

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board
October 6, 2009

In the matter of the application submitted by Aaron Moss for a Site Plan Review for a Change of Use Per Section 225-A2C(14) Permitted Use Chart, from retail to office, in the building addressed as 3-11 West Genesee Street in the Village of Skaneateles..

Present: Bruce Kenan Chairman
 Steve Krause, Member
 Douglas Sutherland, Member

Jorge Batlle, Clerk to the Planning Board
Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board

Robert Eggleston, Architect for the applicant
Don Trabold, Jordan Street
William Eberhardt, Member (recused)

Absent: Lauren Waite, Member

Chairman Kenan opened the adjourned meeting at 5:33pm for Aaron Moss, 3-11 West Genesee Street.

Robert Eggleston, Architect for the applicant made the presentation. He said, "Aaron Moss is looking to relocate his real estate business over at 3 West Genesee Street. The building also contains Bluewater, Sweet Water restaurants. It was the former location of a retail use that was the White Sleigh. So, this is a change of use from retail to a professional office which requires Site Plan Review.

Aaron is moving from Jordan Street down to this location. He has 7 to 8 full-time and part-time employees that work out of this office. There is usually no more than 4 people that would be at the office at any one time. Most client contact is made off-site. You do have occasionally buyers coming in, and also they are looking for people coming in off the street interested in making inquiries. Typical of a real estate office, there's a few office deliveries other than US Mail and occasionally a UPS or FedEx package. There's no other truck traffic anticipated. The office generates a minimal amount of garbage, recycle papers and which are removed weekly and taken to the Transfer Station.

Office hours are 8am to 6pm, 6 days a week. Occasionally there are some after hours activities. This is a permitted use in the Downtown D District by Site Plan review. The water/sewer demand is actually about the same as the retail. With 4 people you'd base it on a

sewer use of 60 gallons per day, 15 gallons per employee, and this is well under the change of 400 gallons per day threshold. So, there is no Inflow impact fees to worry about.

Exterior sign actually had been removed. But he will probably put back a sign similar to what was there, that fits within the Ordinance, so he will be developing that, and making application for that.

As far as parking requirements - we get into the old issues of non-conforming parking - buildings with non-conforming parking. Now that there is a moratorium this is not a consideration that we need to be concerned about. I think a lot of similar applications that have gone ???ended up wavering any changes because there's a minimal change of use from the retail to the office use. The parking obviously is taken care of in the Municipal Lot and on-street parking.

I have gone through the Critical Impact questions for the Village Board to consider. Did you want me to go through those, or you have had a chance to review those?" Member Krause said, "I have read them." Eggleston said, "so what we are looking for today is Site Plan Approval and recommendation to the Village Trustees for Critical Impact, because it's a change of use in the Downtown D District."

Chairman Kenan said, "give us read on the parking needs of this use versus the previous one. I recognize that there's a moratorium on the fee and so on." Eggleston said, "the law that has been suspended has a 200 square foot requirement for parking as opposed to a 300 square foot that retail has. The proposed zoning that has been worked on and was close to coming to passage was going to actually put retail and office at the same 300 square feet. So, there would be no change. Based on this use is 957 square feet and that would require 3 parking spaces for retail and would require 5 parking spaces for office, which is a difference of 2 parking spaces."

Member Krause asked, "what are we supposed to follow during this period of moratorium?" Eggleston said, "there are no parking rules, so there's nothing to follow." The Chairman said, "I don't think we are absent parking rules, are we? It a moratorium on the fee?" Battle said, "they vaporized the entire parking ordinance except for one and 2 family houses." Member Krause said, "that shortens the discussion." The Chairman said, "there must be something in the drinking water. I think it would be helpful to the record if you could have a rationale for the use of the facility, and how the parking usage would be not dissimilar from that the practical use would have been from the prior use. I see in the text you expect 4 employees at any one time. In which case you wouldn't need 5 cars. Where do the park now - anybody that uses this space?"

Eggleston said, "there is no on-site parking for this property. I guess there's actually - the actual space is right here. Hoods owns a separate parcel. The owner own an adjacent piece which is a right-of-way, so they do have parking in that parcel here. So, that could be attributed and I think they park about 3 cars in that area." William Eberhardt said, "at least 4." Eggleston continued, "so they do park several cars in this adjacent property." The Chairman said, "obviously that's not for patrons of the restaurant of the ice cream store."

Member Krause said, "this is here for a Site Plan Approval. In as much as there's going to be no physical change to the site other than the use, and in as much as the parking regulation that was in process for quite some time, the one that got derailed, it was looking to equate the requirements I'd be inclined to recommend the Village Board approve it."

Chairman Kenan asked, "it was looking to equate the requirement for parking for retail and office?" Member Krause said, "yes. That undermines the concern over the new use in increasing the need for parking."

The Chairman asked for any other questions. None were voiced. He said, "we need to do a SEQR." Attorney Galbato said, "yes. I would recommend declaring yourself Lead Agency, and Unlisted Action, Uncoordinated Review, and send it onto the Trustees for Critical Impact so they will have a chance to look at the application. Then issue your Negative Declaration." Member Krause said, **I would move declaring us Lead Agency, and Unlisted Action, Uncoordinated Review, and send it onto the Trustees for Critical Impact and issue a Negative Declaration. And also a recommendation to the Trustees for a positive Critical Impact.**

Seconded by Member Sutherland. The vote was 3-0 in favor of the motion. The meeting was closed at 5:43pm.

cc- emailed to: Mayor, Trustees, MJB, Galbato, Eggleston