

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES  
December 20, 2016**

Mark J. Tucker, Chairman  
Joseph Southern  
Donald Kasper  
Scott Winkelman  
Douglas Hamlin  
Scott Molnar, Legal Counsel  
John Camp, P.E. (C&S Engineers)  
Karen Barkdull, Clerk/Secretary

Chairman Tucker opened the meeting at 7:30 p.m. The meeting minutes of November 15, 2016 were previously distributed to the Board and all Members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

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

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Mark J. Tucker	[Yes]
Member	Joseph Southern	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	[Yes]

**Public Hearing Continuance-Subdivision/Lot Line Adjustment**

Applicant:

Russel Zechman  
PO Box 9  
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Property:  
3741 Fisher Rd  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #033.-04-14.0 & 12.0**

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect; Peter Simpson, RZ Engineering

There were a number of questions regarding the drainage plans for the proposed subdivision, and Mr. Eggleston had submitted revised drainage plans based on the most recent site visit. Mr. Camp had provided comments to the plan and additional revisions have been made. The land is wet on northern boundary of the property and the neighbors' properties located to the north. On the north side of the property is a pond that was created by Mr. Trabold when he had purchased the property. The pond collects and holds water that seeps along to the northwest.

The proposal is to take the water from the building site rather than direct it to the existing north pond. In connection with the designed septic systems for lots B1 and B2 that have required curtain drains, that will catch any ground and surface water from the building area as well, it will

be directed to the ditch that will be created along the north side of the driveway. The surface water and subsurface water will be caught from lots B1 and B2 and drain into the ditch along the driveway that will eventually drain into the steeper slope area to the west and safely away from the residential areas. One of the suggestions was for the relocation of the hammerhead to the south side of the driveway that will allow the open ditch to maintain. Also, lot B3 will have a culvert for the driveway and the drainage will flow into the ditch that will lead west and away from the northern neighbors.

The proposed six-inch waterline with a hydrant at the end will end at the most westerly point of lot B2, which will allow an acceptable distance for fire protection for lot B3. The waterline will have an easement and be dedicated to the Town. The applicant will be petitioning the Town Board for the water line extension for the subdivision.

Member Kasper inquired where the drainage that will be focused west would eventually go. Mr. Eggleston commented that it would go down the hill towards the pond on the Bird's Nest property and then cross New Seneca Turnpike at the bottom of the hill. Member Kasper inquired if the proposed water line would end at the hydrant. Mr. Eggleston stated yes, and from the end of the waterline, lot B3 would install their private line. He continued stating that you are not allowed to have a shared private water line, that the shared line must be a public line.

Member Southern inquired on the depth of the proposed drainage ditch. Mr. Eggleston commented that it would be constructed at a 3/12 pitch, 3-4 feet wide and one foot deep. The hammerhead will be located to the south of the proposed driveway on lot B, will drain into the existing southern pond and there will be culverts for the driveways to the individual lots. Member Kasper inquired about the drainage to the existing ponds. Mr. Eggleston stated that the south pond drains to the southeast and the southeast pond drains to the ditch. Member Winkelman stated that with the new drainage design, the ground water would not be directed to the northern pond and the pond will be isolated so that it would not spill more from the new development. Mr. Camp commented that it already had a small watershed. Member Kasper inquired about the two proposed lots on the north side, if the grade will be designed towards the proposed driveway. Mr. Eggleston confirmed that the lots would be graded towards the driveway.

Member Winkelman commented that it is flat and that it would be easy to pitch it towards the driveway. He continued stating that the Board walked the whole north boundary line and the water does want to drain to the north. Those lots to the north of the applicant's property are lower in elevation and some of them are prone to being wet. They are slippery soils, the Board walked all of the way down to behind Mr. Brown's house, and the water kept going to the west. The Board walked the area extensively for the second time and found no water or signs of any excess water in the northeast corner. The corner seems like a high spot that may puddle in a storm. Member Winkelman inquired if there will be erosion control in place during the construction sequence including silt fences. Mr. Eggleston stated that the erosion control plans are included in the submitted plans that will utilize silt fences along the south side of the driveway, below the leach fields and below the houses when constructed.

Member Winkelman inquired about the location of the soils removed during construction. Mr. Eggleston stated that many of the soils have been depleted off the area when the runway was installed. The area where the old hammerhead was will be a stockpile location. Chairman Tucker commented that some of the soils would be removed for the construction of the foundations of the dwellings. Mr. Eggleston commented that the soils might be used to build up

the grade around the houses Member Kasper recommended that sump pumps be tied into the drainage swales. Mr. Eggleston stated that any roof drains would be directed to the road ditch. Member Southern commented that the curtain drains are only three feet deep and he has noticed that they are not as successful after five years of use. Mr. Simpson commented that if they are lined with filter fabric they work more efficiently and that their detail plans call for the use of the filter fabric. Member Southern stated that he has a concern of drainage coming through the crushed stone and Mr. Simpson stated that they are not as effective for silt. Mr. Eggleston commented that typically the filter fabric is placed with topsoil on top of it. Member Southern inquired if the runoff to the curtain drain will flow over lawn. Mr. Eggleston confirmed that it would run across the lawn once it is established.

Member Kasper stated that at the public hearing last month, there were concerns raised regarding water pressure, and inquired if any further research has been completed. Mr. Eggleston stated that there is a letter from Allan Wellington stating that he has no problems with the addition of the three new dwellings to the water district and that there was adequate pressure. Member Southern inquired what his assumption was built on. Mr. Eggleston stated that his correspondence dated October 6, 2016 was connected to an analysis from C&S dated July 1, 2014. Mr. Camp stated that they are planning to do a hydrant test tomorrow for Skaneateles Springs, where they will be taking pressure readings in Manor Heights and Windward Estates. Member Southern inquired if the testing for Skaneateles Springs will affect the pressure on Fisher Road. Mr. Camp stated that when you open a hydrant for testing at the Bird's Nest, it would affect the water pressure on the east side. Member Kasper inquired on the location of the water line and district boundaries. Mr. Eggleston stated that it comes up Route 20 then goes up Fisher Road and back along New Seneca Turnpike. Member Kasper stated that although C&S had modeling of the system, it is based on perfect conditions. Mr. Camp clarified that the computer model represents the actual conditions with some of the pipes as new and some that are older that may be scaled. The reason for the test tomorrow is to verify the model to existing conditions. As The Town Board is reviewing, the application for extension there will be discussions as that is a Town Board concern also. Chairman Tucker stated that the water line also feeds the Richard's farm at the bottom of the hill.

Chairman Tucker asked for clarification of the red lines on the site plan. Mr. Eggleston stated that the northern red line is the property line and the 30-foot easement line for the common driveway. It is the southern property line between the Zechman property and the Buff property. The 30 foot easement consists for 15 feet on Lot A and 15 feet on lot B.

Chairman Tucker commented that there is another driveway off the common driveway, making it the fifth access point, and inquired if a barricade could be placed there to limit the common driveway to four dwellings. Mr. Eggleston stated that there are four dwellings on the driveway and that Mr. Zechman has his own driveway off Fisher Road that is being connected to his garage on the north side of the dwelling. He continued stating that the applicant can put a fence there if the Board's request, so there is no access to the Zechman dwelling off the common driveway. Mr. Zechman stated that he uses it for his mowers and could put up a picket fence there.

Chairman Tucker requested that Mr. Camp discuss his concerns with the drainage plans. Mr. Camp stated that his comment regarding the pond and two culverts has been addressed with the revised plan. Mr. Camp stated that one of his concerns is regarding the pipe at the bottom of the curtain drain could be daylighted into one of the ditches, which is a relatively easy thing to accomplish. He continued reading his statement in the email that. "While it is reasonable to

expect that the project will not have an adverse effect on the neighbor's drainage situation (it may even make the situation slightly better), the neighbors may still experience drainage issues after the project is completed. Many of those homes are constructed in low areas on poorly draining soils." Member Kasper stated that houses on B1 and B2 will have culverts in the ditch for their driveways, and often the ditches are filled in because they are hard to mow. Mr. Eggleston stated that the proposed ditch would be mow-able. Mr. Camp commented that if the ditch is constructed from scratch they could be design to be wide and mellow. Mr. Simpson stated that a lot of fill would need to be required to fill them up.

Member Winkelman inquired what the management goals are for the conservation lot. Mr. Eggleston stated that the conservation lot would be owned by one of the four lot owners in the subdivision. This is the same arrangement that was done with the Maher open space subdivision with the conservation lot owner by one of the lot owners. There will be a restrictive covenant on it that will be consistent with section 148-9H of the Town code. Member Winkelman commented that the conservation value was rated as high conservation value, and it should be as it is contiguous to the undeveloped fields, farmland and ponds to the west. He continued stating that it is very important to be contiguous to the existing woodlands.

Chairman Tucker inquired if the Town or Mr. Camp had received any copies of the test results that the Nicholsons had done. Member Southern commented that they had concerns about the water pressure in the area. There was no information that had been forwarded to the Town or Mr. Camp's office from the Nicholsons. Member Southern stated that it would be good if C&S could check the water pressure in this area when they are doing their tests tomorrow. Member Kasper inquired if a test of the pressure could be done in this neighborhood in conjunction with the Bird's Nest. Test. Mr. Camp stated that they could also take care of the measurement here as well.

At this time, Chairman Tucker opened the Public Hearing and asked if there was anyone in favor of the project. No one spoke in favor of the project. Chairman Tucker asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition, or had any other comments.

Bill Whipple, 1642 New Seneca Tpke: I am still concerned about the drainage at the back of the property and the pond. Could that be further explained to us.

Mr. Eggleston: Right now, the water comes off the Zechman property and goes into the pond. What we are going to do is put a curtain drain that will pick up any water coming down, stop it and send it to the ditch. Any water coming down on this lot will go to the curtain drain and directed to the ditch. The ditch will take water off the road, and will bring it around to this ditch, which will go to the undeveloped land. We are taking this amount of watershed off the north pond and any water off the road is not going into the pond, with the north pond having less water feeding into it. That was a big improvement made based on the public comments and the last site visit.

Chairman Tucker: At the site visit, we were looking on how to move the water away from the pond.

Member Winkelman: The pond has no outlet and is poorly constructed. Without getting into the engineering and taking the drainage across your properties, we decided to isolate the pond so it would not get anymore stormwater or rain from the new development.

Chairman Tucker: We also looked at the ditches near your properties and where it went under the road by Cards. It appeared to be flat and not have great drainage going to the north. It did not look like there is a lot of good drainage there and it might back up sometimes.

Mr. Whipple: When was the percolation test done.

Mr. Eggleston: It was done in September, I believe. It was after the dry period.

Mr. Whipple: Is another percolation test going to be done.

Mr. Eggleston: I believe the County has several comments and they have gone back and forth with the engineer, and I believe the final comments have been addressed by the engineer to the County Health Department. The County Health Department is satisfied with the information they have.

Mr. Zechman: B3 percolation test was done by Billy Miles only a month ago. The other ones were done about six weeks before.

Chairman Tucker: We went out and did a site visit and walked all of your properties; we noticed it is quite damp along the backside of your properties. I think this will help it, hopefully. It may not be something you want in your back yard but it is allowed with our current zoning.

Robin Delaney, 1638 New Seneca Tpke: Why can't the pond be filled back in. It was created with a permit.

Mr. Camp: My guess as I have not been part of any soil testing, would be if you filled in that pond the water is still going to be in the soil. You folks have seen the pond fill up and overflow, through the overland outlet, but if that pond wasn't there, the same amount of water would still be getting there with any rain or snowfall event under current conditions, even if the pond was filled in.

Robin Delaney: We didn't have that problem before the pond was built.

Mr. Camp: It is pretty obvious to me that there is a lot of water in the soil.

Robin Delaney: We didn't have that problem until that pond was built.

Member Winkelman: What year was it built.

Robin Delaney: It was in 2006.

Mr. Camp: That was a relatively short record from a drainage perspective. The reason that there is water in that pond is that there is water in the soil. There is not a lot of surface water that drains into that pond. If you fill in that pond, the water is going to still be there in the soil.

Member Southern: Could you put in a swale.

Mr. Eggleston: The problem is that if you put in a swale along the north property line, it would be too low to be able to get over the hump of the gas easement. We couldn't bring a swale over or drain the pond, as you have to get over the hump of the gas lines.

Chairman Tucker: It is too high, that is why the ditch has been moved to the south and then west.

Member Kasper: Couldn't you go underneath the gas line.

Chairman Tucker: I would like to hear about the water test before moving forward on the application.

Mr. Camp: The applicant has least a couple of months work with the Town Board to get permission to put the water line in the way they have it proposed. It is in an existing district and it would be difficult for the Town to say no to that, but if the Town did say no to that then the plan would look different. To me it makes sense to hold on any kind of consideration for resolution at this point.

Counsel Molnar: Holding the public hearing open can be done.

Member Hamlin: Given that we are holding it open in large part for the water test, is the testing tomorrow enough to give us enough information for this project.

Mr. Camp: In addition to that, there is still a lengthy process that applicant has to go through the Town Board to extend the water line, we should have good information from the test tomorrow. To me, the Planning Board process is not finished until the Town Board process is complete.

Counsel Molnar: The extension would be to include the C&S test and results as well as the Town's reaction to the petition before it for the water line extension.

Mr. Eggleston: Dave Loftus is supposed to be starting the process.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Southern to continue the public hearing on January 17, 2017 at 7:30 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

**Continued Review-Major Special Permit/Site Plan Review/Lot Line Adjustment**

Applicant	Skaneateles Springs Corporation.	Property:
	Rick & Debbie Moscarito	1601 East Genesee St
	120 Madison St	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Chittenango, NY 13037	<b>Tax Map #032.-03-17.1 &amp; 032.-03-17.2</b>

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect; Peter Simpson, RZ Engineering;

At the last month's meeting, engineering plans were submitted and Mr. Camp has provided comments based on his review of the plans. RZ Engineering has responded to the comments and a letter was submitted to the Board. A lighting plan prepared by David Cunningham, was submitted detailing the lighting layout for the proposal, including catalog cuts of the lighting fixtures. The plan indicates the foot-candles in each location. Mr. Camp had discovered light spillover onto the Loftus building and by the road of more than .5-foot candle that will be corrected. Member Southern inquired if the lighting has full cutoff sensors. Mr. Camp stated that they did. Mr. Eggleston stated that the lighting is night sky compliant and all LED fixtures.

All of the pole lights are no higher than 20 feet for the parking lot areas, the poles are 12 feet in height back along the drive to the individual cottages, and there will be bollard lighting along the nature trails where there would be a short cut from the cottages to the main lodge. The nature trails along the perimeter will not be lighted. Chairman Tucker commented that the photometric measurements will need to be verified. Member Winkelman inquired what the view would be from the road at night. Mr. Eggleston commented that there will be landscaping that will influence the view of the lighting from the street. Chairman Tucker inquired about the design of the light fixtures. Mr. Eggleston stated that the lights will be flush with the lamp trim and the bottom of the fixture left open to provide proper control of the light. If the bottom were lensed then the light would go horizontally.

Mr. Simpson reviewed the comments and responses to Mr. Camp's letter:

1. If the intent is to merge the two depicted properties, this should be shown on the plan.  
*RZE Response: The intention is and has been to merge the two lots. It is my understanding that this is highlighted within the narrative by Bob Eggleston's office, however will be included within future submissions.*

2. If grading is required at the northern corner of the "Annex" building, it should be shown. If grading is required, it may affect the elevations of the proposed storm sewer. It is noted that grading may not be required, depending on the type of building construction and the type of apparent external walking surfaces to the rear of the building (decks or patios).

*RZE Response: No changes in grade are anticipated as shown on the grading plans. The 2 patio areas on the northwestern end of the "Annex" are intended to be raised porches on piers or slabs depending on existing grades.*

3. Regarding the proposed footpaths:

a. Construction details should be provided for each type of path.

*RZE Response: The permeable footpaths detail shall be provided the next submission. These paths shall be mulched paths, 5 ft width and generally include filter fabric, buried under a layer of mulch, stretched between natural downed tree trunks. These paths shall be arranged so as to minimize grading and avoid any existing trees, so as to minimize any clearing.*

Chairman Tucker commented that the proposed is similar to what was installed for the Butters Farm walking path. Member Kasper commented that it would be more natural and follow the contour lines. Mr. Simpson stated that when they are installing it they will make sure that the pathway follows the grade to reduce any changes there.

b. If grading is required for any of the paths, it should be shown. If no major grading is required, a detail should be sufficient.

*RZE Response: It is anticipated that no major grading shall take place however the permeable footpath detail shall be provided within the following submission.*

c. Any proposed footbridges, boardwalks, or culverts should be shown on the plan.

*RZE Response: Proposed boardwalks are limited in crossing the wetland areas and shall be detailed within the following submission.*

Chairman Tucker commented that there were wet areas when the Board walked the area. Member Kasper inquired if the boardwalk would be similar to Beaver Lakes. Mr. Simpson affirmed that it would be constructed similarly. Mr. Eggleston stated that it will allow water to flow underneath it. Mr. Eggleston continued stating that there will be a path that will lead to a dock that would extend 20 feet or so into the wetland pond.

d. The arrangement of the path along NYS Route 20 should be discussed including maintenance responsibilities, easements, construction materials, treatments at termination, ADA requirements, and other characteristics related to the fact that this path could be the first of its kind in this area. Snow removal techniques may affect design parameters, including both the width and cross-section.

*RZE Response: The details for the path/sidewalk along NYS Rte 20 will be consistent proposed Eastern Gateway master plan. They are anticipated at 5 ft wide concrete sidewalks meeting ADA requirements and will be placed within an easement along Rte 20 and extend from property line to property line. Snow removal will likely be the responsibility of the owner and will commence once other properties on east and west connect to this proposed sidewalk.*

Mr. Simpson stated that the sidewalk would be outside of the State right-of-way and that snow removal would be the responsibility of the property owner. Mr. Eggleston commented that there is an Eastern Gateway committee that is reviewing what improvements they would like to see and have defined the eastern gateway from the Village limits to the Skan-Ellus property. Chairman Tucker clarified that the committee has limited their review to just the HC district along Route 20. Mr. Camp stated that one of the reasons he continues the discussion on this is that there has not been a lot of direction on how this will be handled. If the sidewalks are viewed as public sidewalks the responsibilities should be identified for construction standards and maintenance including snow removal. Who will maintain and what equipment is used to plow will influence the width of potential sidewalks. The chicane by the driveway could be problematic with plowing. Member Winkelman stated that he sees it as more of an extension of this property in particular for the guests to get to Skan-Ellus, and that it doesn't necessarily need to be plowed in the winter. Mr. Camp stated that if the sidewalk would be connected in the future, then planning the sidewalks to the correct specifications is worth looking at now. Mr. Eggleston stated that in the Village it is the property owner's responsibility to clear the sidewalks and that as an accommodation, the Village goes through and plows it with their small five-foot wide plow.

4. The clearing limit line is not realistically shown in several areas:

a. In the vicinity of cottages 11, 12, and 13.

b; The driveway near the cottages 11 and 12.

c. The proposed grading to the rear of cottages 8 and 9.

*RZE Response: The next submission will address the construct limit line and grading, however, minimal grading within the buffer is anticipated. This contract limit line was shown attempting to respect the current wetland buffer/ and provide minimal disturbance within the buffer. Coordination with the DEC is anticipated for interaction with the buffer.*

Mr. Camp stated that the intent of that comment is that in a couple of areas such as cabin 12 that is being abutted by the wetland buffer line on both sides. It is not realistic to build it that way. Mr. Simpson stated that the cabins may need to be shifted a little bit and as we work through that area we will work with the DEC and the Town to ferret out those concerns.

5. Regarding the construction sequence and phasing:

a. Phasing delineations should be shown on the plans.

b. Both the topsoil stockpile location and the construction staging area should be shown on the plan.

c. A more detailed construction sequence should be prepared. This construction sequence should reference the proposed phasing and should identify the individual project elements, including the septic system, the parking lot, the entrance reconfiguration, the individual buildings, etc.

d. It is recommended that the Planning Board and the application discuss the schedule for construction of the individual cottages relative to the recently adopted abandonment law.

*RZE Response: Soil stockpiles/Staging has been added on the southeastern end of the property within a generally flat area of the property and are to be included on future revised plan submission. Construction sequencing is currently highlighted within the provided SWPPP document included with the project, and there are construction sequencing notes provided on the Erosion Control Drawing C-4. Additional detail if necessary for clarification shall be provided on subsequent submission. The recently adopted abandonment law only relates to projects that are not approved. Typically the schedule is part of multiphase projects when they are approved.*

Chairman Tucker commented that it looks like you will get into more detail as the process continues. Mr. Eggleston stated that the SWPPP provides that detail that you are not seeing on the plan. Mr. Simpson stated that the SWPPP provides all of the detail and the plans could be modified; however, the SWPPP document show the details. Mr. Eggleston clarified that the abandonment law only applies to unapproved projects that are under review where the applicant has not come back for a period of time. Once the project is approved the abandonment law has no bearing on the project. There will be phasing in the project, although it has not been determined at this time which phase will occur first.

6. Regarding the drainage design and drainage calculations:

a. We recommend that roof runoff be directed to the storm sewer wherever possible.

*RZE Response: It is intended that the Cottage Roof runoff shall be disconnected and any roof downspouts shall have roof drain splash pads as detailed on page C-6. Grass buffers/100 ft wetland buffers shall provide treatment as detailed within Chapter 5 of the NYSDEC Stormwater Manual for Runoff Reduction/green practice measures and shall eventually be discharged into the pond. With the Annex/Amenities building, it was our intent to connect to the nearest storm structure with downspouts and provide treatment for WQW within the Stormwater BMPs.*

b. Care should be taken not to block the existing drainage way from the “Skan-Ellus” property.

*RZE Response: Ok.*

c. The size and orientation of the orifice in the proposed pond outlet structure should be clarified. i. The detail on the sheet C-6 shows a 3-inch by 12-inch rectangle while the stormwater model ;uses a 4-inch by 12-inch rectangle.

*RZE Response: This detail shall be revised within the submission to reflect the 4-inch wide by 12-inche tall rectangle as shown within the stormwater calculations. All details/plans shall be updated accordingly to avoid confusion.*

ii. Depending on the actual height of the proposed orifice, the constructability of the structure may be an issued given the relatively short vertical distance between the orifice's invert and the rim.

*RZE Response: The rim elevation shall be adjusted accordingly.*

iii. The stormwater model output shows a 4-inch wide by 12-inch wide tall rectangle while the detail on sheet C-6 appears to show the opposite orientation.

*RZE Response: See the response above.*

Mr. Camp asked for clarification on how the stormwater would be directed from the cottages to the pond. Mr. Simpson stated that they would drain to the existing pond with the wetland area being the outlet point. Mr. Camp stated that the calculations reflect that all stormwater will be directed to the new pond. Mr. Simpson stated that they were conservative in their calculations. Mr. Eggleston commented that the pond is large enough to take all of the calculations. Mr. Simpson stated that the roof drains won't go to the pond because they are designed with rooftop disconnection to use green infrastructure to treat those areas, however our calculations are more conservative to show that the pond will be built to handle the stormwater runoff from the roofs as if they were not disconnected. Mr. Camp inquired if any of the rooftops will be directed to the pond. Mr. Simpson stated that none of the cottage rooftops will be directed to the pond, however, the annex building and amenities building will be directed to the pond. Mr. Camp inquired how the annex and main building rooftops will be connected to the nearest stormwater structure then into the pond. Mr. Eggleston stated that there is a storm structure behind the buildings. Mr. Camp stated that there is also one behind the cottages. Mr. Simpson stated that everything could be connected to the nearest storm structure if the Board requests it. Mr. Camp stated that generally speaking according to the State DEC stormwater manual, you catch the runoff from the site and direct it to your treatment site. Mr. Simpson stated that provisions are provided to do that, however, green infrastructure encourages another way to provide measures to be able to take some of the items off-line and treat them in more of a green and natural way. We are proposing to use the buffer around the cottages as a way to treat stormwater in a green manner. Mr. Camp stated that it will be dumped on the ground and not treated at all. Mr. Simpson stated that maybe it could be a level spreader or they could drain into pea gravel diaphragm that filled up. Mr. Camp stated that it will be something that will need to be discussed further as the project moves forward.

7. As per Town Code Section 148-18, proposed lighting levels must be less than or equal to 0.5 footcandles at the property boundary. There are two general areas where this is not the case: a, the driveway connection at Route 20; b. The wester property boundary in the vicinity of the existing office building. Both of these areas are sensitive: the road for traffic safety reasons and the existing office building due to its close proximity to the property boundary. We recommend that the lighting levels be reduced at these locations.

*RZE Response: the lighting and photometrics shall be revised as requested for future resubmission.*

8. Regarding the proposed water system:

a. C&S performed an analysis using the existing computer model of the entire water system. This analysis showed that the expected fire flow needed by the proposed project will not result in a noticeable change to existing water service.

b. It is our understanding that the proposed project will not contain any private hydrants connected to the public system and that the fire suppression system will not contain any chemicals. If this is correct, a double-check valve protection systems may be appropriate, pending review by the Department of Health.

- c. The water meter should be provided in close proximity to the connection to the water main. Final location should be coordinated with the Town Department of Public Works.
- d. If the Department of Health requires two water services, two meters should be provided.
- e. The Onondaga County Department of Health has asked if there are any point in the municipal system below minimum pressures under fire flow conditions. C&S has been working with the existing water system model to provide an answer to this question. C&S has also been coordinating with the Village to ensure that the recent and planning improvements are considered. In order to provide the most accurate answer, C&S and the Town will conduct an additional field test. This field test has been tentatively scheduled for December 21<sup>st</sup>.

*RZE Response: Ok, these comments regarding the water and connection have been noted. Water shall be coordinated with the project MEP, Town DPW/Engineer and DOH for resubmission.*

Mr. Camp commented that the computer model is showing that it is right on the edge of working/not working and there are a lot of things in play. There are some piping improvements that have been made and some that will occur in the spring in the Village, and then there was a bit of a discrepancy at the end of the Town's fire test, and that will be checked in the field with a different measuring device.

Member Hamlin inquired if any of the cottages will be ADA compliant. Mr. Eggleston stated that they have a percentage of the cottages that will be made ADA compliant as per State regulations. There will also be ADA compliant rooms in the annex building.

Mr. Eggleston inquired if the Planning Board will be scheduling the public information meeting next month and if there is any additional information needed for SEQR review. Counsel Molnar stated that the SEQR does not need to be completed prior to a public information meeting. The information meeting will help to build a record upon which the SEQR could be done. Mr. Camp inquired if any more interaction has happened with the OCDOH. Mr. Simpson stated that the OCDOH is still in the review process and may be holding their final review until the water information is available. Mr. Eggleston stated that the Board has done a dry run of the SEQR in the past and inquired if that would be the case with this application. Chairman Tucker stated that there is still information that the Board is waiting for including the final phasing of the project. Counsel Molnar stated that after the informational meeting and after the C&S water testing, would perhaps be a time to schedule a workshop to do a dry run SEQR in advance of doing the forma review at a meeting.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Southern to schedule a public information meeting on January 17, 2017 at 7:45 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

Chairman Tucker recused himself as he is a neighbor and farms a portion of the land on the Ditch lot and Mr. Ditch's well is on his property.

**Sketch Plan-Lot Line Adjustment**

Applicant      Mark Ditch  
                    2762/2752 Rickard Road  
                    Skaneateles, NY 13152  
                    **Tax Map #036.-02-04.2 & 036.-02-04.3**

Present: Mark Ditch, Applicant; Thomas Flanagan, Applicant;

Mr. Ditch stated that about twenty years ago he had subdivided his property to create the lot for Mr. Flanagan. Mr. Flanagan would like more room on the north side of his lot line, and they would like to make a lot line adjustment. The northern Flanagan lot line would move 120 feet further north and would be approximately 1 acre. Vice Chair Southern inquired about the impermeable surface coverage. Member Winkelman commented that the only lot that would matter for impermeable surface coverage would be the Ditch lot. Mr. Ditch stated that the impermeable surface coverage would be at 2.68%. With the lot line adjustment the Flanagan lot would become a conforming two acre lot. Member Kasper inquired on the location of Mark's property. Mr. Winkelman stated that Mark's property is north of this property. The application has been submitted to the Onondaga County Planning Board and the application will be continued at the January 17, 2017 meeting.

Chairman Tucker returned to the Board

**Amendment-Special Permit/Site Plan Review**

Applicant	Pat Carberry	Property:
	Kelly Engle	4361 Jordan Road
	112 Tyler Dir.	Skaneateles, NY 13152
	Auburn, NY 13021	<b>Tax Map #023.-01-13.1</b>

Present: Pat Carberry, Applicant

Ms. Carberry stated that she would like to put a yoga fitness center in the two story stone building that is on the east side of the lot. Chairman Tucker commented that it is already being rented to Gazella Fitness. Ms. Carberry stated that she was advised by realtors that she could put a business in the building because it is a commercial business building already. Member Winkelman inquired about the parking for the new use as the space was a former office. Ms. Carberry stated that Gazella Fitness will conduct their classes at 6 am – 10 am, and a 6 pm yoga class Monday through Thursday when there is no one else there at that time. The lease agreement with Gazella Fitness states that there can be no classes the same time an event is being held in the event center. Maximum occupancy for the classes is about ten people.

Member Winkelman inquired where the parking would be located. Ms. Carberry stated that they typically have no more than ten cars and parking up front near the building. Member Kasper inquired about the existing office uses. Ms. Carberry stated that she uses an office, Janice Miller has an office and Clear Edge has an office. Member Kasper inquired where they park. Ms. Carberry stated that are only three people that work for Clear Edge, and Janice Miller for a total of four cars.

**WHEREAS,** a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Hamlin, the Planning Board adopted and ratified its prior SEQRA determination for the Application. The Board being polled was unanimous in their decision.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** upon a motion made by Member Joseph Southern, seconded by Member Scott Winkelman, and upon a vote thereon as recorded below, the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board **APPROVES** amendment of the Approving Resolution, with the following conditions:

1. That narrative dated November 22, 2016, prepared by Patricia Carberry, be followed in all respects; and
2. That the conditional lease agreement between the applicant and the lessee, Gazella Fitness, must remain unchanged for the days and times of use of the building; and
3. Except as modified hereby, the conditions set forth in the Approving Resolution remain in full force and effect.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Mark J. Tucker	Present	[Yes]
Vice Chair	Joseph Southern	Present	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	Present	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	Present	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	Present	[Yes]

**Informal Discussion**

Applicant: Welch Allyn, Inc.  
 4341 State Street, State Route 321  
 Skaneateles, New York  
**Tax Map #022.-01-16.0**

Present: Mike Sheehan, Scott Spanfelner, Welch Allyn; Frank Miles, Welliver Construction;, Jo Anne Gagliano, EDR; Ed McGraw and Andrew Shuster, Ashley McGaw;

The owner is looking to have new jobs at this site with a net addition of workers at this site. There is a 60,000sf distribution facility in Auburn that is not very efficient for Welch Allyn to handle materials twice, since the materials are manufactured in Skaneateles then shipped to warehouse in Auburn to then be shipped back to Skaneateles for preparation for shipping out to clients. The applicant is looking to incorporate the warehouse facility at the Skaneateles location that will compose half of the 110,000sf proposed addition. The other half is for future opportunity.

Ms. Gagliano stated that they had met with Chairman Tucker and Mr. Brodsky for a pre-application conference to get a sense of how to approach the proposal. The proposed 110,000sf addition would be located on the west side of the existing main building, covering existing parking with the loading dock area extended. An additional 224 parking spots would be located at the south side entrance of the building with the walking trail re-aligned to accommodate the parking.

There would be no change to the traffic to the building, and an extensive traffic study was completed with the last addition to the complex. The study can be re-verified that there would be no substantial change in the traffic to the facility. The DEC has already issued a letter of no impact regarding the sanitary system on site and the proposed expansion. Member Kasper commented that no impact just means that the system could handle the proposed addition. Ms. Gagliano stated that the system can support the minor increase in use from the expansion. Mr. Spanfelner stated that the reason is based on the head count. The head count on the former building expansion would be a little higher than what is expected with the expansion as the head count had dropped and this proposal will increase it. Mr. Camp inquired about any potential truck traffic increase with the warehouse. Mr. Spanfelner stated that the traffic would not change

as right now the trucks leave the facility to go to the warehouse then to the customer. The proposed warehouse is needed as their business model is changing from a made to order model to a warehouse on site model.

Member Winkelman inquired what year the prior addition was completed. Ms. Gagliano stated that it was finished in 2011. Member Hamlin stated that as part of the expansion is for future use, there may be an impact later on with the future use. Mr. Spanfelner stated that the confirmed use today for half of the building is for consolidation of warehouse space. There are about fourteen different scenarios being reviewed for other things that may come into the building that they will probably know by this coming spring Ms. Gagliano continued stating that the stormwater management plan will need to be developed for the additional parking with DEC guidelines, that would include paths and berms.

Their survey is underway and there is a brisk schedule for the applicant to take advantage of opportunities before them. Mr. Spanfelner stated that they would like to break ground in the spring. The pictures shown were from Mottville Road, and they would like to continue the character of the area. Member Kasper commented that the last addition paid attention to the screening of the addition and shared his concern that the additional parking may be more visible with this proposed addition. Ms. Gagliano stated that they want to screen that additional parking that would be 150 feet from the road as well, and continue the use of a berm and trees for screening. Chairman Tucker commented that the existing parking lot to the west where the proposed addition would be located is very visible from Mottville Road. He recommended that additional screening would be warranted to shield the view of the building from the road.

Mr. Camp inquired if the trucks come exclusively off Mottville Road. Mr. Spanfelner stated that the trucks exclusively come off Route 321 to the docks. Member Winkelman inquired if the new parking lot would be placed on grade or excavated. Ms. Gagliano stated that it would be on grade and that there would continue to be a berm that would shield the parking from view.

Mr. Spanfelner commented that they had met with CPCS regarding the proposal and had received positive feedback. Mr. Camp commented that they should also partner with the neighbor to the west, Mr. Hunt, as he had several comments for Welch Allyn and the Board with the prior addition. Ms. Gagliano commented that she would like to see a copy of the correspondence from Mr. Hunt. Mr. Lanning commented that any construction workers should be notified that there is no smoking on the property and that they should be respectful of the neighbors as well.

Mr. Shuster stated that the overall design of the Welch Allyn property has a campus feel that they are interested in maintaining. The proposed addition will be for a warehouse, however, it will be in keeping with the existing roof level and design. Mr. McGraw stated that he had spoken with Mr. Hall, the Town's CEO, and verified that he was in approval of the roof lines being aligned. The addition's rooftop HVAC units will be located inside of the building and there will be no roof-mount equipment on the building. The most recent addition has a metal panel system with a stucco-type finish and the new building will be concrete tilt-up panels that will be architecturally coated to have a similar finish. The floorplan is primarily a warehouse with additional employee bathrooms. As there is a clearer idea of what other functions will occur in the building the floor plan would be modified. The building will have ten truck bays. OCIDA will be conducting the SEQR review.

Mr. Camp inquired how the parking lot addition will drain. Ms. Gagliano stated that it will probably drain like the existing parking and will be directed to one of the ponds. The drainage plan are still in process and the drainage will probably be directed east and away from the neighbor to the west. Mr. Camp commented that the drainage may need to go in both directions. The existing drainage has been functioning well from the last addition.

Ms. Gagliano inquired if an update to the existing traffic report prepared by Jim Napoleon & Associates will work. Member Kasper commented if the addition would increase traffic and accidents at the corner of Mottville and Route 321. Mr. Spanfelner stated that the speed limit was decreased on Mottville Road to 35 mph.

Mr. Camp inquired if the parking capacity by the lodge has been solved. The 2011 improvements have been completed for the lodge. Member Winkelman inquired if there will be any windows in the addition. Mr. Shuster stated that there will be windows in the staff areas and there may be windows added later. There will be some daylighting either through roof access or windows in the high bay spaces, and they will be designed to be flexible for future uses.

Mr. Camp commented that the ACOE was concerned with disturbance of the roadside ditches along the perimeter of the road with the last addition as the ditches had some wetland characteristics. He continued commenting that if the roadside ditches are disturbed that the applicant partner with the ACOE. Member Southern inquired if there will be more personnel with the future use of the building. Mr. Spanfelner stated that they have a commitment to bring in over 100 people in addition to bringing over the Auburn warehouse staff. Mr. Camp stated head count is important but also the truck traffic entering and leaving the facility.

Counsel Molnar stated that a public hearing would be required with the amendment of a major special permit handled the same as an initial special permit with findings of fact and a conclusion that is part of the resolution. He continued recommending that they review the prior resolutions as there may be facts that were reviewed that have not been mentioned at tonight's meeting. Mr. Camp stated that as part of the last approval there was a lot of complex drainage sequencing that may or may not be required for this addition. There will not be a lot of excavation for this project except for the parking area; there will be more fill in the location of the proposed warehouse. Chairman Tucker stated that the proposed addition will cover existing parking but there is a portion of grass that will be replaced with building, increasing the impermeable surface coverage, so drainage will need to be addressed in that area.

The application, once submitted, would require at least two meetings, with the first meeting providing an opportunity for the Board to review materials and determine if the application is complete before scheduling a public hearing. The public hearing may possibly be scheduled but a Planning Board decision cannot be rendered until the SEQR review and determination has been completed by OCIDA. Special meetings can be held to assist with the finalization of the resolution. The application will probably be submitted for the February meeting.

### **Discussion**

Chairman Tucker commented that the Planning Board has some larger cases that the Board is reviewing and that there is draft legislation for the Board to review. He recommended that the Board consider scheduling a second meeting in January 2017 to accommodate the workload.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Chairman Tucker and seconded by Member Southern to schedule a special Planning Board meeting on January 24, 2017 beginning at 7:30 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Mark J. Tucker	[Yes]
Member	Joseph Southern	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	[Yes]

**Discussion**

The Planning Board discussed the proposed revision to the 2015 Joint Town and Village Comprehensive Plan updated October 31, 2016. The draft Open Space Plan will be an attached addendum to the Join Comprehensive Plan and adopted at the same time. Member Winkelman suggested that there should be encouragement for Hamlet-like areas or neighborhoods to give areas a sense of community. The Hamlet of Mandana should not be expanded to include the Marina, although the Marina was classified Commercial prior to 1996. Chairman Tucker commented that if the Marina were included in the Hamlet, it would encourage more development on the lakefront, which would not be beneficial for the lake.

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Board reviewed the proposed revision to the 2015 Joint Town and Village Comprehensive Plan updated October 31, 2016; and

**AND WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Winkelman and seconded by Member Kasper recommending to the Town Board that they adopt the proposed revision to the 2015 Joint Town and Village comprehensive Plan with an updated date of October 31, 2015. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

Chair	Mark J. Tucker	[Yes]
Member	Joseph Southern	[Yes]
Member	Donald Kasper	[Yes]
Member	Scott Winkelman	[Yes]
Member	Douglas Hamlin	[Yes]

The Planning Board Meeting adjourned at 10:10 p.m. as there being no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull, Secretary/Clerk