

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
June 23, 2015

Public Hearing in the matter of the application of Margaret Purcell to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard set-back, right; Both side yards combined; Percentage of structure width/lot width; and Percentage of open area; to construct a 20 by 20 foot patio and move deck stairs from north side to east side of deck at the property addressed as 82 State Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Craig Phinney, Chairman
 David Badami, Member
 Michael Balestra, Member
 Curt Coville, Member
 Larry Pardee, Member

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

 Maggie Purcell, Applicant

 Carol Stokes-Cawley, Village Trustee
 James Lanning, Village Trustee (at resumption)
 Elizabeth Govern, 36 State St.
 Dianne Washington, 6 E. Elizabeth St.
 Pat Carroll, 7 E. Elizabeth St.
 Nancy Cihon, 11 E. Elizabeth St.
 Jill Goldstein, 34 Academy St.
 Marilyn Schick, 9 W. Elizabeth St.
 Molly Elliott, 125 Orchard Rd.
 Kathaleen Underwood, 29 State St.
 David Underwood, 29 State St.
 Linda Roche, 39 W. Lake St.
 Amy Marsden, 16 E. Elizabeth St.
 Mark Marsden, 16 E. Elizabeth St.
 Katie Severance, 34 State St.
 Jack Severance, 34 State St.
 Robin Rulli, 1675 New Seneca Tpk.
 Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Ave.
 Joshua Lagrow, 57 State St.
 Cynthia Brennan, 27 Academy St.
 Richard Krenzer, 1391 E. Genesee St.
 Becky Barker, 1382 New Seneca Tpk.

Rob & Carolyn Coville, 3750 Fisher Rd.
Tom Blares, 3895 Fennell St.
Bob Eggleston, 1391 E. Genesee St.
Kathleen Zapata, 41 Academy St.
Darlene Kerr, 1275 Oak Bluff

Chairman Phinney called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm. Prior to calling the first matter, he addressed the audience saying, "Before we start anything, I think there may be some confusion regarding what this Board actually does and what our purpose in life is here. We are not, never, nor have we ever been an enforcement Board. That means we have nothing to do with enforcing any form of existing zoning or any people who may choose to break the particular individual Zoning Laws. We are an interpretive body. It has come to my attention that there are a number of you here to discuss 'summer rentals' and the problem that exists in the Village with that. This is not the forum for that – the forum for that is Thursday evening at the Village Board meeting. And you have been invited to attend that. So unless you have something specific that has to do with the opening of a bed and breakfast ('B&B') within the Village today, I will not be entertaining any comments regarding the particular vacation rental/summer rental issue because it is not under the surveillance or purveyance of this Board. I know you are disappointed. A lot of us have opinions other than the fact that we sit on these Boards regarding vacation rentals and summer rentals. I am looking forward to be able to have the Village discuss that, personally where I live myself, because it affects me where I live myself. So I have empathy; I think all of us live within very short distances to the issue that we all have on the tip of our tongue, so to speak. So I apologize that this is not the venue to do that. If there are sincere and other types of things that can be commented on -- again on a B&B – certainly please stay. We always accept opinions during the course of a public hearing on specific matters. We always, if you would like to make comments in writing; though it is not our purveyance, we certainly will accept anything that you may have and make sure it is part of the public record. In looking back also; I have been doing this about 15 years, and in looking back I could not find an instance of a Planning Board or Zoning Board meeting where the issue of someone looking for approval of a summer rental has ever entered into the public melieu, with the exception of Downtown D lodging establishments. In the A1, A2 Districts, I could not find anything in 15 years that even came before the Boards on that issue; again, to reinforce why this is an enforcement issue in contrast to a 'boy do I not want that next to me issue'. I have been here for 36 years, but this has been going on for longer that I have been here. We all know it goes on, we may have relatives, friends whoever else may be actually doing this as we speak. What we are doing is we are trying to progress through the Village – handle this in an orderly fashion and discussion in orderly fashion in front of the proper Boards and then see what can be done to perhaps allay some of the situation. Any questions on that? Thank you, you are all welcome to stay and listen to our porches and decks and other things as we go through our normal course of business for what you are doing. So feel free to do that and again if you have comments for when we get to the B&B issue – as long as it is relevant only to the B&B issue – then you are certainly welcome to comment there too. Thank you."

At 7:34 pm Chairman Phinney opened the Public Hearing in the matter of Margaret Purcell for 82 State Street. There was no one present on behalf of the applicant. Attorney Galbato suggested that the Chairman keep the public hearing open in case she shows up, and start the next item.

At 9:34 pm Chairman Phinney again called the matter of Margaret Purcell for 82 State Street. Member Balestra rejoined the Board. All in the audience except the Trustees had departed the building. Ms. Purcell introduced herself and presented, "That's what I want to do. I am shrinking it down. Money is becoming an issue. The stairs are being turned because they are too steep the way they are. The porch is falling apart. So we are going to take down the porch face it east and do a small patio around it, just to clean out the brush that's around it." Member Pardee, "So it's not going to be 20 by 20?" Member Balestra, "So you may not even need an area variance?" Ms. Purcell, "I think John said that anything I will because it is preexisting nonconforming." [Multiple conversations]

Member Pardee, "It depends on the location and the size." Member Balestra, "You are currently 86.4% open area, so you are conforming in that respect. The 20 by 20 patio makes it 83.6%. Depending on the size of the new patio, you might still be at 85 or above and not need an open area variance." Ms. Purcell, "What size do you guys want the patio?" Member Pardee, "Don't care." Ms. Purcell, "I'll keep it as small as you want it. I just want to fix the stairs and clean up the mess. Member Balestra, "It is our obligation to grant the smallest variance possible in order to meet the applicant's needs. I don't do math. Whatever size you build the patio, if you keep it to 85% then you don't need a variance." Member Pardee, "There is one little matter. The right side set-back is only 5 feet." Ms. Purcell, "Isn't it already there? My dining room is almost already on her driveway. I'm not going any closer." Attorney Galbato and Member Pardee, "We need to know what that setback is." Member Pardee, "What's the set-back going to be for this part right here?"

Member Balestra, "Ms. Purcell let me ask you a question. When were you planning to do this?" Ms. Purcell, "I wanted to start ripping the porch out now." Member Balestra, "Like immediately. I was only asking because I was wondering if we waited for revised drawings." Attorney Galbato, "Do you want to revise what you are thinking and present revised drawings to John and he can evaluate what variances, if any, you require." Ms. Purcell, "If I can start taking the porch down immediately, then yeah." Mr. Cromp, "It is 13 feet from the proposed patio to the lot line." Member Pardee, "So if it is smaller..." Mr. Cromp, "It is still a nonconforming lot so you need a variance either way." Ms. Purcell, "So am I good or what? What do I have to do?" Mr. Cromp, "It is up to you. You tell us what you want to do." Attorney Galbato, "Do you want this Board to consider your application as it presents?" Ms. Purcell, "Is it going to pass?" Member Balestra, "I'll tell you that I had concerns with the 20 by 20 patio, just because there is a lot of impermeable surface and there's the concrete pad there. I'd prefer to see a revised drawing with exactly what you want." Ms. Purcell, "I don't know what I want. I want a small little thing. This is not a complicated thing. I'm a single woman owning a house who is trying to clean up a porch that's falling apart. I don't want to make anything bigger than what's already there." Member Balestra, "And just please understand that we just need enough information so that we can actually see what the application entails in order to vote on it."

Member Coville, "If we pass it as is she can always reduce it afterwards and she won't have to come back to us." Chairman Phinney, "Correct, or she could keep it as is." Member Coville, "I would be inclined to move on the project as proposed."

Chairman Phinney opened the public comment portion of the Hearing. There was no one desiring to be heard on this application. Chairman Phinney, "I move that we close the Public Hearing." Member Coville seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion the Hearing was closed. Member Balestra, "I have hesitation of voting to approve an application that I am not sure about. If this is actually what you are going to do, I have a lot of hesitancy because it doesn't sound like you need a 20 by 20 patio by your own admission, and we are charged with granting the smallest variance that suits your need." Member Coville, "We have adjusted on the fly before." Member Balestra, "We need to know what variances we are actually granting so we can adjust and begin playing with the dimensions, we still need to know what the variance is because it's going to stick to the property forever."

Chairman Phinney, "I guess what we are saying is we are not comfortable with 20 by 20 is what it is sounding like. Now we need a more specific." The members discussed possible changes. Member Pardee, "If you reduced to 15 by 15, you would not be over on coverage."

Member Coville, "I'd like to make a motion that we approve the application of Margaret Purcell to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard set-back, right; Both side yards combined; Percentage of structure width/lot width; and Percentage of open area; to construct a 15 by 15 foot patio and move deck stairs from north side to east side of deck at the property addressed as 82 State Street in the Village of Skaneateles. The final setbacks and amounts of variances shall be determined by the Code Enforcement Officer for the file. The approval is based on plans dated 6/23/2015. This is a Type 2 transaction and applicant shall have one year to complete." Member Badami seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion the motion was carried.

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
June 23, 2015**

Public Hearing in the matter of the application of Steve & Linda Chow to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard set-back, right; Both side yards combined; Percentage of structure width/lot width; and Percentage of open area; to construct a 6 by 12 foot addition to an existing deck and convert it to a screen porch, and to alter a second floor window at the property addressed as 3 West Austin Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Craig Phinney, Chairman
 David Badami, Member
 Michael Balestra, Member
 Curt Coville, Member
 Larry Pardee, Member

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

 Richard Krenzer, architect, on behalf of the Applicant

 Carol Stokes-Cawley, Village Trustee
 Elizabeth Govern, 36 State St.
 Dianne Washington, 6 E. Elizabeth St.
 Pat Carroll, 7 E. Elizabeth St.
 Nancy Cihon, 11 E. Elizabeth St.
 Jill Goldstein, 34 Academy St.
 Marilyn Schick, 9 W. Elizabeth St.
 Molly Elliott, 125 Orchard Rd.
 Kathaleen Underwood, 29 State St.
 David Underwood, 29 State St.
 Linda Roche, 39 W. Lake St.
 Amy Marsden, 16 E. Elizabeth St.
 Mark Marsden, 16 E. Elizabeth St,
 Katie Severance, 34 State St.
 Jack Severance, 34 State St.
 Robin Rulli, 1675 New Seneca Tpk.
 Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Ave.
 Joshua Lagrow, 57 State St.
 Cynthia Brennan, 27 Academy St.
 Becky Barker, 1382 New Seneca Tpk.
 Rob & Carolyn Coville, 3750 Fisher Rd.

Tom Blares, 3895 Fennell St.
Bob Eggleston, 1391 E. Genesee St.
Kathleen Zapata, 41 Academy St.
Darlene Kerr, 1275 Oak Bluff

At 7:35 pm Chairman Phinney opened the Public Hearing in the matter of Steve and Linda Chow for 3 West Austin Street. Mr. Krenzer introduced himself and presented, "They plan to take an existing deck and add to it; add a 6 foot addition to the deck, and then add a screen porch on top of that footprint. The side yard set-back remains the same, 12 feet. The open area reduces from 79.7% to 79.1% where 85% is required. As part of it, there is an existing window upstairs that is too long for the roof of the new porch so we are going to pop that out, shorten the window up a little bit and give it a little bit of architectural pizzazz."

Chairman Phinney, "You can fairly see through the screen?" Mr. Krenzer, "Yes, regular porch screen." Chairman Phinney, "Anyone have any questions here?" Hearing none, he opened the public comment portion of the hearing. There was no one who wished to comment. Chairman Phinney, "I will move that we close the Public Hearing. Member Pardee seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, the Public Hearing was closed.

Member Coville, "I move that we accept the application of Steve and Linda Chow to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard set-back, right; Both side yards combined; Percentage of structure width/lot width; and Percentage of open area; to construct a 6 by 12 foot addition to an existing deck and convert it to a screen porch, and to alter a second floor window at the property addressed as 3 West Austin Street in the Village of Skaneateles. This action is based on 2 pages of plans dated 22 May 2015; it is a Type 2 transaction; the applicants will have 1 year to complete." Member Pardee seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, the motion was carried. Mr. Krenzer thanked the Board. This matter was concluded at 7:39 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
June 23, 2015

Public Hearing in the matter of the application of Martin & Tara Lynn to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for 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 remove an existing porch and to construct a new front porch at the property addressed as 38 Academy Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Craig Phinney, Chairman
 David Badami, Member
 Michael Balestra, Member
 Curt Coville, Member
 Larry Pardee, Member

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

 Richard Krenzer, architect, on behalf of the Applicant

 Carol Stokes-Cawley, Village Trustee
 Elizabeth Govern, 36 State St.
 Dianne Washington, 6 E. Elizabeth St.
 Pat Carroll, 7 E. Elizabeth St.
 Nancy Cihon, 11 E. Elizabeth St.
 Jill Goldstein, 34 Academy St.
 Marilyn Schick, 9 W. Elizabeth St.
 Molly Elliott, 125 Orchard Rd.
 Kathaleen Underwood, 29 State St.
 David Underwood, 29 State St.
 Linda Roche, 39 W. Lake St.
 Amy Marsden, 16 E. Elizabeth St.
 Mark Marsden, 16 E. Elizabeth St.
 Katie Severance, 34 State St.
 Jack Severance, 34 State St.
 Robin Rulli, 1675 New Seneca Tpk.
 Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Ave.
 Joshua Lagrow, 57 State St.
 Cynthia Brennan, 27 Academy St.
 Becky Barker, 1382 New Seneca Tpk.
 Rob & Carolyn Coville, 3750 Fisher Rd.

Tom Bares, 3895 Fennell St.
Bob Eggleston, 1391 E. Genesee St.
Kathleen Zapata, 41 Academy St.
Darlene Kerr, 1275 Oak Bluff

At 7:40 pm Chairman Phinney opened the Public Hearing in the matter of Martin & Tara Lynn for 38 Academy Street. Mr. Krenzer introduced himself and presented, "The Lynns are proposing to remove the existing front porch on the house and add a larger, more Village-appropriate front porch the full length of the house on the front. It will be slightly forward of the garage to push that back a little bit, as much as possible. The existing side yard set-back is 3.9 feet, proposed will be 6.5 feet with the new porch. Obviously the open area changes and reduces – where 85% is required, 81.8% is proposed. As you can see on the elevation, the porch is very close to the ground. It will be of concrete construction because it is so close to the ground. The floor will be concrete. And then there's a reverse gable and a hip roof on the rest of the porch."

Chairman Phinney, "And you're going to take out the existing fillers and then move them out a bit?" Mr. Krenzer, "Everything goes; everything is new." Chairman Phinney, "I read that the Planning Board had suggested the possibility of a railing to break it up. In contrast to a railing, had you thought about vegetation or some kind of thing? I did agree with their assessment; when you look at a blank porch like that it is a naked look. Especially now when you have nice gardens in front." Mr. Krenzer, "They are planning on shrubs." Chairman Phinney, "Which would be better than a railing, I think." Mr. Krenzer, "Absolutely."

Chairman Phinney asked if anyone on the Board had questions. Hearing none, he opened the public comment portion of the hearing. There was no one desiring to speak on this proposal. Chairman Phinney, "I move that we close the Public Hearing." The motion was seconded by Member Coville. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, the Public Hearing was closed.

Member Pardee, "I move that we approve the application of Martin & Tara Lynn to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for 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 remove an existing porch and to construct a new front porch at the property addressed as 38 Academy Street in the Village of Skaneateles. This is based on two pages of drawings dated 20th of May 2015, it is a Type 2 transaction and applicants will have one year to complete." Chairman Phinney seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, the motion was carried. Mr. Krenzer thanked the Board. This matter was concluded at 7:39 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
June 23, 2015**

Public Hearing in the matter of the application of Joshua Lagrow to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Front yard set-back; 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 remove an existing deck, construct a 12 by 14 foot patio and construct a 24 by 26 foot attached garage with 16 by 24 foot bonus room above at the property addressed as 57 State Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Craig Phinney, Chairman
 David Badami, Member
 Michael Balestra, Member
 Curt Coville, Member
 Larry Pardee, Member

 Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the ZBA
 Jphn Crompt, Code Enforcement Officer
 Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the ZBA

 Richard Krenzer, architect, on behalf of the Applicant
 Joshua Lagrow, Applicant

 Carol Stokes-Cawley, Village Trustee
 Elizabeth Govern, 36 State St.
 Dianne Washington, 6 E. Elizabeth St.
 Pat Carroll, 7 E. Elizabeth St.
 Nancy Cihon, 11 E. Elizabeth St.
 Jill Goldstein, 34 Academy St.
 Marilyn Schick, 9 W. Elizabeth St.
 Molly Elliott, 125 Orchard Rd.
 Kathaleen Underwood, 29 State St.
 David Underwood, 29 State St.
 Linda Roche, 39 W. Lake St.
 Amy Marsden, 16 E. Elizabeth St.
 Mark Marsden, 16 E. Elizabeth St.
 Katie Severance, 34 State St.
 Jack Severance, 34 State St.
 Robin Rulli, 1675 New Seneca Tpk.
 Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Ave.
 Cynthia Brennan, 27 Academy St.
 Becky Barker, 1382 New Seneca Tpk.

Rob & Carolyn Coville, 3750 Fisher Rd.
Tom Blares, 3895 Fennell St.
Bob Eggleston, 1391 E. Genesee St.
Kathleen Zapata, 41 Academy St.
Darlene Kerr, 1275 Oak Bluff

At 7:45 pm Chairman Phinney opened the Public Hearing in the matter of Joshua Lagrow for 57 State Street. Mr. Krenzer introduced himself and presented, "Josh is here tonight if there are any specific questions for him. What was approved before was a detached two-car garage. Now because of a change, they would like to get some second-floor space over the garage that would be accessible directly from the house. So we've moved the garage up. It still appears detached from the street, in that there is a small appendage that attaches it to the house and it sits behind the house, in keeping with most Village Houses. We remove an existing detached garage that is in about the same area, and we remove a deck that's in the area of the proposed garage and the new patio. 3 foot proposed side-yard set-back where 15 is required. The area coverage changes from 82.3% open area to 82.2%. When it was approved before it was a slightly larger garage and open area was 81.2% -- all where 85% is required. The garage will appear similar architectural elements as the house. It is a two-car garage and then there is a hall leading to a space above the garage."

Chairman Phinney, "And the reason that you now need a side yard variance for 3 feet is because the house is now attached." Mr. Krenzer, "Exactly, exactly." Member Badami, "Why did you draw it the way it is now instead of flipping it, so you wouldn't have that situation." Mr. Krenzer, "Over closer to the south?" Mr. Badami, "Correct." Mr. Krenzer, "That would destroy any back lawn that they have. Right now this is when the driveway is; you could pull the driveway around the back but again it totally obliterates the back yard." Mr. Lagrow, "There is a beautiful sugar maple there that I don't to get rid of. When we did the initial remodel, that tree has been there forever. We would hate to lose that." Member Badami, "The use of the bonus room; could you give me a little more detail on why you want that, why you need that?" Mr. Lagrow, "The initial garage design had the same type of room above it. I have had two boys in the past 3 years. I'd like them 30 feet as opposed to 300 feet away from me. That's the truth. We don't need; the first garage we had planned was huge. We don't need that. I'd rather those guys a little bit closer to me than a little bit farther away." Chairman Phinney, "And there will be no plumbing upstairs?" Mr. Krenzer, "It is just a room."

Chairman Phinney opened the public comment portion of the hearing. Mr. Lagrow, "I have been to all our neighbors. I don't know if you remember from the first time that Fran's daughter came and she was kind of against it; the size of the garage. We said we wanted to pull it forward and make it smaller; not like we have a barn in the back yard. We wanted something that fit the Village a little better." There was no one to speak in opposition. Chairman Phinney, "I move to close the Public Hearing." Member Pardee seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, the Public Hearing was closed.

Member Badami, “I will move to approve the application of Joshua Lagrow to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Front yard set-back; 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 remove an existing deck, construct a 12 by 14 foot patio and construct a 24 by 26 foot attached garage with 16 by 24 foot bonus room above at the property addressed as 57 State Street in the Village of Skaneateles. The approval is based on two pages of plans dated April 24 of 2015. It is a Type 2 transaction and the applicant will have 1 year to complete the project.” Member Pardee seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, the motion was carried. Mr. Krenzer thanked the Board. This matter was concluded at 7:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
June 23, 2015**

Public Hearing in the matter of the application of Jack & Katie Severance for a Special Use Permit to operate a bed & breakfast homestay and to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Percentage of open area; to change the use to a single-family dwelling with a 2 bedroom bed & breakfast at the property addressed as 34 State Street in the Village of Skaneateles. The applicants have withdrawn their pending application for conversion to a two family dwelling – a matter which was to have been the subject of a Public Hearing that was previously adjourned to June 23 at the applicant’s request. That Public Hearing is hereby declared moot and cancelled.

Present: Craig Phinney, Chairman
 David Badami, Member
 Michael Balestra, Member
 Curt Coville, Member
 Larry Pardee, Member

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

 Robert Eggleston, architect, on behalf of the Applicant
 Katie Severance, Applicant
 Jack Severance, Applicant

 Carol Stokes-Cawley, Village Trustee
 James Lanning, Village Trustee
 Elizabeth Govern, 36 State St.
 Dianne Washington, 6 E. Elizabeth St.
 Pat Carroll, 7 E. Elizabeth St.
 Nancy Cihon, 11 E. Elizabeth St.
 Jill Goldstein, 34 Academy St.
 Marilyn Schick, 9 W. Elizabeth St.
 Molly Elliott, 125 Orchard Rd.
 Kathaleen Underwood, 29 State St.
 David Underwood, 29 State St.
 Linda Roche, 39 W. Lake St.
 Amy Marsden, 16 E. Elizabeth St.
 Mark Marsden, 16 E. Elizabeth St.
 Robin Rulli, 1675 New Seneca Tpk.
 Beth O’Sullivan, 10 Leitch Ave.
 Cynthia Brennan, 27 Academy St.

Becky Barker, 1382 New Seneca Tpk.
Rob & Carolyn Coville, 3750 Fisher Rd.
Tom Blares, 3895 Fennell St.
Bob Eggleston, 1391 E. Genesee St.
Kathleen Zapata, 41 Academy St.
Darlene Kerr, 1275 Oak Bluff

At 7:58 pm Chairman Phinney opened the Public Hearing in the matter of Jack & Katie Severance for 34 State Street. Chairman Phinney, "As we approach this particular application, one of the members of our Board, Mr. Balestra, has recused himself, because he has a potential conflict of interest, in that his law firm has represented or been involved with the Severances in the past. Is that correct?" Member Balestra, "Correct." Chairman Phinney, "So to eliminate any potential conflict of interest, we always make sure we separate that from where we are. However that changes the burden on the applicant. The burden on the applicant now is we need to have a majority of 3, in order for anything to pass, so any vote that we might take this evening would have to be 3 to 1 in favor of the applicant in order for it to be passed. Anything that would be 2 to 2, would be a rejection of the application. So it's a different level that you would have to cross as we go on here, so the burden is slightly different."

Mr. Dundon, "On 4/28/15 at its meeting the Board held a Public Hearing on the Severance variance for a 2 family dwelling. It was adjourned to 7:30 pm this evening. That application has since been withdrawn and therefore that Hearing became moot and was cancelled administratively. That of course does not affect the current application which is before the Board tonight. The Planning Board referred this item without a recommendation to the ZBA, and since the packets were distributed to you, there have been several more letters that were received and you have received copies of them. The Onondaga County Planning Board received our referral made under General Municipal Law 239, which is required since the site is within 500 feet of a state or county highway. They have indicated that they will be taking that up at their meeting on July 8th, therefore we do not have their recommendation or comments for tonight's meeting. The applicant's architect filed revised narratives and site plans yesterday afternoon. I have reviewed them and compared them to the versions in the file. The differences are that in the narrative, Mr. Eggleston added the criteria and his arguments in favor thereof for Special Use Permit. On the site plan there were several additions of plantings, both on this property and adjacent properties. Also, the application now contains a new 6 foot high privacy fence on the eastern side. That was not referred to in the narrative."

Chairman Phinney, "What we will do as we head into the; I am not going to read all of the letters for and against the project, but I will acknowledge all of those that I have hard copies for and acknowledge as to whether they are for or against the particular project that's involved here at this point. They are all part of the public record and you are always welcome to read those in the office here. They are available and they are part of the public record."

Chairman Phinney introduced the application and called on Mr. Eggleston. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "I appreciate your requesting to do site visits, you had individually gone to the site to look at the house in and out. As a result of that and as the Severances were explaining some of the additional things that they were doing that didn't require variances or special permits, we were advised to show those on the site plan. So we came up with the June 18th site plan that showed the additional plantings, the 6 foot high privacy fence to the neighbor on Academy Street and the optional 4 foot high dense shrubs that was suggested by the Planning Board should you consider this application. Also, we have added the Special Use Permit criteria for you to consider. In a nutshell, this is a 23,000 SF lot, which is actually one of the larger lots on lower State Street. It has a 4,700 SF house, which is one of the larger homes in this area. While the interior of the house has had extensive renovation and been brought up to a very nice level, a lot of work still remains to be done on the exterior. It was on the market for over 3 years; it was rented temporarily for some of those periods, and it has been a very difficult house to market based on its price range and its size."

Mr. Eggleston continued, "The Severances purchased the house with the intentions of either converting it into a two-family dwelling or making it into a bed and breakfast ("B&B"). We initially applied for the two-family and they were intending to rent the second unit. When a number of concerns from neighbors came up over that they decided to withdraw that application and therefore we have made the B&B homestay application in accordance with Section 225-40. There will be two bedrooms as shown in the diagram on the plan and as you saw, each guest suite will have a sitting area and a bedroom area and a private bathroom. That leaves the master bedroom suite plus one additional room upstairs that will be used as an office for the Severances' personal use. Downstairs, what was an office with a bathroom attached, will be a personal guest bedroom for the Severances for when their kids come to visit or their personal friends. There will be no exterior changes to the house except for repairs and a couple of the items that we had mentioned – which include putting in the patio where an old tarvia driveway used to be located. The architectural integrity of the house will be maintained, both interior and exterior and it will continue to function as a single-family dwelling."

Mr. Eggleston continued, "We are here for one variance and that is the percent of open area will be decreased. Currently it is conforming at 85.1%. It will be decreased to 82.6%. Part of the issue the lot area, after you take out the right-of-way is only 23,127 SF, where the gross area including the right-of-way was 28,495 SF. Over the years the State Street right-of-way went from a 24.75 foot to over a 33 foot right-of-way. So the property has lost area, yet the sidewalk remains based on the old right-of-way. Normally you think of the property going to the sidewalk, but in this case the sidewalk is some 10-15 feet into the right-of-way. In having the B&B we are required to have 1.25 parking spaces per guest room, so that's 2.5. Village Zoning says to round down, so we are required to have 2 parking spaces for the B&B plus 2 parking spaces for the dwelling. The driveway is rather large as it exists; we can accommodate those additional 2 parking spaces without making any changes to the tarvia. But open space is the area not occupied by buildings, structures (such as patios), or required parking. So even though there is no physical change, we lost 360 SF which is 1.5%, just because we now have to count the cars that park there."

Chairman Phinney, "But you also removed at least that amount of tarvia in the back, where the patio is, so there is far less tarvia now." Mr. Eggleston, "There used to be a loop driveway in the back. They have removed the tarvia; they would like to put in a patio. The patio is what makes the other difference, bringing us down to 82.6% where 85% is required. That's a 2.4% variance in open area. In the lower State Street and in the A2 District, the majority of lots are under 30,000 SF and open space that are lower than 85%. Lower State Street typically is closer to the 50% open space range, so this is not out of character with the neighborhood. Also the A2 Zoning District as a whole has an average lot size of closer to 15,000 SF and 75 – 80% open area. So it is not out of character with the A2 District. It is clear that the Severances' minimal variance request is entirely consistent with well-established local land use pattern and the character of the immediate and bordering neighborhoods. In purchasing the property, the Severances relied on being able to convert the dwelling to 2 family or making it a B&B homestay. The 4700 SF house had 6 bedrooms in it and is much larger than what they would require. They would not have bought this solely as a single-family house for themselves. The resources that they will gain from the B&B will allow them to make the necessary exterior repairs that the property requires. They already have done quite a bit to improve the landscaping and some of the other things about the house. As they are able to maintain the house will help to maintain the value of the property and the value of the neighborhood. Larger homes on State Street and in the A1/A2 Districts have been allowed to become B&B homestays. It has not been a detriment to the neighborhood, while preserving the larger family homes as single-family dwellings. I have gone through the area variance criteria. Would you like me to review those with you?"

Chairman Phinney, "I'm comfortable. Do we need to read through that? They are part of the public record. What he is saying is that there are two different sets of things that we need to go through for criteria. One is specifically involved with the obtaining of a Special Use Permit and there are roughly 7 different criteria that you need to meet or fall within the guidelines of, in order for that to be an acceptable change or variance. For B&Bs there are 4 and for area variances there are 5. So there are actually 3 separate issues, they are not lumped into one issue. So when we regard this we will be regarding it (1) does it meet the criteria of the B&B, also does it meet the criteria for a Special Use Permit; separate from that would be the area variance that we'll deal with on the side." Mr. Eggleston, "The area variance is strictly for the 82.6%." Chairman Phinney, "Gentlemen, does anyone have questions or comments? We have been dealing with this issue for awhile. We have done research, we have all made home visits to the house so we have seen the way that the house has been redesigned and is currently being set up. I can say that from what I have seen that it is setup as a B&B at this point in time. I can't speak for the other Board members, but there is only one kitchen, one dining room, there is only one living room. It is set up as a home that also has two rooms that are laid out as Mr. Eggleston has said. We have had that advantage of having been inside the actual building itself." Mr. Eggleston, "I think the most important criteria definition for the B&B is that it has to be an owner-occupied residence. Katie Severance has actually owned and managed a B&B; she actually has experience doing this." Chairman Phinney, "I guess just before I open the criteria; I have had a number of people oddly enough, comment to me over the course of the last six weeks, regarding B&Bs, and two-family dwellings and one family dwellings. It made me start to think how those types of situations have been different for me. I don't know how many of you travel or travel extensively, I have been very lucky in my lifetime to have traveled. And when I have

traveled in both Europe and the United States, I have stayed in B&Bs quite often. And I tried to think of who the other people are when I stay in a B&B. And I couldn't come up with anyone other than couples of a certain age, or a couple of ladies or people traveling in a country. I was trying to think of a single instance in which I had seen anyone other than couples – meaning teenagers, 20 year old singles – in any place that I have ever stayed in Europe or the United States which has been extensive. So I think as we look at this and we think of who the people are that will be coming in as potential renters, it isn't somebody who is bringing Tom, Dick and Harry to stay at a Howard Johnson's somewhere for the cheapest rate that they can find. I would profess that it's a different type of clientele. Again, a separate issue from summer rentals, from what we are finding and the people who are coming in, not regulated and so on. For my own two cents worth on B&Bs, at this particular point there are 3 existing in the Village; one I believe one is for sale. It is not an easy business – it is very time-consuming to go at it. I believe there are 4 in the Town, 4 or 5, and I believe a couple of those are also for sale. I am now ready to open the public comment portion of the hearing; is there anyone who wishes to speak in favor of this proposal?"

Mr. Eggleston offered 'no objection' letters signed by several of their neighbors. He offered a color coded tax map in which blue represents the subject property, yellow represents neighbors with whom the Severances have talked but who did not sign the letter, green represents those who have signed the letter. Chairman Phinney read, "We the undersigned are aware that Jack & Katie Severance are proposing to create a B&B and add a patio to their residence at 34 State Street. We are aware that this requires a special use permit and area variance. We have reviewed the drawings of Robert O. Eggleston, architect, dated June 5, 2015 and narrative dated May 22, 2015 and have no objection to this application. It was signed by residents at 25 State St, 22 State Street, 24 State Street, 27 State Street, 28 Academy Street, 26 State Street, 23 State Street, 20 State, 31 State, 29 State, 35 State and 32 Academy. In addition we have also received letters from 34 State (favor), 22 Jordan Street (favor), a former resident of the house (favor), John Copley (favor), 31 Academy Street (opposed). You are still more than welcome to add to this list as we go along until the Public Hearing is officially closed. Anyone in favor?"

Ms. Elliott – in favor – spoke about difficulty selling the property, renovations done by former owners, experience of Ms. Severance in running B&B (10 Fitch and Lady of the Lake) and interior design, improvements made since Severance purchase, is 100% in support, would stay there herself, fact of a B&B 5 houses down the street, they should be allowed to have it.

Ms. Underwood – in favor – lives across street, glad that owners have stopped the deterioration, B&B will not devalue her property at all, B&Bs have different clientele, strangers in the Village are a given, will be owner on premises, just two rooms, will not increase traffic.

Ms. Roche – in favor – this town needs B&Bs, we are tourist town, Ms. Severance runs a great ship, community depends on tourism, visitors spend money in restaurants and shops, keeps the Village going, all in favor of it.

Ms. Barker – in favor - all experiencing frustration with the congestion in town, B&B helps to alleviate, off-street parking very important, way to allow John D. Barrow home to continue, local

residents need places to accommodate guests that they can't accommodate in their homes, Severances are proven winners, most appropriate use for this home.

Ms. Brennan – opposed – submitted a letter, problem with Katie being manager of Lady of the Lake but not owner. Ch. Phinney interrupted stating that absentee ownership of Lady of the Lake is a code enforcement issue, not a Board issue. Ms. Brennan persisted in pursuing vacation rentals mentioning a recent Village Board executive session with ZBA. Ch. Phinney not the forum for it. Ms. Brennan argued it all ties in together. The Board disagreed. Brennan cited comments in support of Ms. Severance's experience in running Lady of the Lake; will the Board consider these? Ch. Phinney admonished her to come up with some valid arguments and stay off vacation rentals. Ms. Brennan said Severances want to put a commercial tourist business in the middle of an A2 District – a thriving intact neighborhood with infants to 90 year-olds. Adding a commercial enterprise fundamentally changes the character of the neighborhood. With a B&B comes a transient population not expecting children to be on the street and brings security issues of strangers in the neighborhood. Brought up issue of declining school enrollment. Ch. Phinney interrupted declaring it irrelevant. Ms. Brennan said originally applied for 2 family with intent to use it as illegal short term rental. Ch. Phinney application was for 2 family; speculative that they might be able to have a change of use for the property. Ms. Brennan asserted that people will apply for B&B; many are operating as such without Board approval. Ch. Phinney interrupted reminding that is an enforcement issue that is not before the Board; directed Ms. Brennan to restrict her comments to a B&B application, not vacation rentals. [Multiple Discussions] Ms. Brennan stated that the flow of traffic will be impacted by this plan; Planning Board asked for some shrubs, but the sight distances at that intersection are terrible; Severances improved conditions by taking down some bushes, now want to put some back. Member Badami explained where the shrubbery suggested by the Planning Board would be located and its purpose. Ms. Brennan is happy with people [visitors] walking around Genesee Street, a lovely vibrant center as contemplated by the Comprehensive Plan. What she is looking for is a safe stable neighborhood; she and her husband don't want people all over the place; we want the quiet of Academy St. and this proposal changes it. Precedent is an issue; approval of this application will mean others are going to do it on Academy St., Leitch and East Elizabeth; means fewer homes and housing stock for families; would like to hear SOCPA comments; concerned about the future.

Chairman Phinney, "The Zoning laws were drawn up and laid out with certain uses in certain districts, and allowing some options in other districts. Until that changes, we are bound to follow that Zoning code which does involve the ability of people to have a B&B in A1 or A2. Until that changes, we have to consider that. I can't say that 2 applications in 12 years is setting a precedent. I don't see where the addition of 2 cars and 2 couples on a weekend is putting our children in danger/ I would submit that the kids who are home this summer from school are putting more people in danger on Academy Street than any tourist would."

Ms. Carroll - opposed – never thought there would be the potential of having something akin to a hotel next to her; house at Jordan and East Elizabeth that would be ripe for this; B&B would be disruptive; innocuous until they are all over the place; a residential district should not be economically developed; don't have to entice more people to come here.

Chairman Phinney noted no flood of applications. There are strict criteria that apply if someone is going to attempt to run a B&B. We have to take someone at her word as to their intent to run a business according to the rules. Member Badami expressed sympathy for her position, but noted that the board has a set of rules that we have to follow and interpret. Speculation about what could happen needs to be addressed to another body. Member Badami pressed Ms. Carroll for examples of disruption – she noted that vacationers may not be on the same timetable as Village residents. She does not favor economic development in a residential neighborhood.

Ms. Zapata – opposed – wants to make Skaneateles her home; doesn't like idea of B&B on same street; pregnant with 4th child; what's to stop B&B next door, wrote a letter in opposition.

Ms. Elliott – in favor – live in Parkside; construction area brings in more people than B&B; B&B no more harmful than living on any other Village street.

Ms. Zapata – opposed – Sees Academy Street as different from Jordan Street. Ms. Elliott there are many B&B for sale; no one is buying them; it is not going to start popping up on Academy, Leitch and West Lake streets; Lady of the Lake has been there for a long time, no one has heard of a major thing happening; Village is tourism, where people want to stay. Ms. Zapata does not want her family to be amongst a B&B.

Ms. Marsden – opposed – need to carefully consider a variance because it is promoting the Village as a resort town and not a community; this has been a topic of discussion for years; we want this to be a community not a resort town; do not want any more action; number 1 impediment to young families moving back to Skaneateles is affordable housing.

Chairman Phinney, “I would submit that any house which is large enough to be a B&B is out of the price range of any young family with young growing children.” Ms. Zapata disagreed. Ch. Phinney noted that she is the exception, not the rule. He continued to say “This is not the same Village it was when I moved here 36 years ago. Nor is it for any of us. The change that has come over the course of the last 25 years is, that whether we like it or not, we are a resort community. Kicking and screaming, we have been dragged into the 21st century and that is what the majority of the village core is involved with. The shops downtown are not necessarily designed for you and I to go in there and buy a trinket. May they all stay profitable and in business, otherwise we would not be able to go to the restaurants in the winter. Without the tourists there are no restaurants, without the tourists there are no bars. Is that happy? I live literally a half mile up from the intersection of Jordan and Genesee and I have people parked in front of my house on weekends. I truly understand that this is a tourist destination area. If they are not staying here, they are staying somewhere else. Whether we like it or not, that is what has happened to our community. I don't happen to like that direction. That does not however preclude how I can make decisions regarding what is legal and not legal, and allowable and not allowable in our Village according to the existing Zoning laws.”

Ms. Bennett, “I think all these interests can peacefully coexist. I think it is possible to keep quiet neighborhoods and have a vibrant Village core. Have tourists...” Chairman Phinney, “As long as there is no B&B, and nobody runs out of the house next to you – any summer person – as long as your particular corner is protected. I get that part. It's a NIMBY scenario; I understand that.”

Ms. Bennett, "Mr. Chairman, I really don't appreciate the sarcasm." Chairman Phinney, "Ma'am you have become so redundant in your comments here that it is very hard to not have that creep into my [unintelligible]." Ms. Brennan, "You have to make careful decisions now because we are at a watershed moment in this community and this Board has a role in that decision making." Chairman Phinney, "That is correct. And the reason we are on this Board is because we have been given the responsibility by the Village to make those decisions, that is correct. We are forbidden from voting our emotions. Any time a Board votes emotion in contrast to following the existence of the codes, you find yourself reversed and in big trouble. So you have to be able to understand that any decisions that we make will be done in an unemotional basis, to the best of our ability, based on the information we have and our interpretation of the information that has been presented to us."

Ms. O'Sullivan – opposed - B&B sounds relaxing and wonderful; a resident innkeeper serving you breakfast and being rented out no more than 3 nights per week; currently the B&Bs are not being monitored some are operating 4 nights per week and renting out attic spaces; how can we be sure it's only two bedrooms? Chairman Phinney said that based on physically going through the building, there is no way that they can have more than two bedrooms in that building. It can't physically happen.

Ms. Cihon – opposed – Isn't there a bedroom and bathroom on the main floor as well? Chairman Phinney said yes, that's where they live. There is a guest bedroom in the back of the house separated by walls and a locked door. That is for entertaining guests in their own home.

Member Badami, "With Mr. Eggleston's approval, I would like to put your clients on the spot. I had some initial concerns about the Severances' first application and I addressed that with them when I went to physically inspect their house. I wanted to address the point of having a group or a party or a wedding or a conference on this property. I had read something that appeared on line that troubled me greatly when I read that. I did ask the Severances about that when I made my inspection and I would ask your permission for your clients to respond if they would."

Ms. Severance, "There was something on the website that was an absolute mistake. There is another property that I manage in Auburn called Celebration Hall that has a huge wedding facility that is up online called Chantelle Marie, and Celebration Hall is next to it. There was a new website that went up with that property on there as well as several others. There was one sentence which I understand. I grew up here, I'm a native. I moved here when I was a year and a half. I know you are not going to have parties and functions or any kind of wedding gathering – big hoopla – on the corner of State Street and Academy. It is not going to happen. I grew up in that neighborhood. I remember visiting many houses when I was a kid, and I hear the children playing now on Sunday afternoon that reminds me of that. I spent a lot of time in those homes. I am not going to destroy that neighborhood. That one sentence was a mistake. I am not sure how that happened. It went on 34 State Street and it was supposed to be on Chantelle Marie lake house, which is in Auburn on Owasco Lake. It was not on both of them, it was only on one. It was an error. I had someone helping me do the website; I had a designer in California doing the website. My family had my brother-in-law who was incredibly sick during that time and I hired other people to do that. That may have been my fault or my oversight to allow other people to do something for my business at a time when I needed help. But I did and that's the way it is. I

apologize to all of you for giving you any concern. Mrs. Brennan made a comment about peace and harmony. We had two deaths in our family within one week. And we had neighbors who were taking pictures going by our house on a daily basis during this time period and saying at the last meeting when we were adjourning to consider what we were going to do. There were people who stated in the minutes ‘there are people in and out of that home in all types of attire, day and night. We know there is something going on there.’ There was; there were two deaths in our family. So I apologize to my neighbors that you had to see out-of-state cars and people in and out of our house, but we have family and that’s what was going on. If you would like to come in the house now and take a look at it like all the Zoning Board members have we would welcome you to, because we are certainly not open for anyone to be staying there. It is still under construction – it’s not even close. I hope that clears up why the big uproar came in. And I know what it was. It was sent to me by Bob and as soon as I saw it my heart sunk. I knew that people would think the worst because of that. In no way was it ever our intention, nor is it our intention, nor will we be having big parties, functions or anything else unless it is my family that’s 7 people, and sometimes it is going to happen. As far as renting it out in that manner, absolutely not. Never, ever is that going to happen. It’s our home, we live there. This is our neighborhood, too. And I apologize to all of the people who came out to support us and to the board members for having to suffer through all the things that continually are being brought up that have absolutely nothing to do with this application. It has taken up too much of your time already.”

Ms. Brennan, “Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question? What is the structure? I know Mr. Cromp is here. You know that we have a lot of information on this. How does that fit into all this? I think you know that at some level...” Chairman Phinney, “I’m not sure when you say you have a lot of information; if you have a lot of information on what you consider to be illegal rental of people’s properties on a short-term basis – then what you should do is have very specific detailed information and then you should bring it up to the Code Enforcement Officer.” Ms. Brennan, “Which he has already been given.” Chairman Phinney, “But that is the procedure. The procedure is to go there and if you find you are not having satisfaction, then I would have to imagine that you could surely talk with members of the Board of Trustees.”

Ms. Brennan, “Do you have any role in code enforcement at all?” Chairman Phinney, “None whatsoever.” Ms. Brennan, “But you understand what we are saying.” Chairman Phinney, “Of course we do because we have the same frustrations.” Member Badami, “We live here too.” Member Pardee, “We are not the enemy.” Ms. Brennan, “This opened our eyes. We have done a lot of research and we were shocked by what we found. That’s part of the context of where we are coming from.” Member Badami, “As far as this forum goes, it is not properly before us. I understand your argument that it is a global problem, but not to us. And with no disrespect; not to us it is not. It is separate.”

Chairman Phinney, It is an emotional issue. Any given board or CEO cannot deal with emotion other than by being patient while the person is venting their emotion. At that point any particular decision or action that they take is going to have to be based on what they are capable and able to do under the codes and the way that the laws are laid out. John works under the guise of the Trustees, so the Trustees will have occasional input regarding how things are working as well. That’s why Thursday evening will be a much better venue for this conversation.” Ms. Brennan,

“Talking about the character of the neighborhood perhaps becomes emotional, but that’s one of the things that you have to look at. But that is something that this Board is charged with looking at – the character of this community, of this neighborhood. Much of what we have been talking about deals with the character of the neighborhood.” Chairman Phinney, “Your perception of the character of the neighborhood.”

Ms. Brennan asked if the Public Hearing would remain open. Chairman Phinney said it was his inclination to close the hearing but to continue to accept written comments. There has been a substantial amount of information and opinion gathered. He suggested that at the Trustee meeting, the arguments be rational and cogent and that emotion be kept out of the discussion.

Attorney Galbato, “So do I understand you correctly, given what you indicated to Mrs. Brennan, that you are considering closing the Public hearing tonight, but you will still accept any information in writing from anybody in the public including the applicant. So if it pleases the Board we are waiting for a decision from the Onondaga County Planning Board, which we should receive by mid-July before our next meeting. If it pleases the Board you could close the Public Hearing tonight, given what you indicated to Mrs. Brennan, and in fairness to all the public and the applicant, you would close the public hearing tonight, but people could submit things in writing to the Board. The applicant could respond to comments made tonight or other comments they would like to make in writing, the sooner the better.” Chairman Phinney, “And we will take all of that into consideration.”

Ms. Kerr – in favor – beautiful community; love the character of the community; people have objected because tourism is getting out of control; during 51 years of visiting, tourism has always been the backbone of the Skaneateles economy; the businesses here are viable because there are tourists; visitors want to have events here which drives business to restaurants and hotels; businesses employ our families and friends, they pay taxes and raise the quality of life for all of us; Jack & Katie Severance are fine upstanding people; have seen many of the homes that they have restored and improved character of the neighborhood in every instance; will be selective in accepting people into their home and will be accountable for the people staying there; support this application, too few places for people to stay here.

Chairman Phinney, “I would like to move that we close the Public Hearing. The Board will continue to accept written comments from the public, the Onondaga County Planning Board and the applicants until our next meeting on July 28, 2015.” Member Pardee seconded the motion. Upon the affirmative vote of Members Badami, Coville, Pardee and Chairman Phinney, the Public Hearing in this matter is closed. Member Balestra was recused.

Chairman Phinney, “So the Public Hearing has now been closed. Because the Village has not received a response from the County Planning Board, as a Board we feel that we do not want to vote on this application tonight in the interest of having a complete record. We will conduct our SEQR review later as well. This matter will be tabled to our next meeting on July 28, 2015.

Chairman Phinney thanked the audience for their courtesy during what could have been a volatile meeting, and said, “I don’t believe that any of us are pleased with the nature of how vacation rentals exist in this Village. We have the same concern about the burgeoning problem

of vacation rentals. It does exist. We are not approaching this blindly. Talk to us understanding that we know that.”

This matter was concluded at 9:34 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
June 23, 2015

Request by Finger Lakes Luxury Homes, Inc. for an extension of the variances previously granted by the Board on June 25, 2013.

Present: Craig Phinney, Chairman
 David Badami, Member
 Michael Balestra, Member
 Curt Coville, Member
 Larry Pardee, Member

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

 Carol Stokes-Cawley, Village Trustee
 James Lanning, Village Trustee
 Elizabeth Govern, 36 State St.
 Dianne Washington, 6 E. Elizabeth St.
 Pat Carroll, 7 E. Elizabeth St.
 Nancy Cihon, 11 E. Elizabeth St.
 Jill Goldstein, 34 Academy St.
 Marilyn Schick, 9 W. Elizabeth St.
 Molly Elliott, 125 Orchard Rd.
 Kathaleen Underwood, 29 State St.
 David Underwood, 29 State St.
 Linda Roche, 39 W. Lake St.
 Amy Marsden, 16 E. Elizabeth St.
 Mark Marsden, 16 E. Elizabeth St.
 Robin Rulli, 1675 New Seneca Tpk.
 Beth O'Sullivan, 10 Leitch Ave.
 Cynthia Brennan, 27 Academy St.
 Katie Severance, 34 State Street
 Jack Severance, 34 State Street
 Becky Barker, 1382 New Seneca Tpk.
 Rob & Carolyn Coville, 3750 Fisher Rd.
 Tom Blares, 3895 Fennell St.
 Bob Eggleston, 1391 E. Genesee St.
 Kathleen Zapata, 41 Academy St.
 Darlene Kerr, 1275 Oak Bluff

At 7:54 pm Chairman Phinney opened the discussion of Finger Lakes Luxury Homes, Inc. for 46 East Genesee Street, “We are scheduled to hear the application for the Special Use Permit and area variance for Jack & Katie Severance. We have something before the Board that will take not more than 2 to 4 minutes, and I’d like to get that done before we start the other hearing. Is there anyone here to speak on that?” CEO Crompt, “Mr. Chairman, I don’t think anybody is here, but I will speak on that. I have talked with John Taylor who is the contractor on it and also Mr. Moscarito who is the owner. Their permit runs out two days from now, on the 25th. They have started to move in, they are allowed to move in without a certificate of occupancy (C of O), but as soon as they do that a time limit of 30 days to wrap it up is on. So I think 30 days is; I wouldn’t give them any more than 30 days; a 30 day extension. They plan on having it wrapped up and I think that just coincides with getting their C of O.” Chairman Phinney asked, “Any contingency in that?” CEO Crompt, “No. I don’t see a problem with giving them a 30 day extension.”

Chairman Phinney, “Is there anyone to speak on this matter or any comments from the Board?” Attorney Galbato, “I think that if the Board makes a motion it should be either 30 days from today or 30 days from the expiration of June 25 of 2013, so it is clear.” **Chairman Phinney, “I would move that we grant an extension of 30 days from their current expiration date for the variances previously approved at 46 East Genesee Street in the Village of Skaneateles.” Member Coville seconded the motion.** Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, the motion was carried. This matter was concluded at 7:56 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards