

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
April 7, 2016**

Area Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Eric Gay & Nicole Marquis to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Front yard set-back; Side yard set-back, right; and Percentage of open area; and Section 225-69D Nonconforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion to rebuild an 8 by 14 foot existing porch and to add a 202 SF patio in back yard at the property addressed as 37 West Elizabeth Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
 Brian Carvalho, Member
 Stephen Hartnett, Member
 Doug Sutherland, Member

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

 Bob Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the applicants

 Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee
 Guy Donahoe, 4503 NW Townline Road
 John & Carol Young, 46 West Lake Street

Absent: Bill Eberhardt, Member

Chairman Kenan called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm and called the matter of Eric Gay & Nicole Marquis for 37 West Elizabeth Street.

Eggleston – The existing house has a porch on it. The porch is rather small and is in poor condition. What he would like to do is remove the porch and make it a full 8 foot deep so he has a useful porch that he can actually sit out on. So right now there is about a 4.5-5 foot; the house sits in front of it, so it will stick out 3 feet in front of it. He will be putting a shed roof on it, keeping with the simple style of the home, would like to put a standing seam metal roof on it. Keep the porch posts nice, simple, square; they will be 8 inch square posts on it. The second thing he'd like to do; in doing some landscaping around the barn, he has some large rocks to reinforce the side of the driveway leading up to the barn. He'd like to make that raised area a patio. While it is detached from the house it is kind of a nice area where they can enjoy the back yard. The street average is 15.9 feet and currently they are at 16.7; with the 3 foot extension of the porch, it will be 13.8. So we are asking for a front yard set-back variance of 2.1 feet. The existing house is nonconforming with its right yard is only 4 feet instead of 15 feet, and both side yards are only 27.9 instead of 35. The open area is just under the 85, it is 84.1%. We are going to decrease that to 81.8% by the time we make the porch bigger, put the patio in. So that's the

second new variance that we create is asking for a 3.2% open space reduction from the required 85%. As you are aware on Elizabeth Street 80% is a good number so it should not be out of character with the neighborhood. So this requires a variance and we are looking for a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Carvalho – What is the material of the patio?

Eggleston – It will be stone. Stone on a granular base.

Sutherland – The trim details on top; that will be what's built?

Eggleston – Yes. He wants to keep it clean and simple, but he wants a porch to sit on.

Member Hartnett, “I make a motion that we recommend approval of the variances to the ZBA, requested for 225-A5 and 225-69D for the address at 37 West Elizabeth Street, based on plans dated 21 March 2016.” Member Sutherland seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the motion was carried on a vote of 4 – 0.

This matter was concluded at 7:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
April 7, 2016**

Site Plan Review in the matter of the Application of Craig Froelich to demolish the existing main house and to construct a two-story, 6 bedroom 5,971 SF house with decks, porches and breezeway at the property addressed as 100 West Lake Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
 Brian Carvalho, Member
 Stephen Hartnett, Member
 Doug Sutherland, Member

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

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee
Bob Eggleston, 1391 East Genesee Street
John & Carol Young, 46 West Lake Street

Absent: Bill Eberhardt, Member

Chairman Kenan called the matter of Craig Froelich for 100 West Lake Street at 7:49 pm, saying, "I understand that the applicant has communicated with Counsel Galbato that they wish to defer that until the next Planning Board meeting."

Attorney Galbato, "That's correct. We received an email from Leif Kallquist late this afternoon and he has asked for an adjournment until our May meeting."

Chairman Kenan said that with the Board's expressed concurrence that the matter would be continued to the May 5, 2016 meeting of the Planning Board.

This matter was concluded at 7:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
April 7, 2016**

Review of concerns from both Parkside residents and Director of Municipal Operations Harty as to the adequacy of the drainage plans in Section 4 of the Parkside Village Subdivision in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Brian Carvalho, Member
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Doug Sutherland, Member

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

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee
Bob Eggleston, 1391 East Genesee Street
John & Carol Young, 46 West Lake Street

Absent: Bill Eberhardt, Member

Chairman Kenan called the matter of Parkside Village Subdivision at 8:02 pm.

Dundon – There was a meeting last Wednesday at the site. Dunn & Sgromo the engineers for Dr. Ellstein and GHD were present along with Brillo Excavating. The parties agreed to return to the site today to resurvey the locations and to develop a revised inter-lot drainage plan that would address the problems that the residents have been experiencing. That is being done cooperatively and in a spirit of solving the issues. That plan is obviously not done yet, but when it is complete it is Shannon’s intent to have a town hall meeting with the residents and make them aware of what the plan is and to enlist them in the process of developing the easements needed.

Hartnett – Has anything further been done with the Homeowners’ Association?

Dundon – No sir.

Kenan – And that’s up to the residents?

Dundon – It is.

Kenan – In the absence of the Homeowners’ Association what’s happening?

Dundon – The Homeowners’ Association owns the drainage infrastructure and they are therefore responsible for maintenance. The Village in the spirit of trying to get something fixed, is spearheading the direction and the payment for this work.

Sutherland – Will the association eventually get itself worked out?

Dundon – I am not optimistic. There has not been any coalescing of interest on the part of the residents in becoming responsible for this stuff. I don’t think they are making their payments of the HOA dues or fees.

Sutherland – Is there a list of what the Association was supposed to do?

Galbato – It is limited to drainage and includes all of the homes except section 1.

The matter will continue to be monitored.

This matter was concluded at 8:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
April 7, 2016

Downtown D Design Standards Review and Critical Impact Permit recommendation in the matter of the application of Guy Donahoe (Goode) to construct a carriage house consisting of a dwelling unit above a 3-car garage at the property addressed as 43 Fennell Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
 Brian Carvalho, Member
 Stephen Hartnett, Member
 Doug Sutherland, Member

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

Guy Donahoe, Architect, on behalf of the applicants

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee
Bob Eggleston, 1391 East Genesee Street
John & Carol Young, 46 West Lake Street

Absent: Bill Eberhardt, Member

Chairman Kenan called the matter of Guy Donahoe for 43 Fennell Street at 7:35 pm.

Donahoe – Kevin and Sarah Goode own and live in the house adjacent to this property to the north. This property became available to them and they purchased it. There was a residence there and behind it was a run-down auto repair garage. The property had been in rather tough order. The Goode's bought this property; their plans were to remove those buildings and to build a structure that would replicate a carriage house in nature. The property they have has a small barn with one stall garage in it but has no other garage facility. Their intention is to build this structure to provide parking and a shop downstairs and to provide an apartment upstairs, and to develop this so that these two properties would appear to be as one. In fact they are in the process of joining these properties. But at this point they are independent properties.

Kenan – The intent is to merge the two lots?

Donahoe – It is, yes.

Kenan – Not at this point, but in the future?

Donahoe – They are going through that process right now, Bruce. It just seems to take a while to do.

Galbato – Did John know that you were going to merge them before he issued his determination?

Donahoe – He is aware of it.

Dundon – I don't think he did – not before he issued his determination.

Donahoe – I don't know that it makes a difference. I assume we will treat this as a separate property, which it is.

Sutherland – I think the Downtown Design Standards would apply whether or not merging the lots was planned.

Donahoe – Again looking at this as an individual property, the use that we are proposing, as a 1 bedroom apartment that we are going to rent out, would have less impact on the infrastructure, the utilities, the sewer system of the Village. Although it is currently it is two different pieces of property as we have indicated on the site plan, it is our intent to create the image that it is a single piece of property – the way that the properties are landscaped, the barriers that had separated properties are being removed. We have worked with John as we have on the property to the north, and we are moving forward with the assumption that we had all overlooked the need for a critical impact permit. So we were moving forward with this process, we had demolished the building, we had made application for permit and then we became aware that it had needed to go through Critical Impact Permit. The Goodes have met with and talked to the neighbors to the south, that own Arbor House, and because they are in agreement about taking down the fence that is there, we are proposing to put up a fence; the fence that used to exist between 43 and the property to the north. That is a vinyl fence, it is a solid vinyl fence and take down the current fence which belongs to Arbor House. Because this process had taken a little bit longer than anticipated, the owners had met with Bill and what they are proposing now is that Bill is going to paint up that fence that's kind of falling down and the Goodes will put up a small bed of annual flowers to clean that up in the meantime.

Dundon – So is the fence coming down or is it staying?

Donahoe – The fence that's there belongs to Arbor House. But that will be coming down. And we will be putting a fence up.

Sutherland – Do you have a detail on the replacement fence?

Donahoe – I just have where we are locating it. I don't have a photograph of it. I would say it is a rather typical solid vinyl fence. It has a beige/taupe panel and then it have a white frame, white posts to it. And it is a two-sided fence.

Sutherland – Has it been selected yet?

Donahoe – It actually already existed between 43 and the property to the north. It has been taken down and it has been stored on the property.

Galbato – If you do decide to merge it, it would come back to this Board because we treat them as a subdivision.

Sutherland – With respect to the Downtown D Standards, I think architecturally it is a nice looking project but the vinyl that is on the house next door – I think it would be a mistake to repeat that. If we could be looking at one of the materials that's more encouraged, either a wood or Hardie plank smooth side out that replicates a clapboard, and the shingles, if we could go with a real shingle rather than a synthetic shingle.

Donahoe – If the Board is going to make that recommendation, one of the things that we were exploring was also doing for this secondary structure, so it appears as a secondary structure, was to use a board & batten type of siding.

Sutherland – That also would be legitimate.

Donahoe – Concrete or wood product. So if the Board is going to recommend that it would be inclusive of other types of shakes.

Sutherland – That would be OK. It would be nice to see the detailing of it before sending it off. But either board & batten or clapboard shingle is fine. Is there a way to informally get something; I'd be happy to take a look at it before the whole Board gets it just to nail it.

Donahoe – Sure.

Sutherland -- If you do that it would be fine – pending the detailing of it...

Galbato – We could hold it over with the understanding in a motion that the Trustees could begin the process of scheduling a public hearing, but the public hearing would be after your May meeting.

Sutherland – I don't want to hold it up either, that's fine or if the rest of the Board trusted my judgment just to take a quick look at it and give you a verbal on behalf of the Board. If you can get something to me in the next few days, I can something right back to you.

Kenan – That works for me.

Donahoe – I'm fine with that.

Carvalho – Would the board & batten or the shingles stay?

Donahoe – I don't think it would be the board & batten; I think it would be the shingle. I think we would still have a drip cap over the window heads, I think we would probably not do the water table.

Sutherland – I think there are some details that you have to work out and once you work them out we'd like to be comfortable. I'm sure it's going to be fine, but seeing the details would be helpful.

Kenan – Could you describe in not too many words, the materials that are acceptable versus the ones that are not. You are suggesting that it not be vinyl siding, and I assume that includes aluminum too.

Carvalho – It's right in here.

Galbato – It's all spelled out.

Kenan – How is it spelled out. Oh, here it is.

Donahoe – Well I would suggest to you that vinyl siding is not OK, then a concrete product [unintelligible].

Galbato – What the Board could consider is a motion on the Downtown D standards subject to Doug's final review of the drawings and materials. If they can't reach an agreement then the applicant would have the right to come back to your May meeting, and obviously within that motion could be a recommendation to the Trustees on critical impact. He has not provided a short form SEQR yet, so I'll have to ask Jordan to do a SEQR review with the Trustees.

Chairman Kenan, "I will move that we approve the review of the Downtown D Design Standards for this application, subject to subsequent review and approval by Doug Sutherland of the specific detailing and materials used for the siding, the trim materials and the roofing material. Specifically the approval is consistent with the drawings and details shown here. It is the approval of the materials that will be subject to Doug's review, but recognizing that the details may change to a degree if he goes to a board & batten material. And this subject to this subsequent approval, we make a recommendation to the Trustees that they approve Critical Impact Permit." Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the motion was carried on a vote of 4 – 0.

Attorney Galbato, "Just for the record, the property owner has no intent to use this as a short term rental."

This matter was concluded at 7:49 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
April 7, 2016**

Site Plan Review of use as General Office in the matter of the Application for Certificate of Occupancy made by Richard Charles for the property addressed as 37 Jordan Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
 Brian Carvalho, Member
 Stephen Hartnett, Member
 Doug Sutherland, Member

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

 Bob Eggleston, Architect, representing the applicant

 Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee
 John & Carol Young, 46 West Lake Street

Absent: Bill Eberhardt, Member

Chairman Kenan called the matter of Richard Charles for 37 Jordan Street at 7:50 pm.

Eggleston – I did put together a narrative, realizing that this did come in as a Certificate of Occupancy application for a permitted use. We have been granted the Critical Impact Permit for the three approved uses – Physical Fitness, General Office and Professional Office. In the motion for that, the Planning Board required that we come back with the details for a specific use. We did get approval for Physical Fitness; as it turned out Richard Charles was not able to come to terms with the tenant who was proposing to have that. He now has a tenant, Trademark Cleaning & Contracting. They are an established business on Wolf Street in Syracuse. They are looking to expand their service area into the Auburn/Skaneateles area. Their main headquarters will remain in Syracuse. What they are looking for is a business office; it is not a construction, services office. There won't be any construction, there won't be any shop work, there won't be any major storage of materials or things like that. It will be basically for accounting, marketing, that type of thing. They will have 2 to 3 people who will occupy the space. There will be some storage of incidental materials, but it won't be a major supply house for the company. As with most contracting companies, the majority of the employees report to the job site directly, they don't come in to this site. There will be an occasional foreman that would come in if they had to pick up some things or get some direction or whatever. It's possible they could have some vendors that might be coming in talking to them about products and things like that. It is possible they might have clients come in, but the majority of their client contact is done at the home or at the site. They plan on making absolutely no improvements to the property. They are

not going to redesign; they are taking it as it is. The building was originally built to replicate a carriage house; it does set behind off from Jordan. We will have 3 striped parking spaces in the front and there will be room for about another 4 cars that could be located behind. I think you will find that this is a low impact; there's not a lot of traffic coming and going. Typical hours are 7:00 am to 5:00 pm, Monday through Friday, not to say that somebody might not be in there on a weekend or later. Are there any questions relative to the change of use to General Office?

Carvalho – The way you describe this business – how is it not a commercial services category?

Eggleston – Commercial services for a contractor would have large storage of materials, it would have shops, it would have actual construction or assembly of things; this is really a business accounting/marketing office. It is that aspect of the business. They have all of that stuff in Syracuse. That's where all the materials come out of, that's where any assembly would occur. This is more of a marketing, bookkeeping; the office function, the payroll that type of thing that they would do out of this space.

Dundon – When you prepared the narrative, was that based on discussion with the tenant or with Charles?

Eggleston – With the tenant. I had a dialogue with the tenant on his intent.

Dundon – So on the record, this second paragraph is the tenant's intention not your characterization of it.

Eggleston – The tenant's intention and it's on the record. That's what it is.

Hartnett – So you are saying there will be no outdoor storage, no parking of equipment?

Eggleston – Correct. It's just employee cars or customer/vendor cars.

Hartnett – So if they have a job in Auburn, they are not going to stage material here because it is closer and easier?

Eggleston -- Correct. They may have a few gallons of something here.

Kenan – this is a site plan review process; we did it before on a broad range of acceptable uses, and because they are zeroing in on one, we are looking at it in context of the specific use..

Galbato – Critical Impact Review was already done.

Eggleston – The use itself is permitted by right but a condition of the Planning Board in granting the blanket approval is they wanted to see and do a site plan review for any specific use.

Carvalho – And can we recommend approval based on stipulating that it is not a warehouse, it is not a equipment yard, it is not for trucks.

Kenan – You can, yes. Do you want to make a motion and impose the conditions for the motion?

Galbato – I think John is preparing a letter for a C of O in anticipation of tonight’s meeting, so we will advise him of any conditions so they can be incorporated into his CO letter.

Eggleston – Don’t forget that the Critical Impact already has a condition that there is no outside storage, there is no outside noise and a number of things that still would be a part of this approval.

Galbato – The Critical Impact motion from 10/22/15 indicated ‘all activities will be inside the building and that there will be no outside music.’

Sutherland – When we do an approval, do we automatically attach minutes to the approval so that John’s got it and that the tenant and the owner have that?

Eggleston – My experience is that the approval is the bold written part of the minutes, and it’s the whole minutes and you have the reference to the April 1 narrative and the March 11 drawings.

Sutherland – Just think that to the extent that the owner of the building or the tenant wouldn’t ordinarily see that.

Galbato – John can incorporate the minutes and the narrative and staple it to the CO.

Member Carvalho said, “I make a motion that we approve the site plan for office use, with the stipulation that is an office use only for the construction company. It is not to be used for warehousing materials, or for storage of equipment, or for storage of trucks, or for any assembly having to do with their construction operations. Further that there is to be no outdoor storage of materials or equipment.” Member Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion it was carried 4 – 0.

This matter was concluded at 8:01 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
April 7, 2016**

Area Variance recommendation in the matter of the Application of William Lynn to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Percentage of structure width/lot width; and Section 225-14C(5)(a/b) Accessory Buildings, distance to lot lines or structures; to construct a 73.3 SF concrete planter and wood pergola for outdoor seating and to install a 48.6 SF storage shed with relocated parking stalls at the property addressed as 22 Jordan Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Brian Carvalho, Member
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Doug Sutherland, Member

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

Gregg Erikson, Village Trustee
Bob Eggleston, 1391 East Genesee Street
John & Carol Young, 46 West Lake Street

Absent: Bill Eberhardt, Member

Chairman Kenan called the matter of William Lynn for 22 Jordan Street at 8:07 pm.

Kenan – Backing up a bit here, the Lynn application; should we put that over to the next meeting?

Sutherland – Given what’s here can we act with or without them and approve something subject to the conditions. Why don’t we move it on. It seems like we should get it off our plate.

Hartnett – Shannon said we are good on the grease trap issue, one of the major sticking points last time.

Kenan – Is there nothing done on the SEQR process?

Galbato – I don’t think so. The ZBA could do it because there is a variance. Before this Board is the recommendation on the variance application to the ZBA, site plan review and an advisory opinion to the Board of Trustees on Critical Impact, and in working with Attorney Byrne and DMO Harty, the grease trap issue has been resolved by an email today from Shannon – installed and inspected. The two other outstanding issues that I would ask you to consider in any approval would be making your motion contingent upon the existing lease between the property owner

and the Village being amended to redraw the boundary of the leased premises so that the area devoted to storage and outdoor dining is not part of the leased parcel. And that the owner consent, in writing, to the Village placing bollards in the entrance to the alley in order to prevent its use by vehicles.

Kenan – And I presume, that the owner keep the grease trap in full operating condition.

Galbato – Any thought as to where the bollards should be placed; you might want to consider that.

Sutherland – We discussed that last month; one set closest to Jordan Street aligned with the front of Doug’s.

Kenan – Is that a fire lane?

Carvalho – No, we asked that last month.

Hartnett – Having bollards only at one end kind of opens that up for people who work in that area to use that as their own private parking area. I’d rather see it at both ends.

Kenan – That’s my concern; I agree with that. If it’s at both ends it won’t get cluttered up with vehicles which would be in the way of emergency vehicles.

Sutherland – Which is something we should recommend to the Trustees. Maybe incorporate it with the recommendation on Critical Impact that they look to provide bollards both front and rear.

Chairman Kenan, “I’ll move that the Planning Board recommend that the Zoning Board grant variances required by this application. Further, that we perform site plan review and approve the site plan subject to conditions to be recited. Further that we advise the Board of Trustees that we recommend that they issue the Critical Impact Permit subject to the same conditions. Further that we recommend that the ZBA perform the SEQR review. Further, that among the conditions be (1) the lease between the property owner and the Village be redrawn so that the area devoted to storage and outdoor dining is not part of the leased parcel; (2) that the owner consent, in writing, to the Village placing bollards at one or both ends of the alley to prevent its use by vehicles, with our recommendation being that they be placed at both ends for that purpose; (3) that the owner of the property keep the grease trap in good operating condition forevermore; and (4) the Planning Board observes that unfortunately the improvements being reviewed have already been put in place. In light of that a review of the Downtown D standards with regard to that shed would be a useless exercise. We encourage the Village and the applicant not to take this as any kind of precedent.” Member Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion it was carried 4 – 0.

This matter was concluded at 8:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

