

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting September 6, 2012

In the matter of the application submitted by **Francis Moran** to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Front yard set-back, Side yard set-back, Right, Both side yards combined and Percentage of open area; and Section 225-14C (5) (a/b) Accessory Buildings, distance to lot lines or structures to construct a two story four bedroom dwelling with deck, 2 car garage and driveway at the property addressed as **62 Fennell Street** in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Bill Eberhardt, Member
Megan Keady, Member
Douglas Sutherland, Member

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Planning Board

Bob Eggleston, Architect, representing the Applicant
Francis Moran, Applicant

James Lanning, Village Trustee

Absent: Toby Millman, Member
Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board

Chairman Kenan opened this portion of the meeting at 7:58 pm announcing the application of Francis Moran for the property at 62 Fennell Street, and asked, "Has this lot ever been built upon?" Mr. Eggleston said, "Not in the last 33 years." Chairman Kenan said, "Longer than that, I can attest." Mr. Moran said, "Something was on it. I found a couple of horseshoes and things like that." Chairman Kenan, "Horseshoes but not foundations." Mr. Moran said, "No. No. There is a small slab; there's grass over it now." Chairman Kenan, "there may have been a house on it then." Member Sutherland, "Could have been a stable or something else." Mr. Moran, "It was part of the original Village, when they drew up the lots." Chairman Kenan, "It was a separate lot from the beginning?" Mr. Moran, "Yes. I've had it since '76." Mr. Eggleston, "I haven't looked at some of the old Village maps; there were dots showing houses." Member Eberhardt, "There had to have been something on it." Mr. Eggleston, "It was probably a very simple house." Member Eberhardt suggested a call to David Huxford.

Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "Mr. Moran has owned this property for quite a while, and he always had anticipated that he might move back to the Village, and is considering

that at this point. What we looked at is to try to put a Village-appropriate house on the lot. We knew that the nature of the lot being a corner lot, it is subject to a number of set-backs. Sorting through what we're required...what our standards are. We have two front yards, and have called Fennell Street our front yard since that's how it is identified in the tax rolls. We have the street averages. We took the two houses on this block and one across the street, to come up with the Fennell Street average of 21.5 feet. We chose to put the house at 26, because visually it actually aligns better with 60 Fennell Street. We have turned the house to be perpendicular to Austin Street, so it begins to kind of turn the corner. So it relates a little bit more with Austin, given the commercial nature of Fennell across the street. On Austin Street, we went up the street. We used 3 house to sort out the street average, and actually came up with 17.9 feet for the street average."

Mr Eggleston continued, "Under Section 225-70, we are allowed to take 15% of the lot depth, but a minimum of 25, or the street average. The street average was the better number for us. The adjacent house is 17.3 to the porch. For the south lot, that we are calling to side yard, we take 20% of the lot width, which is 52.9 feet, so we come up with a required 10.6 foot side yard on the south. We have the rear yard...the house has no problem with the rear. We come to the garage; we thought it was appropriate to have a detached garage, so that we could maintain some usable yard between the house and the garage. Also we thought the detached garage was a more traditional Village feature. The garage itself is allowed to have a 3 foot side yard; we have proposed 5 feet to not have to worry about having a fire rated wall. And for the rear yard we are asking for 5 feet instead of 15 feet, again to try to preserve the back yard to give us 32 feet from the deck or 44 feet from the house to the garage. We feel that this is really our only outdoor living space." Chairman Kenan asked, "So does that meet the requirement of being a distance equal to the height of the accessory building?" Mr. Eggleston replied, "The height of the accessory building is 15.6 feet and we are 32." Chairman Kenan said, "Good. OK. It's got to be greater than."

Mr. Eggleston said, "Even though this is a rear yard, because you have to have one someplace, it acts like a side yard, so having 5 feet is not out of character. In working the house, we were hoping to fit within the building area that I have shown here a little better. We stuck to a 26 foot wide house with 1300 SF on the first floor. We wanted to definitely have a first floor bedroom, just so Frank doesn't have to deal with stairs. We have put 3 bedrooms and 2 baths upstairs for a more traditional family house, which would give him the ability to live on one floor. We also felt that while we are not required to comply with the architectural standards for Parkside, we felt those were some good standards to be looking at for what defines a traditional home. So we have a 21 foot porch; we have made it 7 foot deep, so it is functional. So that is part of the intrusion into the 17 feet, plus this small little bay for the kitchen. We will be using cement board siding and composite trims. The first floor is 3 feet above grade, typical of the Parkside standards, even though we are not compelled to comply with these. We tried to maintain some of the traditional architectural features of the Village homes. So there are several Variances that are required; the percentage of open space, where 85% is required, we'll have 71.6%; the left side yard where 17.9 is required we'll be 7.9; the right side which is supposed to be 10.6 feet, is 7.9 feet. Otherwise we meet all the other criteria." [Interference on recording]

Chairman Kenan asked, "The main roof and the garage materials?" Mr. Eggleston replied, "Architectural shingle." Chairman Kenan, "You don't call out, but it seems to be designated a standing seam metal roof on the porch?" Mr. Eggleston said, "That's what we were looking at for the porch. Correct." Mr. Kenan reiterated that lot coverage is 71.6% rather than the 85% open space that is required. Mr. Eggleston said, "The larger lots in this neighborhood tend to be around 80%, the smaller lots, more like 70%. Some others are tighter than 71%." Chairman Kenan reiterated, "So the issues are lot coverage, the Austin street front yard, the south side yard and the garage rear yard." Member Eberhardt asked, "What will the buffer be between the garage and the Austin Street property?" Mr. Eggleston said, "There are actually some plantings there now, which are right on the property line, and a lot of those will be maintained. There is one tree in this back corner that we have to take down. This house is 39 feet to the property line on West Austin, and it has its garage on the further side, and this is all yard." Member Eberhardt, "And there's trees along here?" Mr. Eggleston, "Yes, there are trees there."

Chairman Kenan, "So this photograph right here seems to show a little railing up there where Bill is talking about." It was established that there is a rail fence on that line and a wire fence along the other line, with trees and shrubs along the line, as well as sidewalks on both sides.

Chairman Kenan asked, "Are there any other questions? Does anyone have a motion to propose?" The Chairman recapped the variances required. **Member Eberhardt said, "I make a motion that the ZBA approve the Variances as requested, for Mr. Moran's application shown in drawings dated 24 August 2012. Member Sutherland seconded.**

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

Messrs. Eggleston and Moran thanked the Board. Member Sutherland complimented them saying, "It's a nice plan." Mr. Eggleston noted that the Applicant is requesting that this matter be held for the October meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

This matter was concluded at 8:10 pm.