

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
April 11, 2013

In the matter of the application submitted by Dave & Jill Miller to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Percentage of open area, and Section 225-69D, Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion to remove an aluminum & glass sunroom and deck, replacing it with a permanent sunroom over block foundation, and to reinstall portions of the original sunroom on the lower deck at the property addressed as 3 Sachem Drive in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Bruce Kenan, Chairman
Mark Roney, Member
Carol Stokes-Cawley, Member
Douglas Sutherland, Member

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

Dave Miller, Applicant

Absent: William Eberhardt, Member

Chairman Kenan opened the meeting at 7:30 pm. He began by introducing Carol Stokes-Cawley as “a new member of the Planning Board who comes with a great resume. She is replacing Megan Keady who served this Board quite well for a couple of years.” He then continued, announcing the application of Dave & Jill Miller for the property at 3 Sachem Drive. Mr. Miller introduced himself and stated that he was prepared to answer any questions from the Board. Chairman Kenan said, “If we understand it correctly, you are going to remove a sunroom of aluminum and glass and replace it with a wood framed sunroom.” Mr. Miller said, “Correct. The aluminum and glass room is older and the seal between the panes has failed and it doesn’t look very good. So the motive is repair, because it has deteriorated. As long as I’m taking it down, I’d like to put a conventional stick-built room rather than another aluminum and glass room.”

Member Roney asked, “Are you removing the sunroom and another deck?” Mr. Miller said, “About 20 years ago I put a deck across the back of the house. The section behind the family room – I had an 18 foot by 8 foot sunroom that I had in South Carolina. When I moved up here, I reinstalled it on this deck. So the deck that goes behind the house is nominally 10 foot wide, but in the area where I was putting the sunroom I pulled it back to 8 foot because that was the dimension of the aluminum truss. So now when I take that aluminum and glass room down, I want to put in a regular foundation and I’d like to make it 10 foot wide, so it is the same as the deck itself. The protrusion will leave 80 foot between the deck and the back line of the

property.” Chairman Kenan said, “So the variance effectively is because the lot coverage is increasing by that 2 feet?” Mr. Miller said, “2 feet by 20 foot, so 40 SF. I also understand that the whole subdivision we are non-conforming back to 1987, so if you make any change in something that’s non-conforming, you have to come here anyways.”

Chairman Kenan said, “The form that is filled out indicates that the rear yard before the change is 87 feet, and will become 86 feet – but the site plan shows 82 feet.”

Mr. Miller indicated, “These numbers here are right; this number should have been changed. It should be 82.” Chairman Kenan said, “And because it’s an angle...” Mr. Miller, “Because it’s an angle and these are converging, it becomes a little close.” Chairman Kenan, “So it becomes 82 and 81?” Mr. Miller said, “82 and 81. This number here is correct.” Chairman Kenan said, “This Board is advisory to the Zoning Board, so before this goes to the Zoning Board, you should correct those numbers and put the 81 foot dimension on the ‘after’ site plan.” Mr. Miller said, “For some reason my copy got corrected.” Chairmman Kenan said, “And other than that; though it is minor, it is an expansion of a non-conforming use, therefore it requires a variance from the Zoning Board.” Mr. Miller said, “It is .2% reduction in open area.”

Member Sutherland asked, “What is the exterior material?” Mr. Miller said, “It will be the siding just like the house. The foundation will be the same and the siding shingles will be the same.” Chairman Kenan said, “So it is a reduction of open area as well as expansion of a non-conforming structure. Any other questions from the Board?” Hearing none, he asked, “Does anybody have a motion to propose?”

Member Roney said, “I move that we recommend to the Zoning Board that it approve the two variances requested, for open area and non-conforming structure expansion, with the corrected numbers.” Member Sutherland seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, Chairman Kenan declared, “The motion is passed.” Mr. Miller thanked the Board.

This matter was concluded at 7:38 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards