Village of Skaneateles
Special Planning Board Meeting
October 12, 2010

Special meeting to discuss the application for the Krebs Restaurant renovations and modifications

Present: Bruce Kenan Chairman
Toby Millman, Member
Douglas Sutherland, Member

Audrey Clark, Special Clerk for this meeting
Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board

Andrew Ramsgard, Architect for the applicant (Kim Weitsman)

Clifford Abrams, State Street
Douglas Clark, West Lake Street
David Allyn, West Lake Street
John Pidhirny, West Lake Street
Joseph Steencken West Genesee Street
Scott Feldmann, West Lake Street
Debbie Loescher, West Lake Street

Chairman Kenan opened the Special Meeting at 7:05pm. He said, "Andy, I understand that you have a modified plan to share with us."

Andrew Ramsgard, Architect for the project said, "Adam and Kim gave a lot of though over the weekend they want to be respectful of their neighbors concerns. So, they have eliminated the parking lot in the back of the lot and provided 5 additional spaces on top of the 3 spaces that currently exist on the site. The proposal is to leave the curb cut exactly the way it is. No change in the curb cut. Once you come in at the sidewalk, curbed driveway over as it currently does. There would be no (noise) It would actually be a little less pavement on the 3-family house to the west. We would also be removing the dumpster from the 3-family house that is on the west as that currently sits on the other parcel. Bring that back onto our site. We are proposing to create 8 spots, handicap only, on a parking lot to the rear of the restaurant. Four spaces on the northern portion of that, and 4 spaces on the southern portion of it. It would be completely hedged around it, with 2 walkway openings to a side walk that accesses the handicap access to the south – west side of the property. Then relocated, what we've shown for a long time, the Cutting Garden – put that out into the big open space, and allows us to get some ??on that.

This proposal, we are only dealing with Krebs' parcel. Currently the existing lot #010-02-12.0, that's 75,779 square foot parcel and is the only parcel that we are dealing with. We are not

proposing any changes to any of the other parcels, with the exception new landscaping that we would be putting onto the adjacent parcel to the west – that's the 3-family house. There would be a hedge around it's parking area. The 3-family house as well as Norway Spruce trees, double row, and then a 3rd row of deciduous trees to line the driveway coming in.

As with the original proposal, we would be removing all the sheds that are in the back portions of the parcels to consolidate all of the restaurant functions into one building. So, we are still making a new reduction of 309 square feet of foot print, and over 10,000 cubic feet of volume reduction from the existing buildings, after the alterations to consolidate all the restaurant functions into one facility.

The only thing that would exist besides the cutting garden on the back portion of the parcel would be the fence enclosure of the rubbish area. That is precisely on the location of the last shed – that currently exists on the location. It terminates the driveway access, which allows trucks, straight box trucks, to do a 3 point turn and leave and enter the site as they currently do, as well as trash trucks to come in and 3 point around.

The restaurant – there will be a large reduction in the number of seats. We feel that 150 is appropriate for the indoor dining portions. We still have the front porch seating and the outside patio. Those numbers wouldn't change, so they are waiting areas for diners. We expect those functions to stay. The way the parking lot is arranged, there is access off that patio to the waiting area, or wait on the front porch as they currently do. All the architectural changes are as originally proposed. The north elevation stays the same with the alterations of repairing the siding, new architectural windows to match, repairing the porch, repairing the handrails, repairing the stairs. Doing those necessary functions. The west elevation was as originally proposed keeping the façade of the portion of the building, taking down the sheds that are on the side of the building. ???the facility for consolidation purposes, matching the existing siding, materials, roofing and architectural details of the Krebs. Each elevation as originally proposed.

I have submitted with your copy, a copy of the Narrative which we have been through a couple of times. It is largely the same with the minor changes. The number of seats reduction is considerably larger. Obviously the parking has been reduced considerably. Then there is also a Short Form EAF included with the proposal. Any questions on those portions?"

Attorney Galbato asked, "the driveway, the curb cut on this is going to remain the same?" Ramsgard said, "correct." Galbato asked, "the driveway itself, I'm looking at the survey, prepared by Richard Wheeling, of Auburn, provided to all of us by e-mail – is that going to be changed, modified, expanded at all?" Ramsgard said, "our turn in is right in here, so we are going to be removing a little bit of pavement." Galbato asked, "but you are not going farther west from where it exists now?" Ramsgard said, "correct."

Member Millman asked, "what was the reason for the reduction in the seating?" Ramsgard replied, "it's really because we felt that there were too many seats. It wants to be a quaint, small place. The number of seats drives the capacity in which drives the engine, which drives the needs of all the other items. So, the more seats you have the more you feel that you need to do. The purpose of this restaurant is for charity. So, they are not under the pressure to

pack more and more people in." Member Millman asked, "did that change the amount of square footage, or just fewer tables?" Ramsgard said, "we reduced a lot of the congestion. The original plans show accurately depict the locations of the existing tables with inside the facility. We reduced the number of tables and the number of congestion in the front rooms. We went to a little bit bigger tables and less people at the tables. If you have been in there, there's a lot of the tables in the front rooms are just stacked on top of each other."

Galbato asked, "on page c-1K, just for the record, tell us the orange the reds, what they are?" Ramsgard said, "ok. The orange are facilities that are not changing. The red hash marks are the facilities that are being removed and replaced in-kind. The blue is the square footage that currently devoted to adjacent structures, consolidated functions into the building. It increases the footprint of the main restaurant building. The hash mark red that's existing facilities that are going to be torn down and rebuilt. You can think of it that way. Orange is going to be remodeled and restored, and the red is torn down and rebuilt, and then the blue is relocated."

It was asked, "are you restoring the aluminum siding?" Ramsgard said, "no, we are not restoring the aluminum." Member Sutherland said, "I thought you said that a moment ago." Ramsgard said, "no. Repair the siding....we are going to remove all the aluminum siding and then hopefully we are going to find good stuff. If we don't we are going to repair it. We are going to replace it with clap board. When you look at the porch, the fascias are wrapped in aluminum and it wraps the header of the beam, and then it stops underneath the beam. Then the inside is wood. It is sort of halfway done."

Chairman Kenan asked, "any other questions? So, with the proposal amended the way it's amended, what are the actions expected of this Board and what are we able to do this evening? Is there anything that we are not able to do this evening?" Galbato said, "you could consider doing possibly a SEQR determination. If you wanted to make that determination you could decide whether New York State DOT should still be an involved agency. The plans as depicted by Andy, represent that they are not expanding the curb cut. So, I do not believe that State DOT Permit would be required at that point. So, this Board could choose to not have any limited coordinated review with any other agency and consider a SEQR determination. In addition we have a plan that the applicant is proposing to go forward with, refer the application to the Onondaga County Planning Agency under General Municipal Law 239m. A Special Use Permit is required. Variances are going to be required. It is on Genesee Street and the Code provision is ???"

Chairman Kenan said, "so, as presently proposed, we do not have a Site Plan review function?" Galbato said, "no. Unless the ZBA or the Trustees would recommend as a condition Site Plan approval." The Chairman said, "it is our obligation to make a recommendation to the Zoning Board with regard to variances. Is there still a Special Use Permit?" Galbato said, "yes." The Chairman said, "and to the Trustees with regard to the Critical Impact Permit." Galbato said, "and for the Special Use Permit to the ZBA. My concern about making those recommendations tonight is that our Code Enforcement Officer has not had a chance to review the plan and make a determinations as to the variances needed." Ramsgard said, "it is the appropriate thing. Jorge is out of town right now. He hasn't been able to have his review. He has to deny the building permit based on the variance, and we have to ask for the variances."

Galbato said, "I think it is also important Andy, as we discussed, talk about the storm water. That would eliminate or possibly eliminate the Village Engineer reviewing this." Ramsgard said. "there is no storm water management practice associated with this project because it's not required. Storm Water Management Practices are required after more than an acre of land disturbance. An acre is 42,560 square feet – 43,000, sorry – the net area of disturbance, including the demolition of the structures is approximately 12,000 square feet. (Chairman Kenan – "like half an acre or less.")

The Chairman said, "so, you are suggesting that it is premature for us to advise the Zoning Board of the Trustees on the issues before them." Galbato said, "I don't think we are slowing down the project because those Boards can't act on final determinations until we have head back from County Planning. After Jorge reviews it this week or early next week, and makes those recommendations at our November meeting, then it's likely if we get the County Planning referral back the ZBA can take their action in November." The Chairman asked, "so this is not a Negative Declaration? What is the SEQR action contemplated?" Galbato said, "you have declared yourself Lead Agency. This would be an Unlisted Action and this Board determines that you don't need a limited review. Two other Board of the Village are going to have an opportunity to review this project, and they would provide determinations and approvals required. The only other agency that we talked about in past meetings and special meetings was the DOT." The Chairman said, "it doesn't appear that they are involved." Galbato said, "it doesn't appear because the applicant has indicated that the curb cut is not changing and therefore no need for a State DOT Permit. If there was a need for a permit they would be an 'involved agency.'"

Chairman Kenan said, "ok. So we should, if the Board is so inclined, determine, make the determination that this is an Unlisted Action, refer it to the County Planning Agency." Galbato said, "you want to make your final determination on the SEQR that it is a 'Negative Declaration,' with 'No Significant Environmental Impact.' That is something that this Board can do." The Chairman said, "if there are no more questions, anyone want to make a motion?"

Galbato asked of the applicant, "this is the actual survey from Mr. Wheeling. I'm looking at the dimensions in the back. It doesn't square with them. Seems like some of the red is new, as well as this orange part. Maybe I'm reading it wrong." Ramsgard said, 'that's the overhang, see that dashed line? This corner right here is the overhang on the photograph, the porch. Right now if you look at the building – if you go back here, the bar area sticks out over nothing. It's got columns in the back. That's what that is. That's what that dashed line is." Galbato said, "so this is going to be actual building. What's the orange?" Ramsgard said, "that's the patio. That's existing."

The Chairman asked, "does anyone have a motion to propose?" Galbato said, **"based on this Board's review of this project and amendments to the project, with numerous proposals and documents submitted, all the information is in the file including the discussions at our Board meetings and special meetings, the Board is declaring this action under SEQR to be an Unlisted Action. There is no significant negative environmental impact and is declaring this action by making a Negative Declaration under SEQR."** The Chairman said, "you didn't mention the County Planning." Galbato said, "separate motion." The

Chairman asked, "would anyone like to move that motion?" Member Sutherland said, **"I will move that motion."** Member Millman seconded the motion. The vote was 3-0 in favor of the motion."

Galbato continued, "**motion to refer the application of 10-12-2010, to the Onondaga County Planning Agency pursuant to general Municipal Law 239m, with the variances needed and the Special Use Permit form the Village." Moved** by Member Millman. Seconded by member Sutherland. The vote was 3-0 in favor of the motion.

The Chairman said, " both motions passed. I think we are done for this evening. Thank you Andy. We express our thanks to the applicant for absorbing the input." The meeting was closed at 7:25pm.

Transcribed by: J. Batlle

email to: Planning Board, Galbato, Ramsgard
Trustees, ZBA