

# Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting December 2, 2010

---

In the matter of the application submitted by Marty Hubbard to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5, density Control Schedule, for left side yard set-back, both side yards combined, percentage of open area, percentage of structure width, rear yard set-back and Section 225-69d, Non-conforming buildings structures and uses, extension or expansion to add a 12ft. by 20ft. carport and connector add a 6ft. 6 inch by 11ft. 8 inch addition to the second floor and modify the existing patio on the premises located at 52 Jordan Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

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

Jorge Batlle, Clerk for the Planning Board  
Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board

Robert Eggleston, Architect for the applicants

Mark Angelillo, Village Trustee  
Mark Aberi, Clift Land  
Kate & David Hoefl, Skaneateles  
*Skaneateles Press and Skaneateles Journal* reporters.

Chairman Kenan opened the meeting at 8:44pm. Robert Eggleston, Architect for the applicant made the presentation. He said, "they recently purchased the house on the corner of Academy and Jordan. They wanted to do, now that they have been in it for about a year, wanted to do a couple of small alterations. The first is that they would like to provide a carport on the north side of the house. It would be an open structure. We would take the architectural cues from the house - simplify them a little bit for the carport. Using a masonry base with the columns and then a relatively flat roof across the top to provide a little bit of protection for the car and also a little bit better protected entrance into the side entrance.

We are also changing the side entrance. Currently it enters at grade level on a very small platform. It's very difficult to come in, open the door, go up the stairs. So, we are going to have the stairs outside under the roof so you enter in at the main level and it will also connect into the patio in the back area.

The second item that he's very concerned about is - on the east side of the house, the roof sheds directly into the Tiedemann's driveway. The house is only 1.7 feet off the property

line. So, accumulation of snow would actually fall into the neighbor's property. So, in wanting to change the roof line, we talked about reversing it or what ever. What we came up with was there was a bathroom addition put on by the Bonnivers several years ago. What they want to do is kind of bring that over, still keeping it set-back from the original house so you see the addition versus the original house. Then it will provide a 6 ½ by 12 foot area just to enlarge a closet and put the laundry upstairs. And, reduce the amount of roof that is shedding onto the Tiedemann's – providing a lower pitch Italianate style roof up here and be able to better control the snow and water drainage to the Tiedemann's property.

Member Sutherland asked, "which way does the extra go right now?" Eggleston said, "right now the roof – it's a long pitched roof. It just dumps it to the east., What we are proposing is taking this hip roof and bringing that out and over. So, instead of having a steeper roof, this will be a flatter roof like the Italianate roof, with gutters on it to help control the drainage so it's not all coming on to the Tiedemann's. Just leaving the small set-back so keeping it consistent with the addition that was done before and just squaring it off."

Member Eberhardt asked, "is this the elevation of it here?" Eggleston said yes – and explains to Member Eberhardt using the drawing. "We are taking this addition and just extending to farther over. It will tie in with the addition of the same." Chairman Kenan asked, "how does raising the roof control the water flow?" Eggleston said, "what it is right now there's a steeper roof that just lets this all build up. So, right now this will be able to pick up and control this at the upper eave. So drainage and what-ever will bring it down and instead of having a big landslide, it breaks it up before it comes onto the smaller roof and down."

Eggleston continues, "this is a non-conforming structure that has 56.1% open space. It has a left side yard dimension of 13 feet where 15 is required. The right side yard dimension is 13.7 where 20 is required. And 26.7 on both side yards. It has a lot of non-conforming elements to it. The only thing we are altering is the carport will actually change this to a 1.1 foot set-back off from that side yard. The open space actually is not reduced that much because we are going from cars to a car port. So, it's just an exchange of ..." "... you are going from pavement to the carport, is that what you are saying?" asked the Chairman.

One of the things he's been very careful and he's been working with the Tiedemanns on, is he felt the car port was a good solution. They have a kitchen window that looks across this area toward Jordan (Street). So this will be keeping it a very low pitched roof, Tiedemanns will still have the ability to look under the car port toward Jordan and they still get that glimpse that they currently have."

Member Sutherland asked, "do you have any correspondence from the neighbors?" Eggleston said, "yes. He's had correspondence with them. He's talked to them about it. He was actually going to go visit and show them the detailed plans now and have them prepare a 'no objection' letter for the Zoning Board of Appeals." Member Millman asked, "both neighbors he's talked to?" Eggleston said, "yes, both the elderly lady and the Tiedemanns over here, yes." Member Millman asked, "Dorand, 54 Jordan, she hasn't expressed any objections." Eggleston said, "no, she's delighted in anything he does over there." Member Millman said, "I know this isn't our prevue – you are OK on Fire Code separation from the property line?" Eggleston said,

“yes. What e have to use is a cement board products within 3 feet of the property line on that corner. So we are able to resolve that from a Building Code issue.”

Chairman Kenan asked, “so the fence that we see in the photographs, that will remain, around the patio, in the rear?” Eggleston said, “yes. There will actually still be a fence that remains between the patio and the car port.”

The Chairman asked for a motion. Member Millman asked, “is it possible in the motion to add to incorporate in there that the applicant that the applicant get written concurrence or support from the neighbors?” The Chairman said, “you can recommend it.” Member Millman said, “I think in this case it’s really important. This house is so wedged in. I would want to make sure that the neighbors are fully understanding it.” Eggleston said, “I’ve got prior history of doing projects on this property. I do know because it is tight , it’s very sensitive. So, Marty’s very aware of it, that’s why he’s kept the neighbors addressed on what’s going on...obviously that why the Zoning Board of Appeals process that has the public hearing. Your prevue is to see how it fits in with the general character of the Zoning Law. Obviously it’s the ZBA to bring it to the public. You could obviously recommend anything that you like. It was my position with Marty that that was a necessary component

**Member Millman said, “I move that we recommend that the ZBA approve the variances as requested in the application for 52 Jordan Street, and recommend that the applicant present written letters of support from the two neighbors on wither side of the property.”**

Seconded by Member Eberhardt. The vote was 4-0 in favor of the mortion. The meeting was closed at 8:52pm.

*email to: Eggleston Hubbard, Galbato, ZBA*