

Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals
June 22, 2010

In the matter of the application submitted by Mark Ramsgard to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5, Density Control Schedule, for percentage of open area, front yard set-back and Section 225-69D, Non-conforming buildings structures and uses extension or expansion to construct a 2 sty addition off the rear, trellis between the house and garage, and a front and side porch on the premises located at 22 West Elizabeth Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Lisa Banuski, Acting Chairman
Larry Pardee, Member
Craig Phinney, Member
John Cromp, Member
Lee Buttolph, Member

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

Andrew Ramsgard, Architect for the applicant

Clifford Abrams, State Street
Tim Lynn, Academy Street
Jill Goldstein, Academy Street
M/M Lantier, Academy Street

Chairman Banuski opened the meeting at 7:39pm. Andrew Ramsgard, Architect for the applicant was present. The Chairman said, “extensions like this aren’t really a problem. It looks like last year when this was brought for the year extension that all seems ok. But there’s a *For Sale* sign in front of the house.” Ramsgard said, “they’ve tried to go back and forth a couple of times. They’ve tried to sell it and they haven’t had really much of any offers. So they will do the addition and stay. It’s a 2 bedroom house right now and it’s very hard to sell a 2 bedroom house. The purpose of the addition is to get to a 3 bedroom house. If something luckily happens and somebody just walked in the door and say hey, we’ll buy the house now. Maybe they’d sell it.”

The Chairman asked, “what is their plan to start work on the exterior addition part?” Ramsgard said, “they are ready to start as soon as we possibly can. They have talked with contractors. We have the construction documents done. The extension ran out in February of this past year. So, we weren’t able to start then. The idea would be able to start as soon as possible. So, this year.”

Chairman Banuski said, “we started with the time limits – we thought for really good reasons that things would go faster.” Ramsgard said, “it is realistic to consider time limits. If

something else happens – I don't think it's unrealistic not to put another time limit on it. It's an appropriate thing to do.”

Member Phinney asked, “twelve months max?” Ramsgard said, “yes.” The Chairman said, “I would say that this would be the end of the extensions. This is the first time we've had a request for three. I'd say that this should be the last one before we have to look at it over again.” Member Pardee suggested, “should we give it to the end of summer next year, like 15 months as opposed to 12 months?”

The Chairman said, “**I will move that we grant the extension until September 1st, 2011.**” Seconded by Member Phinney. The vote was 5-0 in favor of the motion. Motion adopted.

The meeting was closed at 7:42pm.