

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
December 1, 2016

Correspondence & Announcements

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
 Brian Carvalho, Member
 Mike Perrone, Member
 Doug Sutherland, Member

 Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
 John Crompt, Code Enforcement Officer
 Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

 Robert Eggleston, architect, on behalf of the applicant
 Mark Edwards, applicant
 Doug Clark, on behalf of the applicant

 Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
 Carol Stokes-Cawley, Village Trustee
 Peter Osborne, Widewaters Parkway, Syracuse

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

At 7:28 pm Chairman Kenan noted receipt of a letter from the State Historic Preservation Office, Department of Parks & Recreation, saying that at its December meeting it would be considering the addition of Lake View Cemetery to the State and National Register of Historic Places. Chairman Kenan, "I think it's a great idea."

Chairman Kenan also noted receipt of a letter from Onondaga County Industrial Development Agency (OCIDA) with regard to an application by Welch-Allyn for renovation and retrofitting of facilities at their property. OCIDA is requesting to be lead agency, and the Village of Skaneateles Planning Board is listed as an involved agency. They are asking for the Board's acquiescence to their being designated lead agency. **Member Sutherland, "I move that we agree to the request." Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0.**

This matter was concluded at 7:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon
Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
December 1, 2016

Site Plan Review, Downtown D District Design Standards Review and Critical Impact Permit recommendation in the matter of the application of Mark Edwards to change the use from Personal Service to Restaurant and to add outdoor seasonal seating at the property addressed as 10 Jordan Street (Rear) in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Brian Carvalho, Member
Mike Perrone, Member
Doug Sutherland, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
John Crompton, Code Enforcement Officer
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Robert Eggleston, architect, on behalf of the applicant
Mark Edwards, applicant
Doug Clark, on behalf of the applicant

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Village Trustee
Peter Osborne, Widewaters Parkway, Syracuse

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

At 7:30 pm Chairman Kenan called for Mark Edwards for 10 Jordan Street (Rear). Chairman Kenan noted that this is the brick building adjacent to the municipal parking lot behind Doug's Fish Fry.

Eggleston – This actually involves two properties; Doug Clark's remaining holding in this block is the old brick building referred to as the blacksmith shop that used to be Doug's dining room. Back maybe 10 years ago, we got approval for expanding, moving the dining room from this building over into the building next to the original fry so that it was one unified restaurant. That has worked quite successfully. Mark Edwards, or Mate LLC, owns that building. At that time, 3 parcels were joined; this was one parcel, this was another parcel and then the parking lot out back was the third parcel. So that is now one parcel owned by Mate. Mate has since purchased this building and that will remain a real estate office. This building was approved for a number of different uses – retail, office, personal service – and has had a fair number of different tenants; 6 tenants, 8 different uses over the last 10 years. Doug has never had a tenant in there that pays

fair market rent so it has been a difficult building to maintain and sustain itself. Doug and Mark talked, and Mark has a purchase offer on the property. Not that he will immediately do his, but it is not a value to Mark unless he knows that he can put accessory restaurant uses in there. He has a need for bringing the prep kitchen out into this area. There will be no exterior alterations to the building. It will be used only by employees, not as an eating place as it was before. That way he will have a prep area, prep kitchen with tables lined up in front of the windows here; Doug's Fish Fry does feature a lot of fresh products and that way they can have their employees chopping the potatoes and onions and preparing the fresh food. It has become a popular thing in restaurants to see where your food is coming from. It also gives him the ability to put another cooler in without having to put an exterior cooler in. It already has the handicapped bathroom and mechanical space. Upstairs, will actually be an employee lounge. Mark has 18 employees during a heavy shift during the summer; he really doesn't have any place except the basement for them to go to or put their personal things. There was a toilet upstairs also, so they won't need to use the restaurant. That is how Mark will use the building. I know there was concern about expanding yet more restaurant – but it would not be expanding eating; the 99 seats that he has in the restaurant would remain the same.

The second element that he'd like to do; he does have the outside dining room, which was part of the growth of Doug's Fish Fry. He was thinking about doing some tasteful bollard and chains to just cordon off – and set up a more bistro-like table, wrought iron type seating, just for the 4 or 5 months spring, summer, fall. Another option for people eating outside. The one thing that they have done is taken a lot of pride in this back area and tried to improve it. They have created this whole area between the ramp and the old fry cellar entrance as a garden area, with roses growing and annual & perennial flowers there. So what he'd be doing is enhancing this area with the table tops and having potted plants. One of the things that has brought this idea to him is he used to be able to park over in this space.

Kenan – Which space Bob?

Eggleston – Between; in this area here. As a result of actions that the neighbor has taken – cutting off vehicular access to the alley and putting up those planters – he has lost access to that parking space. So he has reduced his parking spaces from 10 down to 9. So putting the tables out back helps to clean up the area. Just a seasonal thing; he sees it as wrought iron tables, chairs. He had reduced the size of the fenced-in area that has the air condensers. He currently has a grease recycling container back there. He is looking at a different system for his oil. That would be removed and would not be back there either. So, what we are asking for is a change of use of the brick building from personal service/retail uses that it is approved for back to restaurant – which is a site plan review application and also Critical Impact. Also using the area between the buildings as seasonal outdoor dining, and expansion of the restaurant use of the existing buildings. We would need to go to the Historic Board. The brick building is not in the Historic District, but the alleyway I believe is part of a property that's in the Historic District. So any of the exterior changes we do in that area would need to go to the Historic Review Board. Are there any questions that you have? I know I provided you with a narrative with site plan review criteria.

Kenan – What are you going to do with the ‘stuff’, the trash containers and so on that show in the photograph? They are in that space between the two buildings.

Eggleston – A lot of that stuff can now go inside this building.

Kenan – The trash containers?

Edwards – Those are aprons, it’s laundry not trash.

Eggleston – Any of the trash itself will continue to be in this fenced in area over on the east side of the original fry.

Kenan – In the photographs there are these guardrails. In the plan I see 3 of them. Are they one in the same?

Eggleston – They are one in the same. We might lower them, right now they are a tad high.

Kenan – And in this plan what are those ovoid things between the rails and the building?

Eggleston – These are seats. There would be like two-tops, maybe 5 two-tops.

Kenan – Is there room for that there? It looks pretty narrow.

Eggleston – Yeah, there’s about 5 feet in there; they could fit in there.

Carvalho – It does look much narrower in the picture than on the plan.

Kenan – It sure does.

Sutherland – Conceptually it all seems fine, but the details are kind of important on how this stuff is. I think returning the restaurant function is fine, I like the idea of the planters and seating and enlivening that back area. I think all that is good. It’s just do these things really match up is kind of the only question that I’d have.

Eggleston – This is a survey, which is to scale. We are talking about very small, little 24 inch small table; just like for two-seaters. In the back would be some larger ones. Obviously, it’s something that he will bring in the furniture and select what seems to fit. This will be a different feel than inside, which is wood and heavy. This is going to be a light metal kind of feeling; almost kind of like you see in the city. We will be putting gutters on the building. We will have a downspout that comes down in this area; everything drains to a catch basin in this area. We were thinking about a copper gutter with a copper chain. You have experienced the creativity that Mark and Doug have had in the restaurant to kind of make things a little bit unique.

Carvalho – Are you doing anything with a picture window to make it?

Eggleston – The idea was to keep it. It is what it is. That’s just the area where you can see the activity of the kitchen. There was some discussion as to whether we need or want some awnings? We really haven’t gotten that far with any details or selections of that nature.

Dundon – By doing outdoor dining are you losing any spots that are currently parking today?

Eggleston – We lose no parking other than the one space we can no longer access.

Carvalho – The other outside area you are maintaining?

Eggleston – For instance this chain here will be coming down as deliveries come in. Right now the trucks back in and hit this area and offload.

Edwards – we are just trying to beautify that back area and make it more pretty with flowers and have a nice little feeling there; not some huge cram-packed people sitting in there. If we have seating for 4 or 5 tables, maybe a few in front. We don’t know exactly how it will lay out. But we are not looking to pack in more people. We just want to give people another option. Maybe they want to sneak over in there and be a little hidden alcove area. And have it flowery and nice and pretty, because right now it looks a little dreary.

Sutherland – One of the things that’s nice about Doug’s and the way it has gone over the years, is there’s this organic set of things that happen. You have gotten those right. There’s a quirkiness that’s appealing; my guess is it’s going to be the same thing here. Typically, what we would look to do is try to get a little more detail on how some of those things go; the experience with you folks though has been really well done and I guess I kind of recognize that these things happen in stages over time, and I’m OK with it in this case. If it was somebody else I might have a little more concern.

Edwards – We are not looking for gaudy or overwhelming, just a nice little area.

Sutherland – For instance reintroducing some awnings there; some color softens that building a little bit. I think it’s something you’d eventually get to – I’d want to encourage that. The building is just a little Spartan; with a little color and a little fabric to soften it that would look great.

Kenan – Any questions or thoughts on the part of the Board? Or a motion of some kind? The question before us is site plan approval, Critical Impact Permit recommendation to the Trustees and review of the Downtown D District Design Standards.

Galbato – The application and project is within 500 feet of the state road so it should be referred to SOCPA.

Kenan – Should be referred to the County. And we should make a SEQR finding as well?

Galbato – Yes.

Kenan – Anyone have a motion?

Eggleston – Could this be Type 2 since it is under 4,000 SF of commercial?

Galbato – But it is Critical Impact which technically should be Type 1. But we treat them as unlisted. On the SEQR, the applicant has provided the short EAF form, Part 1. I have gone through Part 2, I would recommend no or small impact in regard to the 11 questions in Part 2 that we have to answer, and it is my recommendation that on the SEQR that the Planning Board declare ourselves lead agency, that this would be an unlisted action receiving uncoordinated review, and given the application that we issue a negative declaration that there is no significant environmental impact.

Chairman Kenan, “Rather than repeat all those words, I would move that with regard to SEQR that we make the findings that Attorney Galbato just suggested. Further that we make a recommendation to the Trustees to approve the Critical Impact Permit. Further that since the application is within 500 feet of a state highway that we refer the application to the Onondaga County Planning Agency for their review. If there are any issues raised it will come back to the Board in January. Further we find that the application satisfies the Downtown D Design Standards. Further, I move that we approve the site plan as submitted based on 2 pages of drawings dated November 16, 2016.” Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0.”

This matter was concluded at 7:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
December 1, 2016**

Consideration of further actions in the matter of the application of Gary Dower for Site Plan Review, 7 lot subdivision, lot line relocation and recommendation to the Trustees on Zoning Amendment and Critical Impact Permit to construct 4 extended stay lodging buildings, add parking spaces, construct 5 detached dwellings, provide a pocket park, redesign and engineer the storm water management system at the Mirbeau Gateway properties at the corner of Fuller and West Genesee Streets in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Brian Carvalho, Member
Mike Perrone, Member
Doug Sutherland, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
John Crompton, Code Enforcement Officer
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Robert Eggleston, architect, on behalf of the applicant
Peter Osborne, on behalf of the applicant

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Village Trustee

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

At 7:53 pm Chairman Kenan called for the Mirbeau Gateway matter.

Eggleston -- Peter Osborne, landscape architect is here as well. This is a zoning map of the proposed zoning taking your suggestions of keeping the zoning A-2 District. The A-2 District is across the street. This has always been A-3 here. It allows A-2 residential across the street from A-2. The lot sizes we have proposed 50 feet, I have examples of the Village where there are 50 foot lots with actually similar style and size homes, with similar set-backs. We have a minimum of 20 feet between the two; in contrast to most of the Village, there are no driveways in between these houses, since they are all in the common area behind. Keeping this in A-2 and keeping the A-2 density the same, it will require a number of variances for the subdivision and for the development of this. We would require variance for the lot size; the smallest lot we have is 6,700 up to about 12,000 in the last lot that contains some of the detention pond area. We would have a variance of the lot width of 50 feet, where 100 feet is the standard. The front yard we are asking for 15 feet where 30 is the standard. The side yards we are asking for 10 feet where 15 is

required. For both side yards we are asking for 20 feet where 35 is required. We would be looking for 70% open area where 85% is the standard. That's to make the density of the images that we are showing work. We do comply with the 35 foot rear yard, we do comply with 65 percent of building width and a percent of lot width. That's what will happen if we keep this A-2. The balance we are asking to bring into the A-3 District, in that we have been encouraged to continue the lodging use in the new Gateway area. These would be extended stay lodging units that would have kitchens and living spaces as well as bedroom and bath. They would be totally accessed off the service road for Mirbeau; for financing purposes we would create its own lot, so we can put the mortgage into place without encumbering the entire Mirbeau property. In doing that this would be a conforming lot, conforming use, conforming set-backs; where we are required to have a 30 foot front yard set-back, we have a minimum 15 foot side yard, we have 35 foot rear yard. Basically what we do is a lot line relocation where we take part of the Mirbeau property and add it, so we come up alongside this electric easement, we come along the edge of the service road, and we come back the 35 foot required for the D unit which is spaced to accommodate to sewer easement which passes through.

Regarding the residential units, I went out on a shooting expedition and on Genesee Street from Orchard to Fuller, these are all 50 foot lots. What I found was that these houses are in the 24 to 28 foot wide range. Where there is no driveway it is 20 feet between the houses; exactly what we are proposing. Where there is 1 driveway it was 25 feet between the houses, where it was 2 driveways it is closer to 30 feet between houses. I think there is a case to be made that this density is in keeping not with the tightest section of town, but a moderate section of town. You'll see this pattern extend around the corner to Orchard Road. There's 20 feet between these two houses that actually has one driveway in it. Coming up there's 25 feet between those two houses. It is similar with the fact that there are no driveways.

Sutherland – Set-backs next block up; how far back from the sidewalk to the porch?

Eggleston – I didn't measure that but it is probably more than 15 feet.

Sutherland – I think it is more like 20 or 25.

Eggleston – Which is more appropriate because it is Genesee Street, but even more important is that they all line up. I believe that Parkside had 15 feet.

Sutherland – I thought it was more like 20.

Eggleston – I think it was 20 feet but the porch could encroach into it.

Sutherland – That could be it.

Eggleston – We are 15 feet to the porch, so we are actually 22, 23 feet...

Kenan – How about when you take in the greenery between sidewalk and curb? What's the dimension from curb to front of the houses? That's part of it.

Eggleston – That’s part of it. One of the things we are proposing is that we would have the pull-off here, but we also have the sidewalk further into the right-of-way that it is on Genesee Street. So you probably have more like 20, 22 feet from the sidewalk back. So I don’t know you are going to be much off.

Sutherland – If you wanted to get a line of street trees that helps define that corridor, where would you put them?

Eggleston – I’d probably put them between the sidewalk and the property line. I’d probably put them there. I’m not sure about the overhead lines in that area. There is some space and we can vary where we put the sidewalk too.

Kenan – One thing I’d like to suggest; I think you need a turn-around or cul-de-sac at the end of this drive. If this homeowner fills the drive with cars, there is nowhere to go. You could probably bring the property line down here and create a cul-de-sac or something in there. And there should be an easement designated on the plan.

Sutherland – I don’t think it’s a cul-de-sac, but some simple...

Kenan – Hammerhead or something so there is room to turn around.

Eggleston – That’s an excellent suggestion.

Carvalho – Could you improve your density by just pushing back the property line? That seems to be just open space?

Eggleston – We are dealing with grading...

Carvalho – even if it was still hillside and it is property belonging to those homeowners...

Eggleston – Yeah; what will happen is we raised the grade from the sidewalk to in front of the porch by about 3 feet or so; the house sits up 3 feet so it’s a traditional front porch. This is all raised up so you are driving in and it is one step from the garage in. So we have got grade there. There is a grade change here; though it is less than it used to be, correct?

Osborne – It is less, but I think pushing back you capture [unintelligible].

Carvalho – Give them a little green space; you could have a garden over there and improve your densities. If it is just empty space anyhow, why not?

Eggleston – Sure. And there is discussion about; obviously what this provides is the buffer between the hospitality and the residential side.

Kenan – There isn’t really any buffer with all the grading going on.

Eggleston – right, not with any existing trees and Peter will be talking to that in a little bit.

Sutherland – I think what might be helpful is for Peter to get into the hillsides.

Kenan – You have one more line in this version; the one that curves around the back drive.

Eggleston – This is actually part of lot 1; the detention pond will be owned by...

Kenan – You would suggest a new property line there that curves.

Eggleston – This will be in the A-2; this is all A-3 over here.

Kenan – But both sides of that straight line would be one parcel.

Sutherland – So essentially the pond is split between A-2 and A-3?

Eggleston – Correct.

Osborne – The idea is to wholly have it within the extended stay parcel.

Eggleston – So one owner is responsible for the pond.

Dundon – So is that a single parcel?

Eggleston – So the single parcel comes down here across. We are taking from Mirbeau up here across the back. It is one parcel that is split between two zoning districts.

Sutherland – It seems a little peculiar to create a lot that you are not going to build on that splits into two zones.

Eggleston – This is not a lot. It is part of this lot.

Kenan – That line that turns the right angle is just a zoning line.

Eggleston – In the extended stay hospitality units, there are 7 bedrooms per building. We are still trying to develop the building to Gary's satisfaction. For the parking; we have created a parking area over here, we can provide lots of vegetation around it. So there will be a number of cars here, and we do have the pods here. Here really needed to be close because of the short distance there; then we are expanding parking across there. We have the existing sidewalk from the spa that will come across the service road. We are putting in a new sidewalk that goes from the Western gateway sidewalk that comes straight level across so one can enter Mirbeau or they can come down to the extended stay.

Sutherland – The large group of parking spaces between the A unit; is that pretty much level now?

Osborne – It is fairly level there; we are actually doing some additional surveying because I don't have that part. But when you look at it, it looks fairly level.

Carvalho – That parking lot is new from what we saw last time; rather than seeing that as you drive by every time, could you put that at the other end?

Eggleston – There really is no room right now. This drops off, we are filling this to extend this out. There probably will be a couple spaces that aren't filled with parking because of trees or lighting.

Kenan – You know if you moved Unit A over where that parking is and made up for the lost parking in part with a few more that are perpendicular with the ring road there, would that cut back on some of this grading that's going on?

Osborne – The grading, especially down below where the pond is, is all driven by the storm water that's coming from the Town.

Kenan – No, I understand that, but at the top of the hill you are dropping the grade rapidly between these buildings. If this building were over here where it is relatively flat, you could probably leave a lot of those contours alone in that area. In order to do it...

Osborne – I think we are trying to meet a parking count too.

Kenan – I'm still not happy, even after going out to look at the site, that we have to tear down all that woods to move every piece of dirt on site, and I still just believe that there is a simpler way of accommodating what you are trying to do.

Osborne – I wish we were not handling all that water from above.

Kenan – It's two things – it's that and it's what you are doing to accommodate the buildings where they are at the top of that slope.

Eggleston – What percentage of the detention pond is handling water from above?

Osborne – My guess is 2/3 of it.

Eggleston – So the pond could be 1/3 the size if the water handled by the Town detention pond were to bypass and just go to Fennell Street.

Kenan – Or, and I don't remember what's up above along the top of that hill, there's a ditch, right? Can that store more water if it was graded differently?

Osborne – Not really. It's pretty minimal; in fact the town has requested we fix it along these boundaries here because it has lost its shape. Some of the water spills over onto other property.

Kenan – But could it be regraded to accommodate more of the water up there?

Osborne – No because it is a fairly steep site coming down.

Sutherland – Instead of a bigger pond is there a way to do a series of smaller pieces that spill one to another that allow you to retain more of the existing slope further down; almost create like a feature of some detention, some detention, some detention that gets to a smaller pond at the base?

Osborne – We could look at doing that, but because this area down here is a lot flatter; just beyond that it rises pretty dramatically. You could do check dams to do something like that but it is not going to store a huge amount of water.

Sutherland – There's a wooded area back deeper in. Somewhere in there is there a way to accommodate – where exactly they fall I don't know.

Eggleston – Part of the problem is that Rosalie's water never got treated. It's kind of silly to retreat the Town water once it has been treated, but that's the way it works.

Kenan – Do you mean treated or detained?

Osborne – It is detention.

Sutherland – With the initial concern of a pond that's a little larger than it might be and a whole series of dominos, and the loss of the hillside mature trees, what are you thinking now after our site visit and conversations?

Osborne – I just had a rough area for the detention pond; now I ran the numbers and this is sized correctly for the development and all the off-site water that's coming down. So if there is an area where we could take some of that off-line, that would help a lot. But I'm not sure...

Sutherland – The second question is, given the pond that you show now, how does that effect the rest of the hillside?

Osborne – I'm not sure I understand.

Eggleston – Are we cutting, filling?

Sutherland – You need the cut to build up where the houses are along Fuller/Franklin.

Carvalho – Are you filling this hillside too? So you have to clear it before you fill it?

Eggleston – This because we are at pond level, I think we are into the cuts. There is a very steep bank here, so this is filled from here to here. Half of the fill is the building. And then we are filling in so we have access from the upper level.

Osborne – To about midway on the building is fill and then the rest is cut.

Eggleston – the designs that we are working on for here, you enter straight across into the 3rd level and you go down 2 levels to the middle and lower levels. Over here we are toying with entering halfway between the second and third levels so you go half up, half down and 1.5 down.

Sutherland – In the site visit that we had, one of the things that's striking is that there are some nice size trees the you would want to have as a foundation for whatever planting program was going to happen between the extended stay units on top and the other houses down below. Maintaining the better trees that are in there and the kind of fairly radical regrading – there's a conflict in there.

Carvalho – This plan, is it possible to do that the way it is drawn now? With these contours?

Eggleston – If the pond were only here, then you'd have success in keeping the trees.

Dundon – To Doug's point, if Peter is saying that 60% of the water is coming from off-site and is currently being collected right now with the existing pond. Then don't you have 40% of the water that you have something else to do with it?

Kenan – And do you have the ability to intercept the 60% uphill?

Eggleston – If we have the ability to correct the town pond to make it do what it's supposed to do.

Sutherland – If you were doing all of this grading here; there's a big expense to that. It is a lot easier to fix the town pond; the cost of that ought to be significantly less than all the stuff you are having to do here, both in terms of economic cost and also in terms of cost to the community to losing a great bunch of trees and your having to wait 20-30 years to get back to a point kind of where you are at the moment. It seems like you don't have to take a bunch of steps back; you'd be better off; if you take the town pond that should be a fairly easy fix, you're going to have less dollars out-of-pocket. It may be that you are spending some of those dollars up there, but if it saves a bunch of money here it may be both an economic interest and an esthetic interest. Because of the kind of facility is, the esthetic interest is also significant to the dollars-and-cents issue.

Osborne – We did look at the existing pond up there, what if we could play around with the outlet and choke that down? It really didn't make a significant difference. The only way to do that would be to make the pond bigger.

Sutherland – But wouldn't it be better, cheaper, more beneficial to everybody to make that one a little bit bigger? Especially if it is land that is way back – less valuable, less seen, never going to have anything going on in our lifetimes anyway – wouldn't it be better to put a lot of that function there, so that you can get to something that isn't too large?

Osborne – I don't disagree with you.

Kenan – I stayed in a place in Napa Valley about 1.5 months ago; a place called Meadowwood. They created a bunch of units, very much like these, in a situation very much like this – a wooded area, road going uphill, and just dropped off precipitously from where the road was, down to a little 9 hole golf course. Each of the buildings and every unit was different. You took a path down some steps or around a bend. In each building there would be 3 or 4 units and they would all have porches and entries on different levels. They were not one on top of each other, they were spread around on different levels. So each building had to be designed individually to fit an individual site. But they did an excellent job of it , they didn't disrupt the grade, they built it on the grade by adapting to it, and it was an enchanting circumstance, environment because of that. I think you are going to have the opposite here, because you are moving bit of dirt, you are tearing out all the trees and it will be decades before you grow up some vegetation again. I really suggest that your client pay for you to go out to Napa Valley and pay for you to stay there and take a lot of pictures and notes. They did an excellent job; very cleverly and non-invasive.

Eggleston – We'll put it on the Village escrow account. Part of what we are currently playing with is that this bridges across; you keep this original grade down to the second level...

Kenan – The buildings might go exactly where you have them or you might move them around. You put them on the grade where the grade is.

Eggleston – Exactly. Sure.

Kenan – That would fix a lot of the earth moving. The rest is being driven by digging a big hole at the bottom of the hill. If there's a way to dig your hole where the water that causes the problem enters the site, you could eliminate a lot of this. And then you'd save all those woods; you'd have an enchanting environment – exactly what Gary would like to create.

Eggleston – Any other comments or suggestions? OK. We will take this back and see what we can develop out of it.

Mr. Eggleston agreed to continue the discussion to the January meeting on behalf of his client. This matter was concluded at 8:26 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
December 1, 2016

Consider the Draft Revised Joint Comprehensive Plan v. 10.31.2016 which was referred to the Board by the Town of Skaneateles

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
 Brian Carvalho, Member
 Mike Perrone, Member
 Doug Sutherland, Member

 Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
 John Crompt, Code Enforcement Officer
 Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

 Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
 Carol Stokes-Cawley, Village Trustee
 Bob Eggleston, 1391 East Genesee Street

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

At 8:29 pm Chairman Kenan called for this last agenda matter.

Chairman Kenan said that the Board had received a PDF version of the document and would like to request that the Town furnish a Word version for the Board's use in comparing its prior comments to this newly revised draft. Mr. Dundon said he would make that request of the Town.

Member Carvalho noted that it is difficult to determine if the numerous suggestions made by the Board have been incorporated. He observed that it appears that new language has been added to weaken what was there before. Chairman Kenan noted that the cover letter also said that language regarding the Open Space Plan had been inserted as well.

Member Sutherland said that Member Carvalho had made a good point. Member Carvalho suggested that the Board might consider a recommendation that the currently adopted version of the plan remain unchanged.

This matter will be continued to the January meeting.

On motion of Chairman Kenan, seconded by Member Carvalho the meeting was adjourned unanimously at 8:31 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards