

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
August 4, 2016**

Area variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Colin Carroll to vary the strict application of section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Minimum lot dimension, Minimum lot width and Minimum open area; and Section 225-69D Nonconforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion to construct a kitchen addition and a second-story addition and dormer over the one story section of the property addressed as 14 State Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

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

Bill Murphy, Architect, on behalf of the applicant
Corey Carroll, on behalf of the applicant

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
Bob Eggleston, Skaneateles
John & Stephanie Devins, Skaneateles
Mark Aberi, Skaneateles
Mike Dudden, Skaneateles

At 7:32 pm Chairman Kenan called the matter of Colin Carroll for 14 State Street.

Murphy – Since moving into 14 State Street in 2011, the Carrolls have increased their family size; they are now 6 people. They really enjoy being able to walk from this location to all the great places in the Village. They would like to get a little more size for their family time with their children and still maintain a similar location. They have done some looking; trying to find houses that would meet their needs of charming, location, size. But they haven't been able to find one that they like quite as much as this one. So they have decided to add onto it over a couple of different phases. We figured it would be better to show you the grand scheme as well as Phase 1 separately. The first phase of the addition is the 506 SF kitchen on the first floor and then the second phase would build second-floor space over existing single-story structure to create a master bedroom suite and another bedroom. We are lifting some dormers up on the south façade to allow some egress out of those bedrooms. We have a preexisting nonconforming structure on a preexisting nonconforming lot. The addition will cause our minimum open space to decrease slightly, but all of the other variances are unaffected by the proposed addition. Also

with this plan is a slight modification to the curb cut. The curb cut right now does not align with the two-car garage, so they have to do an S turn to get into the garage. We'd like to straighten that out for them.

Dundon – Are you looking for approval of both phases, or just Phase 1?

Murphy – We would like to get approval for both phases, but we wanted to be clear about planning to construct it in phases. The variances do not change, but it still is expanding the nonconforming structure. We are planning to match the existing esthetic of the building; it's a pretty classic structure – it has white clapboard, white trim. We are looking to duplicate that. They really want to provide more of the look and esthetic of an enclosed porch for this kitchen; there will not be upper cabinets that face the street. They will try to keep that glass and maybe a shelf, but allow that light to come in – and also to allow Corey from the kitchen to see out and watch the kids playing basketball in the driveway.

Carvalho – What's the set-back of the new addition?

Murphy – From where?

Carvalho – From the property line.

Murphy – From the street side it is 24 feet.

Carvalho – So that's a variance?

Murphy – The existing set-back is 19.66 ft. we are inside of that. So that's what I mean by all the other variances are preexisting nonconforming. The addition where it sits does not increase the nonconformity of the structure, because there's structure closer to all of the set-backs than it is.

Sutherland – One of the things that hit me is that typically when you are adding on to an historic house, you defer the front façade by some amount, it might even be by just a couple of feet, but having this in line with the front façade. This should be in an historic district, but it's not. If it was, you'd be looking to move that back a bit; it's a little harsh. The other thing is the change of materials; the wainscoting versus the clapboard side-by-side there is a little uncomfortable. I think if it steps back in, that becomes less bothersome.

Murphy – OK; certainly the porch is going to break up that façade too, but I can see stepping that plane back a little bit, sure.

Sutherland – If you look at your floor plan, there are a couple of spots going from the living room...

Murphy – There's two windows that come out and we're trying to put a base cabinet there.

Sutherland – It looked like you could step back, still keep that, and still get close to 2 feet of relief there.

Murphy – We can definitely explore that.

Carvalho – Did you look at putting this on the back?

Murphy – The main issue with kind of the back like there's a big patio out there already. The way the house functions and the way the house entry works and where their family room is, they really don't use this front room. So the hope is by putting kitchen space in the front adjacent to that room that they will actually use that front room as well. Right now it's kind of like a dead-end space.

Carvalho – This is a really congested front yard and this is making it even more so.

Murphy – A little bit. We have matched the window size to the windows that are on the main house; we put one above each garage door.

Kenan – I do think the use of a hip roof on the second floor of the garage is inconsistent with the house itself – the architecture of it. If you use a gable roof it's going to fit into the flow of the building a lot better than a hip roof will.

Murphy – We can certainly look into a change of that nature. We were trying to keep the prominence of the main house.

Hartnett – Doug, your concern is to move this back?

Kenan – In reality this is the plane of the front of the house; the rest is porch. He's saying move it back a couple of feet from that.

Eberhardt – This is one of the very attractive houses on this street, as you enter and leave the Village.

Kenan – It is; it always has been. Echoing Bill's concern; this is a nice looking house. Nice setting with the trees and the driveway and the garage set back. I know you want to increase the size; I'm not sure you have enhanced the character.

Carvalho – That's why I was thinking if there's a way to put this off the back, you wouldn't affect the façade; it just seems like a better way to do it.

Murphy – They are hoping to, you know, capture this space that really isn't; it's an old bow window in the dining room; they use this part of the house the way it is, they don't use up here. By putting this up here that are hoping to live more on the street side. We certainly can take a look at some of the modifications you are discussing; pulling back and breaking up that front façade, incorporating a gable over the garage addition. But we are essentially trying to look a lot like Pat Carroll's house where they just enclosed a front porch.

Member Sutherland, “I think we are probably all thinking that it needs some more work? I think I agree with Brian’s point, that if there’s a way to get the kitchen back further; that front area is lovely. It would be a shame to lose that. This needs to shrink in and needs some more detail work. I move that we table this application and continue this matter to the September 1 meeting, for additional development of the concept along the lines that we have suggested.” Member Eberhardt seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion it was carried 5 – 0.

This matter was concluded at 7:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
August 4, 2016**

In the matter of the application of Gary Dower for Site Plan Review, 7 lot subdivision, lot line relocation and recommendation to the Trustees on Zoning Amendment and Critical Impact Permit to construct 4 professional/medical office buildings, add 31 parking spaces, establish new commercial driveway entrance, construct 6 detached dwellings, provide a pocket park, redesign and engineer the storm water management system at the Mirbeau Gateway properties at the corner of Fuller and West Genesee Streets in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
 Brian Carvalho, Member
 William Eberhardt, Member (*Recused*)
 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 Applicant

 Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
 Jorge Batlle, Village Historian
 Mike Dudden, Skaneateles

Chairman Kenan called for the matter of the Dower application at 8:34 pm.

Eggleston – Gary wrote a letter that summarizes things. Peter Osborne, the landscape architect and site engineer has talked with the Town Water Department and we are looking at putting a proposal together. Right now there is a Town water line that comes down Fuller Street, it crosses the property right in the middle and then heads up Genesee Street. They seem to be agreeable with our rerouting that down to the corner, across and then bring it back up to do the appropriate tie-in. We talked with Shannon Harty; the Village has currently funded a project that will change a 4 inch water line that comes down Highland Street and Fuller Street to an 8 inch line. That’s timely, so the houses along here can pull off that line, and what we’ll do is bring an 8 inch line up to this area that will feed these buildings and over here. Right now the Mirbeau out of simplicity, pulls off a Town water line so is actually a Town customer rather than a Village customer. We can then continue the 8 inch water line up to a hydrant, and then feed Mirbeau off a Village line and disconnect the Town line. The current Mirbeau has a sewer line that comes down on the north side of the pond. We’ll have a sewer line that comes down by gravity and ties in. The electric will pull off the street for here, or feed off here. Bottom line, Shannon had a good sense as to how to provide the services. We have made application for a

sketch plan subdivision, we have proposed some zoning amendments that are outlined here, and I know that Rick Galbato has actually marked up a chart for what's suggested. Possibly there will be site plan review of any office/commercial uses that would go to here. We are thinking that it is probably best to treat this as a package rather than do one thing at a time -- go through and approve it as a whole group. Make recommendations to the Village Board for Zoning amendments and then come back and finish up the subdivision and approval of the build-out. You were going to take a look at what we presented and comment.

Kenan – OK; thank you. I think the Board members have all given this a lot of thought over the last month. I have. The property at this time is zoned A-2 and as such everything you want to do doesn't meet the zoning. That's no surprise to anybody. Rather than doing everything at once, in my mind I think this Board has to come to grips with whether or not it will endorse the plan as proposed – X number of houses, X number of office buildings and locations and configurations or something like it – or something different from that. I think that initial decision really drives what you do in terms of zoning amendments if any and then following that subdivision which would have to comply with the zoning. In a subdivision application the Planning Board can waive certain requirements; I don't think it would be the intent that they waive all the requirements. You have to get the zoning issue squared away first. Sequentially that's my thought on how we ought to proceed. I think we need discussion on the plan itself – the uses and the character of them and just see how the Board feels about that.

Carvalho – Frankly the part I'm having difficulty with is the commercial office building portion of this project. We originally recommended that it be zoned A-2 because we didn't want to cut zoning mid street. Across the street on Fuller Street we have residential, across the street in Route 20 is residential and so now we are putting in commercial office in amongst the residential. I just don't see that it fits.

Kenan – If I could respond just to that principle in itself; we stated the principle that you shouldn't change zones down the middle of a street. So if you put A-2 residential on the near side of the street in that plan, it doesn't mean you couldn't extend the line in between there and where the office buildings are now, and build office buildings there. You just have to deal with the zoning issues.

Eggleston – You have cemetery; these are cemetery drives right here. The residential in the Town doesn't start until you are back up here.

Kenan – I think we did express, in a meeting several years ago, a concern because they are in a touch position because they are on the edge of this on one side and that on the other. It has always been the Board's mission to move things better and upward rather than creating an impetus for them to degenerate down. Residential buildings start to degenerate because of commercial around them. That's the principle, the question is does this do it?

Carvalho – And then the other issue is you have an area with traditional drainage issues and now you are putting a parking lot on top of the hill.

Eggleston – the drainage was looked at specifically during the annexation part of this. The drainage pond is probably three times bigger than what it is currently. It has also been engineered properly to receive all of the water from the Town school bus property, from the Mirbeau, from all the properties that drain into it. Right now Gateway is not retained; it just free flows down Fuller Street. It will now be contained. So the drainage for the property as proposed will be taken care of much better.

Carvalho – Where is the drainage for that parking lot?

Eggleston – This is a higher elevation than this. It will drain to this point, there will be a catch basin that will take it into the detention pond and it will be properly treated by DEC requirements.

Hartnett – Bruce you touched on that the lower section with homes on it could actually be A-2 if you withdraw the line. Is that what you said?

Kenan – That’s all I was saying – just because you follow the principle you could change it behind those homes.

Hartnett – Which could change the dynamic of this greatly; to protect any further changes on any other portion.

Kenan – So if, for instance, to the upper right of that arbitrary line there it was A-3, and to the lower left – it’s the other way around. A-2 facing Fuller and then A-3 west of it. That’s an option.

Hartnett – A-3 up the hill.

Galbato – Do you have the one showing the existing zoning? He’s going to show the existing zoning now. It is A-2 now. It’s in the Planning Board recommendation and the Trustees accepted that.

Eggleston – And under the current zoning in that space you could fit only 3 houses. In all of this, you could only fit 3 houses.

Kenan – That’s at 30,000 SF?

Dundon – But that’s true whether it is A-2 or A-3.

Eggleston – If it’s in A-2 or A-3, you could only fit 3 houses.

Hartnett – 3 conforming lots.

Sutherland – If you were going to do more houses, you would need to either change the Zoning in the case of A-3 or in A-2 you’d do some sort of variance.

Galbato – Have you looked at considering this cluster housing or the open space subdivision?

Eggleston – The problem is we would need all this space somewhere, so you would get 3 houses here and this would all be open space.

Kenan – Unless you merged that open space calculation with some of the existing A-3.

Eggleston – Right. There is some extra area not utilized there but to maintain the 15% or 20% coverage, it pushes it.

Kenan – What's the 15 or 20?

Eggleston – It's the coverage on the lot. A-3 has 80% open space; you wouldn't get enough open space to put any reasonable number of houses.

Kenan – For instance, all of this becomes drainage basin, which would qualify as open space for that purpose.

Sutherland – Does it or doesn't it

Kenan – Well we did in the McDonald subdivision.

Sutherland – With McDonald, wetlands were not part of the calculation because you couldn't build on it. I think you'd be really limited in this.

Kenan – Is there an embankment up along here that is not practical to build on that you could count as open space?

Eggleston – I'd need to look at the open space calculations for Mirbeau.

Hartnett – That comes into what Gary Dower was mentioning; these are two separate areas; two separate owners.

Eggleston – I think if you look at Whitegate that was done as a cluster/open space subdivision, though it was the A-1 District that has 44,000 SF lot areas, that's the kind of space you are talking about. It's a huge amount of open space.

Kenan – The dilemma is, right now you know what you can build in that space, 3 houses. And then you'd meet the zoning. So if you are going to change what's allowed on the property, how are you going to do it? You could either create a lot of variances, and they'd be a lot of variances. I'm not sure that would meet the intent of a variance – you're supposed to do the minimum variance necessary. Or you could change the zoning globally. The problem with doing that is that if you change A-2 globally, you change 3/8 of the Village. And you don't want to do that, for sure you don't want to do that.

If you change the A-3 globally, you'd impact the rest of Mirbeau, but I don't think, I'm assuming, if the Board wanted to accept 6 houses along there in this just one select instance, they probably don't want to see them all over the Mirbeau property somewhere down the road. That would be the consequence of a global A-3 change. So how do you do it?

Eggleston – Sure.

Kenan – So you can leave it A-2 and do a lot of variances, or make it A-3 and do a lot of variances, or maybe there's a way to do a cluster housing concept that satisfies both those needs. Leave it as A-2, because the density doesn't matter between A-2 and A-3, there are minor differences, come up with some sort of cluster calculation that allows those things to be built, that you want to build now; it just encumbers some of the Mirbeau land, which may not be developable anyway in consequence of slopes and things like that. I think that's worth a look at. That's if the Board wants to do that. I'm still trying to get to that point so we know what we are talking about.

Hartnett – That's certainly an option that should be looked at.

Carvalho—I think some type of housing is a good fit for that location. I don't think the commercial fits in there.

Sutherland – I share Brian's thought – there's probably something more clever than 3 office pads that might develop over the next 10 or 15 years, because the office market's not great. I still wonder if there isn't some residential or hostelry kind of use, an extension of Mirbeau in some kind of way, that is just a better fit than an office building down in a ditch.

Hartnett – And changing that line of what's A-2 and A-3 to the area behind what could be housing would solve a lot of our problems.

Kenan – That depends on how you respond to Brian's suggestion that he doesn't think it should be offices, there may be no reason to put a line in there. You could have it A-2 or A-3 and deal with it, maybe with cluster housing or some other way to make it permissible.

Hartnett – Strictly from the housing side, moving the line could solve some of the issues on trying to fit your cluster in or just how it was going to be laid out.

Kenan – Bob the green neck of this plan, you are incorporating into this parcel for the purpose of the housing and the offices. Is that just a density consideration?

Eggleston – No, it's actually to not have the drainage basin on two different properties.

Kenan – Because you are moving more of the property line than that.

Eggleston – Right now the drainage basin is right here. What we are proposing is it needs to be fattened and wider.

Kenan – What about the area behind that where it says sanitary easement? Why are you moving that?

Eggleston – Well we were just cleaning up the line to make it square off.

Kenan – Or are you doing that so you can put more office buildings there?

Eggleston – Part of it was what are the set-backs and the original configuration we had was that one large office building was. We just wanted a clean line where let's give X amount over and get some reasonable set-backs.

Dundon – Once again in both A-2 and A-3 office is not currently a permitted use.

Kenan – Residential is, but under a set of criteria that what's proposed here doesn't meet. What guidance do you want to give the applicant on this Board's feelings on this approach to developing that area. Brian, you are suggesting that it shouldn't be offices.

Carvalho – I think that cluster housing is an idea, if you can find a way to fit smaller houses, more affordable houses as he proposed. I think those 6 are too tight, but maybe if you eliminate the commercial property you can fit 6 reasonably in that whole site.

Kenan – Are you saying 6 residential units in that entire site?

Carvalho – Versus the 3 that it is zoned for.

Hartnett – Or if not 6 then some number; my concern is the distance between houses. Right now 10 feet, in my opinion, is way too tight.

Kenan -- Steve, what's your feeling on use of the land?

Hartnett – I'm not completely against the commercial buildings. I think it can be done better probably. I have a problem with treating it as two different entities, with a common road/driveway connecting them.

Kenan – I'm sorry, the fact that two different property owners are connected with the same driveway?

Hartnett – This is; it's one project. It's an addition to Mirbeau.

Kenan – I think it is intended to function that way despite the ownership of the properties.

Galbato – I think that as we go forward we should get some type of letter from the company that owns Mirbeau consenting to the opening of a driveway.

Kenan – Doug, your thought was?

Sutherland – I'm fine with the houses. If there are offices that's OK. I think there's probably a better use than the office use. I would prefer something that's either hotel related in some way – related but it may be a different thing from Mirbeau, like Mirbeau has the rustic motel across the way. If there is some other thing that's all under the Mirbeau umbrella that was more residentially focused with long term stay or shorter term stay.

Kenan – So lodging would fit in?

Sutherland – Lodging of some nature would be a better use. I think it would be a better use for the area around it.

Hartnett – Talk about apartment?

Sutherland – It could be some sort of condominium thing, but again it could be some sort of lodging operated by the Mirbeau folks that could be a different format than the Mirbeau itself. It sounded like when we spoke with Gary last time that he had enough rooms for what he is doing at Mirbeau, but we know other folks...

Hartnett – I certainly think there is a need in the Village for additional housing; smaller type units whether it is apartment or condo. I agree that would be a great use of this.

Sutherland – The other thing that hits me is I think it's a really interesting site; it's this little glen that's down in a ways and then you climb up to Mirbeau. There is some way to do something there...

Kenan – That utilizes the glen.

Sutherland – That utilizes the glen in a way that is maybe a little unconventional. Having just been in Italy and Malta, with winding streets, there are houses that are in there that in character are not unlike what Gary was looking to do with the French-themed Mirbeau itself. It just seems like there is something that's a little more interesting than what's has been proposed.

Hartnett – I absolutely agree that making this look and act as a secondary function to Mirbeau is a great idea.

Sutherland—But not doing something that's cutesy; but something that is taking advantage of the change in elevation, the climb up, buildings that respond to that climb up rather than; the current plan looks like it could be flat sited Illinois or Iowa. It doesn't really work with the site in the right way. But the houses along Fuller, I'm fine with that. I just think there's a better plan than what has emerged for that middle piece.

Kenan – Something focused toward lodging or residential, rather than office.

Sutherland – That would be my preference. We aren't the developer and we are not trying to get the numbers to work. We need to keep all that in mind, but I think there is something that is a more effective plan than what this is at the moment.

Hartnett – So then moving that line of the A-2, A-3 to behind where those residential units would be, would keep that consistent with the lodging that is part of A-3.

Sutherland -- I guess there's two parts to it. Part of it is getting the A-2s and the A-3s to be logical. To me that's secondary to getting a really good plan for the community. I still look at it like get the plan to work and then get the zoning to work around the plan. I would start by getting the plan to work from both a use and design perspective, and how it responds to some unusual, really special conditions. Once that gets worked out then figure out how to A-2 it or A-3 it or variance.

Hartnett – I agree with what you are trying to get at, but by separating off the residential area, would help meet that goal.

Kenan – I'm going to replicate what Doug just said; figure out what you are doing first and then you can decide where the line is.

Galbato – It is arguably easier to do the housing in A-3 zone because the variances won't be as large.

Sutherland – I'd still rather have a good plan and then solve the zoning in the context of a plan.

Kenan – And I would suggest that whatever it is that you come up with some sort of a formula for the cluster housing that justifies the number. The point of it is to know that it's not going to wind up being polka dots all over the rest of the Mirbeau property. Do we have a deadline from the applicant?

Galbato – There's always deadlines, but so far the applicant has agreed to this discussion. You can treat the discussion and drawings in the concept of a sketch plan.

Kenan – I'd just like to hear it from Bob.

Eggleston – Yeah, I think we are all trying to get to the same place – let's get a plan that works, let's get the uses and actually this is the first time that you are feeding back to us more formally. We need to take that back.

Kenan – I think everybody has been giving it thought over the last month. It's an important piece of land.

Eggleston – I'll show you how cluster housing will look horrible here.

Kenan – That's not the point. I know you can also show us how it will look good.

Eggleston – We can't without only 3 – 4 houses.

Kenan – If you encumber some open space; the point is to try to enable you to put more housing in that newly annexed land than 3. But do it in such a way that it doesn't open the floodgate to some similar development elsewhere. And that rather than a bunch of variances.

Eggleston – I think also what I can do to help ease your concern is how many other places on the Mirbeau property could we throw in these 5,000 SF lots, which would not be an appropriate approach.

Kenan – You can do it if you want to, but I think the concern is driven by the other end of the subject matter.

Sutherland – It probably would be helpful for the Board to just understand better what the rest of the lot is.

Kenan – My goal is not to constrain that but more to facilitate this or something like it that you'd like to do.

Eggleston – I will mention that we do a lot of things that you never see. We tried to do just residential. And we tried even doing this; you can't do it because you would have one story homes with 3 story basements. This pond has to go here; it's the low place it feeds out here.

Sutherland – Is the pond open water?

Eggleston – Yes.

Sutherland – Is there a way that becomes a feature? Some of these things locate around it. It's not like Village stuff like we know it, it more like enclave stuff.

Eggleston – We tried putting a row of houses here and then they looked out on the pond.

Sutherland – What if you had something that's condominium and a building that layered up. And a series of; an attached building that was a little more organic – it's got patio spaces, a lot of character, looks not unlike Mirbeau in that it has more of a European look about it. Because it is in, back and down it is not seen in the same way – you wouldn't put it in plain sight. But you would tie it into Mirbeau in a way that it feels like an organic extension of Mirbeau – slightly different use. I shouldn't be designing, that's not my job.

Eggleston – Which would introduce multiple family into the A-3 zone.

Kenan – It's multi-family if they are connected and that's what Doug was saying.

Sutherland – But if it is condominium ownership of some sort or it is part of the hotel operation but it's done in a different way. You could almost take some of the hotels that are in Santa Fe, NM and give a little more French feel to them, but the same sense of the material. Just a thought.

Kenan – By the way, just looking at the contour, you wouldn't think it looked like this by looking at that. It's a hill that slopes down almost parallel to Franklin Street all the way on this property.

Eggleston – We have a grading plan in one of the drawings where we are building up this area and this we are working with the natural slope. We balance out the cut and fills on this site.

Sutherland – At one time, this is probably 10 years ago, Gary had a plan that had – I think they were condominiums. They were managed by Mirbeau, people spent part of the year there; I don't know what ever happened to that?

Kenan – Is that helpful?

Eggleston – We'll take this back to Gary and have that discussion.

Galbato – I think at the next meeting if you are ready and you have your plans in time and that's the plan that you are going to submit, then we could talk about Lead Agency, SEQRA and start that process as well as referral to County Planning.

Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board. This matter was tabled at 9:08 pm and will be continued to the September meeting of the Planning Board with the applicant's concurrence.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
August 4, 2016

Area variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Cyrus Weichert to vary the strict application of section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for front yard; Side Yard, left; and Minimum open area; and Section 225-69D Nonconforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion to construct a 28 by 10 foot deck addition and a 6 by 10 foot porch at the property addressed as 7 Leitch Avenue in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Brian Carvalho, Member
William Eberhardt, 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 applicant

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
John & Stephanie Devins, Skaneateles
Mark Aberi, Skaneateles
Mike Dudden, Skaneateles

At 7:47 pm Chairman Kenan called the matter of Cyrus Weichert for 7 Leitch Avenue.

Eggleston – Cy Weichert, actually the Harold Weichert Trust, purchased this property on Leitch. It is a small green house, for his mother to live in so that she would be closer to the family. It is 2 feet off the sidewalk going up Leitch and it's just an adorable early 1800s carriage house turned into a house. It has a very steep back yard; it has a basement level that's about 12 feet tall, that comes out to a small level area. This area here, a previous owner had removed some trees and tried to do some landscaping, but stopped. The uphill; this area here. So it needs tending; and we'll be putting some retaining walls in. This is the south elevation – I'm actually standing in the Riordan's driveway. There is a patio behind the stacked logs here, the patio comes right up to the property line. It's an existing nonconforming structure in that it's only 2 feet off the front yard; it's a 10 foot side yard where 15 feet is required, but it does have the required rear yard and the side yard on the other side. The first thing they will be doing is putting in a series of retaining walls. In the Village you can't have a retaining wall taller than 3 feet, so we have a series of 3 of these – will be large rock retaining walls. It will be placed in this area and we'll be making this a little larger so you can comfortably fit two cars outside on this north parking area. This will be landscaped in the space between the retaining walls coming down. There is the ability to actually bring a utility vehicle down to the back yard that they will

be maintaining. On the other side there is an existing retaining wall that they were going to repair. Currently there is a very large patio on the basement level, 734 SF. We are going to reduce that to 182 SF. There was a small entry porch that had been removed; we are going to be putting a small 6 by 10 entry porch from the driveway coming in. There's a front door off the sidewalk. Then we want a 10 foot by 20 something deck off the main level. So basically the main floor; we have rearranged this to give 1 bedroom and 1 bathroom and make this reasonably accessible for his mother. A large open living room dining room; the kitchen area in the corner; putting a bathroom laundry area, reconfiguring the stairs to make them safe for going downstairs, and then one comes in off this covered entry porch. What they wanted was a door off the back and also you could come off the front porch so you'd have a 28 foot by 10 foot deck at this level. Having a deck at this level is very important because, for the elderly Weichert, she'll have the ability to easily live on one level. Coming down the stairs, they will have just a general rec room and a guest room, bathroom and mechanical space. It's a very small but efficient house. The house itself is 744 SF on each level; so it's only a 1400 SF house, but Mrs. Weichert will basically live on the main floor; her guests can be on the lower floor. The variances that we are asking for is expansion of this nonconforming structure, but the deck totally conforms, it's got a 21 foot side yard and a 34 foot , I think on the other side, it's well beyond the required amount. The open space actually improves from 78.2% to 82.1%. 85% is what's required.

Kenan – Because of the reduction in the patio?

Eggleston – The patio, correct.

Kenan – Where is the patio in plan here?

Eggleston – Right here; it comes underneath the porch. The existing one comes way out. That's the existing patio. We are substantially reducing it to a smaller patio underneath the deck.

Carvaho – Are you just cutting the concrete or will you be doing something new?

Eggleston – It'll be pavers; everything in here is tired. We'll get rid of the concrete, put in grass along here, and then put a permeable paver type patio in this area. Cy Weichert did talk with the neighbors; he did get a letter from the McClintons I believe it is – 13 Leitch – they have no objection. He has had a couple of conversations with the Riordans below. I see the Riordans did write a letter to you expressing their issues and concerns. I do want to point out that the deck totally conforms with all the setbacks. It has the required side yard set-backs, rear yard set-back and the project as a whole we are actually substantially improving by 4 % the open space and we are only 2.9% less than required. I do want to point out and this is the Riordan's home. This is where they park cars; cars are usually outside. This is a side entrance; the main entrance comes off Genesee Street here. So yes they have a window here, they do have a side porch here. But they also were given relief by this Board a couple of years ago, to construct a patio in a very private area of their home. So they have a nice private patio that comes off their family room and dining room, that they can enjoy and sit out, which is totally shielded from this area that they are concerned about. And their open space is actually only 80%, so they were granted a greater variance than what we are asking for. The Weicherts agreed that rather than 6 foot, they will put in 10 foot arborvitae. The choice of arborvitae, while it is generally not my first choice, is that

they are thin and tall, so they are an effective screening material. I appreciate that when you look from the driveway towards here it is going up the hill, but that's also always been there and that's what was there when the Riordans bought their property. So the 10 foot arborvitae are going to come up about this high. So the deck sets back another 15 or 20 feet and would be in this area, so actually I think the screening here will effectively even from the get-go block most of the visual impact of the deck. Originally we had proposed putting a porch with a roof on, but then they decided that the roof was getting a little heavy and massive, so they reduced it to a deck. We'll have some nice classical posts setting on stone piers. Cy Weichert lives in an historic house in the Historic District and he wants to do this, make this appropriate for the Village. Are there any questions relative to the variance that we are requesting?

Hartnett – It's a rather steep drop-off on that, on Leitch right there. I'm looking to see how much higher their house is from the Riordans'?

Eggleston – Standing in their driveway here, I think the basement patio level may be about 3 or 4 feet. It's probably about 12 feet from this patio up to this floor.

Sutherland – I'd bet if you looked that the first floor of this house is probably close to even with the second floor of Riordan's.

Kenan – Why are you blocking off that window on the south end on the second floor?

Eggleston – That's a first floor basement. There's a ledge here and this is a tiny little window.

Kenan – Is that it right there?

Eggleston – Right there. In actuality we might make a shelf in there or something.

Kenan – Any other questions? Comments? Suggestions? Proposed motions?

Eggleston – Maybe I'd like to just state that the neighbors' concerns are actually something that the ZBA deals with in a public hearing forum. So I think that's the proper place for the Riordans to express themselves. Yes they did happen to write a letter; I'd like to see that vetted out at the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Hartnett – I can understand the Riordans' concern about the sight line. I don't think the arborvitae are going to do much to change that as far as the deck goes. From the patio, yes I agree; that changes the sight line. If the issue is off that deck or porch it's not going to change anything.

Kenan – If you look at that lower right-hand picture, you see a precipitous wall of that house next to you. I do think that if you put in planting that is legitimately 10 feet high and legitimately opaque as opposed to big gaps between them, I think it would reduce the impact of what's there right now a great deal.

Hartnett – From the ground level, I agree. But up there, I don't believe it's going to do much.

Kenan – The deck. I understand that, nor will it hide the rest of the building. I'm just saying I think it would change the impact of that structure. It's not the patio I'm talking about, or the deck. It's the impact of this thing looming above you.

Carvalho – I was surprised when I walked down there how high it is. You see it from the street side.

Kenan – If the deck is a reasonable thing to do, I don't think there's any way to hide it.

Hartnett – I agree with you.

Member Carvalho, "I think it's OK. I'll make a motion that we make a recommendation to the ZBA to accept the variance for open area, front yard, left side yard and extension of a nonconforming use." Member Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members voting, the motion was carried 4 – 0, with Member Eberhardt abstaining.

This matter was concluded at 8:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Special Meeting
August 4, 2016**

Area variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Harmony Homes to vary the strict application of section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side Yard, left; Side yard, right; Both side yards combined; and Minimum open area; and Section 225-69D Nonconforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion to remove an existing garage and to construct an 18 by 35 foot addition and an 8 by 23 foot porch, add a dormer and construct a new 2 car garage at the property addressed as 56 Leitch Avenue in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
 Brian Carvalho, Member
 William Eberhardt, 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 applicant
Mark Aberi, applicant

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
John & Stephanie Devins, Skaneateles
Mike Dudden, Skaneateles

At 8:04 pm Chairman Kenan called the matter of Harmony Homes for 56 Leitch Avenue.

Eggleston – Mark has purchased this home anticipating that he will actually move in here himself with his wife Diane; they want to downscale from the house that they currently have on Clift Lane. The existing house is nonconforming in that it has a side yard set-back of 11.8 feet and 10.4 feet from the back corner here. There is a garage that's nonconforming; it's close to the property line, less than 3 feet. The open space is 82.8% where 85% is required. What they would like to do is take off the small little sunroom and put a larger addition on the back of the house to enlarge the house. And then put a porch on the front. They'd like to, because the driveway kind of snakes in and around; they'd like to relocate the driveway to the north side of the property. Also this existing garage is too close; it has to be 10 feet from the adjacent garage – so we'd like to build a 2 car garage that comes in straight. The 2 car garage will conform with the required 3 foot side yard set-back and the 15 foot rear yard set-back. The proposed addition, we will be putting a porch across $\frac{3}{4}$ of the front that will make it a little more Village traditional, and that meets the required 30 foot set-back at 32 feet. It also aligns with the adjacent houses for an appropriate streetscape. This is a trapezoidal property; while it has 74 feet at the front, it only has 43 feet at the back. It only has 8 feet at the back corner, 12 feet in the side. The house is a

simple cape; we'll be adding the dormer in the front, the front porch another gable. I'm giving it a more traditional treatment to the front. The side will maintain the original roofline with the dormers that are held back to try to maximize the space in the back and then there's a reverse gable in the back. From the sides and the front we have tried to maintain an appropriate Village home character using cottage sashes throughout; a series of small windows to add a nice character while still giving privacy from the close neighbors. The floor plan will enhance the front with the porch and reuse the space in the center of the house, providing for a larger family room/kitchen in the back. Two bedrooms and a bathroom upstairs. The garage; a two-car garage, there will be storage above in the garage. From the street you'll see the carriage house doors with a small dormer in the front.

Hartnett – No utilities going to that?

Eggleston – Electricity but no water. It's a 1950s house that needs a little more charm in the front. We'll be taking off this piece here; we will be enlarging the dormer, pulling it over to the sides. Putting this family room on the back side, over here. So the garage will actually be straight back in on the north side, set way back in a traditional format. The variances that we are requesting; we are expanding a nonconforming structure. The proposed variance will be decreasing the open space from 82.8% to 75.4%. In that the lot is only 9,500 SF the 75% open area is not uncommon for a lot that size in this neighborhood. The left yard will be less nonconforming at 12.7 where 15 is required. Right yard will decrease to 8 but that's because the property line comes in on that side. Both yards will be 20.7 feet. Are there any questions you have relative to the application?

Carvalho – The 3 foot side yard set-back on the garage; what's on the other side?

Eggleston – On the other property it's open yard. So whereas before the garage was right next to another garage, here it is open yard.

Eberhardt – Mark, what are the new materials? Siding and Shingles?

Aberi – I will probably go with cement board siding and a 30 year shingle on the roofs. I'll probably do a painted SmartTrim for the shake material in the front.

Kenan – Some dimension as the existing?

Aberi – The existing siding on the house is vinyl; I was going to go to cement board.

Sutherland – A little lesser profile it looks like.

Aberi – It wouldn't be as wide. Probably be a 5 to 6 inch.

Sutherland – Will you do it with the smooth side out rather than the rustic side that doesn't look like any siding anywhere?

Aberi – As far as the texture on it?

Sutherland – One side has texture the other is smooth so it looks more like the neighbors.

Aberi -- I guess I hadn't thought about it too much. I tend to lean toward something that has a little more texture to it so it looks more like wood.

Sutherland – Actually, if you look at the neighbors' houses that are wood, they're smooth. You don't see texture.

Kenan – I think the textured looks like fake wood.

Aberi – It's a little easier to touch up which is why I lean toward it; the overall maintenance.

Hartnett – My concern is that we are looking at a new structure 3 feet from a property line with a neighbor, and bringing in the driveway along that property line. I don't know when this survey was done. In my opinion we need to decide as a Board how close to a property line we should go without requiring a new survey and if we think that this new garage is too close to the property line to begin with.

Sutherland – I look at the houses on Leitch and that's a pretty standard kind of condition. When people buy into a neighborhood, that's kind of what they buy into. You find the same thing on Griffin Street. I am not troubled by a garage being fairly close. I see it around in my own neighborhood. It's just kind of the historic condition.

Hartnett – Since this is going for a variance to the ZBA, I'll tell you that when I did the ZBA it was very nice to go out and look at a staked project.

Sutherland – I don't have any problem with making sure the lines are correct.

Hartnett – My concern is to make sure that the property line is that property line, before you have something that close to it, and to have the new proposed building staked out for the ZBA and the neighbors. I don't know if we want to as a Board come up with a guide or rule of thumb for how close to a property line before we should suggest that it should happen. But 3 feet is inside of that number.

Galbato – It looks like there is a survey from July 2nd of this year that Bob's site plan is based on. But we have to see that survey.

Hartnett – This is not just for this project; this just opened up the topic for us to consider. It is a new survey; I would still like to see it staked.

Eggleston – We can have it staked. Mark is an experienced builder and since zoning allows 3 feet off the property line, he will have it staked before he builds it so it is in the right place.

Hartnett – If we made a recommendation to the ZBA to approve this, I would make it a condition. And I would ask the Board to consider what we think how recent the survey needs to be and how close to the property line should require a current survey.

Kenan – Are you prepared to put that in a motion?

Sutherland – Aren't there two different motions? One dealing with this and another dealing with procedure generally?

Member Eberhardt, "I'll make a motion for this property with the contingencies that you want; that we recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the variances requested on the drawings dated 21 July 2016, contingent on the garage being staked out relative to the survey dated July 2nd 2016 prior to it going to the ZBA." Member Sutherland seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion it was carried 5 – 0

This matter was concluded at 8:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards