

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Public Hearing
June 6, 2013

Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Robert & Morgan Greene to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Percentage of open area, Side yard set-back left, Side yard set-back right, Both side yards combined and Rear yard set-back; and Section 225-69D Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion; to enlarge a deck and front entry at the property addressed as 16 Lakeview Circle in the Village of Skaneateles.

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

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

Robert Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant
Robert Greene, Applicant

Mary Sennett, Village Trustee

Chairman Kenan opened this portion of the meeting at 8:32 pm. Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented, "Robert Greene is here should you have any questions of him. The property at 16 Lakeview Circle, which I am intimately familiar with, has a problem that it was built sideways on the lot. It is a traditional colonial; because the lots were small, narrow, deep – the garage faces the street, the front door faces the side lot and actually previous in-between owners had taken out some of the trees, you can actually see the front door. You are looking at it across the side. What they would like to do is try to enhance the presence of the front of the building, and the entrance, from the street, rather than the side. So what we have proposed is – there is a 4 foot very narrow not functional porch across the front of the building to the existing entrance. They would like to make the porch 8 feet wide and then put an 8 foot by 12 foot vestibule, so they can have the door now facing the street and the porch, with a reverse gable, to draw the attention to the front door. There will be; the walkway comes along they'd like to have a little patio where you can set some chairs and then progressing into the porch, and then into the vestibule that's oriented toward the street."

Mr. Eggleston continued, "The other item that they'd like to do is there's a deck on the back. Originally it was a 10x14 deck. It was increased to a longer, 26 foot or so longer, deck. Stepping down, it is awkward to get from the entrance – the sliding doors down you are kind of

falling down the stairs. So what we are proposing to do is to put back a 10 by 10 deck area directly at the sliding door level, where they can put their barbeque – and then have a transition down to a deck for table, chairs and a couple of other seats. So we have modified to make that more functional and fit the site properly. The last item that they wanted to include on the site plan was; the property drops off and this is a rather low point. So the backyard is sloped and not as useful. We just want to put a small retaining wall, VersaLock type retaining wall to bring that up 3 feet, just to make that a little more level; a little more functional in the back.”

Mr. Eggleston continued, “The existing property as many of them in Lakeview Circle, is non-conforming as to the open area, the left side yard, right side yard, both side yards and rear yard. The Variances that we are seeking would slightly decrease the open space to 75.1%. That is actually a typical percent of open area for the Lakeview Circle, where you have 9,000 SF lots. The porch will have a 19.3 which is less non-conforming set-back. The existing set-back is 17.9; it will be 19.3 to expand the 4 foot porch to an 8 foot porch. The right side yard will be 21.1, which is the same as what the existing house is and the existing porch. The garage is 15.3 so it is less non-conforming than the existing. The combined yard, of course, is 24.5 and the percent of width of the structure is 48, that’s fine that complies. So it is not untypical of developments done in the Lakeview Circle area. Basically, they will be just slightly enlarging the deck; but they will be vastly improving the front entrance. They had originally talked about extending; there’s a 6 foot fence around the back of the property – extending that to 4 foot and bringing it around the front to a little entrance gate, but they have decided not to do that. They are going to keep the fence as it is now and keep it all open. Are there any questions relative to the proposal?”

Chairman Kenan asked, “So from the variance point of view the issues are percent of open area and side & rear yard set-backs?” Mr. Eggleston, “Correct. That’s the total. And the rear yard is becoming more non-conforming, 24 feet where we were 30. And the percent open space is becoming more non-conforming. Otherwise everything else is less non-conforming than the existing.” Chairman Kenan, “I thought the side yards were...” Mr. Eggleston, “No, the side yards are non-conforming but they are less non-conforming than what’s there.” Chairman Kenan, “Are there any questions?” Member Eberhardt asked, “Mr. Greene, do the neighbors know about the new wall?” Mr. Greene, “Yes. I have talked to the two side neighbors; I am still trying to make contact with the one behind.” Chairman Kenan, “Any other questions or comments? Anyone have a motion to propose?”

Member Eberhardt said, “I will make a motion that we recommend that the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the Greene application dated 5/24/2013 as submitted.” Member Sutherland seconded the motion.

Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, Chairman Kenan declared the motion passed. It was noted that the Zoning Board would meet June 25. Mr. Eggleston thanked the Board. This matter was concluded at 8:34 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards