

# Town of Cazenovia Planning Board

## Meeting Minutes

April 7, 2022

Members Present: Robert Ridler, Chairman; Anne Ferguson; Jerry Munger; Dale Bowers; Thomas Clarke; Mary Margaret Koppers

Members Absent: Gerald Rasmussen

Others Present: John Dunkle; John Seibold; Jennifer Rubin; Vincent Ryan; James (Jimmy) Golub; Janine Golub; Sasha Rasmussen; D. Chris Fischer; Kevin O’Connor; Michelle O’Connor; James Hagan; Daniel Reeder; Jonathan Alley; Douglas Jarvis; Jo Anne Gagliano; John Langey (via Zoom)

-----

R. Ridler called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M.

Roll was taken.

-----

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by J. Munger, to approve the March 3, 2022 meeting minutes was carried unanimously.

-----

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Thursday, May 5, 2022.

The next regularly scheduled work session will be Thursday, April 28, 2022.  
The next deadline day will be Wednesday, April 20, 2022.

### **HEARINGS**

*Crawford, Al & Michelle -- Line Change -- 5039 & 5008 East Lake Road, Cazenovia  
File # 21-1408 (Robert Ridler)*

John Seibold was present to represent the file.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by T. Clarke, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler said this was a public hearing for a line change at the Crawford residence. He explained property from the parcel on the east side of East Lake Road was being conveyed to the property on the west side of East Lake Road.

A. Ferguson asked if the property being conveyed would then belong to the property on which the main house was located.

R. Ridler answered, "Yes." He asked if there was anyone present wishing to speak at this time.

Hearing no comment, motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by D. Bowers, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

J. Langey lead the Board through the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF).

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by A. Ferguson, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR), to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the review of the SEAF and to approve the line change as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

### **LAND DISTURBANCE/SITE PLAN REVIEW/SUBDIVISION**

*McDonough, James & Pamela -- Site Plan Review -- 4555 East Lake Road, Cazenovia  
File # 21-1395 (Thomas Clarke)*

No one was present to represent the file.

T. Clarke said the Board has not received anything new.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by J. Munger, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

-----

*Living On Lake Time, LLC/Jeffrey & Jennifer Rubin -- Site Plan Review -- 1657 Hedge Ln  
File # 21-1406 (Jerry Munger)*

Vincent Ryan of Keplinger Freeman Associates was present to represent the file with Jennifer Rubin.

V. Ryan said they were seeking approval for the Rubin residence at Hedge Lane. He said the last time they met with the Board, the main issues were concerning comments made by the Engineer for the Town. Since then, they have spoken to Mr. Dunkle extensively, and Mr. Dunkle had four (4) comments. The comment regarding the sanitary system had been addressed and Mr. Dunkle had stated that was no longer an issue for him, and the system was now being reviewed by the Madison County Department of Health (DOH) for their approval. Referring to drawing L-100 *Site Preparation Plan Not For Construction Rubin Residence 1657 Hedge Lane, Cazenovia, NY* by Keplinger Freeman Associates, Revised 2022 03 23, he showed the proposed septic system location north of Hedge Lane and to the west of the proposed residence. He said a couple 12-inch-caliper-trees would have to be removed, but its location would be more than 500 feet from the lake.

J. Munger asked for orientation on the site.

V. Ryan showed where the existing driveway accesses Hedge Lane and where the easement for Hedge Lane at the northern property line accesses the lake.

R. Ridler asked if all of the Hedge Lane residents access the lake using that easement.

J. Rubin answered one neighbor has lakefront access, but 6 – 7 other residents use the easement.

T. Clarke asked if the sanitary system would be a raised bed system.

V. Ryan responded saying it would have a sand filter and it would pump to the proposed septic system field.

R. Ridler asked if Mr. Dunkle had any comments.

J. Dunkle replied stating the other items he had included in his comments were small details that he assumed the Applicants would correct.

V. Ryan read from the comments that those items were soils mixes for the rain gardens were to be improved from what they had noted, the execution of a storm water maintenance agreement, and silt fencing.

J. Dunkle explained a condition of an approval would be the agreement that the Applicants will enter into a storm water maintenance agreement for all the stormwater practices on this property.

J. Langey added he had a draft of a stormwater agreement with him which he would mark up if the Board approved the proposal.

R. Ridler asked about the planting and disturbance along the lake shore.

Referring to drawing L-300 *Layout and Planting Plan*, V. Ryan said they would remove a dock, install a small patio, and said they followed the *Cazenovia Lakefront Development Guidelines* in terms of plantings, saying they had spoken to the landscaper today about species selection. He said some of those would be adjusted but the number specified in the *Guidelines* would be reflected.

A. Ferguson asked about tree removal in the area wondering if the existing trees would remain.

V. Ryan answered all existing trees would remain, and some additional trees would be added. He said Bartlett Tree Experts had visited the site and would be doing some trimming and removing lower dead limbs, but no full tree removal would be done.

J. Rubin commented it was a very overgrown lot, and Mr. Cook had previously advised that they be mindful of how they handle that. Bartlett advised that the house first be placed before they developed the plan to clear the overgrown lakefront.

V. Ryan added the full-sized caliper trees to be removed for the construction of the house were shown on the plan, but the plan for Bartlett to clean up the site, with the removal of dead trees, etc. had not been developed.

A. Ferguson thought the extent of the plan for removal and for additional plantings was acceptable at this point, saying anything used to supplement the plan in the future would be fine. She did not think the Board needed a subsequent planting plan.

Other members of the Board indicated their agreement.

R. Ridler noticed a number of trees along the access driveway that had been marked when he was visiting the site and asked if those trees were to be removed.

J. Rubin said she had marked the trees.

It was clarified that those were not trees that would be cut.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by A. Ferguson, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the review of the SEAF and to approve the site plan as most recently submitted and with the conditions Mr. Dunkle suggested, was carried unanimously.

-----

*Golub, James & Janine -- Site Plan Review – 1590 Peth Road, Manlius  
File # 21-1412 (Mary Margaret)*

James (Jimmy) and Janine Golub were present to represent the file.

M. Koppers said the Golubs had applied for a (major) special use permit to have up to 15 events at their farm under Local Law A of 2022. She said the special events would be in addition to the agritourism that was offered at the farm and would be for weddings, birthday parties, graduation parties, and the like. They would have up to 150 guests and would take place in a barn already on the property between June and October. While the Golubs were before the Cazenovia Town Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA), the ZBA noted a problem with the parking on site noting that the spacing was not adequate, and they asked Mr. Golub to remove spaces to make the remaining spaces larger. She said the Golubs (since the ZBA approval) had been working on a plan to change the size of the parking area to accommodate more spaces. Reading through the parking regulations, she had noted that there was a requirement for one (1) parking spot for every 300 square feet of the building for commercial use which she thought was less than adequate (for an event allowing 150 guests), and she said for churches and

auditoriums one (1) parking spot was required for every three (3) seats, which she felt was more in line with what the Planning Board would like to see.

Jimmy Golub said they were unsure what figures to use so they had submitted two (2) new plans for additional parking. The first plan (circulated April 6<sup>th</sup>) used measurements 20 feet deep, 9 feet wide, with 24 feet between the rows. He explained they would rather not lose a row of parking because they did not want people to park on Peth Road. They propose to extend the parking area eight (8) feet on one side and four (4) feet on the other side, and they would angle the spaces which would result in having the required 24-foot distance between rows. He said when their excavator does the work, they would insure the proper spacing would be created. The second plan, which he had submitted today, was based upon a similar configuration, but the spaces were sized slightly smaller, 19' x 9 ½', based upon measurements provided by Roger Cook, the Town of Cazenovia Codes Enforcement Officer. He also said, should they need additional parking (in excess of the onsite parking), his neighbor Tim Aubertine has given permission for parking on his land, which has been the case, already having an agreement established. This overflow parking was on the same side of the road as the farm.

M. Koppers clarified that the 20' X 9' parking space dimension was used by the ZBA as the standard size. She said in reading the parking regulation, she found that the dimension 19' X 9 ½' given by Mr. Cook was the size to be used for a 90 degree angle. She added if the angle used were to be 60 degrees, only 18 feet would be needed between the rows.

Jimmy Golub was unsure of the exact angle depicted in his sketch.

A. Ferguson asked the total spaces Mr. Golub would provide.

Jimmy Golub answered a total 50 spaces would result using the plan he submitted today.

A. Ferguson asked the number of spaces that were required by the regulation for the capacity of the building.

M. Koppers believed using the standard required of churches which was one (1) space for every three (3) seats, 50 spaces would be needed. She believed his building could hold 150 people.

R. Ridler did not think the capacity of the building was 150 people.

Jimmy Golub explained 150 people could not be seated and eat in the building, but 150 people could dance and be spread outside. The dimensions of the building were 30' X 50'.

M. Koppers noted the (ZBA) approval was for up to 150 people for an event regardless of the capacity of the building. She believed parking for 150 people would be necessary.

Jimmy Golub elaborated if 150 people attended, the event would require a tent (in addition to the barn).

J. Langey said the approval from the ZBA had this condition, "The Applicant shall confirm the sizing and acceptability of the parking area for the proposed use with the Town's Code Enforcement Officer." He said the failsafe was that if the site plan was approved, the Applicants would have to confirm with Mr. Cook that the right sized parking would be created before they could reconstruct the parking. They would have to have the right number of spots as well as the right sized spots per the Code. He said that was not to prevent the Planning Board from determining that there would be sufficient parking.

T. Clarke asked about the septic, wondering if Mr. Cook was going to determine the frequency that it should be pumped or if there had been a dialog about that.

Jimmy Golub responded he had been asked about it, and he's never had it done, so he understood he would need to have it pumped.

T. Clarke wondered if it should be regulated to be done every five (5) years and asked Mr. Dunkle his thoughts.

J. Dunkle responded that it would depend upon usage.

Jimmy Golub commented, "it sits vacant for eight (8) months out of the year."

J. Dunkle thought perhaps it could be pumped at the end of each season to provide capacity into the next year. He asked if porta-johns would be used as well.

Jimmy Golub answered, "No."

T. Clarke commented that systems work better when there was continuous flow, which was not the case with this system.

T. Clarke then asked if the dumpster was covered.

Jimmy Golub explained that the dumpster they have been using was not seen from the area used for events and was only on the premises four (4) months of the year. It was not screened, but it was covered.

Reading from the Code, R. Ridler noted, "Location of required parking. A parking area or lot shall be located on the same lot as the building, structure or use to which the spaces are accessory." He wondered how the neighbor's land fitted into that requirement.

A. Ferguson asked if all 50 parking spaces would be on Mr. Golub's land.

Jimmy Golub affirmed they would be. He said only overflow parking would be on the neighbor's land. He spoke about times when small groups filled the current parking spaces.

Janine Golub added the overflow parking (on the neighbor's property) was alongside their designated parking.

J. Munger clarified it was the adjacent parcel.

Jimmy Golub believed the written consent had been submitted. It had.

M. Koppers said based upon the condition captured in the resolution that Mr. Langey read, Mr. Cook's dimensions were the ones to use. She asked if a more professional drawing of the parking was needed.

D. Bowers believed there was some confusion regarding the parking lot and Mr. Cook would be the one to determine those details. Mr. Cook would be present at the next meeting. He said that was coupled with the fact that the Planning Board has a deadline for submissions which was not met for the latest information received.

Jimmy Golub apologized.

D. Bowers said he knew Mr. Golub would be sorry to submit so late, and he also knew Mr. Golub would not want special treatment to be afforded to his project that would not ordinarily be afforded. Therefore, he thought it would be better to continue the file allowing Mr. Golub to submit the pertinent information after speaking with Mr. Cook and getting it to the Board in a timely manner.

There was some discussion among the Board members as to the need to have the parking finalized since Mr. Cook would be approving it before allowing the special events to occur.

The desire for a complete plan executed appropriately and timely was expressed.

J. Golub explained the late submission of the most recent plan was due to the discovery that different dimensions might be needed. He expressed understanding for the need to continue the file.

D. Bowers clarified that the Board would like to see parking based on the maximum number of people allowed to be at an event. He said the Board would like to understand the ratio for the number of spaces required as well. He felt that was unclear.

There was more discussion regarding whether this would be considered a general commercial use, which was the ratio used by the ZBA, or if more parking was needed, which the Board felt was reasonable.

J. Langey repeated the condition by the ZBA for the special use permit regarding parking. He reiterated the Planning Board certainly had the right to sign off on the layout which would also show the traffic flow. He repeated Mr. Cook would be a failsafe on that as well. He felt the confusion was the two conflicting provisions of the Code, one based on square footage of the structure, and the other based upon a different configuration. He said the bottom line was that Mr. Golub had submitted a drawing and the Planning Board has input on that drawing. He felt having received the General Municipal Recommendation Report (GML) from Madison County Planning Department and having received the Major Special Use Permit Approval from the ZBA, that put the application in a good position to have a decision at the next meeting.

Motion by M. Koppers, seconded by A. Ferguson, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

-----

*Rasmussen, Sasha -- Line Elimination – Hoffman Road & Hoffman Road  
File # 21-1413 (Anne Ferguson)*

Sasha Rasmussen and D. Chris Fischer of Alario and Fischer, PC were present to represent the file.

A. Ferguson believed the request was for a simple line elimination.

C. Fischer affirmed it was a very straightforward proposal. He explained the Applicant owns two (2) vacant parcels on Hoffman Road, each being about two (2) acres and they would like the line between the parcels to be eliminated to form a 4-acre parcel for a single-family home in the future. He explained there was a lot on the corner of Hoffman and a 7 ½ acre lot surrounded that corner lot. The 7 ½ acre lot was divided into three (3) parcels creating a separate parcel on East Lake Road and then the two (2) parcels in question on Hoffman Road. He said the obvious goal was to meet the 3-acre requirement for the construction of a single-family house. He said the lot size

would be in keeping with other residences along that side of Hoffman, and much larger than the parcels on the north side of Hoffman.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by D. Bowers, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the Board’s review of the SEAF, and to move the file to a public hearing at the next meeting was carried unanimously.

-----

*O’Connor, Kevin & Michelle -- Site Plan Review – 3004 Overlook Terrace, Cazenovia  
File # 21-1414 (Robert Ridler)*

Kevin O’Connor and Michelle O’Connor were present to represent the file, as was James Hagan of Hagan Architects P.C.

R. Ridler said the O’Connors would like to do a renovation of their cottage on Overlook Terrace.

J Hagan explained there was a 3-bedroom cottage on the property with the core of the building having been added onto many times over the years. Currently on the south side of the building there was a one-story addition that houses the kitchen. He said the kitchen was dated and did not connect well with the rest of the first-floor plan. The second story of the house has three (3) bedrooms and a small bathroom with limited head room which he described as not being very functional. There was also a deck that runs along the south side of the camp. They propose to demolish that deck and the kitchen and build a new two-story building in the front of the house and a smaller deck at the rear. Doing so will accommodate a nicer kitchen that would open to the rest of the first floor and would address bathroom issues on the second floor. They also intend to put a new roof on the house and new shingle siding, having a New England style look, and basically improving the overall massing of the property.

J. Hagan said there was a parking area at Overlook Terrace with a walkway to the front porch. He said the existing dock will be removed and replaced with a shorter, new dock. They also plan to rebuild the sea wall at the waterfront and supplement it with landscaping.

Dan Reeder, the landscape architect arrived at this time and was asked to join the proceedings.

J. Hagan continued saying there was currently a small terrace under the back side/lake side of the house. He said it was tucked under the back of the house; it was brick and

had low head room. The intent was to cut the grade about ten (10) inches which would also allow access to the addition basement and provide more covered deck area which would expand into the rear lawn area to make a terrace area and a fire pit area.

J. Hagan said Mr. Reeder had created an extensive landscaping plan which he distributed entitled *Landscape Prelim. Site Design O'Conor Residence* by Greenscapes dated 04/05/22. Also, there was a plan entitled *Hardscape Prelim. Site Design O'Conor Residence* by Greenscapes dated 04/05/22.

J. Hagan acknowledged the obvious issue was site coverage with an existing condition that does not comply with current ordinance, but he said they were trying to mitigate what they propose (to add) so that the net effect would be almost no change in the overall impact.

D. Reeder said they would be basically replacing what was existing in the front of the house by moving the sidewalk in line with the shift in the front door location. There would be plantings as a buffer between the driveway and the front lawn.

J. Hagan interjected the intent for the plantings was to accept the runoff from the driveway and the adjacent roadway, to slow and capture it rather than allowing it to flow downhill into the lake.

D. Reeder said the beds would be expanded around the house as well. Some of the stone beds would be replaced as a mulch bed. The corner downspouts that currently exit onto the lawn would be put into French drains within the beds to divert the drainage underground.

D. Reeder explained the patio area in the back would be enlarged and would extend to a walkway to the stairs to the dock.

R. Ridler saw that the existing impervious surface area was calculated to be 31.27%.

J. Hagan said at the time the proposal was submitted the impervious percentages listed were 31% increasing to 33%. Since then, Mr. Reeder was able to examine the site more closely. The plan he submitted this evening entitled *O'Connor Camp Proposed Site Plan* by Hagan Architects PC revised 7 April 2022 showed the existing was actually 32.55% with the proposed 33.15%.

K. O'Connor explained the stone in the front beds had not been included in the original calculations.

D. Reeder added the walk at the top of the existing stairs flared in a couple areas as well.

R. Ridler said the existing percentage far exceeds the allowed amount, so the Board would not want the proposed to increase.

J. Hagan responded that the existing being 32.55% has reduced the differential of the increase.

D. Reeder felt the increase was offset by the improved drainage measures that would be installed, specifically the improvement of the gutter discharge into French drains rather than being direct surface runoff. He was unsure if that could be quantified but felt that was a significant improvement.

A. Ferguson asked if flagstone would be used around the firepit.

D. Reeder said it was gravel, pea stone.

It was clarified that pea stone would be considered 100% impervious. Therefore, the calculation for the improvements had been miscalculated.

D. Reed asked what credit could be given for the runoff mitigation.

A. Ferguson answered that Mr. Dunkle would give points for that, but it did not lessen the percentage of coverage.

D. Bowers pointed out it was a .19-acre lot. He asked where the septic system was located.

J. Hagan answered it was in the front yard.

D. Bowers remarked it was a tiny lot and he acknowledged (drainage) improvements were proposed, but they were making a small lot even smaller by increasing the coverage.

D. Reeder countered that the water that has been running off the lot would be percolating in the ground.

J. Dunkle stated the concept was accepted but it did not change the impervious percentage.

A. Ferguson wondered if they would consider an impervious surface reduction associated with the proposed patios.

J. Hagan remarked 1% of an 8000 square foot lot was only an increase of 80 square feet.

A. Ferguson thought with creativity a reduction of 80 square feet could be achieved.

M. Koppers agreed.

D. Bowers commented that it was the Applicants' responsibility to determine where the decrease could be made.

A. Ferguson clarified that the percentage proposed should remain equal to the existing percentage.

D. Bowers repeated the Board would not want to see any increase because the lot was so small. He said any new building lots in the Town now must be a minimum of three (3) acres.

K. O'Connor thought perhaps modifying the size of the driveway at the top of the lot might be an option for reduction.

D. Bowers repeated that the Applicants need to make that determination.

More discussion followed regarding the size of that area.

D. Bowers asked if the Board would like to see how the sea wall would look.

K. O'Connor said they were working with River Rock for that restoration. He was told they often use a steel pile wall and they planned to aesthetically face it. They were told that was what was done at the Brewster Inn.

Timbers were used for that.

It was stated the Brewster was a Village of Cazenovia property rather than a property in the Town of Cazenovia.

D. Bowers explained that he would want to see the details of that work in addition to time to review the planting plan with anything they could submit to help the Board visualize the plantings. They would want to see how it would look not only from the property but also from the lake.

T. Clarke stated because River Rock will be doing work in the lake, a permit would need to be obtained from the Army Corps of Engineers.

K. O'Connor understood that the short list of what was needed for the next meeting was a reduction of about 80 square feet of impervious surface area and a picture of the replaced sea wall.

D. Bowers added he would like to see the septic system location on the site plan as well.

M. O'Connor believed she had that information.

J. Hagan said they would be able to provide an educated guess as to where the septic system was located. He said the intensity of use would not change.

D. Bowers agreed.

M. O'Connor said it had been pumped for the sale to them.

A. Ferguson was unsure if 80 square feet was the correct amount of reduction needed, but whatever amount would equal what was existing was the amount they wanted to see as the total for the proposed.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by T. Clarke, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

M. O'Connor asked if there was anything they needed to provide regarding the house addition.

D. Bowers said they were allowed to do what they proposed for that because the footprint of the structure would not change. Increasing it from one-story to two-stories was not an issue.

D. Reeder asked about the plantings the Board wanted to see.

D. Bowers said the *Cazenovia Lakefront Development Guidelines* should be used in terms of species. He said that resource could be found on the Town website. He stated the Board would like some idea of what would be planted.

The Applicants were assured they would be on the next meeting agenda, May 5<sup>th</sup>, and instructed to submit any new information by April 20<sup>th</sup>.

-----

*Alley, Jonathan & Abigail -- Site Plan Review – 3969 East Road, Cazenovia  
File # 21-1415 (Dale Bowers)*

Jonathan Alley was present to represent the file as was Douglas Jarvis of Green Visions Solar, LLC.

D. Bowers explained the proposal was for (ground mounted) solar panels and the project required a Full Environmental Assessment Form due to the proximity of a house on the National Registry.

D. Bowers said the 25-foot setback from the side yard was fine. He stated the height could not exceed ten (10) feet at its highest point. He also said it required screening on two (2) sides, from the road and from the neighboring property.

The Board wondered about the choice of location on the 17-acre parcel.

J. Alley explained that the majority of the parcel was hay field behind the house, and he wanted to minimize the disruption for tractors and equipment to harvest the hay. The location chosen would allow the farmer to continue to maneuver easily, being a straight shot from the road.

D. Jarvis added there was a grade change as well. He thought he might slightly adjust the location farther from the side yard.

D. Bowers thought the main detail was the screening.

A. Ferguson asked why the angle of the array differed between the drawings in the file.

D. Jarvis explained the angle had been adjusted to prevent any glare for traffic on East Road.

A. Ferguson expressed approval of the angling.

T. Clarke asked about the base, asking if it would be driven directly into the ground.

D. Jarvis affirmed it would.

A. Ferguson asked if the use of evergreen plantings was a sufficient description for the plantings for tonight's purposes.

J. Langey explained the file would need to be continued another month anyway because of its being a Type I Action because of its location adjacent to the property on the Historic Register. The Board will have to complete the FEAF for SEQOR at the next meeting.

D. Bowers said since the Applicants will have to return for the SEQR, they should also have their plan for screening by that time as well.

D. Jarvis wondered if he could just sketch some trees on the plan tonight.

The need to attend the next meeting was explained.

A. Ferguson said the plan should include the number, the size, and types of trees they would plant.

J. Dunkle explained coniferous tree size was measured by height, not caliper. He said typically 6' – 8' trees were recommended. He believed a combination of spruce and white pine work well; white pine trees would grow quickly, and spruce would fill in the gaps. He recommended 10' – 15' foot centers.

D. Jarvis said one dimension was only 9 feet.

D. Bowers thought three (3) trees along the short side would suffice.

The measurement of the panels was 45' on the long side.

It was repeated that two (2) sides of the array would require shielding.

J. Dunkle asked if the Code required decommissioning for a private system.

He was told it did not.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by M. Koppers to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to affirm the matter Type I Action with SHPO as the only Interested Agency was carried unanimously.

D. Jarvis clarified what he needed to submit by the next deadline.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by A. Ferguson, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

-----

*Citylake Properties, LLC/Goldberg, Neil & Robing -- Site Plan Review – 5041 East Lake RD File # 22-1416 (Anne Ferguson)*

Jo Anne Gagliano of EDR was present to represent the file.

A. Ferguson said this project was on the second property acquired by the Goldbergs where they were finalizing work, and they have devised a better solution for the existing driveway.

Referring to the drawing entitled *C-1 Goldberg Single Family Residence 5041 East Lake Road, Town of Cazenovia, New York Citylake Properties, LLC Site Plan* by EDR Dated March 23, 2022 J. Gagliano explained the location of the property, which was formerly Doug Brackett's house, just south of the Goldberg home. She said originally for the approval given September 2020 the Goldbergs did not give much consideration to the driveway, but after the house was in, they realized the paved area currently in an area was unneeded and unwanted because it would cause grading issues, but without it, one would have to back out of the driveway. She asked Mr. Cook about changing the existing pavement and he recommended she talk with Madison County first, which they did. Madison County approved a secondary access for safety reasons, and because there was no issue with sight distance.

J. Gagliano said the width of the driveway was 28 feet which was larger than was needed; the width of the driveway on the main parcel owned by the Goldbergs was eleven (11) feet. By reducing the width (of the driveway, and by reconfiguring it), they could utilize the same square footage of the original approval. They also shrunk the size of a walkway to keep the same square footage. All the trees that were proposed to remain will still remain, and they will add one more. She said because the driveway narrows, one would not see directly into the garage. She said the new design also allows for more landscaping along the front which would soften the views there. She talked about the installation of a hedge which would enhance the view from the road and would provide some private space. She pointed out an existing hedge along the south property line saying it would provide protection on both sides.

J. Gagliano said another condition in the resolution was that the Owners provide a percolation (perc) test or Deep Holes, which they did, so she included that on the site plan for the file. Also, it was indicated that Mr. Dunkle wanted to see underground storage from the gutters, so that detail was included on the plan. The Owners had also asked to remove three (3) cedar trees that were growing at the base of a shed and they were asked to replace those, so this plan also showed that, making this plan a clean submission of the prior approval as well as the proposed driveway modification.

A. Ferguson asked if there was any change in the overall impervious surface total.

J. Gagliano answered, "No."

It was noted the GML was fine.

J. Gagliano said she could send the builder, Doug Klepper, a digital copy of the County approval they received. She explained the County installs and replaces the culvert pipes, and then the contractor makes the connection to the street.

A. Ferguson asked if the driveway material would be similar to what the Goldbergs used at their residence.

J. Gagliano said this driveway would be asphalt.

A. Ferguson expressed appreciation for the inclusion of details from the previous approval on this plan.

J. Langey said he would recommend that the original SEQR be reapproved for the same reasons used the first time. He saw no negative impact to the environment from this modification.

Motion by A. Ferguson seconded by T. Clarke, to reappoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to reaffirm the matter a Type II Action based upon the Board's previous review of the SEAF, and to approve the site plan for the driveway modification as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

-----

*Muserlian, Peter & Nancy -- Site Plan Review – 5201 East Lake Road, Cazenovia  
File # 22-1417 (Robert Ridler)*

Jo Anne Gagliano of EDR was present to represent the file. She said this project was before the Board a number of years ago. She explained originally when they worked on this project, they endeavored to save as many trees as possible, and they worked closely with Mr. Dunkle on stormwater management for the project.

She displayed drawing C-401 *Vegetation Removal and Planting Replacement Plan Muserlian Residence 5201 East Lake Road, Town of Cazenovia, New York Peter And Nancy Muserlian* dated March 23, 2022 by EDR. She explained the location of the house, pool, and stormwater management. She said the depressions were all functioning well and she had photographs of the native vegetation. She explained that they had wanted to save as much as possible along the property parameters and lakefront. She showed an area of large arborvitae on the water's edge as well as a

secondary group of smaller arborvitaes. The smaller group was directly below the stormwater management at the top of the slope. At the time, they did not want to remove the smaller arborvitaes hoping they could encourage development in that area. The vegetation uphill did develop. Despite spraying by Bartlett Tree Experts, the arborvitaes were so deer browsed that they were not thriving which was causing the understory to erode. They now proposed to replace those with red twig dogwood. The arborvitaes would be cut at grade level and then the new plantings would be installed near the stumps. She explained the blank space had been occupied by an ash tree. They would like to use gro low sumac to fill the hole and to supplement some of the understory. She concluded by saying the project was landscaping, but Mr. Cook felt it should be reviewed by the Planning Board since trees would be removed. She also explained how there would be no change in the vision in or from the property. She said the proposal was more of an erosion control measure.

J. Langey asked if this was considered an amended site plan or a new site plan.

It was considered a new site plan because of the passage of time.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by D. Bowers, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the Board’s review of the SEAF, and to approve the site plan for the removal of twelve arborvitae and their replacement with the specified vegetative material as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

-----

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by T. Clarke, to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 P. M. was carried unanimously.

Sue Wightman, Planning Board Secretary – April 8, 2022