

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
December 7, 2023
Skaneateles Village Hall

Area Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Jenna & Diarmid Quinlan to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Side yard setback, left; Side yard setback, right; Both side yards combined; Rear yard setback; Minimum open area; and Percentage of Structure width/lot width and Section 225-14C(5)(a) and Section 225-69D Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion; to replace an 8 by 8 foot shed with a 16 by 10 foot shed at the property addressed as 9 Academy Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Stephen Hartnett, Chairman
Connie Brace, Member
Melissa Komanecky, Member
Jeff Liccione, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
John Crompton, Code Enforcement Officer
Ian Carroll, Municipal Planning and Development Coordinator
Beth O'Sullivan, Deputy Zoning Inspector
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Jenna Quinlan, applicant

Bob Eggleston, 1391 E Genesee St
Clark Maher, 2 W Lake St
Katie Hess, 34 State St
Rene Ridgeway, 5 W Elizabeth St
Helen Ridgeway, 5 W Elizabeth St
Eileen & Michael Nelson, 40 W Genesee St
Tom Fairhurst, 20 E Elizabeth St
Sue Edinger, Thornton Grove
Bob Lotkowitz, Thornton Grove
Andy Ramsgard, 61 E Genesee St
Amy & Pat Schiek, 2876 County Line Rd
Bill Murphy, 3 Fennell St
Guy Donahoe, 4493 NW Townline Rd
Tom Billone, 20 E Genesee St

Excused: Albert Giannino, Member

At 7:20 pm, Chairman Hartnett called for the Quinlan matter for 9 Academy Street.

Attorney Galbato recapped the application to replace a storage shed with a larger unit.

Ms. Quinlan presented that the existing shed limits the amount of storage they have. The property does not have a garage.

Member Brace noted that most of the variances are for preexisting conditions. Additionally, the rear of the shed is in the same place as the existing unit and the new shed will come forward on the lot.

Ms. Quinlan stated that the existing shed is in poor condition with holes that allow animals entry.

Under Section 225-57, the Planning Board recognizes the elements of the balancing test that the ZBA will undertake, and furnishes its perspective below [Board findings in BOLD]:

In making its determination, the Zoning Board of Appeals shall take into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant. In making such determination the Board shall also consider and determine:

*[1] Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance; **No.***

*[2] Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance; **No.***

*[3] Whether the requested area variance is substantial; **No, only a shed.***

*[4] Whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district; **No.** and*

*[5] Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance. **Yas.***

Member Liccion, “I move that the Board recommends approval of the requested variances by the ZBA.” Member Komaneky seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, the motion was carried 4 – 0.

This matter was concluded at 7:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards