

**Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 3, 2018**

---

Continuation of Public Hearing regarding preliminary subdivision approval and site plan approval in the matter of the application of Gary Dower for a 7 lot open space subdivision, lot line adjustment for development of new lodging structures and construction of 5 one-family dwellings as part of the proposed Mirbeau Gateway development project at the corner of Fuller and West Genesee Streets in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

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

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

                  Bob Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the applicants  
                  Stacey Alburnio, Engineer, on behalf of the applicant

                  Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee  
                  Cori Knupp, Syracuse  
                  Patrick Donnelly, Syracuse  
                  Linda Roche, West Lake Street

Excused:        Mike Perrone, Member

At 8:28 pm, Chairman Kenan called for the matter of Gary Dower for Mirbeau Gateway.

Eggleston – Since last here had critical impact permits granted for lodging and open space subdivision. ZBA had approved special use permit for lodging; Board has special use permit for subdivision before it now. They needed some more up-to-date information which they now have. They have adjourned that meeting to May 23. The Planning Board had asked GHD to comment on the plans; they did so and we responded to their letter. As a result we have updated the SWPPP.

Alburnio – They asked about the slope of the basin and addressed the water quality requirements. We had to rerun our numbers because of changing the side slope. We are still able to handle all the water and to meet the DEC standards.

Eggleston – Then they requested for detail on foundation design to mitigate any concerns related to the brownfield development. We have supplied that detail to them. One other item that came up at the Trustees, and you were copied, was the fire chief’s comments during Critical Impact. He said that the shared driveway was not large enough to meet the 2015 International building code, fire code Appendix D – access for fire apparatus. I did do a rebuttal. Our position is that the fire access is, in fact, Fuller Street, which is totally accessible, no dead end. This was never intended for fire apparatus; it is no different than 90% of the residential lots of this size, they don’t have access to the back. Had we gone more conventional with 5 individual drives it possibly would never have been raised as a question. We feel that he was overstating or misinterpreting the requirements for fire apparatus access in Appendix D which has not been formally adopted by the Village. Appendix D says that it has to be specifically adopted. We feel that the way it is laid out, there should be no problem with fire access.

Eggleston – We do have a couple of outstanding items. We want to be sure that you have all the current information so that once these last items are taken care of that we can close the public hearing and get this wrapped up next month. You got the easements and covenants for consideration.

Sutherland – The detention basin is somewhat different than what we’ve been looking at. It looks like what you might see next to a shopping center or an industrial site. The other had a more natural form to it; this looks pretty harsh in a residential neighborhood.

Albunio – In order to meet our water quality treatment, we needed to have a fore-bay to our basin, so we have an upper pond and lower pond. To accommodate the less steep slopes on the ponds we had to loosen things up a little bit and eat into a little bit more space that was originally flatter up in this area. In order to install that fore-bay or upper pond, that’s why our pond looks a little different from what was originally designed.

Sutherland – How does it; does it spill from the upper to the lower? Is it piped?

Albunio – The upper will have an underground drainage pipe, so it could drain through that pipe if it does not fill enough to spill over into the lower pond.

Sutherland – Do the ponds hold water for much of the year or do they fully drain from one storm to the next?

Albunio – That really depends on the amount of infiltration we have through the soils there. We are figuring that a portion of that, the upper pond will always stay a little bit wet.

Eggleston – But the bottom pond is intended to be wet?

Albunio – Correct. So, you have your side slopes and then your permanent pool in the center of it; the infiltration rate is the determining factor on how long that will stay wet.

Kenan – These upper small areas, are they piped to the big area?

Albunio – Our intention is to have an underground pipe that would connect from here down to the lower so it could flow.

Kenan – But just once in the middle, not at the low point of the two?

Albunio – Correct.

Sutherland – Have you prepared a revised planting plan to go along with this?

Albunio – Not at this time. As part of the conditions of approval we do need to develop a full planting plan for the basin.

Eggleston – But the intent is that it be treated similar to what the previous one. That's something you could do for next month?

Sutherland – The concern is something that is soft, feels natural, doesn't feel like commercial...

Albunio – I fully understand what you mean and that is not what our intention is.

Sutherland -- I think you were there with the previous plan.

Albunio – I think this plan gives it a little softer feel because the side slopes are not as steep and we are separating it into two different areas. It will look like one pond spilling over into another.

Sutherland – In terms of the spill, is there a pipe versus stones...

Carvalho – Is it going through rip-rap?

Albunio – Our intention is for it to be a grassed area.

Eggleston – To make it work, it only goes over the grass during a large storm. Unfortunately for the fore-bay to work, you have to let the water settle out and you use a pipe to control the rate at which it goes out.

Carvalho – So for water quality you have the sediment settle?

Albunio – The fore-bay is to let the water sit there and for the sediment to settle out and then the water to go on its way.

Sutherland – So you've got a pipe that's sticking up. When it gets to a certain level, it drains.

Albunio – It's an underground perforated pipe that will help the water to drain out if it doesn't reach the top.

Sutherland – But if it reaches the top, it's going to spill over where it was suggested to be grass. Is there from a water quality standpoint is it a problem to have it a rip-rap stone versus grass.

Albunio – No, it can be done either way.

Sutherland – It would seem that rather than going over grass that going over a surface that's not going to erode over time...

Albunio – Correct, but there's a stabilizing feature that you can put with that, so the grass doesn't erode.

Sutherland – Well, we'll be interested in seeing the landscape plan and maybe a little more thought on how the water spills might be a good idea.

Mr. Eggleston inquired about the appropriate engineering firm for continued reviews. Chairman Kenan said the Board had discussed the matter and concluded that this function should remain with GHD, in the interest of minimizing costs for the applicant. Member Sutherland asked if there might be a transition for inspections? Chairman Kenan said the Board could consider a transition if it were smooth and logical.

Mr. Eggleston asked if the Board needed more information from the fire chief or was it satisfied with his rebuttal? Member Sutherland, "I am satisfied with your response." Mr. Dundon mentioned that the ZBA had requested a review by the fire chief before its next meeting.

Atty. Galbato asked if the Board intended to specify a building envelope to be shown on the plat map. Mr. Eggleston said that it had been proposed on the sketch plan. Chairman Kenan noted this is nothing more than showing set-back lines. Mr. Eggleston agreed to have that added to the subdivision map.

Mr. Eggleston noted that the lot line relocation creates the A-3 lodging lot and that the open space subdivision is a 6 lot subdivision encompassing the balance of the property. Chairman Kenan observed that the act of subdivision affects all of those lots. Mr. Eggleston noted that a multifamily use is not permitted on a lot in an open space subdivision. Mr. Galbato and Chairman Kenan agreed that any approval would be for two steps simultaneously.

Chairman Kenan opened the public comment portion of the hearing. There was no one desiring to be heard. **Chairman Kenan, "I move that we close the public hearing and continue this matter to the June 7 meeting of the Planning Board." 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 8:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards





# Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting May 3, 2018

---

Consideration of a recommendation to the Board of Trustees regarding the ownership transfer and dedication of highway and utility infrastructure from Trason Skaneateles to the Village of Skaneateles at the property known as Parkside Village Subdivision in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

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

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

Cori Knupp, on behalf of the developer

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee  
Patrick Donnelly, Syracuse  
Linda Roche, West Lake Street  
Bob Eggleston, 1391 E Genesee Street

Excused:        Mike Perrone, Member

At 8:48 pm, Chairman Kenan called for the matter of Trason Skaneateles for Parkside. Attorney Galbato briefed the Board that this matter is being worked by the Village Attorney and the Director of Municipal Operations. He said he did not know if the Board is ready to proceed. The Village Attorney has prepared the transfer documents and is working through some wrinkles with developer's counsel. DMO Harty is attempting to reach closure on one remaining drainage issue. When both are signed off, the Board can make its recommendation to the Board of Trustees for acquisition, dedication and escrow account changes.

Ms. Knupp said that they have been waiting for months for this matter to be handled; they are not getting responses. All the legal work should be done. Their attorney has told the Village Attorney that the developer cannot transfer something that is owned by the homeowners' association. Additionally, the Village retains a substantial amount of money in an escrow account. There is just one open item, and that is a quote to clean out a swale. The developer been working diligently on obtaining that quote. Ms. Knupp asked why the Board can't make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees subject to DMO Harty's approval of that one remaining quote. It is about \$5,000 with an estimate \$113,000 sitting in the Village's escrow. She said they have been asking for this since December.

Attorney Galbato replied that there have been substantial, recent and numerous email communications between the Village Attorney and developer's counsel that she must not be privy to. Some of the documents could be construed as having turned over some of the road facilities to the homeowners' association. So, it is not as simple as it is being presented. Ms. Knupp and Atty. Galbato argued over whether the deed had been provided to the Village before the transfer took place.

Ms. Knupp expressed frustration over lack of response to her emails. After more discussion, it was the sense of the Board that this matter should be continued to the June meeting.

This matter was concluded at 8:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 3, 2018

---

Modification of Site Plan Review in the matter of the application of 63 WL Holdings, LLC to construct a 772 SF garage with exercise room below at the property addressed as 63 West Lake Street in the Village of Skaneateles. *Site Plan approval for this purpose was previously granted by this Board on September 7, 2017.*

---

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

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

                  Bob Eggleston, architect, on behalf of the applicant  
                  Matt Kerwin, Esq., on behalf of the applicant

                  Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee  
                  Patrick Donnelly, Esq., Syracuse  
                  Linda Roche, West Lake Street

Excused:        Mike Perrone, Member

At 8:54 pm, Chairman Kenan called for the matter of 63 WL Holdings for 63 West Lake Street. Mr. Kerwin introduced himself and Mr. Eggleston; they are proposing to amend the site plan approved by this Board in December 2017. He recapped that they had applied to the Zoning Board of Appeals, but ultimately withdrew, their request for a variance on the garage height. The design presented is for the same footprint, in the same location as the previously-approved garage, but now having a height of 11 feet. As currently proposed, the top of the garage is some 4 feet above the street level. Impacts are negligible at best. The applicant had hoped that this could be modified as part of the building permit process, but they were advised by CEO Crompton that PB approval was required for the amendment. Previously provided were renditions of the garage from the height of 19 feet and now from the amended height of 11 feet.

Mr. Eggleston made the following points:

- Site Plan Review is required for disturbance of less than 3,000 SF within the lake watershed overlay district.

- It is in the same location; it has been lowered slightly. There is a slight different grading plan.
- Drainage is identical to the previous version. Silt fence will be installed. The construction sequence is in the narrative.
- CEO Crompt had a question on the height determination. Mr. Eggleston then explained how he had calculated the average grade and the midpoint of the roof. The resulting height was 11 feet. He then repeated the same calculations for the cottage and found it to be 11 feet. Therefore, the garage height does not exceed the height of the primary structure.
- CEO Crompt has determined that the height is conforming; the Planning Board's engineer confirmed the calculations at the CEO's request.
- Applied for modification of an approved site plan. There are no variances required

Member Carvalho asked what steps are required to dig the full basement 3 feet from the property line? Mr. Eggleston said they would install pile sheeting by driving it down in; it is likely that they will leave that sheeting in place and backfill behind it.

Mr. Donnelly introduced himself and indicated that his firm is still retained by Camp Jolly, LLC which has a rental interest in the adjacent property. He noted that he had just recently received the drawings and requested more time to understand the impacts on the neighbor, positing that they might not concur with CEO Crompt's findings that height is conforming. He also mentioned the desire to have the restrictive covenants in place to prevent rental. He then asked the Board to consider continuing the matter to its June meeting.

Chairman Kenan noted that the ZBA had not acted on the garage. Atty. Galbato confirmed that in the absence of a height variance there was nothing further for them to do. Member Sutherland asked if there was a step after the Planning Board? Atty. Galbato said not unless CEO Crompt changes his determination to conclude that a variance is needed.

Mr. Donnelly said that he would like the opportunity to comment on the height variance and the legal standard of how it should be measured. In response, Mr. Kerwin indicated that there was no need to hold this over to consider the veracity of the conclusions in this case is irrelevant and outside the scope of what the Board should be considering. There are no additional impacts; they were considered previously. This proposal reduces the intensity of use. Mr. Donnelly stated that he thinks a variance may be required for height; that the garage may exceed the allowable height under the legal standards. He then mentioned that TDK had stated that things needed to be added to the drawing.

Mr. Eggleston said that in response to requests from CEO Crompt's office, he prepared the April 23 drawing and also shared the autoCad version with the Village. That later copy has all the information recommended for inclusion by TDK Engineering. He continued that the question has been asked, the engineers answered, and CEO Crompt made his determination that the applicant submitted an amended site plan with a conforming garage. Chairman Kenan stated that the drawing of the east elevation is dated April 23. The Codes office asked for specific dimensions that are now shown.

Member Carvalho asked about the status of the restrictive covenants? Chairman Kenan said that there is an existing site plan approval that carries that requirement; any amendment to the site plan approval would do so with all those other conditions remaining intact. Mr. Kerwin said that he disagreed with that condition for a variety of reasons. The Board has the authority to impose conditions that are reasonable. This condition was based on speculation about potential rental activities. He said that a Town of Geddes precedent provides case law that determinations made on the identity of the owner are improper. He asserted that the condition was imposed as a result of concern about the ownership of the property. He said there is no evidence in the record of what is allowed by the code; restrictive covenants could cloud the title. Chairman Kenan said that site plan approval that has been given and is requested would not be appropriate for this building were this to be converted into a single-family home – so it is appropriate. The approval has conditions attached to it. Opinions were expressed regarding enforcement. Atty. Galbato said that the Planning Board has an absolute right to impose a reasonable condition, as you did before on your original site plan approval, and that such condition can carry over to a modified site plan approval. The prior approval specified that the garage was not to be used as a dwelling, dwelling unit or supplemental apartment as defined by the Village Code and as amended from time to time, and is to run with the land. Mr. Kerwin continued to object to having it be a Declaration of Restrictive Covenant. Chairman Kenan asked about beneficiaries. Atty. Galbato said it was the Village and adjoining neighbors, as currently drafted.

Chairman Kenan asked the Board if it was their pleasure to continue the matter or to act on it?

Atty. Galbato suggested looking at the definition of a garage, which does not call for livable space, beyond where the cars are kept. Mr. Donnelly repeated his firm's support for restrictive covenant and thought the applicant agreed to it. Mr. Kerwin cited the Town of Geddes case again, reading, "the authorized board shall have the authority to impose such reasonable conditions and restrictions as are directly related to and incidental to a proposed site plan. Such conditions, however, must be reasonable and relate only to the real estate involved and not to the person who owns or occupies. Further, a planning board may not impose conditions that are not reasonably designed to mitigate some demonstrable defect." Atty. Galbato said that in some municipalities routinely, when they grant site plan approval it ends up being a restriction that is filed with the County Clerk's office so it runs with the land. Atty. Galbato further said that in his opinion there was no need to revisit the Board's prior SEQR determination, since this is not a substantial change under the SEQRA regulations.

**Chairman Kenan, "I move that the Site Plan approval previously granted be amended to conform the new building plan and configuration – shown on drawings dated April 12, 2018 and April 23, 2018 -- and subject to the same conditions that were attached to the previous action, including the restrictive covenant." 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 9:22 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

# Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting May 3, 2018

---

Site Plan Review, Downtown D Design Standards review, Special Use Permit recommendation, Critical Impact Permit recommendation and area variance recommendation to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Minimum lot area, in the matter of the application of Richard Charles to change the use from Office, general business C (13) to Dwelling, multifamily A (4), and to construct a four dwelling unit condominium residence at the property addressed as 37 Jordan Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

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

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

                  Bob Eggleston, architect, on behalf of the applicant

                  Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee  
                  Linda Roche, West Lake Street

Excused:        Mike Perrone, Member

At 9:23 pm, Chairman Kenan called for the matter of Richard Charles for 37 Jordan Street. Mr. Eggleston said that in 2014, Mr. Charles had proposed removing the existing auto body shop building and constructing a multifamily residential building consisting of 4 units. Although approval was obtained from the Board, he was unable to put together the financing for the project. Mr. Charles is now proposing a similar project; a multifamily building comprising 4 dwelling units. Two units will be on the first floor with 924 SF each, one of which will be handicap accessible. There will be an elevator to two units on the upper floor. Both of those units will contain a mezzanine space; one being 1245 SF and the other 1471 SF. The units are intended to be sold as condominiums.

Mr. Eggleston reviewed the required parking stating that the two dwelling units of less than 1,000 SF require 1 space each, and the two dwelling units of less than 1,500 SF require 1.5 spaces each for a total parking requirement of 5 spaces. The proposal provides 6 spaces on site, with a 7<sup>th</sup> space being provided on the adjacent 39 Jordan property by easement. Mr. Charles owns both parcels. Rudy Zona, engineer, did a study of parking and vehicle movement, showing that vehicles can pull out with one movement.

Mr. Eggleston said the design is similar to the prior proposal featuring horizontal siding on the lower portion with shingles above and frieze board rakes. There is a shed dormer on top with accent metal. The back of the building is up against the adjacent north property line with a fence in front of it. He continued that his narrative addresses the Downtown D Design Standards and the criteria used by the ZBA in reviewing the Special Use Permit application, as well as the criteria used by the Village Trustees in evaluating the Critical Impact Permit application. The project does require a variance for total lot area. In the D District, 3,000 SF is required for each dwelling unit whereas the lot is 9,063 SF. This same variance was granted by the ZBA in 2014. He continued that he has provided renderings and that there is a cedar fence between 37 Jordan and 39 Jordan and also between 37 Jordan and 41 Jordan. A few sections will need replacement.

Member Carvalho said that if the car in space #7 doesn't pull in all the way, no one else will be able to get out. Atty. Galbato noted that space #7 would be provided by easement; does the easement exist? Mr. Eggleston responded that it could be a condition of approval, noting that 3 of the units will have 2 parking spaces each by way of the easement.

Chairman Kenan stated that his problem is with the parking design. Cars fit in spaces 7, 6, 5, and 4; meeting the standard condition you would expect given the required spacing and lanes. Spaces 3 and 2 don't meet that standard condition, because there is not enough room to back up. Space #1 requires a big long back up and into a slot to turn around is considered reasonable, it can work. He observed that he believes that parking has a reasonableness standard; the code does not address this situation. But the maneuvering required to exit space #3 is not a reasonable expectation. I don't think that's what anybody intended when they wrote the dimensional requirements of the parking. Spot #3, with out and in and out and in, does not meet the test of parking standards. If spaces 1 and 2 are OK then you would still have 6 spaces. In the interests of safety, he suggests that the space be reallocated, perhaps to get 6 reasonable spaces and a 7<sup>th</sup> by easement. Mr. Eggleston replied that the parking was analyzed using Auto Turn 10, which is a CAD program. Movements are shown for a 16 foot compact vehicle and a 19 foot suburban. Village space does not permit a Walmart parking lot. Member Sutherland said that he understands the complexities of trying to provide for parking in a relatively dense urban setting.

Chairman Kenan and Atty. Galbato asked about the sidewalk width. Mr. Eggleston said it is 3 feet wide at the bump out and the remainder is 4 to 5 feet wide. CEO Cromp asked about snow accumulation. Mr. Eggleston pointed out accumulation areas. Atty. Galbato requested that a draft easement for space #7 be provided for his review by the next meeting.

Chairman Kenan noted that the Board is being asked for site plan approval and compliance with Downtown D Design Standards. Member Sutherland requested the addition of handrails and balusters on open porches and patios. Member Carvalho noted the yard light, asking if something could be provided that's not shining on neighbors. Mr. Eggleston said he would incorporate a night sky compliant fixture.

Member Sutherland said that he is OK with the proposal if modifications to the parking are OK. Mr. Eggleston asked the Board to consider making a recommendation to the Zoning Board of

Appeals on the Special Use Permit and area variance applications and have it then come back to the Planning Board?

Atty. Galbato noted that the applicant had provided a completed short-form EAF. The Board could choose to do an uncoordinated SEQR review, since multiple Boards will be reviewing this.

### Short Environmental Assessment Form – Part 2

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 special permit.
2. *Would the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use in the land?*  
PB – No or small impact. There is a change of use, but the proposed use will not necessarily increase intensity of use. It will be comparable.
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 or small 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?*  
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.
8. *Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic archeological, architectural or esthetic resources?*  
PB – No or small impact.
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.

11. *Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health?*

PB – No or small impact.

Atty. Galbato, “Given those answers, as well as the facts that 3 boards will be looking at this project, we have Downtown D Design Standards, the use proposed is a conditional use permitted by Special Permit, and there is site plan review, it would be my recommendation that the Board entertain the following motion – to declare themselves lead agency, no coordinated review, and it is an unlisted action under SEQRA. 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 the SEAF as completed by the applicant and now Part 2 by the Planning Board.”

**Member Sutherland, “I move that the Planning Board declares themselves lead agency, it is an unlisted action under SEQRA and with no coordinated 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 the SEAF as completed by the applicant and now Part 2 by the Planning Board.” Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0.**

**Member Sutherland, “I move that the Planning Board recommends that the ZBA grant the Special Use Permit and area variance for lot area. The Planning Board has asked the applicant to make adjustments to the parking, to include railings on porches, decks and patios, and to draft the easement language for the parking space provided on the 39 Jordan parcel, and that this matter be continued to our June meeting for site plan review, Downtown D Design Standards review, and Critical Impact Permit recommendation.” 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 9:56 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
May 3, 2018

---

Consideration of a recommendation to the Board of Trustees regarding the proposed Local Laws #3 (Demolition permits), #4 (Downtown D overlay district), and #5 (Critical Impact approvals) of 2018.

---

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

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

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee

Excused:       Mike Perrone, Member

At 9:57 pm, Chairman Kenan called for the matter of Local Laws. Attorney Galbato briefed the Board that this is a request for a recommendation to the Trustees. The text of those local laws have not changed and were in your packets.

Member Carvalho asked why is a Brewery OK, when you can't have a restaurant? Attorney Galbato said he believes the Village Attorney had made everything in the overlay district the same as the D District with the exception of Restaurant.

**Member Carvalho, "I move that we recommend adoption of these Local Laws #3, #4, and #5 subject to a correction to draft Local Law #4 of 2018 that Accessory Use #4 Brewery be changed from "X" to "N" in the Downtown D Overlay District." Member Hartnett 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 and on motion of Member Sutherland, seconded by Chairman Kenan the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

