

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
January 7, 2016

-In the matter of the Review of concerns from Parkside residents and Director of Municipal Operations Harty to the adequacy of the drainage plans in Section 4 of the Parkside Village Subdivision.

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

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
Jorge Batlle, Acting Clerk to the Planning Board

Village Trustees Marc Angelillo, Gregg Eriksen
Robert Eggleston, Route 20E
Bill Murphy, Bill Lynn
William Brown, Mike Caraccio

The meeting was opened at 7:31pm. The Chairman said that the next item on the Agenda is a discussion of drainage plans for the Parkside Subdivision.. Attorney Galbato said that she (the Director of Municipal Operations) will issue a report to us. There is noting further to report on that. So there won't be any business taken on that subject..

Meeting closed at 7:32pm

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting January 7, 2016

In the matter of the application submitted by Mike and Beth Caraccio to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5, Density Control Schedule for Front yard set-back; and Section 225-69D Nonconforming buildings structures and uses, extension or expansion; to construct a garage, mudroom, bedroom, and bath on the property addressed as 89 West Elizabeth Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
Jorge Batlle, Acting Clerk for the Planning Board

Mike Caraccio, Applicant
Bill Brown, Contractor for the applicant
Marc Angelillo, Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustees
C. Daniel Shulman

Chairman Kenan opened the meeting at 8:23pm, announcing the application of Mike and Beth Caraccio for property at 89 West Elizabeth Street. Take a few minutes to explain to the Board what the application is."

Mike Caraccio said, "the house has an existing garage, detached from the house and set off to the north side of the lot. We couldn't fit a car in that garage. It's very small, with kind of a shed-like attachment to it. The existing structure of the house has been updated, but it has some smaller bedrooms in it. So, what we wanted to do was to add a two-car garage. Move it closer to the house and attach it to the house so that we could have a master bedroom above the bays for the cars. The structure that we, working with my general contractor here, Mr. Bill Brown, he had an engineer stamp the plans. The idea was to make it a two-car garage, that again is closer to the house. It is actually farther away from the property lines. It's on a forty-five, as opposed to kind of straight horizontal from the view from the road. If you are familiar with where this property is - the house is actually set-back away from the road already. So, the structure is like 24 by 24. It's nothing too large. Even the way Bill's worked it, it's offset nice, to have the bedroom above. We've done it so the pitch of the roof is actually quite steep from the side as opposed to going high, two stories. We are kind of starting the roof, that almost looks as though it's just a Cape-ish, just like the house that's already there. You can look at the elevations that are listed there. The peak of the garage with the bedroom above it is about 2 1/2 feet higher than the existing

house. All of the criteria for - the only reason from my understanding that we needed to apply for a variance and go through these steps was because the existing home, that we had nothing to do with, has one corner of the house - supposed to be 32 feet and we are at 30 feet and at 26. But, that isn't anything that we had. Because we wanted to add to it, we had to go through the process. And as a result of that, it is nonconforming because of the existing."

The Chairman said, "it says that it is an odd lot because it's the neck and the lot is back behind the neck. Apparently, the front yard is measured not from the street but from the front of the rear portion of the lot there. So, the front yard set-back is less than the requirement, making it a nonconforming lot-or building. Any questions from the Board?"

Member Sutherland asked Member Carvalho, "Brian, did you have a chance to look at this?" Member Carvalho said, "I didn't, after work." Member Eberhardt asked, "Mike, how long have you been in this house?" Caraccio said, "we bought the house in May." Member Eberhardt asked, "who was there before you?" Caraccio said, "Yerkel. They lived in Pennsylvania." Member Eberhardt said, "a vacation rental, right." Caraccio said, "I don't know if it was, but for those folks it was their camp basically. So, now it will be a family's home."

The Chairman asked the Board for any questions? Member Carvalho asked, "this is all you are doing? This is new? Is the filler piece already in place?" Caraccio said, no. The existing house is this right here (points on plan), and so we are going to connect the house to the garage." Member Carvalho, with Member Eberhardt looking on, asked, "you are tearing down the existing garage?" Caraccio replied, "correct. This garage will come down and we will actually move it closer to the house." Member Carvalho asked, "so we are looking at this view right here?" Caraccio explains, "this is the driveway down. So, what you used to see right here is actually now moved over a little bit." Member Carvalho asked, "that front elevation is looking in this direction?" Caraccio said, "yes. It is kind of a flat, one perspective drawing. Yes, you are looking at it straight-on."

Member Sutherland asked, "what's the material?" Caraccio said, "it's a HardieBoard siding. We are going to use the same siding. It won't look any different from the existing home right now." Member Eberhardt asked, "you are currently living in it?" Caraccio said, "we aren't currently living in it. We are living in my mother-in-law's basement because the place doesn't have the size we want. We want to paint it and do different things to make it so that it's all-set." Member Hartnett asked where the garage entrance is? Caraccio pointed it out.

Contractor Brown said, "the pre-existing garage is actually a chicken coop with a lean-to on it, literally." The Chairman asked, "any thoughts?" Member Sutherland said, "I wonder is we shouldn't meet there to take a look at it. The Board has kind of an assignment to get together Saturday or sometime, or maybe early some morning." The Chairman said, "we could do it some Saturday, if you want." Member Sutherland said, "I think so. I just don't understand what's going on around it. Yet, it may be fine or it may need a little something." The Chairman asked if that was the Board's desire - schedule a site visit? Member Sutherland said, "I move that we continue this next month with a site meeting between now and next month, to get as many of the planning Board members together." Caraccio asked, "if I may, can I make a comment? Is there anything that I might help to clarify, only because, as you can imagine, we'd like to move it along."

Member Sutherland said, "you want to get out of the basement." Contractor Brown said, "originally we were under the impression we didn't need anything other than a building permit, when we turned everything in. Because everything that we are doing meets all the criteria. But, the existing building is what we found out - the problem is - when we turned in to get the Building Permit." Member Hartnett said, "80% of the Village is in the same boat."

Member Sutherland asked, "do you have any photographs of what your immediate neighbors are to this, or have you had any conversations with them about what you are doing?" Caraccio said, "i don't have any photographs, but I can explain to you - when you go down...89, all the homes are right along the street on West Elizabeth, and then there's a driveway that goes in between (a flag lot). It is set way back. All along here there are like 40 foot pine trees. You can barely see the house that's in front. And the same pine trees go along this bac side here. So, you can't even see this house here. This is all back yard to a white house that is up along the street. Their frame garage is here. Our home is really back behind everything. There is another larger home back in here. There really isn't anything back here. Andy Legg lives back here. It's all like farm land back here, foresty area in front of his barn. This is all grassy. The next adjacent homes are on Franklin (St.) so it is quite a ways away from out place." Using images on a 'smart phone', and using Google Maps, he continues to describe the area. Member Hartnett said, "those pictures will be important for the Zoning Board."

Member Sutherland said, "looking at this, I'm OK. I withdraw the motion. I make a motion that we recommend approval to the Zoning Board of Appeals, and also recommend that the photographs that you have there, have them in form for the ZBA, including the satellite image. Typically going to the ZBA, it is helpful if the neighbors are on board." Brown said that a neighbor across the street just built a garage." Member Eberhardt said, "they did, but they have a huge lot."

Motion seconded by Member Carvalho. The vote was 5-0 in favor of the motion.
The meeting was closed at 8:39pm

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting January 7, 2016

In the matter of the application submitted by Project Bookends, LLC for a 3 lot subdivision, called "Bookends Subdivision" at the property addressed as 130 East Genesee Street (former Stella Maris Retreat), in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
Jorge Batlle, Acting Clerk for the Planning Board

C. Daniel Shulman, Attorney for the Applicant

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee

Chairman Kenan opened the meeting at 8:41pm, announcing the application of Project Bookends, LLC for a 3 lot subdivision for the former Stella Maris property, generically, at 130 East Genesee Street.

Attorney Daniel Shulman, Attorney for the applicants said, "I have submitted the application, the narrative that went along with it. It is pretty accurate of what we intend to do is subdivide the property into 3 lots. The front lot, where the Stella Maris buildings are now, and the two residential lots that would go on the rear out to the lake. Each one of those lots is about 2.8 acres. They will be offered for sale subject, of course, to the Board's approval of the subdivision. The 20 feet that is along the westerly boundary of the property is not included in either lot because the intent is to transfer that 20 feet to Peter Nelson Soderberg, who owns the adjacent property at 118 East Genesee."

Chairman Kenan asked, "Dan, it didn't occur to me until now - but shouldn't this plat or plan...shouldn't that include all of Soderberg's lot, the two could be combined into a single lot? Isn't that the appropriate way to do it?" Shulman said, "we can do that." Member Eberhardt said, "I was wondering the same thing?" Attorney Galbato said, "because it's going to be a lot line adjustment." The Chairman said, "In other words, this lot is going to become that lot, incorporate that. Shouldn't that show as the final line." Shulman said, "but it wouldn't be a lot within the subdivision, wouldn't it?" Chairman Kenan said, "well, at the end of the day you want their existing lot to become different and bigger than it is now. I think that's got to be delineated on a

plan to show what it's ultimately going to be. This would be the plan. It would be a matter of just incorporating that on here." Attorney Galbato said, "it is basically a 3 lot subdivision, but with a lot line adjustment for the adjoining lot." The Chairman said, "it doesn't change the description of it in any way, but I think it does require that it be drawn differently to include that." Shulman said, "we would only have to come back and do that." The Chairman said, "yes, in order to combine the two. I think what's on the Agenda for us is to set a date for a public hearing, in any event. So, if that can be done between now and our next meeting."

Attorney Galbato said, "there is one more thing as well that I failed to put in my Memo, if you could give me and the Village authorization to refer it to County Planning, because it's a subdivision. We can get that process started." The Chairman asked, "do you need that re-drawn before you do that?" Attorney Galbato said, "we will do our best. It could probably move quickly in adding??" Shulman said, "I'll find out because we have the detail of the house. I'm sure there must be a survey of their property now." Attorney Galbato said, "if you want to include that as part of your motion - to refer it to the County Planning under 239 of the General Municipal Law, and schedule a public hearing for February 4th." The Chairman asked, "does somebody want to make a motion then to do all the things that Rick just said? Maybe before that, are there any questions regarding this? We all met on the site there a few weeks ago. Do we have any questions, or suggestions to make to the applicant?"

Attorney Galbato said, "...the surveyor, he might as well put it on his drawings is, and Doug came up with it at our special meeting on-site was that, I believe that the Planning Board, when they consider voting on the actual subdivision, would like to have that any proposed structure on the property, or residence, obtain Site Plan Approval from the Planning Board...as you know Counsel, without that being a notation on this map, it would be hard to enforce it to a subsequent purchaser. So, we would like to have it, in this Village, as a notation on the soon to be filed plat map." Shulman said, "we can do that. I believe that I addressed that too in the Declaration. I think. If I didn't, we could put it in there, because I know we talked about it. I mentioned something in here about coming back and having their proposed dwelling approved by the Board. But, we can do it either way. They will have to take their deed subject to this Declaration, because it would be recorded along with the filed map." Attorney Galbato said, "having on the map is nice because the Codes Enforcement Officer, in the future, is just going to have to be looking at a map."

Chairman Kenan said, "just so we understand it - part of this proposed subdivision is a 26 foot wide combined ingress-egress and utility easement from the Genesee Street right-of-way to the new rear line of the Lot 1. Then across the northerly end of Lot 2, an easement of 50 feet which will be an access easement to allow access to Lot 3. Then there is a proposed utility easement likewise along the new westerly line of Lot 1 - gas and water...it says proposed easement, but the utility lines may exist. Are there any other questions from the Board? I think everybody is familiar with it, at this point. Did we make a motion?"

Member Eberhardt asked, "would you outline the motion?" Attorney Galbato said, "to schedule a public hearing for February 4th, 2016, which is your regularly scheduled meeting, as well as recording the application for subdivision to Onondaga County Planning Department, under 239 of the general Municipal Law." Member Sutherland added, "with the Soderberg property

shown." Member Hartnett asked, "you want that comment?" Attorney Galbato said, "you don't need that as part of the motion now, but I think it is part of the discussion." Member Hartnett said, "he's got to change the plans. That's the time to put it on there."

Member Eberhardt said, "so moved." Clerk Battle asked to have the motion restated, asking, "do you want me to weave it together?" Member Eberhardt asked, "would you restate it Rick?"

Attorney Galbato said, "motion to schedule a public hearing for February 4th, 2016, and refer the application to the Onondaga County Planning Department, under Section 239 of the General Municipal Law for the application to include the full property to the west of the subdivision owned by Soderberg be shown on the revised subdivision map. Also, for the map to reflect any dwelling, structures....." Member Sutherland said, "site plan approval will accompany any development on the sits." Attorney Galbato said, "any development of any of the lots within the subdivision would require site plan approval from the Village Planning Board. That's Bill's motion."

The Chairman said, "Ok, that's moved. Is there a second?" Seconded by Member Sutherland.

The vote was 5-0 in favor of the motion. The meeting was closed at 8:50pm.

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
January 7, 2016

Discussion concerning the proposed annexation of lands located along West Genesee Street and Fuller Streets requested by the Village Board of Trustees as to how these parcels will be Zoned.

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

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
Jorge Batlle, Acting Clerk to the Planning Board

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee

Chairman Kenan opened the meeting at 8:50pm. He said that the remaining subject on our Agenda is the pending annexation of property connected to Mirbeau, along West Genesee Street on the edge of the Village. He said, "recently the Town Planning Board has approved the annexation to the Village of this land. Has the Village Board of Trustees done the same?"

Attorney Galbato said, "they have not. I think it's on their agenda for their next meeting, and the Village Attorney, Michael Byrne has asked for the Planning Board to give a recommendation as to what the Planning Board feels the Trustees should zone, if the motion passes, should zone the newly annexed property."

Chairman Kenan said, "the applicant has requested that it be zoned A-3 which would be consistent with the previously annexed property have built upon. I think that's the request before the Board. I'd like to suggest the following - I think it would be a mistake to draw zone lines down the middle of streets, as opposed to some logical property line demarcation between one zone and another. If we do that, you are going to have zoning of one category facing across the street to zoning of another. I think, generally around the Village, it's not done that way. They are basically drawn around property lines where some logic prevailed, that here it should be this, and there it should be that. So, the properties along Franklin Street or Fuller Street, as it is known in the Village, they are A-2 across the street. In fact, the portion of this combined property which is in the Village now, is zoned A-2 - the little triangular piece at the corner, where there used to be a gas station, oddly enough. I'd like to suggest that rather than all of the annexed land being zoned A-3, that the Trustees should draw a line parallel to the westerly line of Fuller Street, which line is the extension of the adjoining residential properties on Fuller Street. I can't read the map to tell you what the dimension is. It looks like 157 feet , 157.? feet deep. I think the logical

thing to do is, and it's Lots 17 thru 22, I would extend that line (discussion of depth dimensions)...it's not very deep. They are pretty shallow lots. I would extend the back line of those near-by lots on Fuller Street."

Member Carvalho asked, "is that going to give them enough to do ...?" The Chairman said, "that would presume that this will be single family homes, not condos or whatever is shown there." Member Sutherland said, "in fact, what you'd end up with is at most, 2 single family homes, or could be one." The Chairman said, "I think that's the appropriate."

Attorney Galbato asked, "Mr. Chairman, would you object - right now the way the Village Attorney has drafted the proposed resolution in light of our communications with counsel today was, he is proposing the entire annexed property be A-2. Right now, we don't know exactly what type of subdivision the applicant is going to be coming back with. Right now, it's 2 lots. Certainly the development as proposed is going to be more than 2 lots." The Chairman said, "I know that they wanted to build an office building on the land. Can you do that in A-2? Probably not. I'm not sure you can do it in A-3. So maybe it makes no difference, whether it's A-2 or A-3. The office building is still would be a..." "...with a quick review of the Permitted Use Chart, the only difference is A-3 allows Lodging, A-2 does not. Everything else appears to be the same. Obviously, the Density Control Schedule is different between those two districts," said Attorney Galbato. Member Hrtnett said, "so they would be coming in for a variance anyhow."

Chairman Kenan said, "I guess, in terms of that, it makes no difference. I think A-2 would be appropriate, if that's the case."

Member Carvalho asked, "how does that effect the old gas station?" Chairman Kenan said, "I don't know why they are keeping that building..." Member Sutherland asked, "do we know what the acreage is of the lot to be annexed?" The Chairman said, "it looks 1.7 plus a quarter acre - so roughly 2 acres." Member Sutherland said, "and when you take out roads and things, you are basically lookin..." "...the total is 1.86 acres," said Attorney Galbato. The Chairman said, "according to this map it is somewhere around 1.95." Member Eberhardt said, "it's more than that Rick."

The Chairman asked, "what is the Board's pleasure? Do you want to suggest a line dividing it between A-2 and A-3, or make it A-2?" Member Carvalho asked, "what is the density difference between A-2 and A-3?" Member Sutherland said, "for residential units it's 30,000 square feet per lot." Member Carvalho said, "so by making it A-3, the only advantage they get is they could extend their lodge down there." The Chairman said, "that's basically the difference, according to the Permitted Use Chart. A-2 would not permit lodging and A-3 would, and that was not their goal when they made the application." Member Carvalho said, "I think it makes sense to make the whole thing A-2." Member Hartnett said, "I'm fine with that."

Member Sutherland said, "whatever happens we will be dealing with a variance request." Attorney Galbato said, "in either district - even in A-3 it's only lodging that's allowed there. They might need some use variances, unless they can convince the Trustees to change the Permitted Uses." Member Sutherland said, "right now, the only thing you could do is additional hotel rooms down there." Attorney Galbato said, "that is if you guys recommend A-3." Member

Sutherland said, "if we go to A-3 and it's A-2 then it's some houses." Member Hartnett said, "if you go A-2 or A-3 they are going to be coming back for variances either way." The Chairman said, " the difference is that it is A-2 across the street. If you agree with my thought on the matter, you don't want to change zone lines in the middle of the street. You want it to be the same development across the street from what it is there. Make your zone change on a lot line or a back yard. I guess I'd suggest that A-2 be the appropriate one."

Member Sutherland said, "A-2 and A-3 both have 30,000 square feet as the minimum lot size. So his town houses - you couldn't do them in A-2 or A-3." The Chairman said, "so the question is do you want lodging in that area?" Member Sutherland said, "yes, that really is the question."

Member Carvalho said, "I make a motion that we recommend to the Trustees that the annexed land from the Town to the Village be zoned as A-2 to be consistent with the residential properties across the street." Seconded by Member Hartnett.

The vote was 4 in favor of the motion, with Member Eberhardt abstaining. The meeting was closed at 901pm.