

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Hearing
November 24, 2009

On the matter of the application submitted by Christine Place for Michael & Vince Ann Wahlrab to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5, Density Control Schedule, for rear yard set-back and Section 225-69d, Non-conforming buildings structures and uses, extension or expansion to add a second floor addition in the rear and a new roof structure for the premises located at 31 Jordan Street in the village of Skaneateles.

Present: Lisa Banuski, Chairman
John Crompt, Member
Craig Phinney, Member
Lee Buttolph, Member

Jorge Batlle, Clerk to the Zoning Board of Appeals
Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Zoning Board of Appeals

Christine Place, Architect for the applicant

Clifford Abrams, State Street

Absent: Larry Pardee, Member

Chairman Banuski opened the public hearing at 7:30pm announcing the application of Michael and Vince Ann Wahlrab for 31 Jordan Street. She said, "normally we have elevation drawings. I saw your discussion with the Planning Board was that you didn't want to do a lot of elevations and charge them a lot for your time."

Christine Place, Architect for the applicants said, "until we knew that you would allow us to do the project the way that it is, or I have to change it." The Chairman said, "I have here a question. Is the addition on one side, is that correct?" Place said, "no, there's an addition (comes to table and holding up the photo page) this right here - the rear of the building, it has a one story addition. It is just a one story addition in the corner right here. They would like to live on the second floor and as part of the second floor plan, we would build this one story into 2 stories and also extend - square off this corner here only on the second floor. It would be cantilevered out with a column right here. So there would still be open on the first floor. We are not changing the ground coverage or anything."

The Chairman said, "for all intents and purposes you are for that side because it's a roof covering in there and there's drainage." Place said, "well, there is drainage down below in that it is grass." Member Crompt asked, "and that area would be this, where the second floor is?" Place said, "yes. It's really kind of a moot point whether you consider it lot coverage or not lot

coverage.” The Chairman said, “right. Coverage is not an issue.” Place continued, “I am not proposing that they extend the building out beyond any of the sides. We are not decreasing the size of the back yard.”

The Chairman asked, “do you have any drawings of what that might look like conceptually, that cantilevered area? There are floor plans.” Member Crompt said, “there is one elevation inside.” Place pointing on the drawing said, “it says *open*. That is showing the cantilever. That would be looking if you were standing on the side of the house. You would see that this is open here. Here is the second floor above it, and the column. Then way back it would be the door that’s currently in the apartment.”

Chairman Banuski asked, “is there any reason that they wouldn’t just – it doesn’t matter to me, I’m just curious – if I was going to be doing that and coverage wasn’t an issue, why not just build to the first floor also?” Place said, “they don’t have any need to do that and the lot is kind of tight right now as it is. They are working on an agreement with their neighbors where they would all share the driveway and everything.” Member Crompt said, “the driveway comes up that side so if they filled in that corner that could be a problem.” Place said, “yes. And this gives them an area where they do have some covered outdoor space if they want to Barbeque or what ever.”

The Chairman asked, “is it proposed to be...?” “...this is the existing concrete patio. That’s this thing right here that you see in the picture,” said Place. Member Phinney said, “I have actually been in the upstairs apartment. Any thought when they are doing the change to increase the height of the ceiling?” Place replied, “that’s why we are doing a new roof. And there’s, if you look at the floor plan here – the existing second floor plan right here there’s a change in height. You step up here. So, the new floor plan – when we do the roof - we are putting in a new floor structure across here – or that’s what I proposed to them. To raise it up – truss going across so it’s level with this area. Then we build a wall on top of the existing wall here to raise the roof. Even with the roof raised up it’s still going to be lower than the front roof. You are not going to see anything from the street.” The Chairman said, “actually, if it was the same height you still wouldn’t see anything from the street.” Place said, “it’s not going to be higher. This is only going to be a 4-12 pitch because there’s no reason to make it higher, where this is a 12-12 pitch right now.”

The Chairman asked, “are there going to be windows along here?” Place said, “yes.” The Chairman said, “the Planning Board had some discussion with you about siding materials.” Place said, “they have no problem using Hardie Board and I’ve already gotten samples of it for them.” The Chairman said, “that is in the Downtown D (District) and I know that vinyl is not prohibited. But it seems that being so close it would be better.” Place said, “they are fine with putting the Hardie Board on. I have to get from Jorge tonight the D section because it is not on-line. Just that one section. I have 15 and 17 but not 16. Jorge and I are going to go over it after this.”

Member Crompt asked, “is the second floor deck gone? So the roof is going to be pulled out to here or a second deck also?” Place said, “this is not changing. This is the front of the house. Nothing changing there. (multiple conversations) So, we are just trying to make this a

comfortable place. It will be about 1,100 square feet, 2 bedrooms and give them a for real place to live in. You have been in the apartment. It is not a for real place to live in right now.” Member Phinney said, “a good place to rent.” Place said, “even then, it’s a little questionable.” Member Phinney said, “toasty in the summer.” Place said, “he just brought up a good point. Part of raising the roof too was that we will be able to insulate it properly and allow it to become a legitimate living space.”

The Chairman asked, “there aren’t any drainage issues in the back yard there? And it will all be guttered, the new part?” Place said that there were no drainage issues and it will be guttered. The Chairman opened the floor to any one wishing to speak in favor of the application. No one spoke. The Chairman opened the floor to anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the application. No one spoke. The Chairman moved to closed the public hearing. Seconded by Member Phinney. The vote was 4-0 in favor of the motion.

The Chairman asked for a motion. Attorney Galbato said, “the first should be a SEQR review.” The Chairman said, “I thought that the Trustees were going to do that.” Galbato said, “usually Mr. Byrne like it to come from our Board. I would recommend that it be an unlisted action, with an uncoordinated review because the Planning Board has looked at this and you have looked at it and it is going to the Trustees for Critical Impact. Typically with Critical Impact permit application it is treated as an unlisted action, with an uncoordinated review.”

Member Crompton - Motion –The Zoning Board of Appeals for the purposes of SEQR, declares this application as an Unlisted Action and an Uncoordinated Review and also moves to approve the application submitted by Christine Place for Michael & Vince Ann Wahrab to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5, Density Control Schedule, for rear yard set-back and Section 225-69d, Non-conforming buildings structures and uses, extension or expansion to add a second floor addition in the rear and a new roof structure for the premises located at 31 Jordan Street in the village of Skaneateles. Per drawings dated 10-15-2009 with the condition that the exterior siding be Hardie Board or similar material. The Project is to be completed within 2 years.”

Seconded by Member Phinney. The vote was 4-0 in favor of the motion. The motion was declared passed. The hearing was closed at 7:42pm.