Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
August 1, 2013

Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Neil & Christine Strodel to vary the strict application of Section 225-69D Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion; to construct a new 16 x 20 foot screen porch and relocate an existing patio at the property addressed as 6 Teasel Lane in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
William Eberhardt, Member
Mark Roney, Member
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Planning Board

Robert Eggleston Architect, on behalf of the Applicant

Nancy McDowell, Skaneateles

Absent: Douglas Sutherland, Member

Chairman Kenan opened the meeting at 7:30 pm, announcing the application of Neil & Christine Strodel for 6 Teasel Lane. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "The Strodels built their house in 1984 at Teasel Lane, and it was built to conform to the Zoning at the time. Two years later the Zoning law changed and so it became non-conforming in that the side yards were 13.6 and 12.6 feet, where 15 feet is now required. As a result they have a non-conforming house. Section 225-69D says that expansion of a non-conforming house needs a variance. What they are proposing to do is take out a patio that they have, and put in a 20 x 16 screened porch. The screened porch will have a proposed 18.8 foot side yard set-back, which is allowed – 15 is the requirement. They will also relocate a 16 x 16 patio behind the house. The proposed work meets all the Zoning laws, but because this is the expansion of a non-conforming structure it requires a variance. They will match up the materials on the screened porch with those on the house. Are there any questions that you have relative to this application?"

Chairman Kenan asked, "Any questions?" Member Roney asked Mr. Eggleston to explain the right side yard dimension. Mr. Eggleston, "It's 13.6 feet which is existing so it is 1.4 feet non-conforming. But the new right side yard of the addition is 18.8, so that is totally conforming, but this is non-conforming." Chairman Kenan said, "The right side yard set-back is 13.6. The 18.8 doesn't really matter. It doesn't aggravate the non-conformity. Any other questions? Anyone have a motion to suggest?"

Member Eberhardt said, "I'll make the motion to recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the variance for Neil and Christine Strodel based on drawings dated 7/22/13, as submitted." Member Stokes-Cawley seconded the motion.

Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the Chairman declared the motion passed. Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board. This matter was concluded at 7:36 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
August 1, 2013

Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Arthur & Diane Fellerman to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Percentage of open area and Section 225-69D Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion; to install a ramp for accessibility at the property addressed as 31 East Austin Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
William Eberhardt, Member
Mark Roney, Member
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Planning Board

Robert Eggleston Architect, on behalf of the Applicant

Nancy McDowell, Skaneateles
Robert Kleckner, Skaneateles
Cathy Kleckner, Skaneateles

Absent: Douglas Sutherland, Member

Chairman Kenan opened the meeting at 7:37 pm, announcing the variance application of Arthur & Diane Fellerman for 31 East Austin Street. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "The Fellermans have an existing house that is non-conforming in a lot of different ways. It is non-conforming in that the left side yard is 9.9 feet and the open space is 75%, whereas 85% is required. Art Fellerman has Parkinson's disease and his health is declining where he is going to need a ramp. So we have found a good place for a ramp, coming in off the driveway. It is actually very low to the ground, so it's not really going to be up off the ground a lot. It will come, switch back and go back. It meets the 30 foot front yard set-back. It meets the side yard set-back of 21.5 feet. It will decrease the open space by about 1.5%; from 75% down to 73.6%. We are asking for a variance so that they can install this ramp, so he'll be able to have access to the house. Are there any questions that you have relative to this application?"

Member Eberhardt said, "I have a question about the elevation from Austin Street. Am I missing it?" Mr. Eggleston. "This is Austin Street, and it sets back quite a ways. The ramp is going to kind of come in where this green stuff is. It comes in and then comes back. It's really not high off the ground; we have about 20-some inches difference. We're going 14 in one leg and we're

about 24 inches difference. They'll come in next to the steps, come down about a 12 foot length to a landing, turn around and then come back to a landing that's flush with the floor." Member Eberhardt, "I think that's positive Bob, but I think you ought to show that to the ZBA. At first blush you think it's going to ramp right up there." Mr. Eggleston, "You see, this is the view right there, from Austin Street. All you're going to see is a little bit; and it's really – it's just a railing on the ground."

Chairman Kenan, "So this is the same side of the street as the high school." Mr. Eggleston, "Correct, but it is one block further down. It's Charlie Major, Mike Major and then Fellermans."

Chairman Kenan, "Any more questions? Anyone have a motion they would like to make?" **Member Roney said, "I'll move that we recommend to the ZBA approval of the variances." Member Eberhardt seconded the motion.**

Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the Chairman declared the motion passed. Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board. This matter was concluded at 7:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
August 1, 2013

Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Doug & Nancy McDowell to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Front yard set-back and Section 225-69D Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion; to construct 3 one-story additions to dwelling, to raise the roof over living room, and construct a 16 x 12 foot deck at the property addressed as 30 Hannum Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
William Eberhardt, Member
Mark Roney, Member
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Planning Board

Robert Eggleston Architect, on behalf of the Applicant
Nancy McDowell, Applicant

Robert Kleckner, Skaneateles
Cathy Kleckner, Skaneateles

Absent: Douglas Sutherland, Member

Chairman Kenan opened the meeting at 7:42 pm, announcing the variance application of Doug & Nancy McDowell at 30 Hannum Street. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "Nancy is here should you have any questions. This is Janet Tardiff's house, on which they have a purchase offer, at the corner of Kelley & Hannum. It's a cute little red ranch house. It's non-conforming because it doesn't have 1200 SF. We are adding on a couple of small additions. What we'll have is a 16 x 14 foot bedroom. Then fill in the corner over here with a 12 x 10 SF addition and then fill in the little corner over here. And then replace the deck that is there which will be attached to the porch. Right now the deck is separate from the porch on the back side.

Mr. Eggleston continued, "The existing house is non-conforming as to front yard; it's 15.6 feet. The second front yard on Kelley is 1.8 feet and the living space is under 1200 SF. The new addition will have a non-conforming front yard which would be 23.7 feet, but obviously it is less non-conforming than the existing. Otherwise it meets all the other criteria. We are at 91.9% open space; it's a nice large lot so there is no coverage issue. We'll keep the materials similar to the existing house. One of the things we've done is set this addition back. They put an addition

on 12 or 14 feet here that was in line – but we're setting it back to try to break up the façade. It is a cute little house with lots of nice landscaping. I think it will be an appropriate addition."

Chairman Kenan asked, "What is it, a 1 bedroom house now?" Mr. Eggleston, "It's a 2 bedroom house. What we'll have is 2 bedrooms and a den." Chairman Kenan, "Just so I understand the plan, where are the 2 bedrooms now? The den is one?" Mr. Eggleston, "The den is a bedroom, and what's now going to be the master bathroom. It has two very small bathrooms." Chairman Kenan, "So it is still a 2 bedroom house?" Mr. Eggleston, "Correct. It remains a 2 bedroom house plus it has a den." Chairman Kenan, "And the only issue is non-conforming because it's too small today?" Mr. Eggleston, "It's too small today and front yard is 15.6 feet and the second front yard is 1.8 feet."

Member Eberhardt, "Is there any technical issue with the outlet and the water – flooding and all that?" Mr. Eggleston, "We don't have any problems; the only thing we have to be careful about – we can't have a very tall basement, because if we go lower we'll be in the flooding zone. So the basement will be at the same level as the existing, which is above the zone. We'll put a basement below the addition; it's only a 7 foot high basement. But it is good for storage. We'll have the ability to have access to the basement so you can get the lawnmower and bikes in from outside."

Member Stokes-Cawley said, "I make the motion that the ZBA approve the variance request for 30 Hannum Street." Member Roney seconded the motion.

Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the Chairman declared the motion passed. Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board. This matter was concluded at 7:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
August 1, 2013

Reconsideration of the variance recommendation based on a revised plan in the matter of the application of Bob & Cathy Kleckner to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Percentage of open area, Side yard set-back left, Side yard set-back right, Both side yards combined, and Percentage of structure width/lot width; and Section 225-69D Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion; to construct a 6 ft privacy fence along the north boundary adjacent to a new 900 SF deck to be constructed on the north side of the house, construct a new deck and 6 ft privacy fence to be partially constructed over an existing concrete patio on the south side, and to construct a 42 in high picket fence around the rear yard at the property addressed as 8 Lakeview Circle in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
William Eberhardt, Member
Mark Roney, Member
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Planning Board

Robert Eggleston Architect, on behalf of the Applicant
Robert Kleckner, Applicant
Cathy Kleckner, Applicant

Absent: Douglas Sutherland, Member

Chairman Kenan opened the meeting at 7:46 pm, announcing the variance application of Bob & Cathy Kleckner for 8 Lakeview Circle. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself, handed out plans and presented, "This was an application that you looked at last month. They had originally asked for a 900SF deck that would go right up to the property line, with about 71% open space. The ZBA had some issues; you had not recommended that they approve the variance. Since then Cathy and Bob have consulted with me and we are suggesting what might be more appropriate. This is Lakeview Circle; it's on the east side of the circle. It's a 1 story ranch house. We are proposing an 18 x 24 foot deck. It is low to the ground because the house is low to the ground. This little porch is one step to the ground. So that will be a 461 SF deck. We have pulled it away from the house to get some landscaping between the house and the deck. We are proposing a 10 foot set-back, whereas before it was less than 1 foot set-back. There is an existing concrete slab on the south side that's in tough shape, so they wanted to put a deck over it to clean that up. They wanted to just expand it 1 foot on each side so they could put the structure in front of the concrete. That will be 9 x 17. In total they will have 618 SF of deck."

Mr. Eggleston continued, "The previous owners were granted a variance for 80% open space when they did some minor changes to it. So they will go from 80% open space down to 75.4% open space. I have done quite a few houses on Lakeview Circle, so I put down in a chart the reductions allowed for various properties: 12 LVC went from 85 % to 79%; 15 LVC from 80% to 75.3%; 16 LVC from 78.8% to 75.1%; 18 LVC from 75% to 74.64%; and 22 LVC, which was a new house across the street, from 75% to 74%. So 75% is a very typical open area for Lakeview Circle. They are small 10,000 – 11,000 SF lots. I think the proposed deck is much more in keeping with the neighborhood, instead of having a 900 SF deck."

Chairman Kenan asked, "What are the side yard requirements, 10 and 25 for combined?" Mr. Eggleston, "No, it's 25 and 30 in the A1 District." Chairman Kenan, "So in addition to lot coverage it is the side yard set-back." Mr. Eggleston, "Yes; we are asking for side yard set-back of 10 feet and 6.5% combined side yard percent of lot width. The fencing is going to be the same; they are actually going to apply for fence permit this next week, because they don't need a variance for the fence." Chairman Kenan, "So the fencing does not exist now." Mr. Eggleston, "Correct, but they will be applying for that separately." Member Roney asked, "What's the existing material of the patio?" Mr. Eggleston, "The existing patio is just concrete – raw concrete. So what they want to do is put deck board over that." Mr. Dundon recapped the recent Zoning Board of Appeals hearing on this matter for the Board, noting that this matter had been tabled until the August 27, 2013 ZBA meeting and that the plan now being reviewed was responsive to both the ZBA's concerns and the Planning Board's previous position. Mr. Eggleston, "In that we had put this together, we thought it was appropriate to come back to the Planning Board."

Chairman Kenan, "In the drawing, it looks like the fence is on the property line, but the note says it is 3 feet off of the property line?" Mr. Eggleston, "No, 3 inches." Member Eberhardt asked, "What are the different purposes of the two decks?" Mr. Eggleston, "This is an existing concrete patio. It is right off the living space. This would probably be the place that they would have a table and chair and come out to eat. Over here, this is more private; tucked in the back. That's probably where they would have their family gatherings." Mr. Dundon noted that the neighbors across the street (Poppen) and to the north (Kocsis) had expressed their support at the ZBA hearing. Member Eberhardt, "That is important. Even having said that, an elevation would be helpful as you proceed." Mr. Eggleston, "I understand that. It's so low to the ground; it's like one step off of the ground. I understand."

Chairman Kenan asked, "Any other questions? Anyone have a motion to propose?" **Member Eberhardt said, "I will make a motion that the Planning Board recommends to the Zoning Board of Appeals that it approve the revised application for Bob & Cathy Kleckner dated 31 July 2013 as submitted." Member Roney seconded the motion.** Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the Chairman declared the motion passed. Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board. This matter was concluded and the meeting adjourned by acclamation at 8:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards