

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting November 6, 2014

Variance recommendation in the matter of the application by Jill & Todd Marshall to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Rear yard set-back and Percentage of open area; to construct a new patio with pavers, new walkways and a stone retaining wall with steps at the property addressed as 20 Leitch Avenue in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

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

Wayne LaFrance, Architect, for the Applicant

Robert Eggleston, Skaneateles
Dale & Stacy Drake, Skaneateles

Chairman Kenan opened the meeting at 7:30 pm, calling the matter of Jill & Todd Marshall for 20 Leitch Avenue. Mr. LaFrance introduced himself and presented, "Jill & Todd Marshall have a couple of preexisting nonconforming uses; one of them was the open area. Last time we were here we received a variance; we managed to get the percentage improved from 83 to 84 roughly and that took care of the building and we thought we were done. Unfortunately they want to come in with a patio and a walkway off the back of their house not knowing that that required also to come back and forth. I stopped the work when I came across the site, they got part of the work in but the rest has not been done, and I am here to seek variances. So the idea here is that per the plan as you are looking at it – the items that are not complete are the pathways and the round patio. Their intention there is with pavers. This will bring the open area unfortunately down; instead of being 85% it will be 80%. The only thing that I can offer is that under the definition of open space, it does talk about some pavement areas but the intention was for vehicles. It was never I don't believe, intended for pedestrian traffic. The notion here is by providing an activity area; a family room above the garage, they now have pathways from the garage back to the house. So they are actually going to create a path walking back and forth from the house to this certain area. So the logic is rather than tracking mud through the house, they want to walk on pavers. So it really a practicality issue, a technical issue since we are exceeding; but the logic is to give them a place to sit outdoors. If you are familiar with the project or remember it, they did have a deck that they took apart and they have enclosed the rear

porch on the previous project so everything is under cover. So now this rear patio is out in the open; it's in the garden portion of their home. So between the rear garage and the rear of the home is a heavily landscaped area with some stone walls, some stone steps and the brick pavers."

Chairman Kenan, "And what do the dotted lines mean on here?" Mr. LaFrance, "That's supposed to be planting beds." Chairman Kenan, "So the issue is an increase in coverage of 4 point something – 4.3 %." Mr. LaFrance, "Yes."

Member Sutherland said, "I move that we recommend that the ZBA approve the requested variance along with the drawing dated 6/19/14, and application dated October 28, 2014."

Member Eberhardt seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, Chairman Kenan called the motion passed. This matter was concluded at 7:34 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting November 6, 2014

Variance recommendation in the matter of the application by Dale & Stacy Drake to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Front yard set-back, Side yard set-back, left; Side yard set-back, right; Both side yards combined; Percentage of structure width/lot width; and Percentage of open area; and Section 225-69D Nonconforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion to construct a 12 foot by 17 foot kitchen addition, to construct a 3 foot by 5 foot addition to the entry, to extend an existing dormer by 11.5 feet, to enlarge and replace an existing patio with one 16 by 14 feet, and to construct a 16 foot by 24 foot garage with storage above at the property addressed as 9 Orchard Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

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

Robert Eggleston, Architect, for the Applicant
Dale & Stacy Drake, Applicants

Becky Barker, Skaneateles

Chairman Kenan opened this matter at 7:34 pm, calling the matter of Dale & Stacy Drake for 9 Orchard Street. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "They have owned the house on the corner of Orchard and Highland for quite a few years. They were in the military -- they thought it would be a great house to retire into. They had an awesome tenant; when they retired from the military they couldn't kick the tenant out, but they had gotten a variance to enlarge the house by expanding the back porch for a larger kitchen and to expand the back dormer so that they had headroom in the shower. Just a few minor revisions. Their tenant was such a great tenant -- they let her stay -- but now they have found her alternative housing and they are ready to move in. So they would like to renew the variance that was granted earlier. It was to take off a small deck, put a 7 by 12 foot addition on the first floor for the kitchen and to bump out the dormers on the top. They have added to it a 5 by 4 foot addition off the side stairs. They actually use the stairs -- it comes in at grade level then goes down to the basement or comes up. So that is added to the variance. The other thing that's added to the variance -- it is a very small lot -- but they would like a one car garage making it 16 by 24. We would like to push that garage in the back corner. They have the driveway next to the house -- that's where they will keep a car

– but then they'll have a car in the garage. Because the house is such a small house they have kind of taken on a traditional barn with a second level which they can use for storage. There won't be any water or anything like that in it; it's strictly garage storage but it gives them a little bit of space to put extra things – lawn mowing equipment and like that. So as a result the variance that we are asking for is the expansion of a nonconforming structure and in that the existing is about 1.3 feet from the required 30 foot front yard; roughly but not quite in line with the rest of the houses. The left side has a 10.3 foot set-back where 15 is required; the new work will be 10.6 so it will be less nonconforming. The right side yard which is the second street frontage is required to have a 21 foot set-back. We have an existing 15.8 foot set-back to the house putting this little addition bump-out on will decrease that to 12.4 feet. So there is a slight increase in that nonconformity. The combined side yards do not meet the required 35 feet; we have 23 feet for that. The open space will be reduced to 75.3 where 85% is required. As you have seen in the past that's not inconsistent for small corner lots. The garage is allowed to have a 3 foot side yard; we actually have a 6.4 foot side yard so you can have the required 10 feet to the adjacent garage. We are required to have a 15 foot rear yard; we are asking for a 5 foot rear yard just so we are not wasting precious back yard space. So it will be 5 feet off the west property line. That's actually the side yard for the house next door, so it is not inconsistent; we would be allowed a 3 foot side yard so we are asking for a 5 foot set-back there. The finishes on the house will match the existing house and we have carried that over to the garage. Are there any questions or comments that you have?"

Chairman Kenan, "So there is actually 5 individual variances required? You are not changing the front yard are you?" Mr. Eggleston, "No, that's an existing. We have a variance for expanding a nonconforming lot. We are asking for an open space variance, we are asking for a left side yard variance (through it's no more nonconforming), a right side yard variance which is slightly more nonconforming, the combined side yards which is slightly more nonconforming and the garage rear set-back at 5 feet where 15 feet is required." Chairman Kenan, "So right now it is clapboard below and shingles above? And that's what you are going to maintain on the house and on the barn?" Mr. Eggleston, "Yes we are going to carry that over to the barn. Chairman Kenan, "In the drawing it says vertical board and batten. Mr. Eggleston, "That's what it originally was. It will be clapboard and shingle."

Member Carvalho, "That garage – you say it is a side yard but it is going to be this neighbor's front yard." Mr. Eggleston, "No. Is it in that neighbor's front yard? We have the required front yard set back for a side – but yes it will be forward of that house, correct." Member Carvalho, "I think the design of that garage it fits the house very nicely, but it is going to be a big structure they are going to be looking out at." Mr. Drake, "It's hard because it is a corner lot so there really isn't a lot of choices to make it so that it isn't in someone's you know." Member Carvalho, "Is there a better landscape buffer you could come up with?" Mr. Eggleston, "Right now they have the arborvitae there that were put in and have started growing. So whether we make it thicker or whatever you think would be appropriate – I think 5 feet gives an area where you can actually grow something." Member Hartnett, "Do you have input from the neighbors?" Mr. Eggleston, "Have you talked with those neighbors? That's a rental." Mrs. Drake, "It is and we were trying to figure out how to reach – I think that's one of Ilyssa Green's properties, which she is renting out next door. She just purchased it maybe a year or two ago, so we haven't had contact with her. But we certainly could." [Multiple conversations] Mr. Drake, "I think it is

worth mentioning too that there is a shed that's there right now – a pretty good-sized shed that's going to go away. Where that shed is that's where the garage will be.”

Mr. Eggleston, “Also the neighbor, not that Ilyssa Green did it, has a nonconforming driveway that's right on the property line. It is small houses on small lots.” Member Sutherland, “I think the garage is also up against an open parking space. It's not right up against the house, it's up against an open parking space.” Mr. Eggleston, “It's 24 feet away from the house.”

Member Eberhardt said, “I'll make a motion that we recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the 5 variances requested on the Drake application dated 10/24/14, with an additional recommendation that they contact the neighbor and install the buffer zone that is on the drawings, substantially more significant; increased by 100%.” Member Hartnett seconded the motion.

Mr. Drake, “I have a question just so I can understand about the arborvitae, there is roughly 10 of them, so they are covering 75% of the length of the property. They are only probably 3 feet - 3.5 feet tall – they have been there for 1 year. They have not been there a long time but they are the kind of thing that would grow fast – that's why I picked them.” Member Eberhardt, “They are not miniature – they appear to be dwarf plantings?” Mr. Drake, “They will grow to be 10 feet tall.” Member Sutherland, “What are those planted on center, do you know?” Mrs. Drake, “They are 5 feet Emerald arborvitae.” Chairman Kenan, “I think at the spacing they are planted they are never going to grow together. They are too far apart to form a wall.” Mrs. Drake, “So is that what you would like to see; something that creates a wall?” Chairman Kenan, “Interpreting Bill's suggestion to double up; if you planted one between every one, it will take time before it grows to screen much of anything but eventually it could.” Mrs. Drake, “If we can let these grow they will grow at a rate that's pretty fast.”

Mr. Eggleston, “One thing I noticed was if the driveway is on the property line, those are 5 feet over, they need to be moved anyway. I think what we could do is to move them a little closer to the driveway and space them closer. They should be moved halfway between the garage and the driveway. So we can space them a little closer together.” Chairman Kenan, “I think that if you halve the spacing, you have a chance of them growing together.”

Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, Chairman Kenan declared motion passed. Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board. This matter was concluded at 7:49 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting November 6, 2014

Critical Impact Permit and variance recommendations in the matter of the application by Becky Barker to change the use of the property and to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Accessory Buildings, distance to lot lines or structures to convert an existing single-family dwelling to a two-family dwelling, to construct a 12 foot by 16 foot patio and four car parking lot and to relocate a storage building and shed at the property addressed as 41 Jordan Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

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

Robert Eggleston, Architect, for the Applicant
Becky Barker, Applicant

Chairman Kenan opened this matter at 7:50 pm, calling the matter of Becky Barker for 41 Jordan Street. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "Becky Barker recently purchased the Powell residence which is a cute little village house on Jordan in the commercial Downtown D District. What she proposes to do is to convert it to a two-family house, having one unit downstairs and one unit upstairs. That is an allowed, permitted use. It requires Critical Impact so I have provided a narrative addressing the issues of the Critical Impact and going through the criteria. The second thing that we need is a variance for the accessory structure. The Powells received a variance to construct a 12 by 24 foot one-car garage; they had placed it close to the house. Naturally as a single-family house it made sense. In the Downtown D District we are not exempt from the 15 foot side yard, 15 foot rear yard. So we are required to have, whereas in the A and B Districts we are allowed a 3 foot side yard on a detached garage. So we are required to have a 15 foot side yard. What we want to do is to push the garage to the back. She's actually going to turn it around and use it more as a storage area."

Chairman Kenan, "The same building?" Mr. Eggleston, "The same building, correct. We are going to maintain an 8 foot side yard set-back; we will have the required 15 foot side yard set-back. So we will have just 8 feet off the property line instead of 15. The lot is narrow enough that you could just about put it in the center of the lot and get your 15 feet on both sides, but it is pretty narrow back there. There is also another shed that she was going to move which will have a 3 foot side yard set-back, 15 rear yard – so that also needs a variance to the 15 foot side yard.

So the variances that we are requesting from the ZBA are the side yard set-backs for the two accessory buildings because they are required to be 15 feet. The odd thing is the primary building can be zero feet off the property line. So it's kind of one of those interesting little things where the main building can be right on the property line but yet the accessory buildings have to be 15 feet off."

Chairman Kenan, "So the building that shows in the photos is the garage, this building here?" Mr. Eggleston, "That's correct, yes." Chairman Kenan, "I don't see the shed in any of the photos." Mr. Eggleston, "Sorry about that, it's behind the garage; it's just a small little shed. Whether we need both of them or not, it was they are there, why no reuse them. And she may not use one if it doesn't move easily. The garage she was interested in moving and maintaining, because it gives her nice storage space." Member Hartnett, "Is that current garage on slab or is it on driveway?" Mr. Eggleston, "It's on slab. So we can pick it up and basically put a new slab down and relocate it. With the house itself, immediately, she wanted to do just a few things to kind of clean it up a little bit. She was going to add the shutters. Right now it just has a bracketed front porch; she's actually going to put some more traditional columns on it and try to give it a more traditional look. What she is thinking – in a few years after she gets the building up and rentals going, she would come back and do a more professional makeover. It is a vinyl sided building. Currently she will be using her resources for the necessary updates inside and then in the future she plans to come back and do a more comprehensive exterior upgrade. Are there any questions?"

Chairman Kenan, "So it's a single family house today?" Mr. Eggleston, "Correct. It's a 3 bedroom single family house. She's going to turn it into a two family with two bedrooms; one may actually be more like a den than a bedroom." Chairman Kenan, "And the only physical change on the outside then is this cellar, and storage and the porch." Member Eberhardt, "Will she be residing in one of those?" Mr. Eggleston, "No, she bought it as an investment." Member Carvalho, "What's the purpose of the second shed? That you want a variance on?" Mr. Eggleston, "It's there. If that were disturbing to you, it is not critical. It is not a deal-breaker for her. The barn..." Ms. Barker, "It is a very small peak-roof shed that matches the other peak roofs on the other two buildings. I knew the Powells that lived there and it was built by Mr. Powell and I would like to keep it for lawn and garden storage if possible." Member Carvalho, "It makes the back yard pretty cluttered." Mr. Eggleston, "It's all relative. I mean we're in a district that allows 20% open space. We are well under that at 75% open space."

Member Sutherland, "Where does Downtown D stop in relation to this building?" Mr. Eggleston, "It includes Gray's funeral home and I think it may go up to the Village Landing entrance. I believe the Long House is part of Downtown D. [with map] Downtown D includes Village Landing and it goes to the driveway of the Village Landing and then it goes to the end of the Long House." Member Hartnett, "What's your plan for the exterior in the second phase?" Ms. Barker, "My desire to change the outside structure of the house is really not there. I like its quaintness and its size as it is. I'd like to upgrade the finishes on the outside. The first step that we are going to take is to put up a couple of window boxes, new shutters. The garage that we move to the back of the property, we are actually going to turn around so we don't see a garage door; we see the window and a door that's a very nice cottage-y type of look. So from an exterior square footage standpoint – I don't think I'll ever modify the home. I would like to lose

the vinyl siding eventually.” Mr. Eggleston, “So we will be putting up cement board siding, that type of thing.” Member Hartnett, “Would you do that on the garage structure? Matching?” Ms. Barker, “Absolutely. I would prefer it.” Mr. Eggleston, “Right now she wants to get the interior going and she’d like to hang onto this for a while and then start making those other improvements.”

Chairman Kenan, “Any thoughts or comments? [Pause] Bob, I think there is a review process for the Downtown D design standards that has to be followed. In a case like this there is almost nothing happening to the outside of the building. I don’t know how to apply it exactly, but I think we have to go through the process.” Mr. Eggleston, “Correct. Obviously the architecture is not changing. It is a traditional architecture; it is two story. It does have an appropriate pitched roof – they talk about what’s appropriate. For the time being adding some shutters and adding some things to kind of take away from the vinyl siding that’s there will help improve it and eventually she will be putting cement board on it. One of the other strong features that we are adding; instead of parking in the front and side of the house, we are bringing the parking behind it. That’s definitely a Downtown D standard to have the parking shielded. We also are putting in a patio and putting some landscaping around the patio just for the tenants’ use in the outside area. We obviously maintain the street look. We also had talked in general terms of possibly adding a full porch on the front of the house in the future. But again that will be a future thing. Most of the houses here do have full front porches. That will be a future thing. Multi-family again is a permitted use. This is in the fringe of the Downtown D; it’s not really a retail area. Having the two family use is a good use – you have a 3 family next door with David Lee’s property, you’ve got 2 dwellings and an office over here on the Charles property. The two family residence is very appropriate. It is good to have some small 700, 800 SF residence for people in the downtown area. I talked to John Crompt but I don’t know if he added this. There is a conflict in the Zoning Law. In the Downtown D District you are required to have 600 SF minimum per dwelling unit. In the Special Permit criteria for 2 families, the first dwelling is supposed to be 1200 SF and the second one 800 SF, which contradicts that you are allowed 600 SF. We have one that’s 800 and the other one is 718. I’m not sure if John determined that it needed a variance.”

Chairman Kenan, “So the lesser of those two requirements is 800?” Mr. Eggleston, “The Downtown D District requires 600. This is more that but less than the other version.” Mr. Eggleston, “Right.” Chairman Kenan, “I think that if we are inclined to recommend approval I think it would be wise to include a statement that for this purpose we adopt the 600 SF interpretation so that doesn’t remain an open question. Does anyone have a suggested action? [Pause] **Why don’t I make a motion in the absence of any other activity here. The motion being to recommend to the Zoning Board to grant the variance for side yard set-back of accessory structures . . .**”

Member Sutherland, “Before you make a motion, what criteria do you apply here for Critical Impact?” Mr. Eggleston, “Critical Impact is required for the Trustees to determine, There are A - F areas in the narrative; the last 3 pages go through the Critical Impact findings that are necessary for the Trustees to consider. That is whether it meets the prescribed section of the Zoning (no we need a side yard set-back for the accessory buildings and we have made application for a variance); it talks about the character and integrity of the land use within the

immediate neighborhood (I do refer to the fact that Jordan and Fennell Streets have mixed uses including two family, multifamily and hotel uses. Two family is consistent and even more appropriate on that fringe between A2 District and the Downtown D District); whether it is in harmony with the visual and physical context of the neighborhood (again a traditional architectural style home; there will be some immediate upgrades with shutters, porch posts instead of the brackets and that we do follow the Downtown D design standards); that the site development is in harmony and will not impede development or redevelopment of the general neighborhood; and it's consistent with other properties in that neighborhood (in that there are several dwelling units on each of the adjacent properties); that the structure is reasonable accessible for water, sewer, fire protection, surface drainage systems (a 3 bedroom would have about 300 GPD design usage we'll have 400 GPD under the 400 threshold for I&I payment and will be upgrading with smoke detectors); talk about adequate parking (we are providing 4 spaces for the 2 dwelling units and pedestrians have direct access to Jordan Street); we do have room for snow removal pushing it over into the back yard. So it is all spelled out there."

Member Sutherland, "One thing I wonder about is that conversion of single family houses to two family houses has sort of an eroding effect. It is in the Downtown D District, it is permitted to occur there, how it affects the neighbors. It may be permissible but it is probably not real desirable – just a personal view. I think what I would recommend is sending this to the ZBA first without a recommendation and just get another Board's take on it." Chairman Kenan, "They can act on it without our recommendation." Mr. Eggleston, "The ZBA is going to be dealing with accessory structures. So their interpretation is not going to influence you one way or the other. They are going to say whether we can have the two relocated buildings, whether they will honor the 8 foot set-back that was originally granted for the garage; if the don't we'll make it work. To answer your question about one family/two family – I think the closer you get to the Downtown D area, the less likely you want a larger house where you are going to raise kids and that kind of thing. They tend to be in more of the single family residential neighborhood."

Member Sutherland, "I am looking at it more from single large houses in other communities that have been broken up. It may or may not be a significant concern here, but I look at it and feel that it may not be the best solution." Mr. Eggleston, "We are not talking about the A1 or A2 Districts which are predominantly single family." Member Sutherland, "But A2 is close." Mr. Eggleston, "But we are in the Downtown D District. We have funeral homes, we have 3 family houses, we have elderly housing, we have condominiums across the street, we have Byrne Dairy. I honestly think it is a nice transitional residential use. And I think it's a better use than office or retail. Retail doesn't work this far out. I think there are a lot of issues permitted in the district that would be less desirable than a two family house."

Chairman Kenan, "I think from my point of view the important issues in this area are less is it a one or two family home and what is the visual character of the building has a lot to do with which way the neighborhood is going. This, I would not call this a cute house. It is a box that is absent any ornamentation. You have expressed that already that your goal is to improve that. I would urge that because I think that is what makes the value in the property. It is worth a lot more if it looked like a traditional Skaneateles house, which it doesn't right now. It is just a stripped-down farmhouse. But it could be if you add the shutters and the porch and some wood

trim and get rid of the vinyl siding, you could bring it a long ways.” Member Hartnett, “And the barn out back.” Chairman Kenan, “The metal barn does not fit the character of the neighborhood at all.” Ms. Barker, “That’s one of the reasons that we are moving it and turning it, to be honest with you.”

Chairman Kenan, “Having said all that does anyone have a suggested action here?” Member Carvalho, “I think that second shed is still bothering me. There is no stated purpose for it.” Ms. Barker, “I did state a purpose for it. I stated that we wanted to use it for lawn and garden.” Member Carvalho, “I assume as a rental property you are going to hire someone to mow the lawn.” Ms. Barker, “Property manager.” Member Sutherland, “Do you have other rental properties now or is this your first?” Ms. Barker, “Yes, sir.” Mr. Eggleston, “She took her parents home on Orchard.” Ms. Barker, “And also the Quigley General store complex in Mottville. It’s coming along really nicely.” Mr. Eggleston, “I don’t know if you are familiar with that property, but she’s been doing a real nice job of bringing that back to its original historic character. You have maintained the wood siding and traditional trims. Finally working on the barn in the back, which is the last piece.”

Member Hartnett, “Doug, on your point, I don’t have a problem with it going from single family to multifamily. I think there is actually a need for some less expensive housing close to feed the Village with people. I do have a problem with the property looks bad that’s why I was concerned about how soon you were going to make some changes. Unfortunately that’s not what they came in to ask for. If it was we would be discussing this differently, as far as making that barn/garage/outbuilding match and fit in better. But for what they came in for and what is already permitted, I think we are at a – more of a recommendation to the ZBA to maybe remove that second building if you had a problem with it but to encourage that we go to an upgraded exterior as soon as possible; and to make it fit in more with the design standards that they are trying to encourage downtown.” Chairman Kenan, “Is that a motion?” Member Hartnett, “No, I was just talking to his point. But I would recommend to accept it.”

Member Harnett said, “I make a motion that the Planning Board recommend to the ZBA for approval of the variance related to the garage only.”

Ms. Barker, “In comparison to the density of the Charles property next door, we have quite a bit of green space and grass with or without that little 6 by 8 shed. It would be a nice touch to keep it as a tribute to the man who built that property. It is a very old property. It is always going to be a very quaint, understated property, and there is no large building process that is going to go on here to create anything more dense on that lot.” Member Hartnett, “Again this would just be a recommendation to the ZBA.” Mr. Eggleston, “We’ll argue it with the ZBA.”

Member Hartnett returned to his motion, “We actually have three items we have to deal with, right. I move that we defer SEQRA review to the ZBA. I would make a motion to give a positive recommendation to the ZBA for the variance required for the barn, but not including the 3 foot set-back for the shed. We encourage the exterior architectural improvements. We recommend that the Trustees approve the Critical Impact Permit for this revised use.” The motion was seconded by Member Eberhardt.

The Planning Board members Carvalho, Eberhardt, Hartnett and Chairman Kenan voted 'Aye' with Member Sutherland voting 'Nay'. Upon the 4 to 1 vote of the members in favor of the motion, Chairman Kenan declared motion passed. Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board.

Chairman Kenan noted, "One thing we didn't cover was there is a design review. Because there is very little happening on the outside of the building is it *de minimus* or should we conduct the design review. What's the board's feeling on that?" Member Eberhardt said, "It sounded like we should conduct it." Chairman Kenan, "OK. That has historically in the past been Doug's role." Member Sutherland, "I would prefer that more happen sooner and that in exchange for breaking it in two places, I think everyone would like to see that. I hate to see one without the other." Member Eberhardt, "Because it is transitioning to a rental property, so there are two tenants now..." Member Hartnett, "Already permitted." Member Eberhardt, "I understand that." Member Sutherland, "But on the Critical Impact there is an effect on the area around it. It may be technically permitted but it's..." Member Hartnett, "I agree with you. I would like to see those changes as quickly as possible." Member Eberhardt, "It can influence the transition in the neighborhood." Member Hartnett, "How soon are you...does phase two or whatever it is?" Ms. Barker, "I have not considered that. I have quite a few things to do on the inside of course. The beautification of the property on the outside, I am not seeing at this time to be structural in nature – lighting, plantings, the movement of the barn, the garage which is a bit of an eyesore. Flipping it around to give more of a cottage look in back. The loss of a lot of blacktop in the front, which is now creating side-by-side parking for two cars. Bring those cars in the back so we are not looking at parking right up next to the street." Mr. Eggleston, "Would you project that within the next 5 years that you will be ready to do the exterior residing and look at those items?" Ms. Barker, "Yes." Mr. Eggleston, "She obviously has to recover her initial investment. Right now the bathrooms and kitchen are rather ancient." Ms. Barker, "It has been well cared for mechanically and structurally but that's it." Mr. Eggleston, "so 5 years."

Chairman Kenan, "So right now we have a motion that has been carried. I guess I would urge that in transmitting the minutes of our meeting to the Zoning Board and the Trustees that they get the full thrust of what the conversation has been about the exterior of the building and let them take that under consideration."

This matter was concluded at 8:23 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting November 6, 2014

Variance recommendations in the matter of the application by Colleen Plimpton to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Front yard set-back; Side yard set-back left; Both side yards, combined; and Percentage of structure width/lot width; and section 225-69D Nonconforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion; to construct a roof over an existing 14 foot by 16 foot deck creating a screen porch and to enclose and convert an existing 6 foot by 10 foot deck into a laundry room at the property addressed as 40 Academy Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

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

Robert Eggleston, Architect, for the Applicant

Chairman Kenan opened this matter at 8:24 pm, calling the matter of Colleen Plimpton for 40 Academy Street. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "Colleen Plimpton purchased the Leuke house. I had come in 10 or 15 years ago to get a variance to put a deck on the back side of the house. The house has a walkout basement which is the garage. That gave them some first floor living space outside, What Colleen Plimpton would like to do is actually take that exact same footprint of the deck and make it into a screen porch. There is a small walkway on the east side of the house that she would like to turn into a first floor laundry. So she will turn this 10 foot by 5.5 foot section into enclosed space and then she will have a 14 by 16 foot screen porch. She has to make a slight adjustment to the stairs but will keep the stairs on the back side going to the back yard."

Chairman Kenan, "So this area on the side is at what level?" Mr. Eggleston, "Street level. Right now on this east elevation, the deck is half a level above grade." Chairman Kenan, "That will be enclosed space with open air under it." Mr. Eggleston, "Correct. And then the porch; the deck will have a roof put on it as porch." Mr. Sutherland, "So that's still deck space underneath and you look up at the underside?" Mr. Eggleston, "Yes. It's a space that has been used for storage in the past."

Member Carvalho, "Are you going to have lattice? Brick piers? Under the addition are you going to continue the brick foundation?" Mr. Eggleston, "No. We are not putting a full

foundation. We can put a latticed area if that's what you would like to see. We will be putting a better structure under this. This will use the pressure treated posts that are there, but you are right, we will be putting in a more substantial pier for the house addition part." Member Hartnett, "Do you have any neighbor comments?" Mr. Eggleston, "She was talking with the neighbors. The Allyn house is there and right now it is for sale. She was planning on showing no objection letters to the neighbors." Member Hartnett, "I encourage that for the ZBA." Mr. Eggleston, "Absolutely." Member Sutherland suggested screening the under-deck area.

Chairman Kenan, "So what are the issues?" Mr. Eggleston, "We are expanding a nonconforming structure. We conform to the open space. The front yard is an existing nonconforming front yard (25 vs. 30) but the addition does not affect that. The left side (Allyn side) we have an existing 3.9 foot set-back but the deck itself is 8.1 feet. We are maintaining the existing set-back. There is a small porch that is 3.9 feet already, but we are maintaining the 8.1 feet. The right side conforms, the combined side yard conforms in the area of this work. That's it." Chairman Kenan, "So you are constructing within the existing side yard set-back even though the building now is at that same line." Mr. Eggleston, "No we are required to have 15 feet but we were granted a variance for the deck of 8 feet, and we are maintaining the 8 feet. We are increasing the volume of the structure in the area where the variance had been granted, and it's less nonconforming."

Member Eberhardt, "Bob I can't remember. Are there doors there?" Mr. Eggleston, "Currently there are not doors; we are going to be adding doors. We are going to take out triple windows and put in a slider door."

Member Eberhardt, "I'll make a motion that we recommend that the ZBA approve the variances as requested on the Plimpton application dated October 7, 2014. This recommendation is contingent on lattice and attractive structural enhancements, such as brick." Member Carvalho seconded the motion.

Upon the unanimous vote of the Members in favor of the motion, Chairman Kenan declared it carried. This matter was concluded at 8:32 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting November 6, 2014

Critical Impact Permit, Special Use Permit and variance recommendations in the matter of the application by Richard Charles to change the use of the property and vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Minimum Lot Area; to remove the former Trabold Body Shop and construct a new multifamily dwelling containing four dwelling units at the property addressed as 37 Jordan Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

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

Robert Eggleston, Architect, for the Applicant

Chairman Kenan opened this matter at 8:33 pm, calling the matter of Richard Charles for 37 Jordan Street. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "Richard Charles bought 39 Jordan Street several years ago and redeveloped that. It has a dwelling upstairs and office space on the main floor. It has a two car garage with a small accessory apartment over the garage that they use when they visit. After many years of negotiation, he finally successfully bought the Trabold property which has a nonconforming use as a auto body shop. This building was built maybe 20 years ago or so. The plan is to remove that building and he'd like to build a 4 family apartment building. He is wanting to make it a complementary property to 39. We have 2 apartments that are less than 1000 SF, we have 2 apartments that are less than 1500 SF. That works out to have 5 parking spaces required; we actually have provided 6 parking spaces. They will be in front of the building but tucked behind 39 Jordan. We will have 1 handicapped unit, it is required by code. There will be an elevator in the building. He has placed a deck or patio for each unit either facing the east or the west, which will be a fenced in garden green space there. This is Critical Impact and there is one variance for the size of the lot. In the Downtown D District we are required to have a 30 foot lot width – we are 80 feet. We are required to have 3,000 SF per dwelling unit or 12,000 SF where we have a 9,063 SF lot. This is a very common variance in the Downtown D District. We are required to have a Special Use Permit for a multifamily from the ZBA. Again I have gone through in the narrative the details and criteria as it relates to this."

Mr. Eggleston, "This is a new building. We have taken on traditional architectural styling with the steeper pitch roof. We do have the combination of the beveled siding and the shingle siding.

We have enhanced it with some stone. The exterior will have a 6 foot privacy fence around the private green space for the use of the tenants. There is room in the building for storage of trash and recyclables. I have gone through the water usage. When Trabold had his body shop there he was using 139 GPD. With 5 bedrooms we are estimating 500 GPD, just above the I&I threshold that will be used by the Trustees. Are there any questions?"

Member Carvalho, "Do you think there is enough parking?" Mr. Eggleston, "Yes." Member Carvalho, "Next door we are putting in 4 spaces for 3 units, we have 6 for 4 here. We have what is required by Zoning." Member Hartnett, "In the Delmonico building, is it all office?" Mr. Eggleston, "The first floor is all office. The second floor is a dwelling unit and a small accessory dwelling over the garage." Member Eberhardt, "There could be 13 cars in there."

Chairman Kenan, "On the building elevations, I see the decks. You haven't drawn any kind of railing on them." Mr. Eggleston, "I am not sure we have actually honed in on that yet. On the house itself he has white spindles. I know his intent was to use the house as the pattern for the finishes."

Member Hartnett, "So your intent is to make it look like one continuous property." Mr. Eggleston, "There was a barn there used by the ambulance. That building burned in 1990 and Trabold got a use variance to rebuild and expand it."

Chairman Kenan, "so the variance is the lot size. And we do need the design review. Any thoughts on this one?" Member Sutherland, "No I'm fine with it."

Member Sutherland said, "I move that we recommend to the ZBA to approve the variance requested and grant the Special Use Permit, and recommend to the Trustees that they approve the Critical Impact and issue the Critical Impact Permit. From a design review perspective, I am fine with what has been proposed, subject to completion of details on deck wraps." Member Hartnett seconded the motion.

Upon the unanimous vote of the Members in favor of the motion, Chairman Kenan declared it carried. This matter was concluded at 8:46 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
November 6, 2014

Work session and comments on two solar issues that the board has been asked to comment on -- specifically the adoption of the proposed New York State Unified Solar Permit and potential municipal projects under Solarize CNY.

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

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

Chairman Kenan opened this matter at 8:47 pm, saying that the Board had been asked for comments on two solar power issues, "One I can't figure out what it is frankly. To me it's just a lot of words. I have no idea what this is, other than somebody's going to talk about it a lot and give you advice. [in reference to Solarize CNY]. I think it is worth saying, that this doesn't make any sense; we don't know what it is; we don't know how to give a recommendation on this."

Chairman Kenan, "The other one – the question appears to be do we want to adopt a unified solar permit which basically exempts applications of solar panels from any other regulation of the Village so long as they meet a bunch of conditions that are set out here." Member Carvalho, "I'm not sure we want to." Member Eberhardt, "I don't feel like I have enough information." Member Hartnett, "What about design review?" Member Sutherland, "Say you have a great historic house..."

Chairman Kenan, "So I move that we make no recommendation on Solarize CNY. We don't understand it. We recommend 'No' on the Unified Solar Permit. Does that sound good?" Member Sutherland seconded the motion.

Upon the unanimous vote of the Members in favor of the motion, Chairman Kenan declared it carried. This matter was concluded at 8:50 pm at which time the meeting was adjourned by acclamation.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

