

Village of Skaneateles Planning Board Meeting November 1, 2012

In the matter of the application submitted by Virginia Bryce to vary the strict application of Section 225-69D Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion; and Section 225-14C5a Accessory buildings, distance to lot lines or structures to remove an existing garage and replace it with a one-car garage at the property addressed as 8 Orchard Road in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

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

Guy Donahoe, Architect, representing the Applicant
John Granato, Architect, Donahoe Group

Patricia Blackler, Chair, Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission
Walter Blackler, Skaneateles
Mark Waite, Skaneateles

Absent: Mark Roney, Member

Chairman Kenan opened the meeting at 7:30 pm announcing the application of Virginia Bryce for the property at 8 Orchard Road. Mr. Donahoe introduced himself and said, "Currently on the property there is a small building; a small garage. The garage that is there presently is not large enough in order for Ginny to be able to pull her car in. The building I believe is 12 feet by 18 feet, which is not long enough for her to comfortably park her car in, and the garage is also somewhat offset from the driveway making the approach reasonable, but trying to back out of a garage set at an angle is a difficult task. The garage currently, although disconnected from the house, is well within the 10 feet or the same as its height from the building. So what we propose to do is to raze that garage – tear that garage down – and to rebuild a garage in its place. A single car garage, but a larger garage – it's 16 by 28, again still a single stall, but it will allow more storage. We have repositioned the garage on the property that will allow the garage to be 11.5 feet from the existing building, which is also the same as the height through the middle of the slope making it fit the definition of being accessory building removed from the house."

Mr. Donahoe continued, "We have also positioned the garage that, despite its 16 by 28 shape, it still remains the 15 feet required from the rear yard and 3 feet from the side yard. However the lot is; the open space on the lot currently does not meet the bulk regulations. It is existing at

74.58%. Our proposal, because the zoning asks that without adequate parking space that we provide 2 parking spaces on the property, at 300 SF each. Our position is that the garage does not meet the description of a parking space so in actuality, the building of the garage actually reduces our coverage and increases our open area, so we'll actually have a positive effect, that we can store one of the required vehicles inside the building. However we still; even though we get a positive bump, we are still at 75.58% for the open area. So we are here to seek a Variance for the fact that we are still non-conforming regarding the bulk regulations for the open area. Also, although the State of New York would have the wall at that distance require a one-hour fire resistant, my understanding is that even though we have satisfied the requirements for setbacks, the neighboring building to our north, which also is a detached garage, is 6.5 feet from our proposed position. Adam had brought to our attention that may also be something that we need to seek a relief from. The Zoning suggests that the detached building, if it is 3 feet from the property line, needs to be 10 feet from another building. I would have thought that that might have been within our own property, so I'm a little confused about that."

Chairman Kenan asked, "There really isn't a site plan. I see a survey that shows the existing garage?" Mr. Donahoe, "You got all of those and not the site plan." Member Keady said, "We wanted to see how the new garage overlays here on the property." Mr. Donahoe, "I want to apologize. There is most definitely a site plan." [He provided the site plan to the Board.] Chairman Kenan, "So what I understand is that on the one hand the open area presently doesn't meet the zoning, and will not meet it after the new garage is built. But somebody's calculation is that it is improved? How can it be improved if the garage is bigger? What was the logic there?" Mr. Donahoe, "The logic is that the zoning would have that if we have no ability to park a car in the garage, somewhere on the site we have to provide for 2 parking spaces. And the zoning suggests that each parking space represents 300 SF that we have to remove from our open area." Member Keady said, "That's in or out of the garage." Mr. Donahoe, "Correct. And since this does not fit the definition of a parking space, you might say that we have 2 spaces required." Chairman Kenan, "But don't you count them..." Mr. Donahoe, "But I can move one of them inside." Member Eberhardt, "Which you cannot do now." Mr. Donahoe, "That's correct." Chairman Kenan, "OK. OK. Other than open area, the other issue is the distance between this structure and that nearest – which is 6.5 feet where the requirement is 10 feet." Mr. Donahoe, "That is correct."

Chairman Kenan asked, "Any questions? So apparently there is a Variance required for those two issues, percent open area and distance to lot line or structures. So does anyone have a motion they would like to make?" **Member Eberhardt said, "I will make a motion that we recommend to the Zoning Board of Appeals that they approve two variances, one as requested on the application for open area and additionally the distance between the new garage and existing neighboring garage. The recommendation is based on drawings dated 10/22/12." Member Keady seconded the motion.**

Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the Chairman declared the motion is passed. This matter was concluded at 7:39 pm.