Village of Skaneateles
Zoning Board of Appeals Public Hearing
March 27, 2012

In the matter of the application submitted by Steven and Stacy McClintic to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard set-back, Left, Side yard set-back, Right and Both side yards combined; and Section 225-69D Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion to extend the stoop foundation 2 ft 10 in by 6 ft 10 in for a 63 SF entry and a 25 SF porch that enlarges the footprint by approximately 20 SF at the property addressed as 5 Teasel Lane in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Craig Phinney, Acting Chairman
Stephen Hartnett, Member
Larry Pardee, Member

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the ZBA
Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the ZBA

Robert Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant

Trustee Angelillo, Skaneateles
Matt Short, Student, Skaneateles
Ian Strods, Student, Skaneateles

Absent: Lisa Banuski, Chairman

Acting Chairman Phinney explained that with just three of the five members present at the meeting, that any approvals would require three "Yes" votes -- a unanimous decision. He then introduced himself and opened the Public Hearing at 7:31 pm announcing the application of Steven and Stacy McClintic for 5 Teasel Lane.

Robert Eggleston, Architect, representing the applicants introduced himself and presented, "The McClintics have lived in this house for a number of years, and came in several years ago to extend the deck, for which we got a Variance. We actually did encroach on the side yard set-back. The house is an existing non-conforming structure because each yard is less than 15 feet, and just 24 feet for the combined side yards. Otherwise it complies with the Zoning as far as all other dimensional requirements, including open area. What they'd like to do; their front foyer is hardly large enough to change your mind when you come in, and they'd like to expand it a couple of feet – 3 feet out. They have a very tiny mudroom/laundry room which they'd like to push into their powder room, bring the powder room out underneath into the addition, and have a smaller stoop. They currently have no front porch coverage. So within this 12 foot 11 inch by 6 foot 10 inch area, they will expand the front foyer, push the powder room out so that the laundry/mudroom moves to the powder room, and enlarge the powder room. It is totally

complying with Zoning as far as the new work; we have the required front yard set-back and open space; it will be strictly a Variance from Section 225-69D, Expansion of a non-conforming structure. We will be tying in materials the same as the house. In fact, the roof line is already set up to come straight across, so it will look as if it was there from [the beginning]. Do you have any questions?"

Member Hartnett asked "We don't have any letters from neighbors, correct?" Mr. Eggleston presented a no-objection letter for the Board's review.

Member Hartnett, addressing the students in the audience asked, "Do you guys understand what's going on? When you have some work you want to do on your house – you go pay a guy like this a lot of money, and he sets up a whole file for you. Just kidding… You go get a building permit, because this lot and this building is already non-conforming to the rules, so the building permit has to be denied right off the bat. You have to come here and get a Variance for that." Chairman Phinney added, "And they call it a pre-existing, non-conforming situation." Member Harnett continued, "So it's nothing that they are doing right now that's making this subject to review, it's the fact that it is already a non-conforming building." Mr. Eggleston said, "As most of the buildings and lots in the Village are." Chairman Phinney said, "Primarily because the Zoning laws were made after everything was built, so that the property lines were already laid out." Member Hartnett said, "The things that we are talking about are set-backs against neighbors' lots, things like that. You don't want to have your neighbor too close to you. Anything new would have to be built with that much space; these are pre-existing, so they can't make them tear them down because you changed the law; pre-existing and non-conforming to the new law." Chairman Phinney said, "And of course you have to pay each time."

Chairman Phinney continued, "I'm going to read this into the record. 'This is regarding Steven and Stacy McClintic's application. I the undersigned am aware that Steven and Stacy McClintic are proposing to extend their stoop foundation 2'10" x 6'10" for 635 SF entry and 25 SF porch to their property at 5 Teasel Lane. I am aware that this requires an area variance. I have reviewed the drawing of Robert O. Eggleston, Architect, dated February 16, 2012, and have no objection to this project.' This is signed by Rich Brown, Ward T. Vuillemot, Tom Corona and Chris & Neil Strodel, all of Teasel Lane. It is dated 2/20/12."

Chairman Phinney said, "I open this up for anyone to make positive comments, and to open the Public Hearing for anyone here who would like to speak in favor of this application?" Hearing none, he continued, "Any one in opposition?" Hearing none, the Chair asked for a motion to close the Public Hearing. Member Pardee said, "So move." Member Hartnett seconded. Upon unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion the Public Hearing was closed.

Member Pardee said, "I move that in the matter of the application submitted by Steven and Stacy McClintic to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard set-back, Left, Side yard set-back, Right and Both side yards combined; and Section 225-69D Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion to extend the stoop foundation 2 ft 10 in by 6 ft 10 in for a 63 SF entry and a 25 SF porch that enlarges the footprint by approximately 20 SF at the property addressed as 5 Teasel Lane in the Village of Skaneateles, that we approve the application noting that

this is a Type 2 action under the SEQR regulations and that it is based on two pages of drawings dated February 16th 2012. The Applicant will have 2 years to complete construction." Acting Chairman Phinney seconded the motion.

Upon unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the Chairman declared "The motion is passed."

Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board. The Chairman closed the Public Hearing at 7:41 pm.