Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
November 25, 2014

Public Hearing in the matter of the application of Jill & Todd Marshall to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard set-back, left; 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: Larry Pardee, Acting Chairman
David Badami, Member
Michael Balestra, Member
Curt Coville, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the ZBA
John Cromp, Code Enforcement Officer
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the ZBA

Janice Miller, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant

Bob Eggleston, Skaneateles
Andrew Wawro, Skaneateles
Griffin Lisun, Skaneateles
Gary Goodrich, Elbridge
Max Collier, Skaneateles
Jack Maurillo, Skaneateles
Marcus Moreas, Skaneateles

Absent: Craig Phinney, Chairman

Chairman Pardee opened the meeting at 7:30 pm announcing the application of Jill & Todd Marshall for 20 Leitch Avenue. He noted the presence of a number of students attending the meeting. Ms. Miller introduced herself and presented, "They did a renovation on the house and they actually improved the amount of open area, they added the space above the garage. Without realizing that was infringing upon the open lot area, they added a stone patio, this walkway, and since the deck was enclosed they have a paved -- pavers as a patio. That's basically it. They didn't want to track mud to the new entrance at the garage."

Chairman Pardee opened the public comment portion of the Hearing, asking if anyone would like to speak in favor of the project. Hearing no one he asked if anyone was opposed. Again hearing no one, **Chairman Pardee said, "I move that we close the Public Hearing." The**

motion was seconded by Member Balestra. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion the Public Hearing was closed.

Member Balestra said, "I will make a motion that we approve the application of Jill and Todd Marshall to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard set-back, left; 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, per the drawings dated June 19, 2014 and submitted with the application. This is a Type 2 transaction and applicant shall have one year to complete the project." Chairman Pardee seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion this matter was closed at 7:33 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
November 25, 2014

Public Hearing in the matter of the application of 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: Larry Pardee, Acting Chairman
David Badami, Member
Michael Balestra, Member
Curt Coville, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the ZBA
John Cromp, Code Enforcement Officer
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the ZBA

Bob Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant

Andrew Wawro, Skaneateles
Griffin Lisun, Skaneateles
Gary Goodrich, Elbridge
Max Collier, Skaneateles
Jack Maurillo, Skaneateles
Marcus Moreas, Skaneateles

Absent: Craig Phinney, Chairman

Chairman Pardee opened the meeting at 7:35 pm announcing the application of Colleen Plimpton for 40 Academy Street. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "Back 15 years ago, Rev. Leuke came in for a variance to build a deck on the back of his property. That got built. In that the grade falls off, this gave them some outdoor living space in the back yard, because the back yard is really at the basement level and even falls from there. What Colleen Plimpton would like to do is she would like to turn the deck into a screen porch on the same footprint and a 10 by 6 foot area and make that the laundry room off the kitchen. There will be a slight redesign inside to accommodate all that. So really we are not changing the coverage at all it is just building up over the existing deck. The existing house is nonconforming in its front yard is less than the street average and the left side yard is only 3.9 feet. The combined yards are only 28.7 feet. The addition only continues on existing 8 foot side yard set-back. That side yard set-

back is already 3.9 feet but it will continue the existing 8 foot set-back over the existing footprint of the deck. The addition will match the existing house siding. As discussed with the Planning Board, we will put in a brick pier that the addition portion will sit on and lattice on that side to match it up with the existing house. Are there any questions that you have relative to the application?"

There being no questions Chairman Pardee opened the public comment portion of the Hearing asking if there was anyone who wanted to speak in favor of this project. Hearing no one, he asked if there was anyone opposed. Again hearing no one, **Chairman Pardee said, "I move that we close the Public Hearing." Member Balestra seconded the motion.** Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion the Public Hearing was closed.

Member Badami said, "I will move to approve the application of 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. This is a Type 2 transaction and applicant shall have two years to complete the project. This is based on 3 pages of drawings dated 1 October 2014 submitted with the application." Member Coville seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion this matter was closed at 7:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
November 25, 2014

Public Hearing in the matter of the application of 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 open area; and Percentage of structure width/lot width; 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 feet 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: Larry Pardee, Acting Chairman
David Badami, Member
Michael Balestra, Member
Curt Coville, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the ZBA
John Cromp, Code Enforcement Officer
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the ZBA

Bob Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant
Dale Drake, Applicant
Griffin Lisun, on behalf of the Applicant

Andrew Wawro, Skaneateles
Gary Goodrich, Elbridge
Max Collier, Skaneateles
Jack Maurillo, Skaneateles
Marcus Moreas, Skaneateles
Becky Barker, Skaneateles

Absent: Craig Phinney, Chairman

Chairman Pardee opened the meeting at 7:40 pm announcing the application of Dale & Stacy Drake for 9 Orchard Street. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "The Drakes have actually owned the house for quite a long time. They owned it while they were in the military; they rented it out. They retired from the military, came back. They were anticipating that they be moving in, but they had a wonderful tenant who has enjoyed an additional 10 or 15 years there. They are now ready to move into the house. A number of years ago we did receive a variance for putting the dormers, expanding the dormers in the back, redoing this kitchen,

putting a patio in the back. So those variances were granted but of course you didn't grant a 20 year time to finish. What the changes are – they have added a small 4 foot by 5 foot side entrance. They actually use this driveway. It comes right into a 3 by 3 foot landing – you don't have room enough to change your mind, not to mention knock someone down the stairs. So they would like to just expand that so that they can use this little side entrance to go down cellar or into the kitchen as the side door. The other is that they would like a garage. They realize it is a very small lot. What we have designed is a traditional carriage house barn for the lot. It is just 16 by 24 feet to allow for one car plus any lawn mowing equipment, trash cans, things like that. We did put a second level on it for additional storage because they have no attic storage and this is only a 1400 SF house. The garage will pick up on the shingle over the bevel siding to match the house. The garage itself is required to have a 15 foot rear yard. Assuming Orchard is the front yard, that means the west yard would have to be 15 feet. It is required to have a 3 foot side yard; we have actually proposed a 6.4 foot side yard, so it is 10 feet away from the adjacent garage, which is a requirement that accessory structures be 10 feet away from each other. They wanted to push – in essence the garage from Highland could almost be considered a side yard. We have a 20 foot set-back off the street which is required for a second front yard which meets that requirement. There is room to place a car outside the garage if they don't park it in so it wouldn't be out in the street line. We have proposed putting it 5 feet off the property line. There are some arborvitae that they put in last year; we will actually have to replant them because they are 5 feet in on the property line. Also they should be planted twice as close together to provide an effective side yard screen for the adjacent neighbor. The adjacent property is owned by Illyssa Green and is rented out. The Drakes had talked with Illyssa Green and she had no problem with any of this. Unfortunately, she wasn't able to get a no objection letter for her to sign to bring back in. They also talked to the tenant; the tenant had no issue with it. We have tried to keep all the improvements very much in keeping with the bungalow style of the house. Are there any questions relative to what we are proposing here?"

Member Coville, "You are planning to keep the existing driveway?" Mr. Eggleston, "Yes." Member Coville, "Do they need to have 2 driveways?" Mr. Eggleston, "I think the advantage to having a driveway here is that if they have elderly people they can easily get to the porch or the side – bringing groceries in. that type of thing. I see the second car being left in the Orchard Road driveway and the other car would be parked in the garage." Chairman Pardee, "Is there going to be a path from the garage into the house?" Mr. Eggleston, "There will be a walkway possible." Chairman Pardee, "Constructed of what?" Mr. Eggleston, "We really haven't talked about that." Chairman Pardee, "My big concern is the height of the garage. I don't like to two-story. I think it is way, way too high for that neighborhood. The people next door would be looking at a massive wall. I think a one-story would serve their purpose." Mr. Eggleston, "Sure. The Drake's weren't dead set on it having to be as tall as that. I think they would like to get storage up there. I think we could reduce it to maybe 5 feet of wall height or even 4 foot of wall height. Would that work out from your standpoint?" Attorney Galbato, "Like a four foot knee wall." Mr. Eggleston, "They are not looking for living space. They just want some attic storage." Chairman Pardee, "I understand that. But in that setting, that is a huge building for that neighborhood. There is nothing else in the neighborhood like it. If it was tucked; my neighbor across the street has a similar two-story garage but it is way in back kind of out of sight. This was visible from two sides. I really have an objection to its being two stories."

Member Balestra, "I echo Larry's concerns. I like these style garages but because it is a corner lot, and it is a relatively small lot. When you put it in 3 dimensions it is going to be huge. This isn't a question, it is a comment. Having the two driveways and then a walkway at some point seems odd, and like a lot of coverage. Was there any consideration to extending the driveway that is off of Orchard, put the garage back in closer to the southeast corner and put a hedge also on Highland to kind of break it up. Then you only have one driveway." Mr. Eggleston, Then you are shuffling cars; you are putting the edge of the garage right on the front yard line." Member Balestra, "Having two driveways is exceptional. It is quite odd." Mr. Eggleston, "I think the; yeah putting that in would be totally inappropriate. Obviously this is the right place for it, on a corner lot taking a secondary street. They felt that a two-car garage was just too big for the property and the house, even though your percent coverage wouldn't be that much different. They could even shorten the driveway, I think, to the end of the entrance here." Member Balestra, "The driveway off Orchard I get. I have no problem with that one. It is the additional driveway that is a little unconventional. I think I'd rather see a scenario in which you only have one driveway and a garage – because believe me I have no quarrel with a garage. Garages are great." Mr. Eggleston, "It is a unique situation with a small corner lot and we have tried to come up with the best scenario—the best solution. Ideally you would have a back alley and all the garages would be off the back alley, but that's how Skaneateles was laid out."

Chairman Pardee, "Anybody else?" Member Coville, "Was there any thought to actually expanding the driveway that's on Highland width-wise – so you could actually get two cars…" Mr. Eggleston, "No because then you would be into the right of way. The driveway is right on the right of way. That's the deception – there's no sidewalk and it appears that you have got an extra 15 feet. It looks like a very large lot, and to the center of the street it is." Member Coville, "The driveway off Highland by the garage. Any thoughts to expanding that driveway so you would have a walk going right down there?" Mr. Eggleston, "We want just a single driveway here because we have this one here and we don't want to take up the whole back yard. Part of the reason for the rear yard set-back variance was to give us 33 feet of lawn." Member Badami, "Just running through my head – this addition on this side; is there any way you could put this on this side?" Mr. Eggleston, "No you can't. There are a ton of these American Four Square homes and bungalows that have that side entrance. Many of them don't use them. They though it made more sense to use that; they have given up the back porch which used to have an entrance – that's now just a utility room."

Mr. Balestra, "What's the time table on construction?" Mr. Eggleston, "They are ready to start. They have relocated their tenant and they are ready to start." Member Balestra, "What about with the garage?" Mr. Drake, "I can't answer that exactly because of my mason's schedule." Mr. Eggleston, "You'd like to get it in before frost, or let's do it next spring." Member Balestra, "I'm just thinking I'd like to see a; we have expressed some concerns about the height of the garage. If we could see a revised drawing it would be nice." Mr. Eggleston, "Sure. And we will concede to a one-story garage with a 45 degree pitched roof on it. You have seen a number of them. At that point what I'd like to do is get a 45 degree pitched roof." Member Balestra, "I think that would look much, much better." Mr. Eggleston, "So that would be acceptable?" Mr. Drake, "To a degree guys I'd dare say we are at your mercy. But what Bob is saying about the home in its current design and layout inside; the 8 foot exterior wall of that garage, if we bump it 4 feet, it would literally give us a four foot knee wall. It is not as gross in height change as what

you think it is. I see your concerns but if we had a four foot knee wall it is a huge thing for storage inside a small home."

Member Balestra, "I think it would be nice to have a revised drawing quite frankly." Chairman Pardee opened the public comment portion of the hearing asking if anyone wanted to speak in favor of the project. Hearing no one he said, "Anyone opposed?" Mr. Eggleston. "I do have a letter from Mary Buttolph across the street. They have talked with all the immediate neighbors."

Chairman Pardee, "Given the fact that we need revised drawings, I'd like to table this hearing until next month." Mr. Eggleston, "May I have a minute please?" [pause] Mr. Eggleston, "At this time they do have a critical time frame. I'd love to ask if we can bisect the application; if we can get approval on the house and come back with a revised garage – and if necessary we would make a separate application for the garage. It is real important that they start on the house right now. Rick would that be objectionable? Separated the application into two parts; we took care of the house portion and brought back a revised drawing for the garage for next month?"

Attorney Galbato, "Would we close the public hearing, just to bifurcate it, understanding that if you close the Public Hearing then you have 62 days to make a decision on the garage, which probably means your December meeting." **Chairman Pardee, "I move that we close the Public Hearing." Member Coville seconded the motion.** Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the Public Hearing was closed.

Chairman Pardee, "I move that we approve the application of 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 open area; and Percentage of structure width/lot width; 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 feet by 14 feet, at the property addressed as 9 Orchard Street in the Village of Skaneateles. This action is per 4 pages of drawings dated 24 October 2014. Any action with respect to the garage that was also part of this application is hereby deferred until the December 23, 2014 meeting. This is a Type 2 action under SEQRA and the Applicant will have one year to complete this project." Member Coville seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion it was passed.

Mr. Lisun had interrupted to ask that if the Board had no objection to the proposed footprint of the garage, if the applicant's team, "while we have the construction equipment to move ahead with the footing and the block work foundation of the garage at the same time as we are doing the kitchen foundation and the like; to do all that masonry work before frost and do all that masonry work in one shot." Member Balestra, "My preference is don't touch the garage until we approve the garage. I don't think work should be done on something that we haven't voted on." Mr. Lisun, "The question is on the height of the garage, not necessarily the size of the garage?" Member Balestra, "Nothing has been approved on the garage." Attorney Galbato, "I would recommend that you get a second on the motion and discussion and vote on the motion and then entertain his request. If you were to entertain that, it would be a separate vote."

After taking action on the pending motion, Chairman Pardee returned to the request, "We generally don't give the go-ahead on stuff when you don't have approval. I can understand where you are coming from, sir." Mr. Eggleston, "We realize that we would be proceeding at our own risk, should something come up relative to the garage. I think we have had enough discussion to realize that this is the best location for the garage. I'm not sure if there is any question or argument there -- the question is, is it one story, one and a half story." Chairman Pardee, "My personal opinion is a problem with the height, not the footprint. I would like to see a smaller garage." Member Badami, "I would simply add that as long as you are willing to assume that risk and with the understanding that whatever the determination is next month that you are willing to abide by that, I would entertain that request." Mr. Lisun, "I am only going to move ahead, I guess that you guys are giving me a certain amount of indication that you are comfortable with the footprint. That makes me comfortable enough where if I did proceed with the foundation work and getting that out of the way, that I'm ok with that as well. And I appreciate that." Mr. Eggleston, "John Cromp will issue a 'foundation only' permit." Chairman Pardee, "Are you OK with the footprint?" Member Balestra, "No; my position is that nothing should be done. So if we make a motion, I am voting no, quite frankly." Member Badami, "Well if we do two different permits, the one for the foundation is not approving anything other than a foundation. Right John?" CEO Cromp, "Correct." Member Balestra, "I haven't made up my mind on anything with regard to the garage, to be perfectly clear." Member Badami, "Well that's a different story."

Chairman Pardee, "I think we should have a vote?" Attorney Galbato, "If you are going to entertain it and consider it, then yes. If there is no support for it then you don't need a vote." **Chairman Pardee said, "I'll move that we allow the construction of the foundation of the 16 by 24 foot garage with the *caveat* that they come back to our December 23, 2014 meeting with a revised drawing – one story is my choice. They are doing this at their own risk; if the garage gets turned down it is their issue." Member Badami seconded the motion.** With Chairman Pardee and Members Badami and Coville voting 'aye', and Member Balestra voting 'nay', the motion was approved 3 – 1.

This matter was continued to December 23, 2014 at 7:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
November 25, 2014

Public Hearing in the matter of the application of Becky Barker to change the use and to vary the strict application of Section 225-14C(5)(a) 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: Larry Pardee, Acting Chairman
David Badami, Member
Michael Balestra, Member
Curt Coville, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the ZBA
John Cromp, Code Enforcement Officer
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the ZBA

Bob Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant
Becky Barker, Applicant

Andrew Wawro, Skaneateles
Gary Goodrich, Elbridge
Max Collier, Skaneateles
Jack Maurillo, Skaneateles
Marcus Moreas, Skaneateles

Absent: Craig Phinney, Chairman

Chairman Pardee opened the Hearing at 8:06 pm announcing the application of Becky Barker for 41 Jordan Street. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "Actually the only thing before you in this application is the variance for the accessory structure. The Planning Board did a site plan review and approved the change of use. The whole package then goes to the Village Trustees for Critical Impact which the Planning Board again has made a positive recommendation for that. Initially we were thinking that we were in good shape as far as the accessory buildings, but there is kind of an odd clause in the Zoning Law – whereas the primary building in the Downtown D District only needs a 10 foot front yard and a zero side yard and a 20 foot rear yard set-back; an accessory building is required to have a 15 foot rear yard which we have accomplished, and a 15 foot side yard. It doesn't fall under residential A and B, it is allowed 3 feet. The garage was originally built with a variance granting the 8 foot side yard set-back, which allowed it to be at the end of the driveway when it was a single-family dwelling. Becky would like to keep the building and relocate the building; punching it back just for a

workshop storage area for the two-family dwelling. There also is a small little 7 by 12 which Mr. Powell had built that she wanted to keep. We are proposing to have that 3 feet off the property line. What we wanted to do is to push it to the back so that we maintain the 15 foot rear yard set-back, but we wanted to have them closer to the side yard set-backs so they weren't in the middle of the yard. We have provided four parking spaces so we do have; well, each apartment is small -- it only technically requires one parking space – she wanted two parking spaces for each person. She didn't want to have a parking problem. This is very consistent in the neighborhood, you have a three-family – the entire back yard is a gravel parking lot area; and then you've got the Gray House and a couple of other multifamily and business uses up there. The Charles building has two units in it plus an office. As you come down it's a two-family. So two-family is a typical use in the Downtown D Area. It is a nice transitional use between the residential A2 and the downtown commercial area. So it's just the variance that we are asking for on the two accessory structures. Are there any questions that you have relative to those positions or what we are asking for?"

Chairman Pardee, "My biggest concern is the amount of blacktop that has been laid down and the drainage. Given what's coming next door, you combine those two properties you are going to have nothing but blacktop for a long, long way. I have to imagine you are going to have some drainage problems – there just has to be issues. My suggestion would be to put in a drainage system to hook to the storm sewer. There is one right at the street there that is more than adequate. You have tarvia toward the street, I assume you're going to continue that toward the back." Ms. Barker, "Yes. The current garage is set on a concrete pad. We will be moving that garage and removing that concrete pad, and extending the blacktop from there. It was my hope to put 4 slips in behind the building because of the fact that it has gotten busy and parking is an issue. We do have quite a bit of green space between the garage and the shed and surrounding the home. I would not be opposed to putting a drain line from the parking lot to the storm sewer." Mr. Eggleston, "I this the land does fall a little bit as it comes back – it actually goes toward the municipal lot, so I think getting a storm drain in this parking lot area would probably do a lot to relieve any of those situations. We can make sure the gutters tie into it."

Member Coville, "Was there anything in your conversations instead of relocating the, what I consider the really ugly building, and putting up a garage to fulfill two of those parking requirements?" Mr. Eggleston, "Now you get into who gets a garage, who doesn't get a garage. I think that the building is there, it is a fairly new building, they just want to pick it up push back and then you have the outdoor parking spaces." Ms. Barker, "The back side of the garage is rather attractive with the door and the window. I am sure that it was on the drawings that that part is what is going to be facing the street now." Mr. Eggleston, "She is going to turn it around. She envisions it as storage not as functional – put the lawn equipment, the stuff for maintaining te property."

Member Badami, "What is looking at the garage entrance?" Mr. Eggleston, "The municipal parking lot." Member Coville, "I know some concerns came up with the esthetics of the property." Mr. Eggleston, "Becky has actually had a couple of properties over the years. I am kind of proud of the Quigley Store that she owns in Mottville, that she has maintained the historic character and made the improvements over the years. She is not a moneybags that can throw all her resources at this at once. Her plan is to get the apartments occupied and with her

cash flow over five years, she would like to do a major redo of the exterior – bring that back, put a front porch on and make it a more attractive house. The Powells were great people for maintaining, but they didn't necessarily add to the attraction of the house. The immediate plans are that we are going to take off the brackets of that front porch and put up some actual posts, and take off the wrought iron, put some shutters. She is going to do a thorough cleaning of the vinyl siding. She is hoping in five years to get it resided, put some architectural detail in it and we make those kind of improvements. And the same with the garage, that we will resurface it eventually." Ms. Barker, "And paint the multicolored garage solid white as well."

Chairman Pardee opened the public comment portion of the Hearing asking id anyone wanted to speak in favor of the application. Mr. Eggleston, "She has gone to the neighbors including Richard Charles and they have all reviewed the application." Chairman Pardee noted that there were seven resident signatures, then asked if anyone was opposed to the application. **Hearing no one he said, "I move that we close the Public Hearing. Member Coville seconded the motion.** Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the Public hearing was closed.

Chairman Pardee said, "I move that we declare to ZBA the lead agency under SEQRA and note that this is an unlisted action that will receive uncoordinated review. We make a negative declaration under SEQRA." Member Badami seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the motion was passed. **Member Coville said, "I will make a motion that we approve the application by Becky Barker to change the use of the property and to vary the strict application of Section 225-14C(5)(a) 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. This action is based upon 4 pages of drawings dated 14 October 2014. Applicant shall have 1 year to complete the project." Chairman Pardee seconded the motion.** Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the motion was passed. This matter was concluded at 8:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
November 25, 2014

Public Hearing in the matter of the application of Richard Charles for Special Use Permit and to 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: Larry Pardee, Acting Chairman
David Badami, Member
Michael Balestra, Member
Curt Coville, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the ZBA
John Cromp, Code Enforcement Officer
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the ZBA

Bob Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant

Andrew Wawro, Skaneateles
Gary Goodrich, Elbridge
Max Collier, Skaneateles
Jack Maurillo, Skaneateles
Marcus Moreas, Skaneateles

Absent: Craig Phinney, Chairman

Chairman Pardee opened the Hearing at 8:18 pm announcing the application of Richard Charles for 37 Jordan Street. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "We are asking for a Special Use Permit as well as an area variance. You are familiar with the Trabold Body Shop which was a nonconforming use. It burned back in the 90s; it was rebuilt with a use variance. It has fulfilled its purpose. Richard Charles owns the property in front at 39. He redeveloped that and it has two dwelling units in it as well as office space. He was very interested in securing this property; I think it originally went with the front property. What he would like to do is to put in a four-family apartment building. The variance issue that we have is that the current Downtown D District requires 3000 SF of land area for each dwelling unit – which would require a 12,000 SF lot where this has 9,063 SF. It requires a 30 foot lot width, we have 84 feet of lot width at the building line. So that is the only variance that we have. That variance is not an unusual variance; many of the buildings in the Downtown area do have less lot, in that they have this lot per dwelling unit requirement. So any time you get over one or two you are over the 3,000 per lot. As far as the multiple family – what we are proposing to do is to put in four units. There will be two units on the first floor, two units on the second floor. We will have a handicapped

accessible unit on the first floor as required by building code; and it just makes good sense to be able to provide more accessible units in the Village. We will be putting an elevator in the building so actually we have accessibility to the basement which will just be mechanical and storage. The elevator will go to the first floor, second floor. It will not go to the attic/mezzanine level. The second floor units, Units D & C, will actually have a mezzanine and vaulted ceiling. The building will be sprinklered for additional life safety protection. Unit A is 924 SF, Unit B is 872 SF – both under 1,000 SF requiring 1 parking space each. Unit C is a two bedroom unit plus the loft – that will have 1,471 SF and Unit D is a 1 bedroom & den with the loft and that has 1,193 SF; so they require 1 ½ parking spaces for each unit. That is a total of 5 spaces. We are able to fit 6 spaces on the site. That makes sense because one of the spaces has to be a handicapped space. You may be renting to a non-handicapped person and you cannot park in a handicapped parking space even on private property without being subject to ticketing. This property owns the 24 foot section that goes to the street and then 39 has a right of way across it, so actually all the traffic for 39 and 37 Jordan Street uses one driveway. Also being a flag lot like this the parking is actually behind the 39 Jordan Street building. We do have a deck or patio for each unit – the western end will actually have a large fenced-in green space. What he wants to do is to create between 39 and 37 a green space. There will be a 6 foot privacy fence between the Barker property and this property; replacing the chain-link fence that's there. There is storage inside for trash; it is picked up weekly. There is no outdoor storage of trash. The actual water usage for the auto body was 139 GPD. The 4 dwelling units will have 5 bedrooms; at 100 gallons that is 500 GPD, a 361 GPD increase. That falls under the 400 GPD increase that subjects the I&I fee. I have gone through and written out the Critical Impact criteria; some of that is similar to the criteria for section 225-45A. I wasn't sure if those were the Special Use Permit criteria. I didn't know if you wanted to look at that in detail. Are there any questions that you have relative to this application?"

Member Coville, "Where did you say the indoor garbage storage is?" Mr. Eggleston, "It will be inside the building, maybe down in the basement. We are not expecting a lot of garbage." Chairman Pardee, "My issue again is drainage, and I would have the same recommendation for this property – hook up to the storm sewer." Mr. Eggleston, "Exactly; actually we have already been researching that in that when we did the Trabold Garage there was a storm line put in and we will be reusing that." Member Coville, "Where is the snow going to go?" Mr. Eggleston, "It is going to go in space between 5 and 3 and pushing it over into this corner. It is one of those properties where if you get a large accumulation it has to be hauled off site." Member Coville, "For my own curiosity – the fire code requires 150 feet; if the drive is 150 feet long you need a turnaround for an apparatus. Is that correct?" Mr. Eggleston, "I am not aware of that." Member Coville, "It seems like an awful long way." Mr. Eggleston, "The building is 80 some feet back from the road. Currently there is actually an interconnection through the boutique hotel, so that's possible for maneuvering around."

Member Balestra, "I think it is a great use. I used to live right in this area – I rented an apartment – this is the appropriate place for it. I think it is an ambitious project for this size lot and I give you a lot of credit for cramming it in. I certainly like this better than the existing use." Member Coville, "The only concern I would like to voice is that I am concerned about the indoor storage for garbage. As somebody who owns rental properties and dealt with tenants over the years, I know they produce more than one bag of garbage per, and my apartments are smaller than this

building. so my concern is where are they going to put it? It's either going to be sitting outside where it is visible, or it is going to end up in the hallway where nobody wants it. Is there a way to fit some storage for garbage?" Mr. Eggleston, "We could put a little accessory garbage thing out there. He really didn't want to clutter up the outside with a small little whatever. And we will have garbage disposals here." Member Coville, "It just seems to make sense now that he owns the front property and the back property to have something that you can use." Mr. Eggleston, "And maybe there is a small little accessory structure – it would probably go on 39. I can make him aware of that concern or question." Member Badami, "Now that you own them both, this parking space 7 it is in here. You could put it here. It's a legitimate concern."

Chairman Pardee opened the public comment portion of the hearing. There was no one desiring to be heard. Mr. Eggleston, "I do have a letter of no objection from Becky Barker next door." **Chairman Pardee said, "I move we close the Public Hearing. Member Balestra seconded the motion.** Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the Hearing was closed.

Chairman Pardee said, "I move that we declare the ZBA the lead agency under SEQRA. It is an unlisted action that will receive uncoordinated review. We find and issue a negative declaration under SEQRA." Member Badami seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the action received a negative declaration.

Member Balestra asked, "Bob, what's the time frame on this project?" Mr. Eggleston, "He would like to get started by spring. He has the existing building to remove and the closing will be soon. So I suspect he will be gearing up for spring." Member Balestra, "Can he finish by the end of 2015? I ask because I doubt that people in that area will want the construction to go on for two years." Mr. Eggleston, "I totally hear you. The project in the front took – I think a year would be adequate." Member Balestra, "Perhaps we should give to December 31, 2015." Chairman Pardee, "Are there any pollution problems or hazardous materials from before?" Mr. Eggleston, "Believe me, they have gone through all sorts of environmental reviews."

Chairman Pardee said, "I move that we grant the Special Use Permit and approve the variances requested by Richard Charles to vary the strict application of section 225-a5 Density Control Schedule for minimum lot area to remove the former Trabold Body Shop and to construct a new multi-family dwelling containing four dwelling units at the property addressed as 37 Jordan Street in the Village of Skaneateles, subject to provision of appropriate drainage from the parking lot to the storm sewer on Jordan Street. This approval is based on 6 pages of drawings dated 28 October 2014, and to be completed by December 31, 2015. This is a Type 1 action under SEQRA." The motion was seconded by Member Badami. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the motion was passed. This matter was concluded and the meeting adjourned on motion by Chairman Pardee, seconded by Member Balestra at 8:36 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards