

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
July 2, 2015

In the matter of the application of Steve Boulet to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard set-back, left; Both side yards combined; and Percentage of open area; to construct a 12 foot by 14 foot deck adjoining an existing deck at the property addressed as 70 West Elizabeth Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

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

Steve Boulet, Applicant

Jo Anne Gagliano, Fayetteville
Angela Morosini, Skaneateles
Guy Donahoe, Skaneateles
Seth Williams, Skaneateles
Ron Beavers, Skaneateles
Karen Lewis, Skaneateles
Rob Petrie, Marcellus

Absent: Bruce Kenan, Chairman

Chairman Sutherland called for the matter of Steve Boulet for 70 West Elizabeth Street at 7:29 pm. Mr. Boulet introduced himself and presented, "These are my problems; why I would like to do this. I have a beautiful white pine tree that's in my yard close to the first deck. I don't want to remove the tree, but the tree shadows the yard so it doesn't get much sun in that part. It has quite a large root system. I have an older style deck. My plan was to come around and build another deck. I am still back and forth about whether I want to build another deck to match this or add another level. I have talked to my neighbors, and there is only one neighbor that's really close to me. I enjoy quite a bit of space in the back from the new development. Next to me there is about a 40 foot strip of property that I guess can't be developed. The neighbors next to me are absentee landlords. I have talked to them and they are in favor of it; they can't really see it. But it's hard to catch up with them because they are just not at their property very much. Across the street I've got Larry Pardee and I wouldn't ask him because he sits on one of the other Boards. My other neighbors have sold their house and are getting ready to move. I have calculated my density, and if I put the deck up, I will be over on the density slightly."

Chairman Sutherland, "When this is complete, are you able to walk from the old deck to the new deck?" Mr. Boulet, "Yes." Chairman Sutherland, "So you are taking down the railings on the sides and it will all be one deck when you are done." Mr. Boulet, "Yes, exactly. I have got the full plans for the deck here if anyone would like to see them." Member Hartnett, "We have them here in our packet." Mr. Boulet, "I think there may be a lot line issue too and I don't know; I never really got together with John to see if our figures are in agreement, but I don't know how they could be any different. If you look at the map I have the density on one side and on the other side I added up all the rooms. I came up with a difference to my favor of 2260 and the deck that I'm going to build is 168 SF, so that's 145.4 foot deep."

Chairman Sutherland, "At this point you haven't gotten to John yet to verify numbers?" Mr. Dundon, "John's calculation is a 2% reduction in open area, and half a foot on left side yard and 5.5 foot reduction in both side yards." **Member Eberhardt, "I will make a motion that we recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the variances requested on the Boulet application dated 5/10/15, with one minor contingency – that Mr. Boulet verify with CEO Crompt that both have the same numbers."** Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members, the motion was carried. This matter was concluded at 7:34 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting July 2, 2015

In the matter of the application of Jo Anne Gagliano 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; and Percentage of open area; to construct additional parking area, patio, decorative fence and stairs to false door at the Weichert property addressed as 81 East Genesee Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

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

Jo Anne Gagliano, Architect and Applicant for the Weicherts

Chairman Kenan called for the matter of Jo Anne Gagliano for 81 East Genesee Street at 8:20 pm. Ms. Gagliano introduced herself and presented, "I am here on behalf of Cy and Melissa Weichert. You have seen this property before around 2006, when they made the addition with the garage in the back. We already have had an informal review by the Historic Commission because we wanted to be sure that they didn't have any issues with it before we got started. We are planning to go back to see them for final review by that Commission. The site is a long and skinny one. This footprint here is the house and this is the existing street front. There is no change from the street looking at the house. That is an existing walkway, existing stair, existing driveway. The real improvements here are finishing the site from the house addition – take it to the next level. So there are things about it that are inconvenient when they are utilizing it. The rear door which is their back door, their mudroom door, that's adjacent to the garage. There are a couple of little pump house buildings, and just little cute little buildings; they've saved on the site. The idea for this project is primarily to give them space to put the cars – similar to the project you were talking about earlier. It is a long lot; we have over 200 feet of depth behind the house, but what they don't have currently; the cars are parking on the grass. They need a place for 2 cars, they have some children that are driving. They utilize their garage. It is really difficult to get out of here, so they are looking at extending the existing turn-around into the yard a little bit."

Ms. Gagliano continued, "The other area they are looking for some more active space outside – someplace they can sit outside the back door and a welcoming entrance for guests. Truthfully all these historic doors on the side; they all go into rooms and in fact this door isn't even a real

door. It was placed there for architectural reasons I understand. So this is really the entrance to the house; most people come in through the back.” Chairman Kenan, “Are the masonry stairs to the false door; are they new? Just to improve the image?” Ms. Gagliano, “Yes. The door is up about this high.” Blue stone is placed in the lawn so they can move through the yard a little easier. This is a connection to take the trash out, for example; convenience pathways, to keep the flavor of the house.” Chairman Kenan, “So in that image, the light green is lawn and the darker green is planting bed? And the same thing in the back?” Ms. Gagliano, “That’s correct. You can see the ground cover and the lawn. We are not completely through the planting with them yet. This little area in the back of the house, this is a lawn area not in the greatest condition because they are actually pulling in here and driving on it. Here’s the temporary stair that went to the addition. That’s the neighbor’s fence – it is very much on top of them and doesn’t go with the architecture. They want to talk about a trellis or a fence in front of it. You can see there’s the existing fence there. And then a stone wall with a cap and planting behind. And a little cut out against the garage instead of being right up to the foundation. They are looking at a very characteristic historic look, so it would be the irregular flagstone but it would have the cut edges so it is not contemporary looking. And then the stone stairs will be limestone treads and just veneering the existing concrete stoop with limestone. There is Onondaga limestone on the house foundation; they want to apply that to the areas of the new house as well.”

Chairman Kenan, “When was the addition built?” Ms. Gagliano, “2007 and 8. This is the door which they were asked to put in, so they decided why not do the same step there. Here you can see that same pavement that was inside the lawn area, now it comes out with the walkway. This would be a flush, granite-cobble curb in keeping with the historic flavor, groundcover, planting and then you can see where they would like to apply limestone veneer to that as well at the concrete stoop. So it brings it back to the flavor of the original house. That’s the biggest change. Going back to the site plan, most of the set-backs are as it was. There is no change in this dimension at all. This step is going to be repaired, and so is the sidewalk. It will be rebuilt exactly in keeping with where it is right now – in kind and in nature. That dimension would not change. It is 5 feet off this property line right to the bottom step, that’s existing. Then on the western side, the dimension that was used was 7 feet from the step to the property line. It will require a little retaining wall to hold the grade back and that will be 7 feet. That’s the only change we are asking for – to go to the closest point being 7 feet, when we are going from 11 feet. Looking back to the east, there really isn’t a change because the garage is at a 3 foot set-back that was approved. The fence is 2 feet off the property line, but it is my understanding that the fence is not considered to be a structure. We have over 200 feet in the rear. The only change at all is really this dimension. Are there any questions at all?”

Chairman Kenan, “The issue is site coverage, everything else is pretty static?” Ms. Gagliano, “It’s not really an issue because we have a lot of property, but site coverage has increased by this area and the 7 feet is closer than 11.” Member Carvalho, “So they coverage you are showing is 25%. I am just looking at your numbers. You added in the whole 1290 SF for asphalt. Do you just add in the parking; two parking spaces rather than all that area? I think you have shown it worse than it really is.” Mr. Dundon clarified that driveways do not fall into the open space calculation unless they are used for required parking. It is different from the Town. Ms. Gagliano, “So what we were doing is using the original calculations and then adding a column for you.” Member Carvalho, “I’m just thinking it wouldn’t show that much coverage if you

changed that calculation – make it look a little better.” Member Eberhardt, “I think it looks pretty good.” Member Carvalho, “I think the design looks beautiful; I mean number-wise.”

Ms. Gagliano, “So you want us to utilize the where it is existing gravel...” Member Carvalho, “I just think you have to figure the parking space, not the whole area in your coverage.” Ms. Gagliano, “We can talk to John. In this graphic we did this so it would be clear where there is pavement that we could take away and count toward it we did. So right now, there is a walkway there now. So we tried to be as exacting as possible, but I really didn’t understand that as the case. So it is really only the area where the cars park. I will ask John and find out what he says before we go to ZBA. Other than that there isn’t much change. It’s only for the betterment. They want it to be in keeping with the architecture and the surrounding area. They are going to try to build it this fall, if we can get through our approvals.”

Member Eberhardt, “I would like to make a motion that we recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the variances requested in the Weichert application dated June 18 of this year, subject to verification of the coverage calculations for open area with the Code Enforcement Officer.” Chairman Kenan seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members, the motion was carried. This matter was concluded at 8:34 pm. Ms. Gagliano thanked the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
July 2, 2015**

In the matter of the application of Seth Williams 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; Rear yard set-back; Percentage of structure width/lot width; Percentage of open area; and Minimum lot area; and section 225-14 C (5) (a/b) Accessory Buildings, distance to lot lines or structures; to construct a 12 foot by 22 foot shed, 8 foot section of fence, rear yard patio and to reconstruct the driveway at the property addressed as 29 East Elizabeth Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

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

Seth Williams, Applicant

Jo Anne Gagliano, Fayetteville
Angela Morosini, Skaneateles
Guy Donahoe, Skaneateles
Ron Beavers, Skaneateles
Karen Lewis, Skaneateles
Rob Petrie, Marcellus

Absent: Bruce Kenan, Chairman

Chairman Sutherland called for the matter of Seth Williams for 29 East Elizabeth Street at 7:35 pm. Mr. Williams introduced himself and presented, "There's no garage, shed, or anyplace to put any of our outdoor stuff. We just purchased to house in October; that was a problem from the past – everything kind of collects in the back yard. It's a smaller house and we have stuff just everywhere; I feel bad for the neighbors. I'd like to build a shed primarily, which is going to be like a pole barn construction. It will be 5 by 5 rough-cut lumber, board and batten siding matching the architecture with the house, and obviously redoing the driveway was the other segment of that up to the actual shed. And then a small patio area in the back. The diagrams are the ones that I drew. I will be doing the work."

Member Carvalho, "I did not see it on your site plan, but I see it in your picture. Are you widening your driveway?" Mr. Williams, "Yes, it is widened a little bit. The main driveway is

about 10 feet wide; it actually kind of widens out a little bit towards the end. I'd be adding about 8 feet to the side of it, just in the section where you see the tire marks there. It's jockeying vehicles. Where the house is located right off of State Street – one of the things I have noticed is the apartment complex that's across the street – if you come up to the top of the hill with State Street going up; it's constant peeling out, there's cars constantly parked out in front and it's a source of aggravation trying to back into where the cars are parked and then trying to get up over 321. The cars that are coming in are just constantly flying in and we are trying to pull out. But having an extra space there, allowing us to jockey cars and not have to back out against the traffic that's coming in as well as the cars that are parked in front of the apartment complex across the street would be helpful. That's why I was going for widening it so we didn't have to back out so much. From the standpoint of down the road, with all of that congestion on 321, it's almost like that sign should be moved down, so that people park further down the street. Every night we hear people peeling out trying to get up and over with other cars coming down the street. Our neighbors they have the same problem with backing out because there's always cars there in the street; it's so short."

Member Hartnett, "I know exactly where you are talking about and I understand that this is a hard place to get in and out of. I'll give you that. I don't think that those numbers were put in to the application, as far as the coverage and what had to be done." Mr. Williams, "I didn't actually give exact numbers because it was just kind of John and I were just 'if it's the main driveway all the way back that's existing, you are just adding 7 – 8 feet to the side of it'." Member Carvalho, "You are going to be paving a significant portion of your front yard." Mr. Williams, "Right. The existing goes right to this corner, just this section right here, and all the rest of this is still front yard."

Chairman Sutherland, "One of the things that we have tried to avoid over the years is parking areas in front of houses. We have had a lot of applicants, and we have worked hard to avoid when you look down the street, it looks like a series of junior parking lots in front of homes. Ideally, the car goes back further, the house is the dominant feature and the automobile takes a secondary position." Mr. Williams, "Sure. That's actually one of the things we were discussing is actually leaving the main driveway coming in the same but having a little jog so that I can pull back out we can jockey the cars off on the side here, further back in. So the sidewalk would remain the same; it would come across but then there would be a larger grass area up front. That would allow us to pull in at least one car to the side and get another car out past it in the existing driveway." Chairman Sutherland, "I realize what you are saying. Still you want the house up and the car behind. Kind of the typical condition. If you look on the street, the garage tends to be behind and takes a kind of secondary role. The house is the primary role. As you look up the really great streets we've got in town, it's the architecture that establishes the character and the car is just a secondary element further back."

Mr. Williams, "The problem with the property in that respect though is with how big it is. Where do I put; even if I bring the shed back there is not enough room to pull cars in behind it." Chairman Sutherland, "It is not a great solution, I'll give you that." Member Hartnett, "You do have some issues that are bothersome at least. Understand that. And I understand that with this street it makes it even harder. The problem I have is putting a structure that close to the property line. It is congested back there as it is. You may have to find another solution for where you

could place that. I don't see that being an acceptable solution; being that close to the property line going down on this point right here." Mr. Williams, "So the one thing that I am concerned with, though, is that here is a garage right here, and if I build it back and away, then all of this just becomes – right now it is just rubbish, it is just debris that's being thrown behind." Member Hartnett, "Again, I can't design it for you. I understand your situation, but I have a problem with putting it that close to that property line. I wish there were another option to look at; from my point of view that is just too close. When you look at it from the street, it would be very close to that other structure and 1.7 feet from..." Mr. Williams, "1.7 at the beginning of it but it actually goes; it is kind of a weird line, it kind of goes at an angle. So this fence, which was existing, and is still there would just connect onto it. It actually kind of migrates into nothing when you get to the back. It obviously widens as it goes out; it is kind of at an angle. With that said, the house is quite a distance..." Mr. Hartnett, "They are all close. I walked it. I know the property you are talking about and I frankly didn't see a good solution to your problem. I wish I was more in favor; I'm in favor of what you'd like to do – your end solution – I just don't see this being the right solution to the problem from where we are looking at it; being that close to a neighbor. The other members may see it differently."

Member Eberhardt, "I'm inclined to agree with Stephen." Member Carvalho, "I agree; it is not a good solution." Mr. Williams, "From the standpoint of what I have seen on other properties there are structures that are real close to the property line, maybe within 2 feet and then the driveway comes straight down. It's really tight quarters, no matter where you walk in and around the Village; it's tight quarters." Member Hartnett, "We are not trying to create any new ones. We can't go back to them. I wish you had a different design. I wish there were a way to do this in another location, or a different way to make it more; less nonconforming." Mr. Williams, "The only other option would be to put it toward the back of the property?" Chairman Sutherland, "Historically and traditionally garages tend to be in the rear. You drive back alongside the house, especially with older houses late 19th and 20th century properties, it tends to go back further. The cars, if they are there for the night and they are sitting out, they are behind the house they're not in front of it. The garage is enough off the adjoining property that it is not looming over a neighbor. If there was a way to get to a solution that was more like that, it might be helpful. I don't think there is a lot of interest in seeing this proposal get built. I'm not sure what to suggest, but..."

Mr. Williams, "Where should the structure go then?" Chairman Sutherland, "We really shouldn't design it for you, but if the basic goal was to move it back, move it off the property line and have the cars parked at night in the back, rather than in front of the house in a line-up, those would be the kind of things we'd hope a designer could work through." Mr. Williams, "Patio option?" Member Carvalho, "What materials are you proposing?" Mr. Williams, "Pavers." Member Eberhardt, "We probably should look at that when you reconsider how to get your storage." Mr. Williams, "Either way it will remain the same. This will remain the same from the standpoint of no matter where it goes in the back yard we just need additional space. The house is small as it is so we're just trying to create extra space, especially during the summer." Member Hartnett, "I realize what you are trying to do; I think that what Mr. Eberhardt's saying is before you ask for approval on that, you may want to look at this again to make sure you are not eliminating an option." Mr. Williams, "Sure. Well I'll go smaller on the shed, if I have to. I'll bring the shed down in size and just go a portable shed, or something, in

the back that's smaller." Member Hartnett, "So you want to take the shed off the table and amend your application to just the patio?" Mr. Williams, "Just the patio at this point and I'll go to a portable shed; do I need a permit for a portable shed?" Attorney Galbato, "The problem the Board has and that they are struggling with is that the Board is not supposed to segment a project. So they want to look at the whole project and proposal, not bifurcate it between a patio and then a possible garage or possible shed." Member Eberhardt, "You could paint yourself into a corner, if we did that. You might want to look at the whole..."

Mr. Williams, "This scenario would be just the patio and then I'll amend this; I'll talk to John and do a straight back driveway and the actual patio at this point, and then I can figure the shed out at some other point." Member Carvalho, "I think the major issue is where the driveway and the shed is, and the patio probably is not as big a concern in my opinion." Member Hartnett, "I agree with you."

Chairman Sutherland, "Would you like to make a motion?" Attorney Galbato, "You could always ask the Board to make a decision tonight. Their jurisdiction is giving a positive, negative or no recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals for their meeting at the end of July, or you could ask for an adjournment to be on the calendar for next month as you work through some of the issues that you've heard tonight for your storage shed and location. You keep this alive but amend it in time for it to go on the agenda." Mr. Williams, "I think that's the route that I should go, then. Thank you."

Member Carvalho, "I make a motion to adjourn this application in anticipation of an amendment by the Applicant to be considered at 7:30 pm on August 6, 2015. Chairman Sutherland seconded the motion.

Upon the unanimous vote of the members present, the motion was carried. This matter was concluded at 7:44 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting July 2, 2015

Work Session to review the Proposed Joint Comprehensive Plan referred to the Planning Board for review and recommendation by the Board of Trustees on June 11, 2015.

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

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

Chairman Kenan convened the work session in this matter at 8:35 pm. In response to a question from Member Hartnett, Chairman Kenan explained that the comments the Board made previously regarding shared lake rights involve a concept which has no enabling provision in Village code. But the Board's comments were not accepted by the Special Committee for "egalitarian" reasons, according to Member Sutherland. Chairman Kenan opined that "lake rights flies in the face of the concept of Zoning" and that Boards should not be approving more of them going forward. Right now the concept is in the Town Zoning.

Acting Chairman Sutherland suggested that the Board go through the markup prepared by Chairman Kenan point-by-point to decide what comments may be made to the Village Board. Chairman Kenan explained that he had compared the final draft produced by the Special Committee with the version recommended by the Planning Board last August, in order to identify points of difference.

Member Sutherland said that one of the biggest debate points was what to do with mining. A group in Sheperd's Settlement would like them gone, others feel that they were there before the houses. The treatment in the plan is to reduce the size going forward, but recognize it as an important function.

Paragraph C2 in section4 Enabling Actions with similar language also found in Goal 2, 1D. The reference suggests that Density Neutral Conservation Zoning and Subdivision Provisions be written into codes. This Board has implemented this approach and have used it to our advantage. But writing prescriptive language can cause problems. We suggest language that to the extent that this concept is applied it be done in a manner that is consistent and compatible with the existing characteristics of the Village. Member Sutherland believes that these references are intended to apply only to the Town. The Board supports this comment, in Goal 2, 1D.

The Board supports the inclusion of “to the extent feasible” related to green initiatives in number 2. In Goal 1H, there was language removed from a previous draft that should be included.

In Goal 4B, the Board had a spirited debate over the inclusion of shared lake rights, with some members being opposed to the concept, while others feel that with limited public access to the lake and relatively few owners of lakefront property that the concept is reasonable. The Board discussed ways to limit the density of use (number of using parcels) based on frontage, possibly on an individual basis. At some point, such developments may come close to a public beach. Member Sutherland suggested that the Comprehensive Plan should not be expected to contain a zoning solution. The Board discussed restricting the creation of new lake rights to new subdivisions with density restrictions and asked Chairman Kenan to draft the suggested comments.

In Goal 2, 2D the Board had concerns that the language needs to consider funding sources other than a real estate transfer tax, or eliminate the specific reference to a transfer tax. With the impending sale of Welch-Allyn and presumed loss of jobs, conservation of tax dollars and not creating inhibitions on property transfers seem appropriate. There must be a method to raise funds in order to make the acquisition of property a feasible goal. The Board agreed to the inclusion of other generalized funding mechanisms, such as tax sources or municipal sources.

The Board agreed that the presence of the various documents incorporated in the appendices could have the effect of giving those documents the force of law because of their inclusion as part of an adopted Comprehensive Plan. The Board agreed that their removal is preferable.

These comments will be redrafted and forwarded to the Board of Trustees. On motion of Chairman Kenan, seconded by Member Hartnett the meeting was adjourned at 9:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
July 2, 2015**

In the matter of the application of Ron Beavers to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard set-back, left; Both side yards combined; Percentage of open area; to restore an existing front porch to original historic conditions at the property addressed as 50 West Lake Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

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

Ron Beavers, Applicant
Karen Lewis, on behalf of the applicant

Jo Anne Gagliano, Fayetteville
Angela Morosini, Skaneateles
Guy Donahoe, Skaneateles
Rob Petrie, Marcellus

Absent: Bruce Kenan, Chairman

Chairman Sutherland called for the matter of Ron Beavers for 50 West Lake Street at 7:45 pm. Mr. Beavers introduced himself and presented, "What you gentlemen are looking at is a circa 1865 photo of the house. I can prove that with the way the ladies are dressed in their hoop skirts, and the house to the left of it will be built in 1872. What we want to do is recreate the porch as it looked in roughly 1865 – 1870. The next couple of drawings we have in here are from HKK the architects, giving you what the house will look like from the west, east and south directions. If you go to page #5, we are going to be removing roughly 195 SF of the front of the existing porch, so the set-back will go back further by 7 feet from what it was before. The extension is on the side porch there; we will have 274 SF – so the total square footage on increase will be 79 SF. So will be reducing from the front and making it more on the side. It is a wrap-around porch now that would go right into the dining room is what would happen. If you look at the last page, the distance from the property line is 14.2 feet to the property line."

Member Carvalho, "So that's the issue 14.2 feet?" Mr. Beavers, "I don't think there is an issue, the question is can we just get the approval to have it done. You are looking at an Italianate that's a redo to a gambrel roof house that was built in 1833. This is an 1860 variation." Member Eberhardt, "This house has been through this Board twice before." Chairman Sutherland, "It is a

stunning property.” Mr. Beavers, “We came in to do a renovation; we were here last year to do a renovation on the kitchen and the bathroom. Then we found out it was so bad we had to do a tear-down and we came back for that. We are trying to make this as close to what it looked like back during that time period.”

Member Carvalho, “I think you are doing a beautiful job.” **Member Hartnett, “I make a motion that we recommend to the ZBA that it grant the variances for 225-A5 Density Control Schedule as shown in the 6/18 plan.” Member Carvalho seconded the motion.** Upon the unanimous vote of the members present, the motion was carried. This matter was concluded at 7:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
July 2, 2015**

In the matter of the application of Howard & Cindy Brokenshire 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; Percentage of open area; Section 225-14A(2) Minimum lot area and Section 225-69D Nonconforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion; to construct a 14 by 12 foot deck at the rear of the building at the property addressed as 22 Onondaga Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

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

Guy Donahoe, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant
Angela Morosini, Architect, on behalf of the applicant

Jo Anne Gagliano, Fayetteville
Rob Petrie, Marcellus

Absent: Bruce Kenan, Chairman

Chairman Sutherland called for the matter of Howard & Cindy Brokenshire for 22 Onondaga Street at 7:50 pm. Ms. Morosini introduced herself and presented, "The property at 22 Onondaga Street is a 19th century home. We are doing some work to convert the existing kitchen to be more included in the house and to open it up to the rear yard. They wanted to open it up to the rear yard, because typical to the homes of that time it was really closed off. What we are looking to do is to provide them some outdoor living space that they don't have right now. That is a 12 by 14 deck off the back of that kitchen on level with the first floor. That would be about 5 feet off of the existing grade. It is going over top of what is an existing parking space which we want to relocate to be in front of their barn. There will be 2 side-by-side spots where that barn is now. The property lot is existing nonconforming in a couple of ways. It is smaller than the allotted 300,000 SF and the lot width is only 66 feet at the front as opposed to the 100 required. Where the deck is being added it is only 46 feet wide. As a result of this narrow lot, the existing side yard is quite small. This deck that we are proposing is not as small as that existing side yard, but it is non-compliant to what the required side yard would be. In addition, the open space is nonconforming right now at 77.8% and we would be reducing that to 76.1%. This deck that we want to add is right off the back of the existing home, so it won't actually reduce the look of the open space from the public way."

Chairman Sutherland, "Any conversation with the existing neighbors? Are they aware of what you are working on?" Ms. Morosini, "I don't know that. Cindy and Howard would know that better. They have developed relationships with both neighbors." Chairman Sutherland, "If this advances to the Zoning Board of Appeals, if there was time to chat with the neighbors and have some letter or something; typically it is helpful." Member Eberhardt, "A picture is also helpful." Member Carvalho, "Is this a Greek revival house?" Ms. Morosini, "It is kind of colonial; it has a couple of different features to it, but I would say it is more colonial. It started off with the front and actually the back that you are seeing there was an addition. They kind of torqued it within the lot to gain that additional space because of the confinements of that lot." Member Carvalho, "I was there last night, and it has a side porch with beautiful railings and turned spindles, very nice details. Then I see this picture with square spindles and typical suburban deck details. Is the intention to match the side porch or to build this?" Ms. Morosini, "I don't know if it would be to match it; they want to use a PVC product so they are a little bit limited in what you can do. I believe that they would want to keep to a colonial look, but I don't know that they want to match that existing side porch as it is. If that was a requirement, I think they would be open to it, but as of right now what we haven't really gotten to that stage of picking out the exact railings."

Chairman Sutherland, "I think Brian's suggestion there is a good one – of trying to bring the features of the original house into the additions." Member Hartnett, "I am sure that you know with the PVC products, you can get that – something that would match or come close." Member Carvalho, "The spindles are beautifully turned and it's got a nice top railing detail. I think that should be continued." Chairman Sutherland, "What's the timing with this. Is it a project that is planning on being started soon or is it..." Member Carvalho, "They are under construction." Ms. Morosini, "The kitchen and some of the exterior work is under construction right now. They have a lot ripped out. They would like to do it as part of the project they are doing right now." Member Hartnett, "That might be something that they should tighten up with the Zoning Board – what the actual plan and materials would be." Member Eberhardt, "I agree with both comments." Chairman Sutherland, "I do too. I wonder if we should get just a little bit more detail." Mr. Donahoe, "Do you mean come back next month to show that?" Chairman Sutherland, "My sense is that there is a deck – that's not as much an issue as how it is being detailed." Member Hartnett, "I think we could be comfortable in a recommendation to the ZBA for approval contingent on bring similar features to the deck." Mr. Donahoe, "Looking at a PVC product; we can find something similar to or matching the other details. I am sure the Zoning Board could make that judgement."

Member Carvalho, "I move that we make a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals to approve the deck addition and grant the area variances contingent upon changing the details to make them similar and consistent with the details on the side porch and also providing pictures and discussing the project with neighbors." Member Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present, the motion was carried. This matter was concluded at 7:54 pm. Ms. Morosini thanked the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
July 2, 2015**

In the matter of the application of William B. Eberhardt for Site Plan Review and Critical Impact Permit to restore and repurpose Hannum House as a 7 unit hotel at the property addressed as 26 West Genesee Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Douglas Sutherland, Acting Chairman
Brian Carvalho, Member
William Eberhardt, Member (Recused)
Stephen Hartnett, Member

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

Rob Petrie, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant
William Eberhardt, Applicant

Jo Anne Gagliano, Fayetteville

Absent: Bruce Kenan, Chairman

Chairman Sutherland called for the matter of William Eberhardt for 26 West Genesee Street at 7:55 pm. Mr. Petrie introduced himself and presented, “Most of you are familiar with the property. What we would like to do is take the existing building and convert it from an office building to a 7 guest suite hotel. This is the existing site condition; what we are looking to do with the building itself is to add a 55 SF addition in between the existing salon and the house, which would allow us to have a handicapped lift through the parlor and into the building, into community space. This is the plan. In the bottom left-hand corner is the existing condition of what is presently a salon. The addition that we are looking at is this addition here. There is one update; this porch on your drawings – since presenting this to John and talking with Bill, in order to reduce any more footprint changes of the building we have eliminated that porch. Instead we have introduced a Bilco access door into the basement. As it is we have a public space on the first floor, an accessible guest suite in the southeast corner, two guest rooms on the west side of the building. On the second floor, we have 4 guest suites, each in the corner of the building.”

Mr. Petrie continued, “In 1997 it was presented to this Board as an 8 bedroom hotel. It was approved back then, and Mr. Eberhardt was given approval to go ahead and move forward with this. We are now moving forward with it and we have made some changes. We have reduced the demand on the house from 8 bedrooms down to 7. Also, we have provided a social space, a public space for the building. the only change in footprint is the 55 SF for the accessible lift for handicapped patrons. As we move forward, there was a question on Critical Impact. Presently we have 10 – 12 people working in the building; leasing the space below and the offices above.

We are reducing the occupancy by creating guest rooms to be used on a temporary basis. We looked at the Critical Impact in the application and provided some statements were provided. One of the key elements was the parking. At the Sherwood complex right now there's 4 parking spaces in the back. We are looking to reduce that to 3, one of them being handicapped. In the parking behind the Sherwood Inn, 19 parking spaces have already been added; there are over 70 parking spaces. So parking would not be a problem for this project."

Chairman Sutherland, "Would you discuss the changes to the site? What was driving that?" Mr. Petrie, "The oval? Presently what we have here is no definition of the landscape along the sidewalk. We also have the fountain centered. There are four driving issues to the design. One of those is containment. How do we begin to contain the site; give definition to the landscape? The second was give us direction; make connection between the house and the lake. We don't want so much definition that we can't see the lake. This is such a valuable piece of property esthetically for the Village, that we wanted to retain that connection. The third is allow the landscape to be part of the narrative of the house; right now they seem very independent, with a lack of definition, lack of plantings. We also wanted to give greater freedom to the site. So the first move that we did was we took the fountain and moved it closer to the sidewalk. The sidewalk presently has about 3 foot, 4 foot brick paved entrance. We broadened that out to about 8 – 10 feet to allow a broader entrance. Then when people enter, they are directed around an ellipse, which frees the center up to allow us an area for a tent without any interruption, unlike what we have now where the fountain is in the middle. What also happens, as you enter the site, we have a sign in relationship to the fountain, which is also in relationship to the façade of the Sherwood. Inside the Sherwood, when you look through the center bay window of the west porch, this is on axis with the dining room through that window. We start connecting the site with the two buildings – while this remains on axis with this building it also becomes an axis to this building. So when this gets broader and we have plantings along here, now we have a controlled entry. While we want privacy, we also want it to be open. By putting the fountain in and adding a low stone bench on either side, it allows people to enter and then access the space on one side or the other and people are not flowing directly in. By putting plantings along this edge, it allows the space to stop going into this intersection and allows it to be directed more towards the lake, which is really the valuable view for the house. The porch and the primary rooms are in the front, on the south façade of that building."

Mr. Petrie continued, "By allowing this ellipse to occur allows better access between the Sherwood Inn and the house, but we want to draw Patisserie into this view. So by directing patrons through this way and then along this axis, we get this façade being a part of these two buildings. Right now there is a wiggly path that goes through; there's no compositional narrative as one approaches through, or accesses the site, or brings us back to Patisserie. So the events that would occur here, here, which happens throughout the year at the Sherwood and we want to provide that and make it more accessible for everybody. We had to give definition to the house and allow these two to finally relate to each other." Member Hartnett, "A couple of quick questions. The landscaping around the perimeter there, what's the plan for that?" Mr. Eberhardt, "Can we point out that Jo Anne's company, EDR, will be doing that design." Mr. Petrie, "So we are working with EDR on the site right now." Ms. Gagliano, "Waiting on a survey right now. It will be low; from street level you would be able to see over." Member Hartnett, "That was one concern; the sight line making the turn at Hannum. Second question, I

didn't look at the floor plan. When you have events you are planning to have people come back to the Sherwood to use the rest rooms, not into the new building? Mr. Eberhardt, "No, those are private rooms." Member Hartnett, "You are not putting public rest rooms in that first floor." Mr. Eberhardt, "No." Mr. Petrie, "We have one accessible bathroom for the guests of the house. Not public." Mr. Eberhardt, "We do not have an accessible bedroom in the Sherwood Inn. We are accessible via the back entrance for the tavern and the whole ground floor." Member Hartnett, "Are you putting a sidewalk between that and the Sherwood going straight back to the Patisserie then?" Mr. Petrie, "There is one that already exists; what we are doing is improving that path. Right now it's centered on the site," Member Hartnett, "You're not putting something straight that way?" Mr. Petrie, "No sir."

Member Carvalho, "I know one thing that people are real sensitive to in the Village is parking. You said he had recently added 19 parking spaces. Can you go through the calculations as to what is actually required?" Mr. Petrie, "Right now, what's required are 1.25 spaces per room, times 7 rooms, or 9 spaces. We are providing 3." Member Carvalho, "And the Sherwood has excess above what their requirement is." Mr. Petrie, "Yes. They acquired, it is not on this site, at the back of the parking lot here, they have acquired land that added 19 spots in the back corner. It is used for overflow. There is a total of 70 spaces now with that added." Member Carvalho, "And what's their requirement?" Mr. Petrie, "31 spots."

Member Hartnett, "I'm glad to see that the fountain is being relocated and saved. I will make a motion to grant site plan approval and to recommend to the Trustees that they grant a Critical Impact Permit, based on plans dated 19 June 2015 and modified as of today's date July 2, 2015. Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Members Hartnett and Carvalho and Chairman Sutherland voted in favor of the motion. Member Eberhardt had recused. On the vote of 3 – 0 in favor, the motion was carried. This matter was concluded at 8:19 pm. Mr. Petrie and Mr. Eberhardt thanked the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

