lake Street  
Patricia Carroll, 7 E Elizabeth Street  
Jo Anne Gagliano, Syracuse  
Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Avenue  
Kevin Rich, Crow Hill Road

Chairman Kenan called for the application of Goode for 43 Fennell Street at 8:24 pm, stating that at the April meeting the application was approved subject to Member Sutherland's review of the materials and details for the Goode project. Member Sutherland reported that he had received the materials from architect Guy Donahoe and after review had approved the information as submitted and notified CEO Crompton of his approval on behalf of the Planning Board.

This matter was concluded at 8:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards



**Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 5, 2016**

---

Site Plan Review in the matter of the Application of Craig Froelich to demolish the existing main house and to construct a two-story, 6 bedroom 6,637 SF house with decks, porches and breezeway at the property addressed as 100 West Lake Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

**Present:** Bruce Kenan, Chairman  
Brian Carvalho, Member  
William Eberhardt, Member  
Stephen Hartnett, Member  
Doug Sutherland, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board  
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Leif Kallquist, Architect, on behalf of the applicant  
Jo Anne Gagliano, Architect, on behalf of the applicant  
Kevin Rich, Builder, on behalf of the applicant  
Craig Froelich, applicant

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee  
Doc Huston, Skaneateles  
Bob Eggleston, 1391 E. Genesee Street  
Jennifer Ahrens, 96 E. Genesee Street  
Patricia Carroll, 7 E Elizabeth Street  
Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Avenue

Chairman Kenan called for the application of Craig Froelich for 100/101 West Lake Street at 8:26 pm.

Kallquist – On the rework of the project here, we have gone and taken the new structure and placed it at the existing ridgeline of the hillside. The existing structure on the site right now that is coming down is in this location. So we have nestled up, used its footprint for our attached garage structure, breezeway and the link into the primary structure of the house. The goal was to pick the house up, get it back on the ridge of the hill where it falls in line with; as you continue down toward Bruce's house, Bruce's house falls down just behind it and the guesthouses fall down in line with this structure, creating a sense of trying to capture those big great lawn expanses that are down there so that they maintain themselves along that entire esplanade of the west shore of the lake. Allow the existing tall mature tree structures that are on this property to

maintain and allowing that viewshed from the water and the land to be open underneath that tall canopy. The goal is to maintain the existing drive lanes there and to minimize any other road or driveway structures needed for the property. So we started working back as we crest the hill, cleaning up the extra asphalt that's not needed in these areas, which is all impervious structure. Coming down a drive court entrance area and then a direct line visually through the house to the water below. The siting was set in a way so that we are trying to maintain and improve the quality of the existing lawn panels and garden panels that are along the south edge. They point where there is an existing water feature and a water trough element that is a fountain that then feeds down into the water feature that is part of the wall. We are going to rebuild that, maintain that, rebuild that and get it working properly, extend the wall planes along each of the garden edges on the downhill side to capture those spaces and formalize those gardens. The intent of the house is a classic shingle-style house ala' early McKim, Mead & White era waterfront structures with strong gable elements that define a big, strong central roof line down the middle. That is set up to take the private side of the house, which is the master bedroom area and inject that within the first of the upper lawn element. So that becomes a private element with the private side of the house tucked into that and then the lawn panels tumble on down into the garden terraces along the front and the east side, the lake side and then back down into the lawn terrace, which then is usable for events and play zones. The other thing we are trying to do; this is the other existing stone wall feature on the site. We are maintaining that also, improving that and tying that into the axis alignment of the circulation of the house, so that we are; our goal is to pick the living plane/terrace level of the houses and get them up at the elevation of the former houses, which opens up these beautiful view sheds over all the other properties, capturing the view shed down to the lake. We can actually see in the north to the Village and all the way down to the south and east over the treeline that divides the property on the south. Part of the fun things that we did as Joanne and I walked around here is that the quality of this space in what you see and what draws you down to these gardens, it ends in an orchard at the end which we are going to prune up, refurbish and get growing again. Balance the appearance with trees to create a path through so that when you get there you have a central stair that drops down to the lawn panel and then it divides to two and entices you to go to the house panels. Then it comes back together at the bottom and injects you into the orchard which is the lowest scale. This allows the house to orient back up to the lake maintaining a large central lawn area and keeping all the services up along the north side; putting a shoulder as the house develops with a prow on the northeast end here to kind of balance up against all the structures that are developed along the north side.

[Mr. Kallquist then showed his 360 degree tour of the design and the site.]

The arrival courtyard gives onto a flat lawn panel and a path that leads to the water features. Water toys and boats can come up the cart path to be stored under the house. Entry gates will be rebuilt in kind. Will save trees to the maximum extent possible. Fireplace massing anchors the lake side. Everything is on a broken gable form tied into a big shed roof down the middle. With the maximum open space we are at 92.1% right now including all garden walls. Coverage goes from 6.4% to 7.9% in these plans.

Hartnett – by moving the house up the hill, you have moved completely away from the existing sewer line, correct?

Kallquist – Yes – We are completely out of that zone and our disturbance area doesn't even go into that zone. We are well back from that. We have no side yard set-back issues on the north side. Our building height falls within the 35 feet – the average datum point of the roof plane to the average datum point of the sloping lawn. We are several feet below that right now. So we have no coverage issues, we have no set-back issues, we have no zoning issues. We are still going to continue to repair the rubble wall for the seawall element with a turbidity fence out in the lake and we are still adding a dock element outside the high water line. Our goal is to move the dock north and make this the waterfront element right here, where the natural gravel ends up on the beach from wave action.

Eberhardt – Leif, it appears to me that the vista from the Village will remain as it is today?

Kallquist – It will remain as it is today. What you might see through the tree line in the winter is the rhythm of the high house pushed back up to the ridge and the strong roof forms that set in lacy patterns through the tree lines. As a strongly detailed traditional form element it stylistically looks like it wants to be up there.

Eberhardt – How would you define the proposed house?

Kallquist – Early shingle. It is sort of based on McKim, Mead & White. McKim did some of the original houses there and White did the interiors. They are best known for their strong-bodied shingle work and if given a different client of the ilk during the time period, this is something that would very appropriately set up on that ridge form.

Eberhardt – And the stone material is what?

Kallquist & Rich – Seneca limestone.

Galbato – I think we realized a few months ago that the sewer line actually lies partly outside the easement. Is your client still willing to work with the Village Attorney and have a more accurate sewer easement. So that could be a condition of any site plan approval.

Gagliano – When we took time to be out there, there are such great bones to this project. It also has a lot of relationship to the adjacent property with its terracing. Our big concern was to make those feel purposeful and connected to the house. The stairs right now are really pushed over toward the Kenan property. They have to be rebuilt because they are coming apart, along with the wall, including some wood walls. Those would come out and become like the house structure and the stairs will be more centrally located as you see on the plan. The terraces are in good condition; they are nice level terraces but they do pitch. Some of the hedges have been replaced and they were not in kind. There is a grotto on the wall with a pool above. It goes through the pool, down through the grotto right here. We can keep that intact with just a little repair, to have that re-circulate. This is the corner where Leif has pulled the corner right into this panel and the walls connect to the house so it feels as if it was actually built that way. This is a great shot of the view. There is a lower story to the orchard with a few apple trees and honeysuckle. So you do have those filtered views both from the lake and from the house. This one gives you a sense of how it opens up as you go down the terraces and it goes to the left.

Whether it is paving or planting, we want to retain as much as possible, all to hold onto the historic character and fabric of the house.

Kallquist – This is a nice sort of elevated shot, a visual element that gives you a sense of scale as you look out over the great lawn to the water below. You don't have just a shot of a big house on the hill, there is neat little play on how things relate with the tree forms. The cart path is a straight bowling-alley shot down this side here. Some of these trees need to come down anyway. We are going to maintain the drive lane that's there, then break it on a radial line into a soft roll and hook it back around to capture the space around the living side. It brings the drive path here in tight with the drive line that's on the other side of the fence. That's the only area that we are doing anything over the top of the sewer.

Carvalho – That's asphalt?

Kallquist – Yes. Existing asphalt.

Sutherland – Leif where you have the two drives together; shouldn't there be some kind of greenery that runs along that edge?

Kallquist – There will be. Our goal is to solidify that whole side.

Sutherland – It's outstanding.

Eberhardt – It's really great.

Kenan – Shannon has not looked at this grading plan, right?

Kallquist – She asked for and we sent the utilities plan today.

Sutherland – It sounds like there are elements that she has not had a chance to review yet, and it sounds like John Crompt has not completed the code elements yet.

Kallquist – There are none. We are looking at an area of disturbance on this that's hovering just below one acre. I know there was an NOI filed originally; we're going to try to undo that and redo it appropriately, because it was a little bit overblown.

Kenan – So subject to the review by John showing that there are no variances required, and review of storm water and utilities by Shannon, then our task is merely site plan approval.

Galbato – If the Board wishes to act on the site plan, I would ask that it be conditioned on the new easement for the sewer. As well as the zoning reviews by John and the review by Shannon of the utility and grading plan.

Dundon – At some point in our past discussions there was agreement on a plan for the applicant to replace the sewer as part of this project. Is the applicant still amenable to doing so?

Sutherland – I suspect that part of the thinking last time was that because the house and the garage straddled the sewer line, that it was the sort of thing you didn't want to have an issue with. Here, with everything up above it, I wonder if it is still the same circumstance?

Kallquist – We will create a new easement that reflects where the line truly is.

Sutherland – In this case it is easy to get to and it is understood that if we have to get to it, we're going to get to it. I think the circumstances are different.

**Member Sutherland, "I move that we approve the site plan subject to the conditions of the new easement for the sewer acceptable to the Village Attorney, as well as the zoning reviews by John and the review by Shannon of the utility and grading plan." Member Eberhardt seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion it was carried 5 – 0.**

This matter was concluded at 8:58 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

