

Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
November 3, 2011

---

In the matter of the application submitted by Ed Keller to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5, Density Control Schedule, for Right side yard set-back, Both side yards combined, Percentage of open area; and Section 225-69d, Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion to construct a 20 ft. by 10 ft. by 8 ft. carport over existing asphalt at the property addressed as 94 West Elizabeth Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

Present:        Bruce Kenan, Chairman  
                 Douglas Sutherland, Member  
                 Megan Keady, Member  
                 Toby Millman, Member

                 Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Planning Board  
                 Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board

                 Michelle Keller, on behalf of Applicant

                 Karen Armstrong, Lansing NY  
                 Lisa Riordan, E Genesee St, Skaneateles  
                 Jorge Batlle, Franklin St, Skaneateles  
                 Bev White, State St, Skaneateles  
                 Stephen White, State St, Skaneateles  
                 Robert Eggleston, Skaneateles

Absent:        William Eberhardt, Member

Chairman Kenan opened the meeting at 7:27 pm announcing the application of Ed Keller, 109 Orchard Road for the property located at 94 West Elizabeth Street.

The Chair asked "Is anyone here representing Ed?" Michelle Keller indicated that she was. The Chair asked "Do you care to explain the application or shall we go on our own?" Ms. Keller said "It is basically adding a carport to the house at 94 West Elizabeth Street."

Chairman Kenan: "94 West Elizabeth St? So this is not the Orchard Road address, OK."

Ms. Keller: "No, we live at Orchard Road, and we rent the property."

Chairman Kenan: "OK."

Ms. Keller: "We have an elderly couple living in there right now, and they would really like to have a carport to cover their car for the wintertime."

Member Keady: "You are not planning on removing it, it will just be a carport?"

Ms. Keller: "It would become a permanent one."

Member Millman: "What is the variance that's required here?"

Ms. Keller: "I'm sorry?"

Member Millman: "What is the variance that is required? Is it side yard?"

Ms. Keller: "Yeah, I know that the carport will, I believe, be only 6 ft. from the property line and so therefore we need the variance."

Attorney Galbato: "It's a percentage of open area, side yard set-back Right, and both side yards combined, as well as 225-65d9, Non-conforming Buildings Structures and Uses."

Chairman Kenan: "Can you explain the math...the percentage of open area there; it says 29 percent?"

Attorney Galbato: "I put something in one of my memos because I just assumed that was incorrect."

Chairman Kenan: "So open area is 71 percent and the variance is 14 from 85 percent."

Attorney Galbato: "Yes."

Chairman Kenan: "And it is wood-framed?"

Ms. Keller: "That is correct."

Member Millman: "How close is the neighboring home on that side?"

Ms. Keller: "I don't know measurements but there is quite a distance from the actual house on the property alongside."

Chairman Kenan: "The plans say 67 ft from the property line."

Member Millman: "OK; it is not drawn to scale."

Member Keady: "So the 67 ft. is from the carport to the house? They do not have a driveway before that?"

Ms. Keller: "No."

Member Keady: "Their driveway is on the other side too?"

Ms. Keller: "That's correct."

Member Millman: "It's important, I think, to note that the drawing is not drawn to scale, if you look at the width of the lot – the lot is 60 ft, so the house, the way it's drawn, it actually looks like the house is closer that I think it really is in reality."

Chairman Kenan: "Any other questions?"

Member Sutherland: "The carport is also, it's showing that it is 8 ft high and 20 ft wide but it looks like it's again not to scale. I think it would appear to be lower and stretch out longer than what's illustrated here."

Member Millman: "On the site plan it's showing it's 10 ft. while on the elevation it's shown as 20 ft. Is it 10ft.?"

Ms. Keller: "It's ten by twenty and 8 ft. high."

Chairman Kenan: "So this is labeled 20 but it's really ten."

Member Millman: "OK."

Member Keady: "It's ten ft. wide for the car to get by and 20 ft. deep."

Chairman Kenan: "Any questions?"

Member Sutherland: "On the front elevation – the triangle that's there – what's the material that goes into that?"

Ms. Keller: "I believe that's just wood, because it's basically a wood structure with a roof on it."

Member Sutherland: "Does it match the house?"

Ms. Keller: "We had not talked about that specifically -- I'm assuming it's just wood, I don't know if you are saying if it's going to match the house, as far as like the siding..."

Member Sutherland: "What's the material on the house itself?"

Ms Keller: "It's got shingles."

Member Sutherland: "I would think you would want to match with shingles on that piece also."

Ms. Keller: "OK, that front piece, yes. OK."

Chairman Kenan: "What would you like to do?"

Member Millman: "I think the drawings need to be cleaned up a little bit, it appears that there are some things mislabeled – the widths are, in this front elevation, shown that it's 20 Ft. wide, but I think in reality it's 10 ft. wide. I think you are actually doing yourself a disservice a little bit with this drawing because the house is shown as being 67 ft. and if that's in fact the case, the house should be over here a little bit more."

Ms. Keller: "I didn't actually do the drawings, it was done by the landscaper or the builder that's going to do it."

Member Millman: "OK, I guess it's just trying in turn going before the ZBA, I think that things like that would be helpful in proportionally just how far that other house is away from where the new construction is, so it would be helpful to see it actually drawn to scale. I think it's always helpful for us and certainly for the ZBA to see some photographs of what the existing conditions are."

Ms. Keller: "Photos of the actual house?"

Member Millman: "Yes, the current house and the neighboring house, to get a sense of the lay of the land is, so to speak, so you can kind of visualize it a little better. If I were to make a motion, I would recommend those adjustments prior to making a recommendation to or as part of our recommendation to the ZBA."

Chairman Kenan: "Is that a motion?"

Member Millman said, **"I would make a motion that we recommend that the ZBA approve this variance application for 94 West Elizabeth Street, subject to the applicant cleaning up the drawings in terms of the dimensions and so forth, and providing some photographs to the ZBA so they can visualize what's happening out there on the site."** Member Sutherland added, **"If I may supplement and tie onto your motion, showing the detailing of the materials (some simple 4X4 posts going down that seemed a little splindly) so we can get a better sense of what's proposed for there and for the cladding where you've got larger surfaces to make sure that it's a finish cladding that works with the rest of the house."**

Member Millman accepted that supplement. Chairman Kenan clarified that Member Millman was adopting Member Sutherland's amendment to the motion.

The Chairman stated, "That constitutes a motion. Is there a second?" Member Keady seconded. Upon unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the Chairman declared, "The motion is passed."

This meeting was closed at 7:38pm.