

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Regular Meeting
September 1, 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
 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
 Colin Carroll, applicant
 Corrie Carroll, on behalf of the applicant

 Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
 Andy Ramsgard, 61 East Genesee Street
 Bob Eggleston, 1391 East Genesee Street
 Mark Aberi, 1 Clift Lane
 Michael Cogswell, 168 East Genesee Street
 Patricia Ratcliff, 58 Leitch Avenue
 Joyce Barnett, 12 East Lake Street
 William & Mary Beth Gleason, 28 Onondaga Street
 Walter Benson, 50 East Lake Street

At 7:30 pm Chairman Kenan recognized that Supervisor Lanning was not present to speak to the Board about the old Allyn Arena, so he called the matter of Colin Carroll for 14 State Street.

Murphy – We were here last month and went through the plans with you and have since made some changes to take some of the feedback that the Board had into account. We have depressed that front façade from the porch façade, creating a little more secondary and primary façade. We have adjusted the roof over the garage to a gable, more mimicking the gable on the front of the house, as opposed to the hip. We have taken a little harder look at the details of the to-be-constructed enclosed porch if you will. We also did some exploration of trying to move the addition to the back – but the more we tried to do that, it was pulling the Carrolls’ living space out of the charm and character of the historic home; and that’s what they want to enjoy more and

use more – that older part of the home. So in the end we ended up in a similar location with a reduced footprint. We have detailed the porch quite a bit more – more significantly – depressed that façade and went to a gable here. In doing so we also made a barrel dormer as opposed to the shed – we thought that added more character; it also helped us with our flashing detail. As we moved this roof to a gable, we brought a lot more water down into that area. We reduced the open space [*sic*, coverage?] a little bit more due to the reducing of the footprint. Those are the changes we have made from the last meeting.

Kenan – It looks to me from the photo on the top right, which is the existing condition I assume, that there is an eyebrow over the garage doors?

Murphy – There is a little shed roof there, yes.

Kenan – And in the Phase 2 rendering it's there, but in the Phase 1 rendering it disappeared.

Murphy – It will be there in the Phase 1. I apologize for that. It has to be reconstructed, or leave the one that is there intact. The intent is that it remain.

Sutherland – Is this being built for you folks or have you bought another house and this is getting an approval for somebody else?

Corrie Carroll – I'm not sure I understand; we will live there with our family.

Kenan – The County Planning Board resolution speaks about the driveway being widened? expanded? Is that happening?

Murphy – It is not really expanding, it is just shifting. If you look at the area we are adding in the driveway, this area here and the area we are removing it is pretty similar; but we are shifting the curb cut, but we are not increasing the width of the curb cut.

Kenan – You have to deal with DOT on that anyway.

Murphy – Yep, and we have filled out that preliminary paperwork and have that in the file as well. Obviously we can't pull that permit yet.

Kenan – Is this current or last month's?

Murphy – That should be fairly current; the only change is the coverage number slightly; ever so slightly.

Sutherland – So this is the one you submitted before; it is basically correct?

Murphy – The only difference is in that coverage number. All the other variances preexist. The open space number...

Sutherland – Is a little higher than what...

Kenan – It was 67.05 and now it's 67.23%. That's the difference?

Murphy – That's the difference we're talking about. 0.18%, and that's due to the fact that we recessed that front addition off of the porch.

Sutherland – Is that back a foot or what's your dimension here?

Murphy – Well we wanted to keep the 2 foot cabinet depth in front of that window opening that's there into the old portion of the home. That's here if you look here. That's what is kind of limiting us is that 2 foot cabinet. I can't remember what it is off the top of my head. It is not 6 inches, it's probably close to a foot.

Sutherland – 8 to 12 inches. Maybe it says in the narrative but the phasing; is there a sense of timing on the phasing?

Murphy – We are hoping to complete phase 1 first and then phase 2 second, but, I would defer that question.

Colin Carroll – Phase 1 would be near term, phase 2 could be maybe never. But we thought we would go through the permitting now. But certainly not near-term phase 2.

Sutherland – And phase 1 essentially is the kitchen addition coming out. Just the kitchen addition?

Carroll – Yep.

Murphy – It does modify the dormer up on the second floor of the older part of the home.

Sutherland – OK. Those 2 windows and this and the porch in the back?

Murphy – No, no. None of the porch in the back; that's all phase 2.

Kenan – Any questions? Anyone have a proposed motion to make? What would you like to do?

Sutherland – What do you guys think?

Carvalho – I still don't like the addition on the front.

Hartnett – I am not bothered by it as much. It is not the ideal situation obviously. And I don't like doing an approval on a phase 2 unless it is the exact plan, not going to sit there for two years.

Sutherland – I also would prefer it to go on the back; but I think what is proposed is better than the first time around.

Hartnett – I do too.

Chairman Kenan, “I’ll make a motion in the absence of anyone else. I’ll move that the Plan that is proposed; we pass our recommendation on to the ZBA to approve the variances required for the construction of Phase 1 only at this time.” Member Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0.

This matter was concluded at 7:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Regular Meeting
September 1, 2016

Area variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Gregg & Ashley Palmer to vary the strict application of section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Minimum open area; to construct a 26 by 24 foot detached garage with integral 4 by 18 foot storage area at the property addressed as 104 East 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

 Bob Eggleston, Architect, representing the applicants

 Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
 Andy Ramsgard, 61 East Genesee Street
 Mark Aberi, 1 Clift Lane
 Michael Cogswell, 168 East Genesee Street
 Patricia Ratcliff, 58 Leitch Avenue
 Joyce Barnett, 12 East Lake Street
 William & Mary Beth Gleason, 28 Onondaga Street
 Walter Benson, 50 East Lake Street

Chairman Kenan called for Michael Dudden for 37 Fennell Street. Neither the applicant nor any representative were present. Chairman Kenan deferred the matter. At 7:43 pm the Chairman called the matter of Gregg & Ashley Palmer for 104 East Lake Street.

Eggleston – The house that the Palmers have has an existing one-car garage though it is challenging to use. What they would like to do is to do a two-car garage with a little storage on the side. Gregg Palmer is an avid bike rider; he has 5 bikes that he needs to store. They have also provided some extra storage in the upper level and they have given it a traditional carriage house appearance. It will be detached. They have talked to their neighbors the Sherrers and the Aberis who are adjacent to them. As a result of that they have already altered the plan. We had originally proposed that it be 5 feet off the property line, but the Scherrers wanted it further – so we have gone 8 feet off the side property line, where 3 is required. 15 foot is the required set-back in the rear, so the garage meets all the require set-backs but we are going from an 85.8% open area to 83.1%, in the A-1 District which requires 90% open area. So the only variance that we require is that of the open area to be 83.1. Typical lots of about 17,000 SF, where 40,000 is

required for a conforming lot, that is not an uncommon open space for a similar sized lot. I do submit the two no objection letters for the file from the adjacent neighbors.

Carvalho – What’s the material on the garage?

Eggleston – It will be cement board trim; it will match the house. The house was recently redone by the previous owners and I think it has been tastefully done with traditional trim and moldings.

Kenan – In this picture here, that is shed that shows up?

Eggleston – That’s the shed that’s being removed. That’s looking across the back here.

Kenan – And this is Aberi’s garage?

Eggleston – That is Aberi’s garage. The row of pines deceptively come into the property so it kind of lines up with the back of the pines. The shed will be removed.

Kenan – Any questions for Bob? How about a motion then?

Member Sutherland, “I move that we recommend that the ZBA approve the project with the variances that are requested.” Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0.

This matter was concluded at 7:46 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Regular Meeting
September 1, 2016

Site Plan Review and Area variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Kate Cogswell & Walter Benson to vary the strict application of section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Minimum lot dimension; Side yard set-back left; Side yard set-back Right; Both side yards combined; Rear yard set-back; Minimum open area; and percentage of structure width/lot width to remove an existing sun porch with patio below and to construct a 927.5SF addition and a 168 SF patio at the property addressed as 8 Gayle Road 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

Andy Ramsgard, Architect, representing the applicants
Michael Cogswell, Esq., representing the applicants
Walter Benson, applicant

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
Bob Eggleston, 1391 East Genesee Street
Mark Aberi, 1 Clift Lane
Patricia Ratcliff, 58 Leitch Avenue
Joyce Barnett, 12 East Lake Street
William & Mary Beth Gleason, 28 Onondaga Street

At 7:47 pm Chairman Kenan called for Kate Cogswell & Walter Benson for 8 Gayle Road.

Cogswell – I am here for Walter Benson and Katherine Cogswell for their application for site approval and for their further recommendation to the ZBA on two relatively minor variances. With that said, Mr. Benson is here if you have any questions of him, but I'm sure that Andy can handle any issues or questions. If there is any assistance I can be, please let me know. It is good to see you.

Ramsgard – So, the variance that Michael was talking about is the proposed variance to the rear yard set-back which at the bottom of the page says south yard. This is the last property before the driveway access down on Gayle Road before you get to Fucillo's and back in there. The house is a post-WWII raised ranch, sort of wingspread Frank Lloyd Wright-ian structure, that

has a very shallow roof. What we are proposing to do as you see on your site plans; we are proposing to remove the screen porch on the south side. The area in red on the drawing I just gave you is the screen porch that's raised upon the columns that show up in that picture. It cuts across two bedrooms; one of the bedrooms, the southwesterly corner has windows, the southerly bedroom does not have windows directly to the outside, it has to go into the porch. If we were to build that today, it would be a code issue because the second means of egress has to be by a window leading directly to the outside; and it also doesn't meet the light and air requirements. So the proposal is to remove that red section and add an extension to the living room end off of the kitchen; which is all up on the first floor. The first set of photographs I gave you and the massing model shows what the low-slope roof line; it's a structural cathedral ceiling, timber beams and structural deck. It's a 2 ¼ inch thick structure for the roofing and insulation outside. There is really not a way to deconstruct that and put on some cape cod gable roof or hip roof without completely dismantling the entire structure of the roof. Really the only way you can add onto a post war ranch like this is continue on the sheds and overframe; raise the ridge up slightly which shows up in the first front of the house drawing, the ridge raises up a little bit. And therefore, leave the cathedral spaces on all the living areas. So we are pulling off about 152 SF or so in terms of that existing porch and we are proposing to build back additional living space out into what would be our rear yard but is a side yard for the adjacent property coming down off of East Lake Road. This property doesn't really have a rear yard, it has just a front yard and all side yards. One of the things that's nice about the property is it does get a little bit of lake view out, looking down the access easement down to the shared beachfront to the southwest. There are fully mature trees all the way around the structure. By doing these additions we are not blocking the views of any of the neighbors. The way the properties are staggered and set back, as you look at the south side of Gayle Road, when they were all done they were all sort of canted a little bit to the south and face the lake to look sort of over the ridge. Most people's view is directly south or south by southwest. It has a walkout basement so the addition technically is a 2 story addition for the spaces that we're going to add in. All the main living spaces are currently on the first floor; there are 3 bedrooms, 2 bathrooms, kitchen, living spaces. Downstairs there's 1 bedroom with a den and an informal family room. Part of what we are doing with the function of the house is to add on a mudroom. Currently the garage which you see in the photographs and which is on the northwesterly corner of the property, here and there. Right now that's directly adjacent to the master bedroom, so the only way to walk in from the garage, if you could, would be directly into the master bedroom. Otherwise you go back outside to go inside. We really can't change that with the function of the house, but the reality is that people come to the mudroom which is not the front door currently on the house, but really will become the front door which is the addition that we are proposing to the east side. That will allow us to create a new front door right over in this area which is the drive up and approach. Currently the front door is behind the chimney and tucked in over by the garage. So you can see underneath where the existing structures are and what we are proposing. Essentially we are doubling the size of the enclosed mudroom, to provide for washer/dryer, countertop, a little powder room, a couple of closets. We wanted to keep the fireplace. The fireplace is actually inside pretty nice. It's in a weird location; 1950s asymmetry all over the place. So we tried to line that up with the living room and create an open kitchen-great room concept with a breakfast room eating space that will take advantage of some of the views that we have to the south and the southwest. And the lower level comes along really for the ride as a great room space downstairs for kids coming back home or grandkids eventually. The variances, because this is a preexisting nonconforming lot, it

is also within 300 feet of the lake. Technically because of the shared right-of-way and how the lake hooks around, about 30% of the property hits within 300 feet of the lake. That's a preexisting nonconforming condition so that adds a site plan review component to this project. The current lot is slightly undersized; its lot width is also slightly undersized as well. Many of properties on Gayle Road preceded the current zoning ordinance; so although it looks like there are a lot of variances with this, they all have to do with the preexisting nonconforming conformity of the existing property and how the house sits on the land. We are asking for an additional area variance to set back closer than the existing structure to the south property line. We are making the structure slightly more conforming on the west side by removing area in the patio and screen porch that is in that area. Are there any questions about that?

Kenan – So the variances are one side yard, rear yard and lot coverage?

Ramsgard – Right. Technically we've got both side yards because we have preexisting nonconforming...

Kenan – Right. But the new variances would basically be that?

Ramsgard – Right. We have both sides even if we didn't do anything; both sides are preexisting nonconforming. We are going closer with the mud room addition. To 18.9 feet versus the existing at 25.3.

Sutherland – Do you pick up the 50s exterior around...

Ramsgard – We have to...

Sutherland – It is what it is; I was just wondering how you were handling ground floor to second floor and windows for the addition.

Ramsgard – We need to pick up on the language that's already there with the large pictures and the lower vented reverse transoms, because the view is so nice there.

Sutherland – It's a fun house...

Ramsgard – It's a classic 50s ranch before Ryan Homes got hold of ranches. It's a really neat interior space in the living room, all wood ceilings, beams.

Carvalho – In the site plan review, one of the things we have to look at is drainage. Are there drainage issues?

Ramsgard – No there really isn't. It is all mature area; the grade flows from the northeast to the southwest, which continues into the right-of-way. The back of the property is very dry. There is a very large lot to the south. There is a slight swale that goes along from all the backs of the house along Gayle Road that was put in and that follows through to the common right-of-way, beachfront, whatever you want to call it. So all the drainage is taken care of out into the lake, and it has a long distance to go and shed across to get there.

Kenan – You are raising the peak on one segment of the roof. Is this portion of the roof all going to be one plane?

Ramsgard – It will all be one plane, yes. It is a wingspread, it is an unequal shed. It is higher on the east side. So the only way to do that is to overframe.

Kenan – Right. OK. Any questions.

Sutherland – There have been discussions with neighbors and they're up to speed?

Ramsgard – Yes, and there will be through the rest of the process?

Member Hartnett, "I make a motion to approve the Site Plan Review and make a positive recommendation to the ZBA for the variances for 8 Gayle Road based on the 8/18/2016 plans." Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0. Messrs. Ramsgard and Cogswell thanked the Board.

This matter was concluded at 8:03 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Regular Meeting
September 1, 2016

Consideration of the matter of a preliminary subdivision application of James Kevin & Joyce Barnett for a 2 lot subdivision at the property addressed as 12 East 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

Joyce Barnett, applicant
William & Mary Beth Gleason, on behalf of the applicant

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
Bob Eggleston, 1391 East Genesee Street
Mark Aberi, 1 Clift Lane
Patricia Ratcliff, 58 Leitch Avenue
Andy Ramsgard, 181 East Genesee Street

At 8:03 pm Chairman Kenan called for James & Joyce Barnett for 12 East Lake Street.

Barnett – My husband and I own 12 East Lake Street. My attorney, Tom Seeley, is on vacation and my husband is out of the country on business, so I'm going to give it my best try to answer all of your questions. We have applied for a minor subdivision. What we would like to do is do a lot line adjustment with one of our neighbors; William and Mary Beth Gleason are here tonight, and they are interested in taking a portion of the land that we own. It is a 2.2 acre parcel, far more than we need. We will actually be selling our home in the next year. When we moved in in 2007, the strongest reaction we had from our neighbors is that they would like to see this wooded area between Onondaga, East Lake Street and East Genesee Street remain a natural area. We have already been approached by developers. We would like to give the neighbors the opportunity to preserve the green space there that they back up to.

Kenan – And they are at 28 Onondaga?

Barnett – Correct.

Kenan – So, this 1.5 acres would be subdivided from the balance of your parcel and joined to 28 Onondaga.

Barnett – Correct. And that would leave us with 0.7 acres.

Kenan – What's that in square feet?

Sutherland – 30,000 is shown on there.

Kenan – And what is the area requirement in that District?

Sutherland – Probably 30,000. [That was confirmed by Mr. Eggleston]

Kenan – This is, help me Rick, there are 3 lots involved. It is subdividing one parcel into two, but adjoining a third. So I think all 3 have to be part of the application, am I right?

Galbato – Yes.

Kenan – So it is one action; you are not just segregating the lot and leaving out there unattached to anything.

Galbato – My recommendation, after you give some direction to the applicant, this Board should schedule a public hearing if you feel that application is ready for a public hearing and we should refer this to the County Planning Board. Do you have a surveyor?

Barnett – Yes, our attorney has ordered a survey from Paul Olszewski. It was requested almost a month ago.

Kenan – We could do that, call for a public hearing; this is not a complicated subdivision. But there are certain requirements in the subdivision regulation that have to be met in terms of the information available.

Galbato – When Tom returns, why don't you have him submit a short environmental assessment form.

Barnett – A short SEQR.

Galbato – When we send that to County Planning, sometimes they want to see that.

Kenan – Any other thoughts or questions?

Ramsgard – I'm Joyce's neighbor around the corner; she takes great care of the property. It could be handled as a simple lot line adjustment. It doesn't necessarily have to be a subdivision. The two adjoining are both conforming lots.

Kenan – How is that different in process from a subdivision?

Sutherland – It's quicker.

Ramsgard – It's quicker and pending a motion at the Planning Board it's a simple tax map adjustment. It is not very complicated at all because they are adjoining.

Galbato – This Board has historically treated lot line adjustments, even if no new tax parcel is being created, as a subdivision. Under the zoning code, subdivision is defined as a resubdivision.

Kenan – So what was your recommendation?

Galbato – Keep this moving forward. Schedule a public hearing and refer this to County Planning. The sooner we get the survey the better. I would hate for the County to postpone a decision because they don't have a survey.

Sutherland – Rick is there a hybrid that we could do; the things that the Village would need to do for a more regulation subdivision we do, but the process of filing at the County is treated as a simple lot line adjustment which I think takes a lot of the stuff that you'd have to do and makes it simpler. There's different kinds of environmental reporting and different kinds of drawings and such. I wonder if there isn't a way to do both. The Village maintains its review process but we don't put them through a second more aggressive county process?

Galbato – There are county lot line adjustment forms; I'm doing one now for a client in Spafford.

Sutherland – We did one recently; it's a lot easier and a lot quicker. I think everyone at the Village level is fine with what you are proposing.

Galbato – No one here is requesting topographical surveys; just asking for metes and bounds showing the lines. You would need something in recordable format showing the new proposed lot lines and for the Chairman to sign it. A lot of times when I see lot line adjustments that don't go through the true public hearing and subdivision process it's two lots merging into one, not portions of it. I'm just going by what this Board has historically done in the past.

Kenan – But the issues are uncomplicated. If we were to regard this as a lot line adjustment rather than a subdivision, do we still submit it to the County? But we don't need a public hearing?

Dundon – I think we did both in Roben Shappell's case.

Galbato – One thing we could do Doug, is procedurally – with the Chairman's consent – we could on a case by case basis, the first time you guys see it could be the public hearing. So we could administratively schedule a public hearing kind of what we do with variance applications, it doesn't go to the ZBA first to get remanded back to the Planning Board for comment and back to the ZBA – it administratively goes to the Planning Board first for this Board to issue a recommendation to the ZBA.

Dundon – Do you expect you are going to have your survey in time?

Barnett – Do you need it by the next ZBA meeting or the next Planning Board meeting?

Dundon – This is not going to get acted on by the County until October anyway.

Galbato – Even if you get it out tomorrow?

Dundon – I'm just not that comfortable with sending some that is indescribable to the County for approval. If I look at that Lighton survey, I can't figure out what's going on.

Barnett – What's the earliest that we could submit to the County?

Dundon – My cut-off is September 8.

Barnett – There won't be a survey by then.

Kenan – Can we have a public hearing without it being submitted to the County? We just can't act before they respond?

Galbato – You could act 'subject to'.

Kenan – For something like this there is no significance to a public hearing. We are going to have another meeting on it anyway so I don't think it makes a difference. Why don't we schedule a public hearing for the next meeting and we will submit it to the County when we have the survey.

Sutherland – Can we refer it to them as a lot line adjustment rather than as a full subdivision.

Galbato -- Our code says resubdivision.

Kenan – Does the County treat them differently? A subdivision versus a lot line adjustment?

Sutherland – Yes.

Galbato – Yes.

Kenan – Does it make any effective difference? Why don't we treat it as a lot line adjustment and if that makes any difference to the County, we'll take advantage of that. We will refer it when we get the survey. And we'll have the survey to look at ourselves and perhaps act at the next meeting.

Galbato – So are you looking for a motion to officially schedule a public hearing?

Sutherland – It doesn't make a difference to have a public hearing. You open it up and if someone has a comment they make the comment.

Member Sutherland, "I move that the Planning Board considers this action to be a lot line adjustment. Nevertheless, I move that we schedule a public hearing on this matter on October 6, 2016 at 7:30 pm. This matter is to be referred to the County Planning Board when the application has been completed with the appropriate survey. The Board intends to follow the same approval process that would apply to a full subdivision." The motion was seconded by Member Carvalho. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0. Ms. Barnett thanked the Board.

This matter was concluded at 8:16 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Regular Meeting
September 1, 2016**

Consideration of an additional area variance in the matter of the application of Harmony Homes to vary the strict application of section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard set-back left; Side yard set-back Right; Both side yards combined; and 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 two-car garage at the property addressed as 56 Leitch Avenue in the Village of Skaneateles. The Planning Board recommended approval of these variances at its August 4, 2016 meeting.

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 applicant
Mark Aberi, applicant

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
Patricia Ratcliff, 58 Leitch Avenue
Andy Ramsgard, 181 East Genesee Street
Joyce Barnett, 12 East Lake Street

At 8:17 pm Chairman Kenan called for Harmony Homes for 56 Leitch Avenue.

Eggleston – At the Zoning Board meeting there were some concerns that were raised by some neighbors and some question if the driveway location was required to be 3 feet; it was determined that the Zoning law said “may” and not “shall” so I’m not sure the 3 feet was a requirement. Mark took the comments from the neighbor and has been working with the neighbor. To remind you what he project is, this is an existing 1950s cape style home. The driveway is currently on the south side and actually encroaches 2.3 feet onto the neighbor’s property to the south. One has to be a professional driving expert to back out of the garage. The south side is just not a good place for the driveway; it’s only 10.5 feet; it’s on the angled property line. We had proposed last time to have 24 by 26 foot garage placed along the north property line and there were comments about trees being affected. We have provided more information and have redesigned the addition to not be the full width – to pull it in so it’s not as wide as

before but does come out a little bit further. So we actually reduced the south side yard variance; we had asked for 8 feet, we are now asking for 10.4. The right side we had asked for 11, we are asking for 16 now. The garage totally conforms with the required set-backs. We have also pulled the driveway so it is right adjacent to the house and it is 3 feet off the property line the entire way. I have shown the trees; I took a look at where they are on the neighbor's property. There's a 12 inch diameter tree, I believe it's a maple, up near the sidewalk. That's about 9.5 feet over from the property line. There's another 36 inch diameter tree, a very tall mature tree about 9.5 feet over. There's some cedars that are right adjacent to the house; the drip line of the cedars don't even cross the property line. At your request, they had staked the locations so it was very clear where everything was. So the improvements we have made – we have reduced the side yard set-back variance, we have reduced the combined side variance and moved the driveway so it is 3 feet off the property line. Our objective was to try to get a straight driveway; we looked at other ideas like a turnaround. We have reduced the size of the garage; on page 4 the garage is now reduced to 14 foot building height average with 18.6 being the extreme in the back corner. There is a little rise in the back corner; we are going to keep the garage low and have a little retaining wall on the side – so we are not raising the garage up we are sinking it into the natural grade. We also reduced the pitch of the roof to a 9/12 pitch; there's not a room up above there, it's just a [unintelligible] truss that between the trusses you can put patio furniture up there; it's just strictly storage. One of the concerns they had is what's the appearance from the north side. So we have done a profile of the house and the garage. He plans to put up a six foot high privacy fence along the property line which he is entitled to do. So it does show the relationship of the house and the garage as seen from the north property.

Kenan – And where does the fence; I see it starts apparently in line with the front wall where does it end?

Eggleston – All the way around the house to the back corner here.

Carvalho – He's putting the fence up?

Eggleston – Mark Aberi's putting the fence up. There are no trees in the way of the fence; all the trees are over 9.5 feet over onto the neighbor's property. There's also a 30 inch maple which in the corner that we're trying to preserve. The garage will be 12 feet off the maple.

Hartnett – Can you show me the fence?

Eggleston – The fence starts at the front of the house – the front yard is wide open. It starts alongside the house, it comes along here.

Hartnett – How far from that property line?

Eggleston – What are you going to do 5, 6 inches? It will be 6 inches onto his property line.

Sutherland -- Is that part of a way of making amends with the neighbor? Is she aware of it?

Ratcliff – Yes.

Eggleston – The fence starts here, right at the front of the house. It goes all the way around the property and ends at the corner of the house here.

Aberi – At the back of the house, I was looking to return it. I have a dog and it's easier; it keeps him contained a little bit. I don't want him barking or disturbing the neighbors.

Kenan – So you are going to return it to the corner of the existing house. But on the other end it is open for the driveway?

Aberi – Yes.

Eggleston – So we have reduced the number of variances, we have reduced the size of the garage, and we have pulled the driveway so it is 3 feet off the property line.

Dundon – When the ZBA looked at this they felt that a variance might be required because of the location of the driveway. Could you speak to your assertions why that is not the case?

Eggleston – I wish John Crompt were here. I think the statement was made because of the specific language that it said driveways and parking may not be within 3 feet of the property line as opposed to shall not be. We decided to extinguish that question and just make it 3 feet. So it's not a question any more. And also from Mark's point of view, if he paves right up to the foundation that resolves any water issues that he might have with open space between the driveway and the foundation. He will be putting gutters on the house and he will have those piped into the storm sewers.

Kenan – For what it's worth, in this context I think 'may not' means 'shall not'. That's how I read it. Did you want to speak?

Ratcliff – Thank you Mr. Chairman. I am the owner at 58 Leitch Ave. I submitted a letter which you have and also this information from Cornell Cooperative Extension on trees; that was submitted as well. I appreciate the efforts that Mr. Aberi and Mr. Eggleston have made to meet with me and understand my concerns. I did speak with my attorney about the ambiguity of the code about driveways. He agreed it is poorly worded. But I appreciate that John Crompt had said it was 3 feet, but I'll set that aside because you did adjust the plan for that. I'd like to return to my point about concern for the trees. Mr. Aberi kindly listened to my concerns and has spoken with his driveway construction person so that based on this information here about the health of trees that are in proximity to a driveway and also the construction vehicles and traffic there and compaction of the roots and I'm concerned about that. If you read this you'll see the evidence of the damage that can be done. I know that Mark will be very careful; he indicated that. He has been very considerate of me up to this date and I'm sure he will continue to be so and I appreciate that. But we cannot guarantee that this activity – the construction activity for the addition and the garage in the back, as well as the installation of the asphalt driveway and the regular activity on there once the construction is done. I have no guarantee that these mature very tall trees that I depend upon for soaking up water on my property – these are huge old trees, basswood, maple and 3 enormous arborvitae provide shade, they provide privacy and they are a

sound and light barrier. I am very concerned about their health and beauty and the potential for water in my currently-dry basement if they are lost. And I'll also have to deal with the cost of removal of them should they die, which is a possibility here. I very much appreciate Mr. Eggleston's work to map out the trees and think about not going too deeply on the driveway, but there is no guarantee that they will be fine. Additionally, the trees, especially the maple will have to be trimmed quite a bit up which is another concern of mine; the whole side of that tree will have to be trimmed up. I think my biggest concern is will I lose my trees and will I have resulting water problems from this driveway on this side of my home, because there is no guarantee that I am not going to have water problems with snow melt and the installation of this driveway and the loss of this permeable space that's currently there. So thank you.

Kenan – Thank you.

Eggleston – I would like to note that the likelihood is that the existing driveway won't be removed right away; it will be used during construction and so a number of the large construction vehicles will take advantage of that – the excavator, the concrete truck. We do have the existing driveway that we will be using up until the end of the project.

Aberi – I have spoken with Patty a number of times. She has been very kind; my biggest thing when we went to the Zoning Board was can I map out a way to make everyone happy. I want happy neighbors. After having the dialogue with Patty and having gone back and forth, it seems to be mainly the driveway as far as the health of her trees. Bob is correct; all construction; I wouldn't do anything with that other driveway until the very end. At that point, I have talked with my driveway guy; just take out a layer of topsoil – 6 to 8 inches – and begin installing the driveway. And I would be very cautious from a root standpoint. I am certainly willing to pay a tree company to come out for a fertilization program for the first couple of years if that helps. As far as any water issue caused by the driveway, I see zero concerns. I am at a lower elevation than her property, so any of the water that comes off that garage or driveway would be coming towards me or Leitch Avenue.

Kenan – OK. Any more questions? How about a motion of some kind?

Carvalho – Can we make a recommendation that as part of this process an arborist is hired?

Kenan – You could certainly make that recommendation, and at this point we are recommending to the Zoning Board so ultimately that will be up to them, but that could be part of your motion.

Sutherland – Mark did offer to provide that, so...

Hartnett – The change to 3 feet plus making the garage smaller solves my concerns on it.

Member Carvalho, "I'll make a motion that we recommend approval of the variances based on the August 31, 2016 plan, specifying that the driveway is 3 feet off the property line, that the privacy fence is built and that the owner has agreed to hire an arborist to advise him during the construction of the driveway to maintain the health of those trees and to follow up for two years thereafter. Member Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon

the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0. Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board.

This matter was concluded at 8:36 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Regular Meeting
September 1, 2016

Downtown D Design Standards review in the matter of the application of Michael Dudden to construct an addition to an existing garage at the property addressed as 37 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

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee

At 8:37 pm Chairman Kenan called for Michael Dudden for 37 Fennell Street. **Since the applicant was not present Chairman Kenan said, "I move that we table this matter and continue the discussion to the Board's next meeting on October 6, 2016." Member Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0.**

This matter was concluded at 8:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Regular Meeting
September 1, 2016

Consideration of comments regarding Town of Skaneateles draft Open Space Plan referred to the Board on August 12, 2016.

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 Eriksen, Village Trustee

At 8:38 pm Chairman Kenan opened discussion on the draft open space plan. **Chairman Kenan said, "I move that we have no comment on this matter." Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0.**

This matter was concluded at 8:39 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Regular Meeting
September 1, 2016

Consideration of comments regarding staking and survey operating procedures.

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

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
John Crompton, Code Enforcement Officer
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee

At 8:42 pm Chairman Kenan opened discussion on staking & surveys. Following brief presentations from CEO Crompton and Member Hartnett, the Board concluded that a survey conducted within the previous two years should be required if construction activity were taking place within 5 feet of a property line.

This matter was concluded and the meeting adjourned by acclamation at 8:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards