Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Public Hearing
August 27, 2013

Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Barbara Stack to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Percentage of open area; and Section 225-14(d) Swimming pools, 25ft distance to lot lines to construct a 15 X 26 foot swimming pool with steps at the property addressed as 32 Orchard Road in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Lisa Banuski, Chairman
John Cromp, Member
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Larry Pardee, Member
Craig Phinney, Member

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

Barbara Stack, Applicant
Jeffrey LeMon, Cannon Pools, on behalf of the Applicant
John Stack, on behalf of the Applicant

Kathy Farsaci, Skaneateles
Dave Farsaci, Skaneateles
Cathy Kleckner, Skaneateles
Bob Kleckner, Skaneateles
Robert Eggleston. Skaneateles
Art Fellerman, Skaneateles
Diane Fellerman, Skaneateles

Chairman Banuski opened the continuation of the Public Hearing at 7:30 pm in the application of Barbara Stack for 32 Orchard Road. Chairman Banuski noted, "We have some new information. This is one lot; one tax map number. That was the confusing part last time. So it becomes less than 1 percent difference in the coverage. That's quite an improvement over last time. And that now includes the patio that you had and all of that on the drawing. Terrific." Ms. Stack, "And you had mentioned something about turning the pool – so what we have done here this evening is we have made copies of that same map that you have there, and if you want to turn it a special way, we can deal with it."

Chairman Banuski, "Actually, if you can just put it on there so that the pool that you are working with has the least distance to the lot lines – that's how we'd like you to put it down." Mr. LeMon, "That's how we have it; the original drawing did it just that way." Chairman Banuski, "OK. That's all we wanted to do, is take that pool and configure it so it is the least encroaching

on the lot lines." Mr. LeMon, "That's what we did." Chairman Banuski, "We did have this open for public comment last time, but is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor of or in opposition to this application." Mr. LeMon, "I'm in favor of it." Chairman Banuski, "Any other questions from the Board? That's great. Thank you for doing that." Mr. Dundon reported that Ms. O'Connell stopped by earlier and said that she had met with Mr. LeMon and said that she is now satisfied and has no objections. Chairman Banuski said, "That is now part of the record as well. There being no other comments or questions, I move that we close the public hearing." Mr. Pardee seconded. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion it was carried.

Member Cromp said, "I move that we accept the application of Barbara Stack to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for percentage of open area and Section 225-14(d) Swimming pools, 25 foot distance to lot lines; to construct a 15 by 26 foot swimming pool with steps, an included patio and 2 by 6 foot pad at the back of the garage at the property addressed as 32 Orchard Road in the Village of Skaneateles. This is a Type 2 transaction and is based on drawings dated 6/14/2013. The Applicant will have one year to complete work." Member Pardee seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion it was carried.

Ms. Stack thanked the Board. This portion of the meeting was concluded at 7:35 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Public Hearing
August 27, 2013

Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Bob & Kathy 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: Lisa Banuski, Chairman
John Cromp, Member
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Larry Pardee, Member
Craig Phinney, Member

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

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

Kathy Farsaci, Skaneateles
Dave Farsaci, Skaneateles
Art Fellerman, Skaneateles
Diane Fellerman, Skaneateles

Chairman Banuski opened the continuation of the Public Hearing at 7:36 pm in the application of Bob & Cathy Kleckner for 8 Lakeview Circle. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "After the last meeting and listening to your comments, the Kleckners consulted with me and I have come up with revised plans for them to substantially reduce the proposed decks and outdoor living space that they were interested in having. We are now looking at a total of 618 SF of decks minus 122 SF that already exists – so that's 495 or something of additional deck that they are proposing. They continued to want to resurface the existing patio – making that into a deck. It would be one foot larger on three sides just as a means of getting support for that. There is an existing 6 foot high lattice fence towards the street and that would remain. On the other side what we did is we came up with an area of 18 by 24 – which as some of the Board members had suggested it would square off the house. One of the things I did was I pulled it away from the

house; it allows then\m to kind of soften it with some landscaping. It will put the deck 10 feet away from the property line."

Mr. Eggleston continued, "The covenants that Shadowlawn and Lakeview Circle were built under allowed for 10 foot side yard setbacks to buildings; there actually was no restriction for decks, so technically a deck could go closer, by the architectural standards in the subdivision – but we have proposed 10 feet as being reasonable. So we have reduced, substantially, the amount of deck area. We did have the chance to take this back to the Planning Board, and the Planning Board had a totally different point of view from their previous opinion. I provided the photographs of that area; this deck really sits on the ground. Are there any questions that you have relative to the revised application?"

Chairman Banuski said, "No; I see they are going to put a fire pit in the lawn itself." Mr. Eggleston, "Correct. And they don't need to put a structure around it." Member Phinney, "Great compromise. Thank you. Seems to be much more appropriate for the size of where you are at."

Chairman Banuski opened the public comment portion of the hearing, "Is there anyone here who would like to speak in favor of or in opposition to this plan?" Hearing no one she said, "I move we close the Public Hearing." Member Cromp seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion it was carried.

Member Pardee said, "I move that we accept the revised application and revised plan of Bob and 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 or Uses – Extension or Expansion; to construct a 6 foot privacy fence along the north boundary adjacent to a new 461 SF deck to be constructed on the north side of the house, to construct a new deck and 6 foot privacy fence to be partially constructed over an existing concrete patio on the south side at the property addressed as 8 Lakeview Circle in the Village of Skaneateles. This is a Type 2 transaction and is based on one page of drawings dated 7/31/2013. The Applicant will have two years to complete work." Member Cromp seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion it was carried.

Mr. Eggleston and Mr. Kleckner thanked the Board. This portion of the meeting was concluded at 7:42 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Public Hearing
August 27, 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: Lisa Banuski, Chairman
John Cromp, Member
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Larry Pardee, Member
Craig Phinney, Member

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

Robert Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant

Kathy Farsaci, Skaneateles
Dave Farsaci, Skaneateles
Art Fellerman, Skaneateles
Diane Fellerman, Skaneateles

Chairman Banuski opened the continuation of the Public Hearing at 7:43 pm in the application of Neil & Christine Strodel for 6 Teasel Lane. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "The Strodels built this house in 1984, 2 years before the Zoning was modified. They actually were the original owners of the house. At the time, it did conform; at that time it was required to have a 10 foot side yard. 25 foot combined side yard. They have 26.2 foot combined side yard. With the change in the Zoning Law that now makes this a non-conforming structure. What they would like to do is take an existing patio in the back of the house and put a 16 by 20 screened in porch on the back and relocate the patio to kind of the middle of the back yard, 16 by 16. It does meet the required open area, they are 86.9%. The structure will be built to blend with the existing house; it actually isn't visible from the street. So the only thing we are here for is an expansion of a non-conforming structure, because the current structure has an 18 foot setback where 15 is required. So there is nothing in this application that triggers any additional variances."

Mr. Eggleston continued, "They have talked with their neighbors and we do have a 'no objection' letter signed by their contiguous neighbors. Are there any questions that you have relative to this application?" Chairman Banuski, "No." Member Phinney read the letter into the record, "We the undersigned are aware that Neil and Christine Strodel are proposing to construct a new 16 by 20 foot screened porch, relocate a 16 by 16 foot patio at their property at 6 Teasel

Lane. We are aware that this requires an area variance. We have reviewed the drawings of Robert O. Eggleston, Architect, dated July 22nd 2013 and have no objection to this application." He continued, "these are the residents from 8 Teasel Lane, 4 Teasel Lane, 7 East Lake Street and 9 East Lake Street."

Chairman Banuski opened the public comment portion of the hearing, asking "is there anyone here who would like to speak in favor of this application? In opposition? Then I move that we close the public hearing." Member Phinney seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the Members in favor of the motion, it was declared passed.

Member Phinney said, "I move that we accept the 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. We note that this is a type 2 transaction under SEQRA. Approval is based upon 2 pages of drawings dated 7/22/2013. Applicant shall have 2 years to complete." Member Pardee seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the Members in favor of the motion, it was declared passed.

Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board. This portion of the meeting was concluded at 7:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Public Hearing
August 27, 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: Lisa Banuski, Chairman
John Cromp, Member
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Larry Pardee, Member
Craig Phinney, Member

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

Robert Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant
Art Fellerman, Applicant
Diane Fellerman, Applicant

Kathy Farsaci, Skaneateles
Dave Farsaci, Skaneateles

Chairman Banuski opened the Public Hearing at 7:48 pm in the application of Arthur & Diane Fellerman for 31 East Austin Street. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "This is a house that you had seen before when the previous owner came in for a variance to put in a pool. One of the things was that because it was up against the park and it had a lot of open space around it, they were allowed to go down to 75% open space. The Fellerman's bought the house because it was in the Village and it would accommodate their lifestyle as they gracefully age. The time has come where they do need a ramp for accessibility. We actually have put together a very nice plan of putting it right on the side of the house so that it switches back – it is right next to the garage. So when they come up the driveway they can unload, they switch back towards the street, come around and then up and they make this 20-some-inch grade change. Uniquely, this ramp is going to be very close to the ground. In fact we are considering that the first part might even be built out of pavers because it is sitting very close to the ground. It will not be that obnoxious structure that's oddly placed; I think we have been able to fit it in nicely. There will be – visible from the street – only a railing kind of at the end and only part of it, so it won't be that visible from the street. This does change the open space so they will decrease to 73.6%, but that's the only new variance that this application triggers. Are there any questions that you have relative to the application?

Chairman Banuski opened the public comment portion of the hearing, asking "Is there anyone here who would like to speak in favor of this application?" Mr. Fellerman said that he had talked with 5 neighbors and they had all signed off on it. Chairman Banuski said, "I will read the letters. 'We the undersigned are aware that Arthur & Diane Fellerman are proposing to install a ramp to their property at 31 East Austin Street. We are aware that this requires an area variance. We have reviewed the drawings of Robert O. Eggleston, Architect, dated July 24th, 2013 and have no objection' That is the neighbors Milford, Sinclair, Major, at 32 Austin Street, 61 State Street, 27 East Austin and Mike Major 29 East Austin Street. And another letter that reads, 'My wife and I have read the variance request and plans and feel that the Village and Zoning Board of Appeals should approve the request. We are also surprised that the Village Zoning does not automatically allow construction for handicapped entrances. Are there not some federal laws that mandate such access?' Good question. This is Nancy and Lars Lorentzson at 67 State Street."

Mrs. Fellerman said, "I had a question about that too. The fee for a variance is $200. We are not poor, but what about people who don't have the money for this $200 variance to put up a ramp like this? Is there any allowance in the Village for that consideration?" Chairman Banuski, "Not that I know of. It is a very good question." Mrs. Fellerman, "That bothers me a lot. It really does. We have just remodeled the bathroom to make it accessible. I'd like to stay in this house until I check out. Art would like to stay in this house until we check out. We are putting a lot of money into that house to make it useful for us. We all know people in this community who could benefit from being able to stay in their homes." Chairman Banuski, "I agree. We see variance applications from commercial businesses for this, for private residences. It is a very good question and I don't have an answer for it." Member Cromp said, "That's a good question to bring up to the Trustees and the Mayor. Let them mull it over and see what they think about it. Great question." Mr. Fellerman requested help getting to his car. Chairman Banuski, "There being no other comments, then I move that we close the public hearing." Member Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the Members in favor of the motion, it was declared passed.

Member Phinney said, "I move that we accept the 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. We note that this is a type 2 transaction under SEQRA. Approval is based upon 2 pages of drawings dated 7/24/2013. Applicant shall have 1 year to complete." Member Pardee seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the Members in favor of the motion, it was declared passed.

Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board. This portion of the meeting was concluded at 7:54 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Public Hearing
August 27, 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: Lisa Banuski, Chairman
John Cromp, Member
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Larry Pardee, Member
Craig Phinney, Member

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

Robert Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the Applicants

Kathy Farsaci, Skaneateles
Dave Farsaci, Skaneateles

Chairman Banuski opened the Public Hearing at 7:58 pm in the application of Doug & Nancy McDowell for 30 Hannum Street. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "The McDowells are in the process of purchasing 30 Hannum Street, a cute little house on the corner of Hannum and Kelley. This is kind of unique house in that it is non-conforming in both of the front yards – it's only 15.6 feet off from Hannum Street and only 1.8 feet off from Kelley Street. Since there is no sidewalk on their side, it doesn't look that close. One can actually park the car in front of the garage. Also, it is less than 1,200 SF. There is a minimum living space of 1,200 SF for houses in the Village. To correct that, we are adding a couple of small additions. One will be 14 by 16 foot wing on the west side filling in a back corner here that's 10 by 12; and then a small little 7 by 10 foot area there. That brings the square footage of the house up to 1,568. Because they are taking out a deck in this one area, they will be putting in a 12 foot by 16 foot deck, which actually will join the porch. Right now the porch is separate from the deck. We also have carefully placed it between the two water lines that are passing across the property. Raising the ceiling in the back; the back living room has a very short ceiling and this will be a very subtle change; lifting it up from a low pitch here so it will have about a 9 foot ceiling. That won't be visible from the street – the appearance from the street will remain the same cute little cottage with just this one wing, which we purposely set back. The open space is reduced to 91%; it is a large lot with a small house on it. There are no other variances. The only new variance is that the proposed addition will be 23.7 feet rather than the 30 foot set-back requirement. The

addition will blend with the existing materials and style. Are there any questions that you have relative to this application?"

Member Cromp asked, "Did we do a variance on this one other time, Bob?" Mr. Eggleston said, "When Mrs. Tardiff owned it she put the enclosed entrance on the front, and then she put the 12 foot by 16 foot wing on the side here and the deck I believe. I do have a letter from the Yates; there's a rental directly across the street and then you have Creekside and then the Creamery.

Chairman Banuski said, "I don't have any questions. I will open it up for comments. Is there anyone who would like to speak in favor of this application? Or in opposition? There being no comment, I move that we close the public hearing." Member Pardee seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the Members in favor of the motion, it was declared passed.

Member Cromp said, "I move that we accept the 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. We note that this is a type 2 transaction under SEQRA. Approval is based upon 3 pages of drawings dated 7/24/2013. Applicant shall have 2 years to complete." Member Pardee seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the Members in favor of the motion, it was declared passed.

Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board. This portion of the meeting was concluded at 8:04 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Public Hearing
August 27, 2013

Request for modification of a previously granted Variance for Dave & Kathy Farsaci to construct a 18 x 12 foot roof over the newly-constructed deck at the property addressed as 50 East Lake Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Lisa Banuski, Chairman
John Cromp, Member
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Larry Pardee, Member
Craig Phinney, Member

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

Kathy Farsaci, Applicant
Dave Farsaci, Applicant

Chairman Banuski opened the discussion at 8:05 pm in the request from Dave & Kathy Farsaci for 50 East Lake Street, and requested the applicants to describe their situation. Mrs. Farsaci said, "We were here last month and we were approved to put on a new deck and steps to the pool. No sooner was it approved than we began to think that the deck faces west and the sun is so intense on the deck we probably won't be able to get much use out of it from 5:00 until the sun goes down – unless we put a little shed roof over a portion of it where we're going to put the table. So we called Adam and he said 'you need an amendment to your plan; you should come in for an amendment to the original approved deck'. We want to put a shed over just the center portion, where you come out the sliding glass door." Chairman Banuski said, "Have you talked to the neighbors about it? I think this kind of changes it. An 18 foot roof is pretty big."

Mrs. Farsaci, "I brought a picture of the house in case you want to see what it looks like. Adam said it might be helpful." Chairman Banuski said, "I remember where your property is, but it's kind of hard to picture how big that is." Mrs. Farsaci indicated on the photo where they desired the roof to be. Mr. Farsaci, "It's not the whole back yard." Mrs. Farsaci, "It's just a small portion of the deck where we're going to put a table." [Multiple conversations] Chairman Banuski, "So where the sliding glass doors are, just put a shed roof over that." Member Phinney, "Just over that portion." Mrs. Farsaci, "See where these posts are? We made the deck so if we got approval we could put it out to those posts. So we go over just the back portion." Chairman Banuski, "But this said it's 18 by 16?" Mrs. Farsaci, "The new deck, we had approval to go out to 16 feet. And it goes from the house to this deck—it's 16 feet already. And the 18 feet is just from this post to this post. It's 18 feet of the deck but we had approval to go 40 feet across the back."

Chairman Banuski said, "But you are talking from this post to this post – it's well past the sliding doors; it is substantially wider than that, right?" Mrs. Farsaci, "It's on this side of the screened in porch upstairs. So it's from this side of the screened in porch to the chimney." Chairman Banuski said, "So this is the screened in porch upstairs. This is the post which from this perspective looks like it is in front of that, but it is not. This deck exists now?" Mrs. Farsaci, "That's the one we got approved last month…" Chairman Banuski, "And it's already built?" Mr. Farsaci, "Yes." Mrs. Farsaci, "The deck portion is but the roof is not. But he made these supports under where these posts are going to be substantial enough to cover the roof should he get it approved. If it's not approved he said he'd cut the posts off."

Member Pardee said, "What about one of those sun shades?" Chairman Banuski said, "That's what I was thinking about – an awning – this seem…" Mr. Farsaci, "They only go out 9 feet…" Chairman Banuski, "Already you have a swimming pool and umbrellas and; part of the problem is that a deck is meant to be outdoor space and a deck and not to be a porch." Mrs. Farsaci, "Even before we had this one we had a small deck outside the glass doors. We both have very large families; I'm one of 6, he's one of 5. The parties come to our home. So we always had a table for 10 outside that door anyway. Like I said it was an afterthought. We thought it would look good because there is already a roofline coming down over the porch and there's already a deck on the other side. It's kind of in the middle between the bedroom deck and the living room porch."

Chairman Banuski said, "I don't have any objection; I just think that your neighbors on either side should have been able to see that this was a plan for a porch. Because once you cover it, it is not a deck any more." Attorney Galbato asked, "Did the deck that was approved have a set-back?" Chairman Banuski, "But this is not encroaching on that. This is well within the boundaries of the sides of the houses. Did you talk with your neighbors about the roof?" Mrs. Farsaci, "I did talk with my neighbors about the entire project and they said whatever we wanted to do was fine with them. But we never mentioned the roof. But I can mention the roof. They are very agreeable and wouldn't care what we did."

Attorney Galbato, "So what is the variance they would need for this?" Mr. Dundon said, "the variances that were given -- percentage of open area, side yard set-back left, side yard setback right and both side yards combined." Member Phinney said, "I don't see where there's a variance change." Chairman Banuski, "I don't think there is a variance change, it's just a modification." Attorney Galbato, "If the deck encroached on the side yard set-back and now you're going up it is still a variance." After some discussion the Board believed that this case involves an expansion of a non-conforming structure. Attorney Galbato said, "If that's the case, we still don't have anything in writing from Adam; what's before this Board is first a determination (1) if you want to act without Adam's determination and if you do (2) then whether this is a significant change that would necessitate another Public Hearing notice to go out." [Multiple sidebar conversations]

Mrs. Farsaci said, "I'm surprised Adam didn't say something, he said it should be no problem." Chairman Banuski recounted another situation where a roof was being placed over an existing deck and the Board requested that a stop-work order be placed on the property. So, I think you

do need another variance for this." Member Cromp said, "I think it's fair that the neighbors get to see what it is." Member Hartnett said, "It's a sizeable change."

Mr. Farsaci said, "What if we went with that thing that you were suggesting?" Mr. Pardee said, "The roll-up awning?" Chairman Banuski said, "You don't even visit us for that." Mrs. Farsaci observed that they do not extend far enough out.

Mrs. Farsaci asked, "But if we want to put the shed roof on, the next thing is to reapply all over again?" Attorney Galbato said, "Yes. It sounds like some of the members think that this is a significant or substantial change." Chairman Banuski said, "If you were narrowing the stairs, that's a modification. This is a change."

In response to questions about timing, Mr. Dundon instructed the Applicant to apply tomorrow in order to make the Planning Board cycle for September. Chairman Banuski told the applicants that the Board appreciates that they came back with this and didn't just go ahead. Mrs. Farsaci indicated that they would be back next month.

This portion of the meeting was concluded at 8:20 pm, at which point the meeting was adjourned by acclamation.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards