

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
October 3, 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
 Mike Perrone, Member
 Doug Sutherland, Member

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

Mike Dudden, Applicant

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
Tim Taylor, 77 West Elizabeth St
Ron Staples, 10 Highland St.
John Lynch, 48 Academy St.
Tim Lynn, 50 Academy St.
Cindy Lynn, 50 Academy St.
Bob Eggleston, 1391 East Genesee St.

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

At 7:26 pm Chairman Kenan called the meeting to order, expressing thanks to everyone for having accommodated the shift in dates in order to ensure that a quorum of the members was available. He then welcomed Mike Perrone as a new member of the Planning Board who was appointed on September 22 to replace Bill Eberhardt, noting that Bill had sat in that position at the Board table for 25 years. He then called for Michael Dudden for 37 Fennell Street.

Kenan – Basically the issue is the Downtown D District Design Standards.

Dunnden – I drew up some plans for Janice Miller; these are what I gave her. The only thing I'd like to change if it's possible without delaying this process would be the 4 by 12 out the back where it is connected totally to the roof – I'd like to have it under the roof. It's going to be wood siding, asbestos shingles. It will be a 4/12 pitch truss roof with 50 pounds snow load on it. The existing garage has molding along the top under the roof; we're going to put that new roof.

Kenan – you should do everything you can to match the existing building.

Dudden – It is going to look just like it.

Kenan – What do the windows look like on the existing? Are they the same as she has drawn here?

Dudden – No, they are 4 pane glazed.

Kenan – Double-hung?

Dudden – No they are just single frame. They don't open at all.

Kenan – 4 pane meaning two over two?

Dudden – Yes.

Carvalho – So that's what you will make these, two over two?

Kenan – That's what I'd suggest, make these 2 over 2.

Carvalho – Your sketch shows you are putting a metal roof on?

Dudden – I was going to but that has changed – price and availability. It wouldn't be done until next year. So we're going to go with a 30 year asbestos.

Sutherland—What's your house?

Dudden – It's architectural shingles; it's going to match the same color.

Sutherland – So you can match the same color. OK.

Dudden – It's going to look the same as the house.

Carvalho – Are you re-shingling the whole roof or just the addition?

Dudden – The whole roof.

Kenan – And in the Downtown D Design Standards, have Janice look at them. There is not much that would apply specifically to something as isolated as this but there are some requirements on the dimension of the trim and stuff. 3.5 inches I think.

Dudden – The existing trim is 5.5 by 1 inch.

Kenan – OK; I guess match the existing, then.

Dudden – We'll trim up the corners, there's trim across the bottom, trim across the top. It will look the same.

Kenan – Any other questions? Anyone want to suggest a motion?

Member Sutherland, “I move that we approve the submittal with the understanding that instead of a metal roof it is going to be architectural shingles matching the existing home, that the roof of the shed is going to be broken from the main portion of the roof and that the new windows will be double-hung 2 over 2 to closely replicate the existing windows, and that the other trim details will be consistent with either the garage or if you need to look somewhere else, to the house.” Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0.

This matter was concluded at 7:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
October 3, 2016

Consideration of the matter of a preliminary subdivision application of Timothy Taylor & Imhyang Chung for a 2 lot subdivision/lot line adjustment at the property addressed as 77 West Elizabeth Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Brian Carvalho, Member
Mike Perrone, Member
Doug Sutherland, Member

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

Tim Taylor, Applicant

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
Ron Staples, 10 Highland St.
John Lynch, 48 Academy St.
Tim Lynn, 50 Academy St.
Cindy Lynn, 50 Academy St.
Bob Eggleston, 1391 East Genesee St.

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

At 7:30 pm Chairman Kenan called for Timothy Taylor for 77 West Elizabeth Street.

Taylor – I subdivided four or five years ago. Years ago whoever did that lot, they put a double terrace, so the property down here couldn't ever get up to this level where I am. There were some dead trees that were falling over on the neighbor's. So I told Martha Manilla that I would get those trees cut down and cleaned the whole thing up. She said "I'd like you to have that land." Because they can't get to it. It is 12 foot wide on one side and 20 feet. It was a natural boundary, which I probably should have done at the original thing but I really never thought about it.

Kenan – So I can't tell by looking at this what it is you want to do.

Taylor – This is where I live. This was the property line and there's a steep bank here. So this would be the new property line. So it is like 12 feet here and 18 feet or so here. But it gives the top of this hill. So this is all into here and this one here kind of comes up on a funny angle.

Galbato – So the existing line is from here to here, right?

Taylor – Yes. And it kind of runs kind of crazy really. But it was set up originally like that. They wanted to make it so that this property just goes to the top of the first terrace.

Carvalho – Is this downhill or uphill?

Taylor – This was flat here and then there's a hill, like this. And then it was kind of a half-way thing and then another steep hill. You couldn't really mow it; it gave me shivers every time I got near it. So I actually levelled this out a little bit so you actually can mow it and maintain it now. This property doesn't really have a way to get up there.

Kenan – What will the acreage of this parcel be when we are all done? I see two numbers here.

Taylor – It is six-tenths, and so you are taking away; so it would still be over a half-acre.

Kenan – It looks like this 0.67 goes to the center of the road, 0.60 goes to the right of way line; that isn't the change. So that's the new acreage, is that right, to the hardline?

Taylor – Yes. It made sense originally.

Kenan – So this is a preliminary subdivision review, right.

Taylor – Um-hm. Paul Olszewski is the one who did all the drawings and said this is what you would be looking for.

Kenan – And you wanted to get the adjoining property; you wanted to sign it, but she passed away.

Taylor – Yes, but her niece and nephew came to me and basically said she wants you to do it and we want you to do it.

Kenan – OK. But you will need to get obviously their signature, because both of you are involved in the subdivision. And some indication here of the succeeding property owner.

Taylor – they were; John Manilla is the real estate and he came to see me. We got to be very good friends taking care of Martha.

Kenan – Rick, if you would, a little advice. I think we need the plan to be more specific. The plat drawing itself. What is the before and what is the after, and what are the acreages.

Taylor – I have the before drawings. Whatever was needed Paul said he could do it.

Kenan – And why don't we, as long as the reconfigured Manilla parcel is larger than required in that Zone – what are we there, 30,000 SF?

Galbato – 30,000. What the Planning Board could do is schedule the Public Hearing for the next meeting contingent on you getting the required signature...

Kenan – The signature and the before and after maps for consideration.

Galbato – We would need the signature, as the Chairman indicated, of the duly appointed representative of the estate of your neighbor. Also if you could ask your surveyor, he should reference – because we are modifying it – your subdivision map from 2008 or 2009. It is map number 11082. He should reference that because that lot line is being adjusted from the approval that was given a few years back. In that subdivision approval back in October 2008 and also on the plat map, the Planning board did put in a condition that lots 1 and 2 not be further subdivided. As I indicated to the Board in my memo, I do not feel that this is violating that because no new lot is being created, it is actually making lot #2 slightly bigger.

Kenan – What’s the significance of lot 1 here? Because there’s lot 1, 1A and 2A?

Taylor – Originally I owned it all. That has nothing to do with this. It looks like it was on the drawing from before.

Kenan – Paul will know what we need in the way of before and after and the reference.

Galbato – Paul has my email address, he could always email me.

Kenan – and he can create the reference that Rick is referring to. Anybody have any questions?

Member Sutherland, “No; I think what’s being suggested is fine, I think we probably all do, provided that the paperwork can be handled. Let me make a motion that we schedule a public hearing for November 3, 2016, subject to the authorized signatures from the estate being provided and that revised maps are provided that clearly show the relocation being requested. Those maps should bear the same notes as were in the original subdivision map from 2008.” Member Carvalho seconded that motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0.

This matter was concluded at 7:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
October 3, 2016

Area variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Ron Staples to vary the strict application of section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Both side yards combined; to construct an attached garage at the property addressed as 10 Highland Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
 Brian Carvalho, Member
 Mike Perrone, Member
 Doug Sutherland, Member

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

Ron Staples, Applicant

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
John Lynch, 48 Academy St.
Tim Lynn, 50 Academy St.
Cindy Lynn, 50 Academy St.
Bob Eggleston, 1391 East Genesee St.

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

At 7:38 pm Chairman Kenan called for Ron Staples for 10 Highland Street.

Staples – The house was built in 1960 and it has a garage underneath the house. The garage is located on the west end of the house underneath the house. The only egress at this time, without going through the kitchen, down the stairs and all the way from the west end of the house to the east end of the house is through a front door. Being that we are in our 80s and seeing that the house has just about been refurbished about as much as can be done, because it was so old, we'd like to have a garage added to the west end of the house, so the we can have an egress from the kitchen into the garage.

Kenan – One of the things we need is a site plan the shows the addition on it, so that...

Staples – That was supposed to be here.

Kenan – Well we have a survey; I see some red marks on it, I suppose that is meant to be the addition. And then we have some plans that show parts of it. Is that it?

Staples – That’s it, right there.

Kenan – Has John Crompt reviewed this and determined what is necessary in terms of variances do you know?

Galbato – My understanding was that there was one variance for Both side yards combined.

Kenan – So you need 35 feet, you have 15 and 17 which is 32. Is this going to match the house, Ron, in all materials?

Staples – Yes, definitely. I’ve got a contractor to say that that’s exactly what will be done. The roofs match, the shingles would match, the siding will match, the window will match.

Kenan – Our role here, because there is single variance, is to make a recommendation to the Zoning Board and then they decide whether or not to grant the variance. I assume we are ready to make a variance recommendation. I think before the Zoning Board meeting, somebody ought to draw a depiction of the garage on the house.

Staples – Well Janice Miller was supposed to got with John and done that, and had it ready for this meeting tonight.

Kenan – She drew these, but I think it would be very simple for her to add that and to make specific what the set-back dimensions are.

Staples – I think he said the max would be 3 feet, but it would probably be a little less than that anyway.

Member Carvalho, “I make a motion that we recommend approval of the one variance for side yard set-back, contingent on all materials for the addition matching the existing house – windows, siding and roof – and that we recommend you bring a site plan to the Zoning Board meeting.” The motion was seconded by Member Sutherland. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0.

Chairman Kenan said “It can simply be this where someone hard-line draws what the expansion is and specifically what the side yard dimensions are, because that’s the critical issue for the Zoning Board.

This matter was concluded at 7:43 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
October 3, 2016

Area Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Timothy & Cynthia Lynn to vary the strict application of section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Front yard set-back, left; Side yard set-back, right; Both side yards combined; Percentage of open area; and Section 225-69D Nonconforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion to construct a 24 by 16 foot two-story addition and relocate a 12 by 20 foot patio at the property addressed as 50 Academy Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
 Brian Carvalho, Member
 Mike Perrone, Member
 Doug Sutherland, Member

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

Bob Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the applicants
Tim Lynn, applicant
Cindy Lynn, applicant

Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee
John Lynch, 48 Academy St.

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

At 7:44 pm Chairman Kenan called for Timothy and Cynthia Lynn for 50 Academy Street.

Eggleston – We were asked to get an updated survey. Cottrell’s survey did not agree with Paul Olszewski’s in that there was a sliver of land that was given to the neighbor to the west that changed everything. So the numbers are all very different. The numbers are changed in red as to what the variances are. Basically the application is the same.

Kenan – So we received this today. That’s the survey.

Eggleston – That’s the survey you received today and had that totally re-brought to match that.

Kenan – The only thing different is the property line?

Eggleston -- The only thing different is the property line and the location of the house on the property. Cottrell had it closer to the street but it's actually 18 feet to the front porch, 26.4 to the house itself—whereas the other one was 47 feet to the centerline of the road minus 24.75, which was different. We have it corrected. October 3 is the correct one. The house itself is rather small, about 1600 SF. A cute house, and they'd like to keep it a cute house but they would like it to be not so little. We will be taking it up to 2300 SF, by adding a 16 foot addition on the back that's 16 by 24. This will allow them to put a family room off the kitchen area and get an actual working mudroom. They'll be able to have a little rec room and a walk-out or daylight basement. The stairs will actually enter at grade level in the back which makes it convenient when you are coming in; down to the rec room or up to the mudroom. They have 3 small bedrooms upstairs; it allows them to create a larger bedroom and have a second bathroom upstairs. The house is nonconforming as it relates to the open area the existing to be 76.5% versus 85%. The front yard 18.4, the left yard is conforming at 16 feet, the right yard is 11.8 (because of that triangular piece of property that was transferred in the 90s) and the combined is 27.8. the set-backs are no more nonconforming than the existing and it's the open space that will be reduced to 74.1%, which is a 10.9% variance. That's not unusual for a lot that's approximately 8,000 SF in size in this area. There is a patio in back; they will be replacing it with a smaller 12 by 20 patio at ground level in the back.

Kenan – Let me question the way you did the math on the side yard dimensions. One side yard is 16.0 and the tightest part doesn't change even with the expansion. And the same with the 11.8, that doesn't change. So combined they are 27.8.

Eggleston – Right.

Kenan – But column number 3 it is still 27.8. Even though the addition is further from the property line, the property itself...

Eggleston – Correct; but this is the effect of the addition itself. We have to get a variance because we are nonconforming, but what we are actually building is less nonconforming.

Kenan – But what the ZBA would approve is your dimension in column two. Maybe that something that John ought to figure out how he wants to see them.

Eggleston – Sure. The exterior actually is a very nice; the existing house is kind of a crossover between an Eastlake style home – there's some clapboard and some decorative siding bands on it. And Tim will be matching the siding and tying that in.

Kenan – Another thing I can't figure out from the plans – the basement must end right there. So that's all you're adding, the 16 feet.

Eggleston – Correct; we're remodeling...

Kenan – But this gets wider I gather.

Eggleston – Yeah, actually this gets repurposed; it exists but it's getting rearranged.

Kenan – And then the second floor gets built out to here.

Eggleston – gets wider also, correct. That’s why on the plan we see this coming in from the corner.

Carvalho – So there won’t be exterior access to the basement anymore?

Eggleston – Correct; you walk in the door and you walk down half a flight or you walk up half a flight. It makes a great hockey room for taking the gear down and bringing it into the old basement.

Kenan – So how do you get into the basement?

Eggleston – You come in; this is half a level down. You come up for the first floor or down to the basement.

Kenan – I get it.

Carvalho – The stair is lower.

Lynn – The house is about 4 feet in the air.

Eggleston – The entrance is at grade so you don’t have steps you are negotiating outside.

Kenan – Any questions? It’s a nice house, Tim.

Member Carvalho, “I’ll make a motion that we recommend approval of the variances required for front yard, right side, both sides combined and open area and expansion of a nonconforming structure. The Planning Board acknowledges that the existing garage/ice house is located on the property line and also nonconforming though there is no change being proposed or recommended for this area so any nonconformity continues unchanged.” Member Sutherland seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0.

Lynch – Can I ask you a couple of questions? Looking at the plans I really can’t tell. Is it 3 story?

Eggleston – It will be no higher than the existing, but because of the way it drops it will have a half exposed basement.

Lynch – So it is still 2 ½ stories as the existing is.

Kenan – There is a ridge; that continues at the same height. The building gets longer at the top floor.

Lynch – Does the recommendation have anything to do with the neighbors, how they feel about the variances being granted?

Kenan – You are certainly welcome to participate. We usually let people participate here even if it isn't a public hearing. The Zoning Board meeting is a public hearing; you will get notice of it in the mail. Their's is the ultimate decision, we just make a recommendation.

Lynch – What's it based on if there are so many variances required? Is it based on ...

Kenan – Generally speaking, the Zoning Board doesn't have to grant any variances. They should be looking for the least amount of variances which will accomplish their goal...that's a judgment call.

This matter was concluded at 7:59 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
October 3, 2016

Special Use Permit recommendation, Critical Impact Permit recommendation, Downtown D Design Standards review and consideration of Section 225-19 Skaneateles Creek Overzone conditions in the matter of the application of Victor Ianno to construct a second floor on an existing building and to change the use to include multi-family use to create 7 apartments at the property addressed as 25 Fennell Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
 Brian Carvalho, Member
 Mike Perrone, Member
 Doug Sutherland, Member

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

 Bob Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the applicants

 Gregg Eriksen, Village Trustee

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

At 8:00 pm Chairman Kenan called for Victor Ianno for 25 Fennell Street. Chairman Kenan noted that this is the building next to CVS.

Eggleston – Correct. We also got an updated survey; we used the same surveyor and he came up with the same results.

Kenan – Imagine that. So there is nothing new in the survey right?

Eggleston – Nothing new in the survey, right.

Kenan – But it is up-to-date.

Eggleston – I also put together a narrative. This is a special use permit application. This is an existing mixed use commercial building on a 59,000 SF lot with 199 feet of frontage on Fennell Street. There is a flood zone B in the very back that follows along in this area here. The building is not in the flood zone. He has 75 cars on the entire property. We have the original building

built in the 1960s, a very contemporary style building. It has 3 uses on the main floor – a podiatrist, the UPS center and a nail salon.

Kenan – the CVS building predates this building, or is it the other way around?

Eggleston – Postdates. This was built in the 80s.

Kenan – What a shame that what was built in the 80s was built.

Eggleston – I totally understand. It was built for Brooks Pharmacy at the time and they had a very specific standard. There is a covered walkway on the existing building over here. It slopes down a story in the back so it's actually two story in the back. That's office space underneath. The proposal is to add a second floor. What we are doing is taking the 1960s building and adding a second floor to give it a more traditional downtown party-wall-type look. He'd like to put 7 apartments upstairs; there will be 3-2BR and 4-1BR apartments. Two units will be between 1000 and 1500 SF. The intent will be to bring this portion of the building into the Downtown D Design Standards. Because we are making it multi-family we are required to add fire sprinklers. We will be adding an elevator that will go from the basement level to the second floor level. This will be the entrance for the residents off the back; this will be the entrance for the office space. So we will clad the existing building – under the canopy we are going to add a brick veneer. We are going to take these posts and make them brick. The windows we are keeping, but we are going to add grids to the windows to give it a little more traditional storefront appearance. We are going to use double-hung windows that will be 3 foot by 5 foot in dimension. This will be done in bevel siding with corner boards and frieze boards. We are going to put a standing seam metal roof on the canopy to give it a more traditional look. On the sides, instead of carrying the brick all the way around, because of the expense, we will be cladding this in the cement-board siding just to carry this around to tie that in and carrying the top level as the residential and with the double-hung windows across the top. There will be an increase in sewer and water usage for the 10 bedrooms at 110 gallons per bedroom – at 1,100 gallons there will be an I&I mitigation fee of \$13,200. The water use for the rest of the building will not change. Parking calculations; while the zoning doesn't require on-site parking for the commercial day time use, taking 1 per 300 SF would require 82 cars total. There are 75 cars on-site. Historically the front parking has been used by customers for the upper level. Employees park in the back, the office space parks in the back. We will require 8 parking spaces for the dwellings – five units requiring 1 space, two units requiring 1.5 spaces. We are confident that while we have 75 cars that between the daytime use and the prominent evening use of the residential use, that we will have plenty of parking on-site. Historically there has never been a lack of available parking on this site. There is a stretch of land between the edge of the parking and the creek, and Victor has agreed in the past and will make a formal easement to create an area for a creek walk.

Sutherland – Is that level or sloped?

Eggleston – Oh it's level. Very level. Actually quite nice.

Sutherland – In this shot it looks sloped. Was the intent to cut it back a bit?

Eggleston – We could cut back the parking; one of the concerns is that tractor-trailers do come to the back and CVS does receive some of their deliveries in the back. There is a motorized ramp.

Sutherland – Where's the dock that they come into?

Eggleston – It's right in this area here. It is not a dock that you back up to, it's just some double doors.

Kenan – Is there anything under the CVS?

Eggleston – Office space, the whole basement. Digital Analysis is in there. I have gone through the criteria for special use permit, for special use permit multi-family and critical impact. And then I have gone through the pertinent parts of the Downtown D Design Standards for the building itself. Again we are focused on this building; this portion of the building, not on this building here. Vic Ianno has a long-term lease for the CVS store. The people in this are on short-term leases.

Kenan – Both levels?

Eggleston – Both levels. This is like his last project that he's looking to do and was trying to figure out a good use of the building. An advantage is that we are turning this strip building that is kind of a regrettable building from the 1960s into a two-story building. I know at Kinney Drug you wanted to get them to have a two-story appearing building, but it's all fake up above – this is real. These are one bedroom units with dens. The reason these are dens and not bedrooms is they have no windows. Whereas when we got out to the corners where we could get windows, we have two-bedroom units. We are required to have 25% of the units handicap accessible so we have 2 handicap units and we have the commercial elevator.

Sutherland – Are you sure you can do that with just one stair?

Eggleston – We checked that out because it is sprinklered and it's a two-story building, we can. I have done the preliminary code investigation on this.

Sutherland – Our experience ...

Eggleston – when you get into the city. That was one of my big questions. There is a refuge area for handicapped people with...

Sutherland – is it 72 feet from outer area to the stair/

Eggleston – And that gets doubled with sprinklers.

Sutherland – I would look at that again. Our experience is that even with sprinklers that 72 feet or so...It has nothing to do with our approval, but I'm not sure that works.

Sutherland – What we would run into is the code guy telling us that the bedroom in the lower left corner from the remote point in the apartment to the stairs; our experience is that we've had to deal with addressing that.

Eggleston—there's a new building code as of October 1st.

Cromp – The 2015 code went into effect 10/1/2016. Most of the changes relate to the energy code.

Eggleston – We do residential work, but I understand that the commercial code has been relaxed. And you get a lot of latitude when you have sprinklers. Especially in a building like this with the intensity of use, sprinklers is an excellent idea.

Kenan – Is that it?

Eggleston – that is it. This requires special use permit from the ZBA, it requires critical impact from the Trustees, and it requires Downtown D Design Standards approval by the Planning Board.

Kenan – Questions? Comments?

Sutherland – I think from a Downtown D perspective I think the plan that's there misses the point of the standards. Window patterns throughout, the skin of the building; there's all kind of things that fly in the face of the stated goals and some of the specific directives of the standards themselves.

Eggleston – Are you referring to the first floor or the second floor?

Sutherland – I think part of what happens is the second floor it looks like it was from a different era, an older era, dropped on the first floor. They seem to be layer cakes without a lot of harmony between the two layers. The clapboard treatment on the second floor with brick on the ground floor is one of the things that the standards talk about – *it's where land is vacant or contains structures that are not described by earlier sections, the objective is to develop new structures or modify existing ones to bring them into greater harmony with the historic house structures ad party-wall buildings in the District.* This, I think, is missing the mark with that.

Eggleston – Do you think keeping the transoms becomes one of the problems with that?

Sutherland – Elsewhere in the document it talks about window alignments, not necessarily symmetrical window alignments but getting things to work. There are spots here where you, they just don't work together. And that's on the best side. As you go around other sides – and this is one of those buildings that you tend to see from a number of different angles. Looking at the side elevation where you've got the 1960s treatment below the late-Victorian looking upstairs; it's curious at best but probably not your best work. On the back side again, the notion of buildings from different ages being layer-caked on one another just doesn't work.

Eggleston – And I think one of the features with putting in this canopy helps to break up that distinction between the two levels and helps to separate that. I guess I'm wondering if keeping these transoms if they were better bricked-up. Or would you rather see this all bevel siding instead of brick.

Kenan – Bob, I don't think you can take any one piece and say that will make it better. I completely agree with what Doug said, this just looks like one building put on top of another building. They don't go together at all. I think what you have to do; you have to treat the building as a whole. It can't just be a layer cake as Doug said.

Eggleston – Can we be in agreement that we are only talking about the building from here over – and this is what it is?

Kenan – I will accept that; I wish it weren't the case but it would be nice to undo what was done there in the 80s apparently.

Carvalho – But what you have done is taken the existing contemporary building and slapped brick on yet still have the contemporary fascia, just with brick on it.

Kenan – Bob, I think you did a great job on the Lynn application – it's a nice looking house to begin with and that helps. You continued what was there and it works. It all goes together and looks good. This just doesn't; this just falls short. I don't know what to say other than I think you need to start over with it—to make it look like it fits in Skaneateles. This really doesn't.

Eggleston – Right. And even though SHPO could question, because it's over 50 years and has historic value...

Kenan – SHPO would do what?

Eggleston – SHPO, if it is over 50 years old, they consider it to have historic value.

Kenan – I know; I am dealing with a house in Florida that is ???, in the sense that it was built before 1941. That's all that matters. But anyway, we can deal with SHPO. People may want to rent these apartments. And they may want to rent these apartments because they are in Skaneateles, and everything that Skaneateles means. God created a beautiful environment, we all live in it and man created some really nice structures in here. This goes the wrong direction; we really have got to do better than that.

Eggleston – OK.

Sutherland – Our call is how does this work in the Village? It either works as; either you completely redo it – all floors – so it looks like it was all created at one time, or there may be other approaches. If it were a more stellar example of the 1960s, it might be a stellar 1960s building that's been expanded. This one falls short of the term stellar, from the first time around, it's just not a very good looking building.

Eggleston – I think it's a whole lot better than a lot of the stuff done in the 60s. It is attempting to have that contemporary look. A little bit of it is the fascia...

Sutherland – There are some great looking 60s buildings that have had really thoughtful additions to them that are not pretending that they are 1894. This one is just an architectural orphan.

Eggleston – Sure. Then let me see if I can rework the exterior to make it more consistent, later Victorian is what you are looking at.

Sutherland – Whatever it is, it needs to be consistent and thoughtful and good. What's here now is tried to be a lot of things and in the end it is just not working.

Kenan – What do you have to do to put a building on top of this building here? You are going to build a structural floor above the roof structure that's there? What do you have to do to support it down through?

Eggleston – What we have are some significant piers. They actually have CMU piers that go all the way down through.

Kenan – this building does?

Eggleston – this building does, yes. Concrete block piers. The engineer has no problem with; basically I dashed in the piers that are throughout the building down below.

Sutherland – So you are just bearing on the existing structure.

Eggleston – You have the existing roof; technically a 50 pound snow load and a 40 pound live load are technically the same – it was built before the 50 pound. It is metal bar; we have decided to do an independent floor system and then an independent roof system as well.

Kenan – This will be wood frame?

Eggleston – Yes. This will be wood frame.

Kenan – Roof as well?

Eggleston – Yes; we can do that now with the sprinklers.

Kenan – No steel at all?

Eggleston – There will be steel beams on the new but it will be wood frame.

Sutherland – Are you leaving the existing roof and essentially just building on top of it?

Eggleston – We are building a new floor structure on top. One of the issues with residential over commercial is sound transmission. And that gives it to you.

Sutherland – For plumbing, how do you; are you running through existing spaces and ganging it?

Eggleston – We have that space that we are creating between roof and floor.

Sutherland – So you can collect there and take it down in one or two places?

Eggleston – Correct.

Sutherland -- The folks down, do they remain through construction?

Eggleston – This should be able to be, because we are not violating the roof, they should be able to stay.

Kenan – Anyone else? I'd like to talk about the site plan. I believe we need a site plan approval, even though the retail isn't new or materially changing the circumstances of the earlier site plan whenever that was done. In that regard, I am going to insist that we require that the spite fence come down that was built when the other drug store came in, and that the parking lots be combined, as was the intent at the time, and that the curb cuts be reduced. I'd like to reduce them to one, and I think we should try for that. There are far too many curb cuts along there right now.

Sutherland – And there is need for better screening and not having cars immediately adjacent to the sidewalk, as is the case now.

Galbato – Should we have the surveyor show the proposed creek walk easement on the survey map so you can see the distance from the creek itself?

Kenan – What do we need for the creek walk; 10 feet, 12 feet?

Eggleston – I think it has been 5 feet in some of the tight areas

Sutherland – 5 feet, that's just simply a path. I think you want to create a bit of a green edge.

Kenan – You need some landscaping for it to be a creek walk and not just a sidewalk on the edge of a parking lot. Whatever it is; whatever the dimension is, it ought to be from the top of the bank in so it is realistic. It can't start at the edge of the water and have a big embankment in it. I think there's plenty of paving back there so I don't think, at the end of the day, that you lose effective parking count.

Eggleston – I know that combining the parking lots is a deal-killer for Vic Ianno. He can't do that based on his lease with CVS.

Kenan – I'm sure he could talk CVS into it. They didn't insist on the spite fence, did they?

Eggleston – Actually, I think they did. I can't speak to the facts of how it came about. I will take that back.

Kenan – And as you referenced with Kinney, we didn't do very well. We got a second-floor-appearing façade. It is better than it was going to be. But Kinney didn't like the idea either and they eventually gave in. It turns out they have created some much better looking stores elsewhere.

Eggleston – Any other things we haven't touched on?

Kenan—What about rooftop equipment; is there any?

Eggleston – There will probably be some rooftop equipment – air conditioners and things like that. They will be screened; they will not be visible.

Kenan – That's important because in the Downtown D standards it is specific about not seeing the equipment.

Sutherland – Typically what you would look for there is some sort of a parapet that would conceal them. I think if you put a fence around it, it is not particularly effective.

Kenan – Better it is the parapet; I agree. Anything else?

Eggleston – I will take this back to him and see what he chooses to do.

Kenan – Good. Thank you.

This matter was concluded at 8:32 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
October 3, 2016

Consideration of further actions 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
 Mike Perrone, Member
 Doug Sutherland, Member

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

Bob Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the applicants

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

At 8:33 pm Chairman Kenan called for Gary Dower for the Mirbeau Gateway project.

Galbato – Mr. Chairman can we ask Bob when he anticipates giving us some revised drawings on Gary Dower/Mirbeau Gateway? We just put it on here as a control item.

Eggleston – With the Mirbeau project, Peter Osborne had to relocate his office a week or two ago and he was not able to give the attention necessary. We are proceeding with your suggestion of dropping the 6 houses to 5 houses; making the lots larger and providing more space between them, and looking at can we reduce the pond as a result of reducing some of the development. We are seriously looking at extending the hospitality/lodging use instead of the professional office use that we had suggested. So that eliminated that change of use and eliminated the need to rezone for a new use. So that just leaves determining the appropriate lot size for the residential units.

We are actually quite intrigued by some suggestions of images of development of three-story hospitality units that kind of cascade down that steep bank. Where you enter half a level up to the top unit and down half a level or down 1.5 levels; actually utilizing the slope. We are

developing that and are hoping to have that for you in November, so we can continue that dialogue.

Kenan – Can you look at one more thing? When you look at the existing grades coming down that hill, they are much different from what you proposed before. In other words you are cutting a big hole in up here and creating a big hole over there for the water. There must be a way to accommodate what you want to build on that land without moving as much dirt as that.

Eggleston – Actually it is that steep over there.

Kenan – I know, but the things you are doing to it are not necessary.

Eggleston – This doesn't give the complete topography. One of the things that we have for moving a lot of earth is to get this road in here.

Kenan – Right now the grades come down pretty much uniformly down in this direction – maybe not exactly here, but generally this way. You are cutting a big hole out of it and just moving a lot of dirt around. This isn't the most recent plan; a more recent plan had multiple buildings. But climbing up the hill; even this is a huge excavation over here. You've got to have it someplace, I understand that. But the water naturally cascades over here someplace; that not necessarily an optimum location for it but that's where it naturally goes. And you are diverting it to where you are diverting it to.

Eggleston – Because there was the trailer court ??? of it was flat. I think there is more steepness and flatness up here than you recall. It would not hurt to do a site visit sometime to look at it.

Kenan – In any event, you'll be back next month. In which case, is there a motion to adjourn?

Eggleston – Actually I'd like to talk about Weichert one more time.

This matter was concluded at 8:38 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
October 3, 2016

Area Variance recommendation in the matter of the modified 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 an addition and a porch at the property addressed as 7 Leitch Avenue in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
 Brian Carvalho, Member
 Mike Perrone, Member
 Doug Sutherland, Member

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

 Bob Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the applicant

Absent: Stephen Hartnett, Member

At 8:38 pm Chairman Kenan called for Cyrus Weichert for 7 Leitch Avenue.

Eggleston – We went to the Zoning Board of Appeals with the revised plan and the ZBA was listening totally to the Riordans and their loss of privacy. One of the things that the board did say is that they would be more apt to approve an addition rather than an open deck. With an open deck, if this is just a deck, then you’ve got these people hanging out looking at every move of Riordans in their back driveway. We had proposed 10 foot dark American arborvitae which tend to do a nice job of filling in screening. We do have an existing walnut tree here, which is difficult to grow things under, so the neighbors don’t think that will grow to create a screening of the back of the property here. So taking the cue from the Zoning Board that they would rather see a structure here than an open deck, affording the Riordans a little more privacy and reducing the deck. We have taken the same footprint as the 10 foot by 23 foot deck, and we have made a 4 foot by 10 foot sunroom that comes out. This will be an actual reverse gable addition giving a little more space inside to this first floor and then have a 15 by 10 foot deck that is totally screened from the Riordans by the sunroom and then having the entry porch over here. We will then put an addition underneath that’s just an extension of the rec room out here, and then the patio we are maintaining the 15 feet so we have an 8 foot wide patio that wraps around the area here to provide some ground level living space. So we have taken the exact same details; we will copy on this reverse gable so it looks just like a T extension of it; we are taking the large double-hung windows, there will be a French door transom. There will be a six foot high

privacy fence that will have no problem maintaining itself under the tree. So this is what we have proposed. The coverage is not reduced as much as it was before. This needs a variance because we are expanding a nonconforming structure; a couple of foot front yard, an 11 foot side yard and the coverage is 78.2%. We took out some excess of patio area. We are increasing it to 80.8%, still more than 2% better than what we had before. The patio an sideyard set-backs of the addition, porch and deck all comply.

Sutherland – Architecturally it is a better solution.

Eggleston – It is. We also have included a side elevation, so the Riordans will now be looking at this instead of a deck that's up in the sky. I would appreciate a recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals in that we will be taking this back again to them to try to get; to try to balance the benefit to the homeowner of owning this property against the detriment to the neighbor.

Kenan – John, have you reviewed the drawings so we know what we're...

Cromp – No, not at all.

Kenan – In concept, I think it is the right idea. I'm not sure what it is that we are recommending to the Zoning Board, unless John has had the opportunity to review the new drawing.

Eggleston – We are changing the open area, instead of a 76.2% open area it will be 80.8% open space, an improvement, where 85% is required. And it is expansion of a nonconforming structure for front yard, left side yard and percent of open area.

Kenan – So the only thing different?

Eggleston – The only thing different is the open space; we originally proposed 82%, now we are down to 80.8%.

Sutherland – How did you reduce?

Eggleston – We took out a lot of patio. On the survey it shows the patio in this entire area. The patio was right up to the property line; we have now reduced the patio back, pulled it back to meet the required 15 foot side yards. So the patio meets that requirement.

Carvalho – Why is the patio triangular?

Eggleston – To maintain the 15 foot setbacks; it follows that angle, it follows this angle. We are trying to reduce the variances as much as possible.

Kenan – If the Planning Board was of a mind, I suppose we could send a recommendation to the Zoning Board based on what you have shown us and subject to John's review not changing anything.

Galbato – The drawing does not show the patio removal. So it would be with that understanding. That would affect the open area.

Eggleston – I can note that.

Member Sutherland, “I would make a motion that we recommend ZBA approval of the revised plan that encloses much of the addition on the back, provided that (1) the revised lot coverage calculations that are shown at 80.8% are consistent with the CEO’s calculation, (2) the patio be clearly shown to be reduced consistent with this drawing with a 15 foot set-back off the side property lines, and (3) the other details of the addition be consistent with materials, colors, trim and package that are on the existing home.”
Member Carvalho seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, it was carried 4 – 0.

This matter was concluded at 8:46 pm, and on motion of Chairman Kenan, seconded by Member Carvalho, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards