

# Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting August 5, 2010

---

In the matter of the application submitted by Michael C. Domke & Michelle M. Moss to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5, Density Control Schedule, for Right side yard set-back (patio), Both side yards combined (patio), Percentage of open area (patio) and Section 225-69d, Non-conforming buildings structures and uses, extension or expansion (addition and patio) to construct an attic storage space addition on the house and a patio in the rear of the house located at 70 Fennell Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman  
Toby Millman, Member  
William Eberhardt, Member  
Douglas Sutherland, Member

Jorge Battle, Clerk to the Planning Board  
Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board

Michael Domke & Michelle Moss, Applicants  
Robert Eggleston, Architect for the Applicants

Clifford Abrams, State Street  
Dr. D. Elstein, Syracuse  
Andrew Ramsgard, E. Genesee Street

Absent: Steve Krause, Member

Chairman Kenan opened the meeting at 7:30pm announcing the application of Michael Domke and Michelle Moss for 70 Fennell Street.

Robert Eggleston, Architect for the applicants made the presentation. He said, "they recently purchased the house over on Fennell Street. They would like to make a couple of small improvements." The Chairman said, "for our orientation, where is it on the street? This is north of Austin Street?" Eggleston said, "we are right to Dr. Maurillo. Maurillo is on the corner of Austin and then it is one down from there. So it's the second one down." Member Sutherland said, "it's the Beardsley house."

Eggleston said, "Beardsley started remodeling it when they bought it. It needed to be finished – remodeled. There is an odd room where they have 2 double gables right next to each other. They've got a nasty roof situation where the water is coming against – you can see it on this side elevation. This was an addition done later, maybe by the Beardsley's. It is just a small roof. What we want to do is bring this roof up to the eave and put a hip roof on to make a better

connection. It's an attic storage and this will give them better storage in that space. So, what we are doing is s straight going up." The Chairman asked, "it's still pretty tight headroom, in that space?" Eggleston said, "yes, we are getting to about a 7 foot - it's a useful space. It will be a 7 foot sloped up to – actually about a 6 foot sloped up to 8 or 9 feet.

The second item is – there's a stair on the back that comes right down to some steps. It's very unsafe. The door swings open over the steps. What we'd like to do is put a very small 7 by 3 ½ foot landing with some stairs coming down to and then enlarge the slate patio. Right now the patio's 139 and we want to go to 224 square feet, make it about 12 by 16. So, it's just a little bit better area.

The existing house is non-conforming in that the left side yard is 13.55 feet, where 15 is required. The right side is 11.45 where 15's required. Both side yards are 25, where 35 is required. And the open space is 77.04 where 85% is required. As a result of this, the locations of this addition totally conforms. Your are just going straight up. And the stairs and deck will be 12.2. It's the same as what it is now. It's less than the existing side yard. So, we are asking for a 12.2 side yard set-back where 15 feet is required. Our open space reduces down to 75.42 percent from 77.04. I will point out that the patio and that takes into consideration 2 cars. So, there's about 5% of that is actual non-structure, or low to the ground structure that we are talking about relative to open space. Having done several of the homes in this area, 75% is not unusual for this neighborhood for open space... we will be tying in matching the sidings and the trims to tie it into the existing house."

Member Eberhardt asked about the neighbors? Eggleston asked Michael Domke, "have you started talking to your neighbors?" Domke said, "yes. John said absolutely. The Cooks have said that's fine." Eggleston said, "we have given them 'no objection letters' so they can bring then to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Member Eberhardt said, **"I will make a motion that we recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the variances as requested on the Domke/Moss application dated July 9, 2010."**

Seconded by Member Sutherland. The vote was 4-0 in favor of the motion. The meeting was closed at 7:36pm.

CC: email - ZBA, Eggleston, Galbatu