

there was no plan that was never done that kind of carried with the property?" Shappell said, "no." Miller said, "I think only that he had drawn, the homeowner had sketched."

Member Pardee asked about the patio? He said, "in one drawing you have ?? show future patio." Shappell said, "we are going to try if there is any money left over. So, we wanted to put it in there, try to." Member Buttolph asked, "the additional parking space?" Member Pardee said, "it's there already, isn't it?" Miller said, "part of it is. (pointing on drawing) this is here and this is not." Shappell said, "the front was is." Member Buttolph asked, "what's the additional parking space going to be?" Miller said, "one car-length." Member Buttolph asked, "gravel or blacktop?" Miller said, "gravel."

Acting Chairman Phinney asks Attorney Galbato, "if you are thinking of a future patio, is that something we should be considering now if that is something that they are considering doing, all as one package? Or because of the lack of information at this point, hold off and then come in and apply at a different time? On one of their plans they have the existence of a future patio, where on the other one they do not. I'm asking if they have not noted it anywhere in the application, whether that's something that could be an add-on or they in fact would have to come back and re-apply for that patio?" Attorney Galbato asked the applicant, "do you want to amend the application to include that and if so, does the Board feel that there is enough information to go by to add that feature?" Member Buttolph asked, "if it is going to be done within 2 years also?" Shappell asked, "that's the normal time limit?" Acting Chairman Phinney said, "yes, the normal is 24 months. And you can always come back for an extension, if you find that is something that is not working out." Miller asked the applicant, "would you like to go with it now?" Shappell said, "yes." The Acting Chairman said, "it would be much better to expedite everything and if in fact that is something that you feel strongly about doing it versus having to spend more money to come back and go through the whole process one more time." Galbato said, "the Zoning Law doesn't want Boards to segment a project, so it is good to look at the overall project." Member Pardee asked, "what's the size of the patio?" Miller said, "it's 14 wide by roughly 20 deep." Acting Chairman Phinney said, "so the future patio would be roughly 14 by 20."

Member Buttolph asked for an explanation of the patio. Miller said, "we envision a stone permeable one." The Acting Chairman said, "so it will be a permeable surface of one sort or another. Would we just add that when we make a motion of some sort just reference the Site Plan dated the 18th of August." Member Buttolph asked, "the porch going around that, that's going to be above whereas the patio will be, just a wood porch going around." The Acting Chairman opened the floor to anyone wishing to speak in favor of the application. No one spoke. The floor was opened to anyone wishing to speak in opposition. No one spoke. The Chairman moved to close the hearing. Seconded by Member Pardee. The vote was 4-0 in favor of the motion.

Attorney Galbato said, "Mr. Chairman, before you make a motion whether or not you agree that the amended plan is a minor change that wouldn't warrant any additional review." The Chairman said, "this is a consensus of the Board that an amended motion would be fair. You could mention that as you propose it."

Member Pardee said, "I move that we approve the application submitted by Roben Shappell to vary the strict application of 225-A5 Density control schedule for front yard setback, right side yard setback and Section 225-69D, expansion of a non-conforming structure, and Section 225-19, Skaneateles Creek Overzone regarding to construct a addition of 20ft. by 20ft. 7 in.. single story addition, a 20ft. by 20ft. garage and a 4ft. by 10 ft. porch and a 14 foot by 20ft patio at the premises located at 40 West Elizabeth Street in the Village of Skaneateles, per drawings S1 & S2 dated 8-18-2011. This is a Type II SEQR. Project to be completed within 24 months."

Seconded by Member Buttolph. The vote was 4-0 in favor. The motion was declared passed. The meeting was closed at 7:37pm

-email to: Phinney, Banuski, Galbato