Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
June 5, 2014

Continuation of the Public Hearing in the matter of the application of Cathy McDonald for a 21 lot subdivision, called Hidden Pond Subdivision, located off East Street in the area of the Village water tower site in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Brian Carvalho, Member
William Eberhardt, Member
Douglas Sutherland, Member

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

Robert Seeley, EDR, on behalf of the applicant

Jerry Morrissey, Skaneateles
Tim Lynn, Skaneateles
Larry Pardee, Skaneateles
Francis Moran, Skaneateles
David Colegrove, Skaneateles

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

Chairman Kenan called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm, announcing the continuation of the Public Hearing for Hidden Pond subdivision. Mr. Seeley introduced himself and presented, "Our client is just looking for preliminary approval so that he can free up his funding from the bank, so that he can pay to have the revisions made; there are significant engineering fees related to the changes that have been required by the Village engineer. He's kind of in a Catch-22."
Chairman Kenan, "And I believe there is an escrow payment required to the Village too?"
Attornet Galbato, "Yes. The Planning Board has requested an escrow of $5,000 and we have advised the applicant through his engineering form to provide that, because there's an outstanding bill from our engineer already which is in excess of $2,000."

Chairman Kenan, "So in the request for an approval of some kind so that Tom McDonald can get a bank loan, I think in conference with Counsel earlier today, we determined that we can do a sketch plan review, which is part of the procedures spelled out in the subdivision regulations. The drawing you submitted for that purpose is the first drawing of the larger packet that you have already submitted to us for this application. It is basically the parcel layout – drawing V-L1, with a redated date of January 16, 2014. The history being that this Hidden Pond subdivision was approved in 2008, basically with this identical layout, but never filed with the County. So time elapsed and it was necessary to start the process all over again. And now the engineering

requirements of the Village have changed to a significant degree because of the water, sewer, I'm not sure what else." Mr. Seeley, "It's not just the Village, it's the Ten State Standards as well."

Chairman Kenan, "Since this is a Public Hearing, I'll ask if anybody has anything they want to say or comment on the application." Mr. Morrissey reiterated his concerns about the ability to sell the project given the lot costs and the sizes of the houses, saying "as a broker with a lot at $85 and house for $310 it's a tough sell; it is a challenge."

Chairman Kenan, seeing no one else desiring to make a comments said, "I will entertain a motion to keep the Public hearing open." **Member Sutherland said, "I make the motion that we continue the Public Hearing to the July 3, 2014 meeting of the Planning Board at 7:30 pm." Member Eberhardt seconded the motion.** Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, Chairman Kenan declared, "The motion is passed." Attorney Galbato explained to Mr. Seeley the fact that the Board must render a decision on the application within 62 days of closing the Public Hearing.

Chairman Kenan said, "Now in the interest of responding to the applicant's request for 'some kind of an approval' how does the board feel about, I guess I'd call it, a limited sketch plan approval, in that the package of drawings submitted would not meet approval because part of it is the utility plan that needs to be amended after the engineers' review. The parcel map, is identical to what was submitted a number of years ago; it's up to the board. If they are comfortable with that, we can give a sketch plan approval to the applicant based on that drawing with some language that makes it clear that what you are approving is what is shown on the drawing and not other things."

Member Eberhardt said, "I make the motion that we approve the Hidden Pond subdivision Sketch Plan as it exists on June 5, 2014 [drawing V-L1 dated January 16, 2014] with the understanding that there may be further revisions based on engineering review and further comments and requests made by the Planning Board as we move toward a conditional final subdivision approval." Member Sutherland seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, Chairman Kenan declared, "The motion is passed."

This matter was concluded at 7:41 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
June 5, 2014

Special Use Permit and Variance Recommendation in the matter of the application of Gerald Morrissey to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Front yard set-back and Percentage of open area; and Section 225-69D Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion; to convert an existing dwelling unit to a guest house accessory structure greater than 800 SF and to construct a new 4,020 SF single family dwelling on the property addressed as 42 East Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Brian Carvalho, Member
William Eberhardt, Member
Douglas Sutherland, Member

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

Bill Murphy, Architect, on behalf of the applicant
Jerry Morrissey, applicant

Tim Lynn, Skaneateles
Larry Pardee, Skaneateles
Francis Moran, Skaneateles
David Colegrove, Skaneateles

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

Chairman Kenan opened discussion of this matter at 7:42 pm. Mr. Murphy introduced himself and presented, "If we take a look at the drawing, one thing the Board asked for at our previous meeting was the aerial photograph showing more context. We included that in everybody's packet. I called out the lot and where the new residence would be located on the lot and how it relates to all the surrounding structures in the immediate neighborhood. The big change to the plan is we looked at all of the things that the Morrisseys would ever want to [inaudible] and we talked about a pool, so one thing we have done is provided for a proposed future pool. We have planned for that pool to be the minimum 25 feet from lot line. This does require a slightly larger coverage variance. We are looking to tackle that all at once rather than piecemeal and come back in a couple of years.

Chairman Kenan, "So you are not building the pool now or the plan is not to build the pool now? With this variance you could build it without needing to return." Mr. Murphy, "to be built within some period; whatever stipulation you put on that. The floor plans pretty much are very similar; we have addressed the front elevation some more, we have made some changes to the building

finish-wise, just to try to give it a little more of that village charm and tie it into the existing farmhouse on the lot. The idea of the project is to make it look as if this house has been here for a long time, and is not one of the newer, more modern style homes that's been built up and down the street. Trying to bring more of the Leitch Avenue and Academy side of the schools to the other side of the schools, and make that neighborhood kind of wrap around the school district."

Chairman Kenan, "Do you have any questions? The front yard setback it is a variance of 1.5 feet. Is that done to align with the other…" Mr. Murphy, "It's actually on the existing structure. Our new structure is proposed at 44.1 ft from the road line. We had looked at that before and that was more in a response of the drive, not being able to account for more than 25% of the front yard. So 10 foot drive in the 40 foot setback is the 25%, and that's how we are meeting that requirement."

Chairman Kenan, "So the issues are the front yard set-back of the existing structure, the lot coverage taking into account the future pool and in deeming the existing structure a supplemental apartment, it is over the 800 square feet…" Mr. Murphy, "By approximately 347.2 SF." Chairman Kenan, "Any questions?" Mr. Sutherland, "One thing that does come through here, is that there is a fair amount of asphalt; the drive in plus the shared way in between the two properties. I wonder if you have fully grasped how much…" Mr. Murphy, "We have talked about it. What's tricky with the lot is there is a significant grade change which happens from here to here. Using the barn for storage of anything, you need some sort of access to traverse that hill and get into that barn." Chairman Kenan, "From where to where is that grade change?" Mr. Murphy, "It's approximately in here." Chairman Kenan, "Say it in words that the recorder will understand." Mr. Murphy, "It's a little west of the small addition that comes out of the west façade of the existing barn. West by about 15 to 20 feet." Chairman Kenan, "And what happens; the grade falls off as you come away from East Street?" Mr. Murphy, "It is all going uphill into this barn. Trying to position the house, as we get further back it tends to not really fit and as we push further up we get into a tighter pinch point with this [barn]. Is it more pavement than you might want to consider there? Yes. Do I think it's all kind of necessary to allow the turn-arounds to happen, to get into the garage and use the existing overhead door up here? There might be some you could trim out of this area here?"

Member Carvalho, "What about the drive in front of the house?" Mr. Murphy, "The drive in front of the house is to relieve the intersection pressure that will happen with the 21 new homes coming in right here. It pulls that away from that school intersection traffic. It also provides a turn-around for the house; a drop-off point bringing kids in and out. We don't have to ability to do like a circle, or some sort of drop-off point that accommodates that, so this is a convenience drive that would allow them to access away from this intersection of the new road that will come out and provide them with a point as far north on the site to get into and out of East Street." Mr. Morrissey, "May I comment on that? We live right next to Waterman School right now, northwest of this property. Many times we come out it is close to that same intersection over there with the middle school there so one thing we said is it's awfully difficult sometimes two times a day getting in and out of your house – it's actually dangerous. I have to either leave before 7:30 or before quarter to 9. They are all coming out; it seems like every parent drops their child off so there's not only buses there's cars. So to relieve that pressure coming out that end of

the driveway into that and being able to go across and relieving pressure further down the road, it's just, it's almost…"

Member Sutherland, "For the proposed new driveway coming out the side. Is that proposed to come off the …" Mr. Murphy, "New road going in, correct." Chairman Kenan said, "Hidden Pond Way." Mr. Morissey, "It's also, can I say just one more thing, it's also just my little ones are going to have to cross the street somewhere and to cross the street here, where all that action is, to be able to go down the driveway and be able to look both ways is going to be. And people line up and down on East Street, trying to wait for the middle school flow traffic they are up and down their cars; they are down here closer to Waterman, is not much. They are not lined down that far but they are lined down in front of the farmhouse, down about half [unintelligible] To be able to stand and wait and cross the street is very important to us – there's not many crosswalks there's nothing that gets you across the street. And if you are on East Street at some of those times there's a lot of cars and some of them are going pretty fast that's a concern."

Chairman Kenan, "Any other questions? Anyone want to propose an action, a motion?" Member Carvalho, "The issues are the foot-and-a-half setback which is existing conditions, so there really isn't an issue there. The 80% coverage versus 85% proposed. It seems like the concern we have is really asphalt, and that doesn't get included in that 80% either. And the size of the supplemental apartment – that's the third one and the one we really haven't discussed." Chairman Kenan, "That really goes to the issue of whether there's, well both that and open space, is there too much on the lot or not?" Mr. Murphy, "And what I'll say to that is if you think about the village and the density that exists within the urban core of the village, it is far above even an 80% lot coverage. If you look at the variances that exist that relate to coverage up and down our most cherished streets of Leitch Avenue and Academy – your coverages in there are well north of what's allowed in terms of the Village Zoning ordinance. I don't think there's a precedent that's been set by any means to approve variances of this nature but at the same time I don't think it is out of line in the Village to ask for a 4% coverage variance. The question to me really revolves around – the lot is a big lot. Bigger than what's on the lot today. And how do you add space for the Morrisseys to this lot in a comfortable fashion that the village wants to see as opposed to tearing down all the structures on the lot or trying to add onto them in some way. If you look at the historic aspect it would be a house, a gatehouse, a barn. We tended to build structures in small, little communities and that's kind of what this old farm is trying to emulate."

Member Sutherland, "I think the one thing maybe that – it's not the density that troubles me; instead it is the width of the house; 73 feet wide is bigger in that context than what we are used to. I like what you have done in terms of a house that looks like it grew over time, rather than something that was all perfectly proportioned and dropped all at once. The kind of organic growth is what you see. What I might have done is taken the house and instead of running it along the street, I might have run it the other way. So you had the traditional form that is more in the 35-40-45 feet wide to the street and the growth that occurred, occurred going back. And it looks like if this had been a little bit more that way, you would have treated the front differently. If you were working in this fashion I think you still have that pleasant cluster…" Mr. Murphy, "I can tell from looking at it and you probably can too, that the distance here is a pinch point. That becomes really tough. We did look into and explore some early things on a site plan and kind of created like a really shady side yard because you wouldn't pull it all; it's tricky. There is no

doubt that the existing structures pushed us more in this direction, than coming back out the way that you are suggesting." Member Eberhardt, "Doug, the other aspect of it as you just suggested is that then you take the driveway down this way." Mr. Murphy, "The other thing that happens is it puts the garage either in the front of the house, which we don't really like, or in the back of the house. If it's in the back of the house, then it's in between cooking and watching the kids, whereas this kind of puts it in a spot that allows you from inside the living space to see the back yard and the kids playing. For those kind of reasons we ended up where we did, which if you look at the aerial photo is kind of the zone that gets occupied by a lot of the houses. But I do hear your point about it being a little wider on the street, but that's also our widest portion of the lot." Member Sutherland, "I think probably if it's built there what you pick up is the tightness to that property next door. This assembly it's ok; I think if it was flipped there might be a way to get it tighter, but it's sort of that pattern of building to open space along the street – this one is going to feel not as wide as the school, but a lot wider than the other houses around there. To the extent there's a discomfort, it may be in part for that sense of the natural pattern of the street is disrupted. It isn't necessarily; there are a lot of good features about the house – it's just that it's colliding a bit with the existing pattern." Mr. Murphy, "Certainly looking at the width of these structures and then putting this on the back of it, part of that is the closeness of the structures on the site to our north, which we don't necessarily control."

Member Sutherland, "One of the comments that you made was the tie-back into the kind of houses you see on Leitch. The Leitch houses, if you look at the pattern of them, they are all nearly the same width and to the extent that some houses are bigger than others it tends to have been through that growth that has been added going back on the lot." Mr. Murphy, "But not at the corner conditions." Member Sutherland, "I'm not sure this is corner condition. There is an anchoring that happens but it's…" Mr. Murphy, "It's proposed to be a corner condition." Member Sutherland, "This would be the corner." Mr. Murphy, "I'm not trying to be argumentative." Member Sutherland, "Nor am I. I think as a Board we are just trying to sort through that sense of…" Chairman Kenan, "Doug, I think it does create a back yard which the house orients to. If you turn it 90 degrees, the back yard becomes a side yard I'm not sure how much yard you have left over. I think the point he made there is valid." Mr. Murphy, "If the barn were back another 100 feet, 50 feet even, we'd have some room there. But we get to a really weird spot when we turn that house."

Chairman Kenan, "Anything else?" Member Sutherland, "No." Chairman Kenan, "Do you want to make a recommendation?" Member Sutherland, "I think someone else should make a recommendation on this one." Chairman Kenan, "Does anyone have a motion to make?" Attorney Galbato, "There are two things for the board to consider and they are both advisory. Advisory on the variances requested from the ZBA and also on the Special Use Permit because of the accessory apartment." Member Carvalho said, "We still haven't talked about that. I'm new to this. The 800 SF…" Attorney Galbato, "With the accessory apartment there's two issues. One is a variance that the applicant needs because it's over 800 SF, and the other a Special Use Permit just to have the accessory use." Chairman Kenan, "The more frequent circumstance would be where the main house existed and the applicant wants to build the accessory structure to go with it. This happens to occur backwards, since the smaller structure is there already. But you need a special permit to have the accessory structure."

Member Carvalho said, "I'll make a motion to recommend that the ZBA approve the variance on the coverage and the 1 ½ foot setback and square footage of the accessory house structure, and also recommend that the ZBA grant the Special Use Permit for the accessory use." Chairman Kenan seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion the Chairman declared, "The motion is passed." Mr. Murphy thanked the Board.

This matter was concluded at 8:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
June 5, 2014

Subdivision approval in the matter of the application of Lawrence and Anne Pardee for a minor subdivision redrawing lot lines on the west side of the property addressed as 67 West Elizabeth Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Brian Carvalho, Member
William Eberhardt, Member
Douglas Sutherland, Member

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

Larry Pardee, applicant

Tim Lynn, Skaneateles
Francis Moran, Skaneateles
David Colegrove, Skaneateles
Robert Eggleston, Skaneateles

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

Chairman Kenan opened discussion of this matter at 8:04 pm. Mr. Pardee introduced himself and presented, "The only reason I am selling off this little chunk of land is to help my neighbor, Amy Klein, who wants to put a storage shed behind her house. Her current land is obviously pretty small; it's about 11,000 SF. This would give her another 8,670 SF. That's the only reason we are doing it. The land is of no use to me; my house is quite a ways away." Chairman Kenan asked, "Your lot, before the subdivision…" Mr. Pardee, "Is everything except for this right here. 112,000 SF after the sale. We are transferring less than ¼ acre. Where the surveyor said 'proposed garage', he just stuck that in there randomly." Chairman Kenan, "So the Klein lot is .27 acres today to the centerline. You are conveying .2, bringing it up to .47 acres. And yours goes from 2.77 to 2.57 acres?" Mr. Pardee, "2.67 or something like that; I don't remember exactly." Chairman Kenan, "It doesn't make your lot non-conforming. Does it make the Klein lot conforming?" Mr. Dundon advised that 30,000 SF is required for a conforming lot. Chairman Kenan said, "It is non-conforming and it will still be non-conforming, but less non-conforming. And the setbacks to the shed?" Mr. Pardee, "3 feet 4 inches to my shed."

Chairman Kenan, "Any questions? Does anyone have a motion to make?" **Member Eberhardt said, "I'll make the motion that that Planning Board declares itself lead agency under SEQRA and that this is an unlisted action receiving uncoordinated review. We further make a negative declaration since there is no new lot being created. Further I move to**

approve that subdivision requested by the applicant in his application dated May 20, 2014 for an adjustment of lot lines, and authorize the Chairman to sign the final subdivision maps." Member Sutherland seconded the motion.

Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion the Chairman declared, "The motion is passed." Mr. Pardee thanked the Board.

This matter was concluded at 8:02 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
June 5, 2014

Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Francis Moran to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard set-back, left and Percentage of open area; and Section 225-69D Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion; to construct a 4 bedroom house with a 2-car detached garage at the property addressed as 62 Fennell Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Brian Carvalho, Member
William Eberhardt, Member
Douglas Sutherland, Member

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

Robert Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the applicant
Francis Moran, applicant

Tim Lynn, Skaneateles
David Colegrove, Skaneateles

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

Chairman Kenan opened discussion of this matter at 8:10 pm. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "Frank is also here. Two years ago we came in with a proposal to develop the vacant lot on the corner of Austin and Fennel Street. You took a look at it; you thought what we did was a stellar house appropriate to Austin Street and to the neighborhood in the village context. We went to the ZBA, at that time we were proposing a slightly larger house – it had 4 or 5 variances – they all made sense, none of them were inconsistent with the neighborhood. We went to the ZBA; we were rather taken aback by the poor reception we had there. We actually modified the plan to minimize all the variances we could. At the time we had a south side variance and a garage side yard/rear yard variance and we had a front yard variance and the coverage. We actually reduced it down to about a 1900 SF house, 2-stories still, and we call it a 4 bedroom. A couple of the bedrooms upstairs are small. What Frank was interested in was definitely having a first floor bedroom/bathroom, and then we have a large master upstairs and two small rooms. We have minimized this to only 2 variances. We moved the garage in so it had its 15 foot rear yard setback. It has its required 3 foot side yard setback, though we made it 5 feet so we don't have to do anything special for fire code. We brought the north side in so it complied with the required 20% side yard setback. The house proper meets the average setback on Austin Street which is 17.9 feet, but the porch itself does stick out in front and we are asking for 13.3 feet where 17.9 street average is required. Then the coverage; we have 74% open space

where 85% is required. In working with lots this small, 75% open space is not unusual. Some lots similar to this are in the 60% or 50% open space. But we have reduced the house as much as possible."

Mr. Eggleston continued, "One of the objections the ZBA had was that it was a full 2-story house. Next door on Fennell Street is the only cape in the neighborhood or in the block. It's basically just a little 1.5 story cape next door. They said, well gee can't you make it a cape? We have the square footage of the first floor down to only 1100 SF and we really wanted the space. So I went through and in your packet we are showing all the houses. Probably ¾ of the houses on Austin Street wrapping around the corner Elizabeth Street are all 2-story houses. You have a couple that are 1 ¾ story houses; there's one 1-story house by the Catholic church. We felt that the design of the house was very much in keeping with the village standards. We thought that having the porch, and it's a 7 foot deep porch so it's a useable porch, was important to maintaining the character of Skaneateles. We brought the first floor up 3 feet high which is the standard for Parkside where they are trying to make them more village-like. The bottom line is that possibly the neighbors kind of enjoyed having a free side yard – it was the two adjacent neighbors who were complaining about it. One of the big complaints over here on 19 West Austin Street was that this was going to shadow his house and garden. Of course the height of this is such and it's on the west side so the last hour of sunlight is going to be lost in shadows. We did decide to move it 15 feet over. There was concern about drainage; this is a low lot now and it kind of holds everyone else's water because there's nothing impermeable on the property now. We will be putting gutters and take our drainage to the storm system so we won't be contributing any more to the drainage, leaving the 15 feet here maybe gives us a little area where we can keep it a little lower, so their water can still come over."

Chairman Kenan, "What's the 15 feet you are talking about?" Mr. Eggleston, "The 15 foot rear yard set-back – and that's a required set-back. So we have done as much as we can to make the variances as minimal as possible. We feel it is totally in keeping with the neighborhood. Frank Moran can tell you how he has been paying taxes on this property for over 20 years." Mr. Moran, "I took title to it in 1981." Mr. Eggleston, "That makes it 33 years." Mr. Moran, "I guess they were going with no zoning at that point in time, and they got a zoning ordinance passed, so in a hurry these guys, realizing that it wasn't a big lot so they sold it. And I bought it and I've had it ever since. I cut the grass regularly; never had a problem. I put the sidewalk in; as a side lot that takes a lot of concrete than just a front set-back. And I just feel like, I'll be honest with you, you guys approved it and we made adjustments based on the fact that we couldn't get by the ZBA. The person who was running the ZBA, she had made up her mind before we even got into the meeting, that the house was too big for the lot." Chairman Kenan, "Is the lot itself conforming?" Mr. Eggleston, "No. The lot exists. It is a conforming non-conforming lot if you will. Section 225-70 has a minimum lot standard of 5000 SF; we are 7900 SF. In other words, we're supposed to be a 30,000 SF lot. I defy you to find a conforming lot on this block with 100 feet of frontage. We have the minimums necessary that we can build; instead of using the normal density control schedules, we can build 20% side yards, 15% rear yards and front yards of the lot depth and lot width. We have used all of those and we conform with everything except the front porch. The percent coverage we get kicked back to the regular density control schedule and they want 85% open space and we have 74.7% open space. One of the things that we have added; we took the tax map – I have done projects on a third of these

properties and had their surveys and measured adjacent buildings – between that and aerial photographs we were able to put together the entire block to show you what the development patterns are. We are not the densest; the former mayor, Bob Green's house is the most dense, and a lot of these over here are in the 74% open space area. We do have 3 new Board members on the ZBA and we are optimistic that they will take a different approach. We have addressed the neighbor issues that I think are more self-serving issues than community issues."

Chairman Kenan, "The issue before this Board is recommendation on two variances and that's it? You don't need a variance for using a non-conforming lot?" Mr. Eggleston, "No. There's no structure so we're not expanding it." Chairman Kenan, "OK. Any questions? Any motions?" **Member Eberhardt said, "I'll make a motion that we recommend to the ZBA that they grant the variances requested in the application of Francis Moran dated May 22, 2014." Member Sutherland seconded the motion.**

Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion the Chairman declared, "The motion is passed." Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board.

This matter was concluded at 8:23 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
June 5, 2014

Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Timothy and Cynthia Lynn 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 construct a new 288 SF patio in the rear yard at the property addressed as 50 Academy Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Brian Carvalho, Member
William Eberhardt, Member
Douglas Sutherland, Member

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

Tim Lynn, applicant

David Colegrove, Skaneateles

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

Chairman Kenan opened discussion of this matter at 8:25 pm. Mr. Lynn introduced himself and presented, "What we'd like to do; we came before the Board 4 years ago and both the Board and the ZBA approved coverage slightly over the 15% permitted coverage at 16.7% coverage. I also understand that the house is a little too close to the street, so we are expanding a non-conforming structure. It is to put in a patio that's 288 SF. It's an 8x4 section. If you look at the map there's an exterior staircase going to the basement. That piece that's described as 8x4 fills in the area next to it and then a 16x16 patio out the back. The ZBA on their own motion approved a little extension at the bottom of the staircase here that goes up into the house. There's about a 4 foot rise up to the house. The ZBA amended my application to add a small area at the bottom to extend out because they didn't think that I had enough concrete there to make it line up correctly. What I am asking the Board to do is to reiterate the recommendation you gave last time for the Variance on coverage that would take me from 13.88% to 16.7%."

Chairman Kenan said "So the 16/7% is 1.7% over the 15% permitted. Is that the whole issue, the open space?" Mr. Lynn, "Yes. The set-backs are all correct." **Member Sutherland said, "I move that we recommend to the ZBA that they approve the variances being requested by Mr. Lynn for lot coverage and expansion of a non-conforming use." Member Eberhardt seconded the motion.** Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion the Chairman declared, "The motion is passed." Mr. Lynn thanked the Board.

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 8:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards