

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
October 21, 2025**

Donald Kasper
David Lee - zoom
Jon Holbein
Mitchell Sobolevsky
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel
Caitlin Choberka (C&S Engineers)
Aimie Case, Clerk
Karen Barkdull, Planner

Chair Kasper opened the meeting at 6:30 p.m. The meeting minutes of September 2, 2025 were previously distributed to the Board, and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Holbein to approve the minutes as corrected. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

	<u>RECORD OF VOTE</u>		
Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Cochair	David Lee	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Present	[Yes]
Member	Mitchell Sobolevsky	Present	[Abstain]

The meeting minutes of September 16, 2025 were previously distributed to the Board, and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Holbein to approve the minutes as corrected. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

	<u>RECORD OF VOTE</u>		
Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Cochair	David Lee	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Present	[Yes]
Member	Mitchell Sobolevsky	Present	[Abstain]

Public Hearing – Special Permit Amendment

Applicant: 1938 West Lake Rd, LLC
Skaneateles, New York
Tax parcel#058.-01-10.0

Present: John Cherundolo, JC Cherundolo, Applicants; Joe Durand, Tom Trytek, TDK Engineering; John Rhodes, Skaneateles Marina

Mr. Durand stated that the marina in question is about $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre, and they are proposing to merge with the southern lot, which is about one acre. $1\frac{3}{4}$ of overall marina, is being proposed. The expansion of the property to the south is really to enhance the marina operations with a parking lot, vehicle parking

lot, boat storage, and off-season dock storage. There is an existing abandoned home on the one-acre lot that is proposed for demolition prior to moving forward with the proposed site improvements. There is existing access into the marina off Lacy Road, and access off of 41A into the proposed lot expansion to the south. Included in the submittal is a drainage plan and a stormwater pollution prevention plan, which is in a state of flux. Ms. Choberka, of C&S Engineers, was in receipt of the plans and it was anticipated that she would have comments. The docks have been stored, and the proposed site plan would be an incorporation of the marina layout and the screening along the front of the road with some coniferous trees to provide additional screening of the gravel parking lot.

Mr. Durand continued saying that on October 15th, they received County Planning comments, including feedback from the State DOT. The DOT suggested that they eliminate the site access point on 41A; however, this would leave a single access point off Lacy Road, where the public access boat ramp is located. They also had an issue with the percent impervious which is currently at 23% on the lot with the proposed development but would increase to about 76%. It was suggested that they incorporate some of the lands that the Cherundolos own across the road to create a conservation easement. They could then focus on concentrating the boat storage and vehicle parking on the marina property.

Mr. Durand asked the Board their opinion on maintaining access off 41A, as well as the idea of a conservation easement. Although you are allowed one driveway off a state road the circulation would make sense, from our perspective, to have two driveways. Have one off Lacy, where the boat ramp is, and have one off 41A to kind of alleviate the congestion with the boat ramp in the summertime. There were discussions about overflow parking from the Mandana Inn. There are a lot of logistics there and liability concerns such as whether the Mandana Inn changed ownership, they would have to be specific if there was an agreement for overflow parking.

Chair Kasper commented that he agreed that the driveway opening off 41A should be maintained as part of the marina proposal, and that the Board can override the County. He continued saying that the Applicant will need to go to the NYSDOT to verify that they are okay with factors such as the sight distance. Mr. Durand said that they received other comments regarding stormwater management, site lighting, etc., which they would address with Ms. Choberka. He stated that if the Board agreed with their thoughts on maintaining two points of access, they would support an explanation to County outlining the necessity of the second access off 41A and how it would relieve the potential for road congestion and having vehicles parked or standing along the road.

Chair Kasper requested that a narrative be submitted to the Board, outlining how the property will be used: How many parking spots? What is going to be there in the winter? What is going to be there in the summer? The narrative should include hours of operation for the summer months and what would be on the property, and likewise for the winter months. Chair Kasper added that the fire department would need to be involved regarding the proposed traffic pattern for the parking lot. As a precaution, they will need to sign off on the plan given it is suitable for the ingress and egress of fire trucks. This is another point that could be raised with the state to show the necessity of having that second access drive.

Town Planner, Karen Barkdull, noted that there is a provision in the Code on parking areas- where there are large spans of parking lot, breaking them up with landscaping. This lot should have landscaping incorporated into the plan to break up the overall parking area. In viewing the area from the road or lake, some vegetation should be seen as opposed to just parking lot.

Chair Kasper commented that this is a major project. Counsel Molnar recommended that as there is going to be demolition of the house, re-grading, and establishing the parking area together with the driveway,

it should be classified by the Board as an Unlisted Action. Notice can be sent to potentially interested parties, so that at the next meeting, they can run a 30-day clock, and at the meeting following that, they can assume lead agency status and make a determination. He inquired if the Applicant is requesting that the Planning Board hold lead agency status and the Applicant affirmed.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Holbein to accept the Applicant's request for the Planning Board to function as lead agency, consider the proposed action as an Unlisted SEQRA action subject to coordinated review, that the Planning Board will serve as Lead Agency for the SEQRA review, and requests that board Counsel to circulate notice to all potential interested parties as part of the application. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

Chair Kasper opened the Public Hearing. There was no one who spoke in favor, opposition or had any other comments.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Holbein to keep the Public Hearing open. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

Ms. Choberka asked if the Applicant is counting the existing gravel, where the docks are currently stored in their existing numbers, as that was added without a permit and should not be counted as part of the existing impervious. Mr. Durand said that it makes the proposed stormwater management system larger than is needed and can manage that area. Chair Kasper asked how long the southern property has been owned by the Applicant and Mr. Cherundolo said more than ten years.

Mr. Durand said that he would like to discuss the possibility of placing land into conservation to offset the impermeable surface coverage. There are two parcels across the road, totaling roughly 30 acres, with one of them directly across and around the Mandana Inn area. He wondered what the best alignment would be, and if it is a one-to-one, it would be about $\frac{3}{4}$ acre of impervious going into that proposed lot. Mr. Durand continued saying that they can put the easement in the adjacent area buffer that does not crush the future use of the site, but is consistent with what the Board is seeking. It could follow in the adjacent area of the wetland or tucked away. Ms. Barkdull clarified that the amount of land needed to be conserved is the amount of land that would bring the lot into 10% impermeable surface coverage. Conservation easements are discussed in §10-13 of the Zoning Code. Counsel Molnar added that the conservation land would be tied to the two properties that are utilizing the swap and should be under unified ownership. The easement would run with the land, and the conservation easement would need to be drafted. The Town has done this before with the Ranalli and Mahar properties. Once the area is determined to be placed in conservation, the Town Engineer will confirm that it meets the requirements.

Ms. Choberka commented that the proposed stormwater treatment is going to be proprietary units. There will be underground storage for detention, as well as a filtration unit. With these items there are maintenance requirements to ensure that they are continually operable and recommended that the Board may want to consider some means to ensure that maintenance is being performed on the units. Mr. Durand stated that they can provide the Town with third party certification verifying that it conforms on a yearly basis. Ms. Choberka added that the DEC would want to see that, too, and that it is part of the SWPPP. **Mr. Rhodes** stated that what they have done with previous projects is always keep spare filters on hand, then set up a schedule for the inspection requirements. A lot of these treatment units have 5 to 10 filters that need to be replaced.

Ms. Choberka said that it will be important to identify what should be considered as existing conditions, based on some of the impervious that may not have been existing. The subsurface storage has to be flat, and so there is a considerable amount of fill on the one side.

Chair Kasper requested that Applicant supply a photograph from the lake looking in so the Board can see what the sight will look like in the summer and fall. Cochair Lee inquired whether the plans indicate specification for the screening in regard to initial planting height. Smaller sized vegetation would not provide adequate screening. For example, 2-foot bushes would not be acceptable. Mr. Durand stated that they will likely go with junior green giant arborvitae. They already have some on-site and could blend new planting in with what exists. Cochair Lee reiterated that the Board would like to see the specifications.

Chair Kasper noted that at the site visit they saw what looked like some transmission oil, or oil from a motor and asked if there is a spill response kit on-site. He continued, asking if the boats are washed at the marina. Mr. Rhodes confirmed that they do have a spill kit, and what was seen at the site visit was the non-toxic RV antifreeze that goes into boats in the fall. It is non-toxic and biodegradable and is meant for water systems in RVs and winterizing boats. The spill kit is right inside the door and is fully accessible. He continued saying that they wash boats further up in the parking lot and try to use a product called Power One that is also biodegradable. Ms. Choberka noted that the proposed treatment unit also treats for hydrocarbons. Mr. Durand said that if there was a hot spot with the parking lot, they would take care of it.

Ms. Choberka stated that regard to the combining of the lots, it appears that the proposed plan is just making a larger area non-conforming, which does not really meet the intent of allowing a project that is already nonconforming to be less nonconforming. They will reevaluate since the Applicant is now proposing conservation land to offset the impermeable surface coverage.

Public Hearing – Special Permit/Site Plan Review

Applicant	Eugene & Tracy Franchini	Property:
	1511 Quarry Stone Dr	1417 Thornton Heights Rd
	Elbridge, NY 13060	Skaneateles, NY 13152
		Tax Parcel:057.-01-31.0

Present: Eugene & Tracy Franchini, Applicants; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects,

Mr. Eggleston recapped the recent changes to the site plana and stated that they have pulled back some of the elements of the project. They eliminated the otherwise conforming deck between the house and the lake and raised the building one foot to help with the grading. This will have no negative effects on any of the variances. Mr. Eggleston stated that unfortunately, due to a glitch in the publication, the ZBA was not able to open their public hearing, so they are still waiting for the ZBA to make a determination on the variance. Chair Kasper said that it was good the changes were made as they questioned the deck at the site visit.

Chair Kasper opened the public hearing. There was no one who spoke in favor, opposition or had any other comments. Mr. Eggleston said that letters of support from the neighbors are on file.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Holbein to keep the public hearing open. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

Application Continuance – Special Permit Site Plan Review

Applicant: Stephen & Susan Costalas
2 Mill Road
Malvern, PA 19355

Property:
3143 East Lake Rd
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Parcel:040.-01-29.0

Present: Stephen Costalas, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects,

Mr. Eggleston began stating that they had a landscape contract designer that they have worked with on the project. He had a family medical emergency, which prevented him from completing this sooner, but two landscape plans have been submitted. One is of the area adjacent to the lake, near the cabana, shed, and patio. There will be a grouping of various plants, which are small to medium shrubs, some medium and large shrubs, and some perennials. The perennials are all native species, appropriate for planting along the lake. This will provide some screening and add some color and interest to the area.

In the overall plan, they wanted to clarify which plants exist, and the ones that are proposed. This conflicts with the opinion of Mrs. Bitz, but they just wanted to establish that there are existing plantings adjacent on each side of the house. They will be adding some additional plantings, and he has some scheduled types as it goes up towards the road. The previous owner had removed the majority of mature trees from the property, but the Costalas will now add some meaningful plants to provide appropriate buffers between the two properties. The Costalas have been in conversation with the Curtins, who have had no issues, and appreciate the open communication that they have had with the Costalas on this. There are a number of pines that are along Curtin's property. There was a large tree that came down near the waterfront which had damaged the fence. There was also a large tree that damaged the fence near the road.

The neighbor to the north had concerns about privacy and a sound barrier. Mr. Eggleston said that they have their lakefront area up front as well, so the Costalas would like to provide a reasonable amount of separation. Mr. Costalas said that on the overall site plan, the two circles closer to the road that are colored in green are trees that they put in two years ago. There are 3 evergreen trees along the fence line on the circle closer to the road, as well as 7 green giant trees, so 10 trees in total. When the trees were planted, they were 6 to 8 feet in height. Being almost 3 seasons in, they are higher than that now.

Mr. Costalas continued saying that in the circle, next to the Curtin's, which is closer to the lake, there are 5 evergreen trees, and those were again, 6 to 8 feet when planted. At the lakefront, below the green circle, there is an existing bed that previous owners, the Bright's, had established. He stated that they have maintained that, and Mr. and Mrs. Curtin have requested that they keep it that way and just have it cleaned up. It had been sort of overgrown when they bought the property. On the other side of the property, towards the road, abutting the Bitz's, 7-to-8-foot green giant trees were planted to shield, the Bitz's garage and outbuilding from our property. Again, on the east side of the property, the middle circle is a fully planted bed that was pre-existing from the Brights. Six large rhododendron shrubs were added, which have grown in the last 3 years. This shields the area of their driveway and where the Bitz's have a path from their parking area to the front yard or entrance. Further down towards the lake, four 6-to-8-foot trees were planted almost 3 years ago. After buying the property, they removed all dead shrubs, pruned the healthy ones, and added some new ones. Mr. Costalas stated that when standing on his lawn and looking across towards the Bitz's, the vegetation provides full coverage at this point, and you cannot see through to their yard.

Member Sobolevsky shared a photo and Mr. Eggleston noted that you only see hints of the Bitz's house, and again, it is well vegetated. He said that the rule about planting evergreens is the first year they sleep,

the second year they creep, the third year they leap. Chair Kasper commented that Mrs. Bitz attended a previous meeting and shared her concerns about the noise, especially down by the waterfront. In that area, only short and medium-large shrubs. Mr. Costalas said that on the Bitz's side of the property, they have larger shrubs, and his shrubs would be at least as high, if not higher, than theirs. He added that they are sensitive to the noise as well because the recent patio that the Bitz's installed is in an equivalent spot. There was a gathering of almost 50 people over Labor Day, which is great- that is part of what the property is for, so they are also sensitive to it, and are fully planting.

Mr. Eggleston commented that the other aspect is that the cabana and the shed are actually sunk into the ground and with the cabana being covered, it offers a lot more sound privacy and visual privacy than what the Bitz's have, which is just an open patio. Chair Kasper asked if the Bitz's have any landscaping on their side. Mr. Costalas said that they have some small shrubs on their side of the property. Mr. Eggleston added that they have the ability to add more plantings if they are not satisfied with what the Applicant has done as it is a fairly ambitious plan.

Member Holbein said that he did not see the site. Member Sobolevsky said he was not at the site visit either but pulled up an aerial photo of the site and pointed out that the proposal is very reasonable. The Applicant is being very courteous given that there is more that could be done by the neighbors. Chair Kasper added that with low shrubs down by the water, they are not blocking the view up and down the lake.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Holbein. the Planning Board classified this application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(11) and not subject to further review under SEQRA. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Chair Donald Kasper and seconded by Member Jonathan Holbein, and after a unanimous affirmative vote of the Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board hereby **APPROVES** the Application for minor Special Permit/Site Plan Approval, with the following conditions:

1. That the Special Permit/Site Plan Approval shall expire if the Applicant fails to comply with the conditions stated within 18 months of its issuance or if its time limit expires without renewal.
2. That the Site Plan 1 through 4 dated August 27, 2025, with Planting Plan 1 through 2 dated October 17, 2025, and Narrative dated August 7, 2025, prepared by Robert Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be followed in all respects; and
3. That the Planning Board waives the requirement for special permit findings as the scale of the proposed improvements to a residential property will not have impact on the function of nearby farm operations, or adverse impact to the scenic, natural, and historic character of the Town; and as the Project is not complex requiring findings more applicable to larger projects which include use approvals; and
4. That the Applicant undertake all necessary measures to prevent invasive species entering the watercourse or neighboring properties during construction; and that native species shall be utilized in any landscape improvements; and

5. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application; and
6. That the Applicant establishes an escrow account with the Town of Skaneateles in the amount of \$250 for engineering review; and
7. That \$17,297.21 be submitted to the Town of Skaneateles Land and Development Rights Acquisition Fund; and
8. That an as-built survey for this project is required for the Application, which must be prepared and submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of all phases of the completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Cochair	David Lee	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Present	[Yes]
Member	Mitchell Sobolevsky	Present	[Abstain]

Spetch Plan– Site Plan Review

Applicant: Vincent Lobdell
 21795 County Line Rd
 Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Parcel:051.-01-13.2

Present: Cooper Koehl, RZ Engineering

Ms. Koehl began saying that there is currently an easement through the property for a drainage swale that takes the culvert that comes across Benson Road. The Applicant is proposing a stormwater pond, in place of the drainage easement, to take into account the culvert that comes across the road, the runoff that comes across the property from the south and including the impermeable surface coverage on the property. The Applicant is looking to treat all the stormwater that comes across before it reaches the wetland behind the property.

Chair Kasper commented that this is going to be a big hole in the ground. Ms. Koehl confirmed that it will be on the north side and will be raise with a berm up 2 feet from the existing grade, with a high point which is slightly bigger. The DEC current standard is 25 acres to a drainage pond and with the drainage from across the road and the property in question, the proposed pond exceeds that by a lot. She continued saying that they will hit groundwater when digging the pond so with that and the drainage, they believe that will efficiently and consistently fill the pond. The Applicant is looking to place this pond within a new easement for the site, but it will be a lot larger. Ms. Koehl said that the Applicant has not started work on the easement because they want to ensure that the size of the pond is approved by the Board before starting the work and the legal work for that.

Chair Kasper stated that it is a huge pond and that the owner has three additional lots nearby that were part of this subdivision for this lot. That drainage easement was tying into a stormwater facility farther

down. He asked how the proposal will affect the existing drainage plan for those lots. Ms. Koehl said that the Applicant is not looking to develop those lots at all. He is looking to keep them for himself. This pond will not discharge down into that stormwater pond; it will discharge straight back to the wetland. Chair Kasper asked if the proposal would change what is happening on those lots when if and when they are developed. Chair Kasper shared the original drainage plan for the subdivision and Ms. Koehl said that less water would run along the back of the lots so there potentially could be a smaller pond down the road when it gets designed. Chair Kasper inquired if the water is now directly going into the wetlands with the proposal whether that allowed by the DEC. Ms Koehl said that it eventually discharges into the wetlands. It is the same amount of water; the original swale went right where the barn was built. The drainage plan was designed during the 2008-10-8 manual, or 2005 manual that was done in 2008, so the new manuals definitely more conservative.

Ms. Koehl said that the Applicant wants the pond to be as big as possible with the area they have. He would like to put some kayaks out there. He wants to make it aesthetically pleasing and use it for pleasure which is why the grades closer to the barn are a little bit further apart to allow a little bit of walking access into the pond. The pond will be fenced on the outside of the property, too. Chair Kasper what will be done with the fill excavated while digging the pond. Ms. Koehl said that he is going to distribute it around the property as well. There is a mounded septic in the front yard, and the Applicant talked about flattening that area out a little bit as well. Chair Kasper stated that with the amount of fill that will come out of this, the Board needs to know how it will be utilized and where and how it will or will not affect the drainage pattern.

Counsel Molnar stated that from what he has heard of the description of the proposal, it is not going to entirely eliminate a drainage easement. It is going to replace it in lieu of the swale in this location. More likely than not, they will need to amend the existing easement so that it captures this but remains in place for the benefit of the other lots. He inquired if the drainage easement from last year's approval had been recorded. Ms. Choberka said that John Camp had reviewed the plan, and he does not anticipate any adverse downstream impact from the construction of the pond, both hydrological and hydraulic. Counsel Molnar stated that in the Planning Board resolution from July of 2024, it required that the Applicant submit a proposed drainage easement for review and approval to the Planning Board Chair and Planning Board Attorney. Upon approval, the drainage easement shall be executed and reported. He did not recall that happened. Ms. Choberka stated that she thinks it is worthwhile to provide documentation in consideration of how it impacts what was initially amended. It would be helpful for the Board to have on record, just if and when those other lots are developed, it is not a scrambling of what has occurred- An amendment to that SWPPP that was originally done, stating what modification had occurred. Town Planner Barkdull clarified that they have a drainage district, but we do not have a specific drainage easement on this property.

Chair Kasper asked if they do the change, it would still be in the district, and would they need an easement? Counsel Molnar commented that as he understands it, if the water travels north, the drainage easement was draining this property onto those other lots, and if this property is not going to be draining onto those other lots, you could arguably dispense with a drainage easement because of this structure and that it is still in a drainage district. The requirement for an easement, which benefits this lot and burdens those other lots that are not developed. This is the third time the Town has requested the easement because this water is going to burden those properties, one way or the other, slow, or minimally, the proposed pond is no longer within the easement, but there is going to be the easement that remains to the north lots of the approved subdivision on it, and there is no easement on it. If in the

future the Planning Board in 10 years would be scratching our head what to do with this portion of the easement will be removed, but it will stay and continues onto this property.

The Applicant could abandon those three lots and go back to one large parcel where an easement would not need to be required. The Applicant may want to sell the lots in the future but if he thinks he is never going to do anything, he could merge them back to one large parcel. Ms. Koehl stated that she will discuss the options with the Applicant.

Sketch Plan –Site Plan Review

Applicant:	Matthew Iak	Property:
	Jacqueline Jayson	3133 East Lake Rd
	1025 Hatch Ct	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Southlake, TX 76092	Tax Parcel:040.-01-31.0

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects,

Mr. Eggleston began saying that the new owners of the property would just like to do a few little cleanup items on it. There was a set of stairs that had been approved in the prior application, from the house deck, down towards the lawn which is symmetrical on axis with everything. They would like to put a hot tub up on the deck, of which part of it will be new area, part of it will be rebuilding the existing and set down in so it is only 18 inches above the deck and does not block the view. There are currently chairs in front of the shed/boathouse down by the lake. They would like to put a 12x16 foot deck area, so they do not have to move the chairs when they mow the lawn. They have been using a temporary dock that they would like to replace with a permanent dock, and it is fairly typical of what you have seen that is 60 feet out and 16 feet at the expanded area on the end to give it a little more stability and room to maneuver as people coming and going off the boats.

Chair Kasper commented that the plan reflects cutting a little bit of the driveway out to make up 49 square feet. Mr. Eggleston said that they are still under the total impermeable surface coverage of 13.9% that was approved in 2011. The Board determined that a site visit was not warranted as they have been to the property multiple times and the proposal is for small changes to the property. Cochair Lee said that he is familiar with the property and asked if the property had been re-surveyed. Mr. Eggleston replied that it was re-surveyed in 2025. Cochair Lee said that the driveway had taken the project right up to the maximum impervious coverage when the job was done, and there was pressure to expand it, and I wanted to know what happened. Chair Kasper asked the width of the driveway and Mr. Eggleston said that is has been reduced down to 10 feet, making it uniform all the way up.

Chair Kasper inquired about the existing stairs and if they are open stairs, and Mr. Eggleston said that they are open permeable wooden stairs. Right now, in order to get down to the lawn, they have to come around either side, and they wanted to have stairs that come down, and with the design of the house, they wanted to make a grand gesture.

Chair Kasper asked where the deck will be located and over what surface. Mr. Eggleston explained that the deck is over a shaded area where they have some trees. They put lawn furniture on the ground and there is a tree there. They wanted to make it a deck so that they do minimal disruption of the root system of the tree. The area will be permeable surface with the deck located over the existing permeable stone. The sidewalk will be removed. There are actual stone steps that go down to the dock that will stay.

Cochair Lee asked what the water depth will be at the end of the 60-foot dock. Mr. Eggleston said that it will be 7 feet of water from high water and 9 feet from the deck surface. That gives 3 feet of difference between high and low level, 4 feet of water during low water. Chair Kasper commented that the shore is rocky there and Mr. Eggleston added that it is quite well stabilized with the rocks that are there. Additional rocks will not need to be added.

WHEREAS, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Holbein, the Planning Board classified this application a Type II action pursuant to 6 NYCRR617.5(c)(11) and not subject to further review under SEQRA. The Board having been polled resulted in the affirmance of said motion

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, upon a motion made by Chair Donald Kasper and seconded by Member Mitchell Sobolevsky, and after a unanimous affirmative vote of the Members present, as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board hereby **APPROVES** the Application for minor Site Plan Approval, with the following conditions:

1. That the Site Plan Approval shall expire if the Applicant fails to comply with the conditions stated within 18 months of its issuance or if its time limit expires without renewal.
2. That the Site Plan 1 through 2 dated October 1, 2025, and Narrative dated October 1, 2025, prepared by Robert Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be followed in all respects; and
3. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or the Application; and
4. That an as-built survey for this project is required for the Application, which must be prepared and submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of all phases of the completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

RECORD OF VOTE

Chair	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Cochair	David Lee	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jonathan Holbein	Present	[Yes]
Member	Mitchell Sobolevsky	Present	[Yes]

Sketch Plan –Site Plan Review

Applicant: Patrick Fall
Louise Clooney
1135 Rydal Rd
Rydal, PA 19046

Property:
2346 Thornton Grove N.
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Parcel:056.-03-16.2

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects,

Mr. Eggleston stated that the Applicants have an existing set of shoreline structures. There are some questions about whether the existing is a deck or a dock. It has an existing wood structure on steel supports and Sono tubes that is over water, and whether it is a deck or a dock, is the question. There is an existing concrete dock that extends into the water, which is low to the water. There is a steel seawall that was put in a number of years ago by the previous owner. What they wanted to do is get a little more area down by the lake, which they are allowed, and the question was, if it is over water, is it dock, and if it over land, is it deck, as it is about 3 feet above the high water. There were some questions when we had the pre-application meeting, and Mr. Eggleston requested Paul Oszewski get them more exact contours and heights of all the various elements, but he would be interested in the Board's initial thoughts and comments. In the past, boardwalks that run along the property line were frowned upon.

Chair Kasper commented that the docks are supposed to be perpendicular going out into the water. The Board does not want all the waterfront, even though they have a lot of waterfront, full of structures along the water's edge. He asked if the dock will be high up and Mr. Eggleston said that it was going to be set on top of the seawall about 5 feet of level space on the seawall before the incline of the bank. Basically 5 feet of deck, which is allowed, and it is within their 800 square feet of onshore structures that they are allowed for their 200 feet of frontage. The Applicant wanted to make it a little more useful by extending it out, so a dock could be 8 feet wide, and they were only going 7 feet. Chair Kasper said that the issue is they have 50 feet of new dock here and he does not know how high this deck is, and then you also have the dock. You have the concrete and then you also have the mile-high deck above that. Mr. Eggleston said that this is not unlike the McCaffrey application. Of course, they were rebuilding something that already existed, and just making it deeper into the land area. So it is not unique in that respect. Chair Kasper inquired what the shoreline structures add up to, and Mr. Eggleston replied their onshore structures would be 481 square feet where 800 is allowed, and their offshore structures would be 637 square feet where 1000 square feet is allowed, so they are well under.

Mr. Eggleston suggested that he get additional topography and maybe see if they can refine anything. Chair Kasper said if it can be shortened and maybe pushed back onto land a little bit more, and get a bigger condensed platform. A site visit will be conducted on November 8, 2025 beginning at 9 am.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Chair Kasper and seconded by Member Sobolevsky to adjourn the meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion. The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 8:04 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimie Case, Clerk

Additional Meeting Attendees:

Robert Eggleston	Joe Durand	Tom Trytek
John Cerundolo	JC Cherundolo	Eugene Franchini
John Rhoades	Cooper Koehl	

Additional Meeting Attendees (Zoom):

Mark Tucker	David Lee	Stephen Costalas
-------------	-----------	------------------