

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
MEETING MINUTES OF  
January 6, 2026**

**Present:**

Denise Rhoads, Chair  
David Palen  
Sherill Ketchum  
Kris Kiefer  
Jim Condon  
Scott Molnar, Attorney  
Karen Barkdull, Planner  
Aimie Case, ZBA Clerk

Chair Rhoads opened the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting at 7:00 pm.

Chair Rhoads stated that David Palen’s term expired at the end of the year and thanked him for sitting with the Board for an additional month on a short-term extension. She also welcomed new Board Member, Beth Estes, who was present to observe the meeting.

**Minutes**

Previous distribution to the Board of the regular meeting minutes of November 4, 2025, was executed, and all Members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Vice Chair Palen and seconded by Member Ketchum to accept the November 4, 2025, minutes as submitted. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

	<b><u>Record of Vote</u></b>	
Chair	Denise Rhoads	Present [Yes]
Vice Chair	David Palen	Present [Yes]
Member	Kris Kiefer	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present [Yes]

Chair Rhoads stated that the Board would table the acceptance of the December 2, 2025, meeting minutes to the February 3, 2026, meeting.

**Attorney Advice Session**

**WHEREFORE** a motion was made by Member Condon and seconded by Member Kiefer to enter an attorney advice session at 7:02 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in favor of said motion.

**WHEREFORE** a motion was made by Vice Chair Palen and seconded by Member Ketchum to return from attorney advice session. The Board having been polled resulted in favor of said motion.

The Board returned at 7:22 pm.

**Public Hearing Continuance**

Applicant:	Christina Ma, Esq. 7 White Plains Road Bronxville, NY 10708	Property:	2847 East Lake Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #038.-01-09.0</b>
------------	---	-----------	--

Present: Tom Trytek, PE, TDK Engineering Associates, PC

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is for proposed shoreline improvements.

Engineer, Tom Trytek was present to represent the Applicant.

Board Members conducted a site visit on November 15, 2025. The Applicant’s Design Professional was present.

At this time Chair Rhoads asked if there was anyone who would like the Public Hearing notice read. No one requested the Public Hearing notice to be read into the record.

This application was determined to be a Type II SEQR action as per section 617.5(c)(12) and not subject to SEQR review at the December 2, 2025, ZBA Meeting.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to reopen the Public Hearing.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by **Member Condon and seconded by Member Kiefer** to reopen the Public Hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

At this time, Chair Rhoads then asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in favor of, against or had any comments regarding the application.

**Robert Eggleston, PC- 1391 East Genesee Street, Skaneateles, NY 13152**  
Mr. Eggleston

With there being no further comments or questions, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to close the Public Hearing.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by **Member Ketchum and seconded by Vice Chair Palen** to close the public hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

**Record of Vote**

Chair	Denise Rhoads	Present [Yes]
Vice Chair	David Palen	Present [Yes]
Member	Kris Kiefer	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present [Yes]

**FACTORS CONSIDERED IN CONTEMPLATING THE AREA VARIANCES:**

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

Reasons: No, by unanimous vote as reflected below. The ZBA found that the requested variance would not produce an undesirable change to the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. The Applicant is addressing the safety hazard posed by the state of the existing shoreline access. The dwelling is set close to a cliff face that is gradually eroding and should the erosion continue unabated, there is potential for the structure to fall onto the lake shore. Efforts to improve the deteriorating shale cliff, and stabilization of the lower shorefront will help prevent collapse of the cliff face and be a benefit to nearby properties. There will be no increase in the size of the dwelling. ISC and TLC will be reduced and shoreline structures will be kept within the allowed 600SF. There are similar properties nearby with similar improvements to the shoreline. There will be no undesirable change by granting the variance for shoreline stabilization by itself.

**QUESTION 1 RECORD OF VOTE**

MEMBER NAME	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice Chair DAVID PALEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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: Yes  No

Reasons: No, by unanimous vote as reflected below. Board Members found that the benefit sought by the Applicant cannot be achieved without the granting of an area variance. The primary benefit being sought is the ability to safely access the shoreline. There is no way to achieve the benefit sought without securing an area variance as this is a preexisting nonconforming lot at less than 20,000SF.

**QUESTION 2 RECORD OF VOTE**

**MEMBER NAME**

**AYE NAY ABSTAIN**

Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice Chair DAVID PALEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Whether the requested variance is substantial: Yes  No

Reasons: Yes, by unanimous vote as reflected below. Board Members found that the proposed variance is substantial. The minimum lot size in the LWOD is 20,000SF, whereas this lot is 7,683SF. The existing ISC is 36.2% where 10% is allowed, and the existing TLC is 44.1% where 20% is allowed. The proposed lake yard setback is 14 feet where 100 feet is required. The property is also noncompliant in regard to the side yard setbacks and front yard setbacks. The Applicant is requesting a variance for preexisting nonconformities which are being reduced slightly or maintained. Outside of the shoreline stabilization the requested variance would be substantial.

**QUESTION 3 RECORD OF VOTE**

**MEMBER NAME**

**AYE NAY ABSTAIN**

Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice Chair DAVID PALEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district: Yes  No

Reasons: No, by a three to two (3-2) majority vote as reflected below, with ZBA Members' deliberations as follows:

Three (3) Board Members found that the requested variance would not produce an undesirable change to the neighborhood or nearby properties. The variance encompasses a design to shore up the structures on the shoreline and reinforce the cliff face to prevent erosion and imminent collapse. Failure to reinforce the cliff face may ultimately lead to the structure falling into the lake. By removing the failing deck and staircase system and the installation of a proposed shoreline wall system, as well as improving the lower shoreline, the physical and environmental conditions will be greatly improved. There will be no change to the size of the dwelling, so use should remain the same. Shoreline structures and the entire system proposed supersede any other improvements or lack thereof to the property itself. The proposal will protect the lake. For the purposes of the very specific aspects of the variance that the ZBA is being asked to look at, there will be stabilization of the structures and shoreline in a way that will improve the integrity of the physical

and environmental conditions.

Two (2) Board Members found that the requested variance would produce an undesirable change to the neighborhood or nearby properties, based on the following factors. The shoreline is eroding and currently unsafe for access to the water and the dwelling is very close to the shoreline embankment. However, there have been no plans presented at this time to improve the overall property, its septic system, or the water runoff which has been a factor in the eroding shoreline. This may have an adverse impact on the environmental conditions of the neighborhood, primarily the lake. The proposed variance, outside of shoreline stabilization, will have an adverse effect. The drawings lack rainwater mitigation so the water that runs off the steep driveway will then run over and behind the new seawall. This application was a missed opportunity to decrease ISC on the lot. The existing lot has 36.2% ISC where 10% is allowed by Code. There is more room for reduction in ISC as the driveway is 1590SF, making up over 13% of lot coverage. There was a small sunroom removed prior to this application and the concrete slab still exists. Removal of the slab could have further decreased ISC. The existing septic steel holding tank has a negative potential impact on the property and lake. The proposed shoreline stabilization project does not involve any modifications to the existing dwelling size or total number of bedrooms. Tearing down part of the structure is a modification to the existing dwelling, and adding shoreline structures to the property is more than a shoreline stabilization.

**QUESTION 4 RECORD OF VOTE**

<b>MEMBER NAME</b>	<b>AYE</b>	<b>NAY</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice Chair DAVID PALEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created: Yes  No

Reasons: Yes, by unanimous vote as reflected below. The ZBA found that the alleged difficulty was self-created.

**QUESTION 5 RECORD OF VOTE**

<b>MEMBER NAME</b>	<b>AYE</b>	<b>NAY</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice Chair DAVID PALEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**DETERMINATION OF ZBA BASED ON THE ABOVE FACTORS:**

The ZBA, after taking into consideration the above five factors and ZBA deliberation thereon, upon a motion made by Vice Chair Palen, duly seconded by Member Kiefer, and concluded by a four to one (4-1) majority vote of all Members present as recorded below, approves the variances requested, and finds as follows:

- The Benefit to the Applicant DOES NOT outweigh the Detriment to the Neighborhood or Community and therefore the variance request is denied.
- The Benefit to the Applicant DOES outweigh the Detriment to the Neighborhood or Community

**REASONS:** In review of the stated findings of the Zoning Board of Appeals, the benefit to the Applicant, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood, or community, lies in favor of the Applicant. This decision is based on all the evidence presented in the Application, the Record, ZBA Member deliberation factors as set forth herein, as well as the Board Members' inspection of the property, and is conditioned as follows:

**STANDARD CONDITIONS:**

1. That the Applicant obtain any necessary permit(s) from the Codes Enforcement Officer or otherwise commence the use within one (1) year from the filing of the variance decision. Any application for zoning/building permit(s) shall terminate and become void if the project is not completed within the eighteen (18) months from the issuance of the permit(s).
2. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from the Planning Board and any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or Application.
3. That the Applicant obtain a Certificate of Occupancy and/or Certificate of Compliance, as required, from the Codes Enforcement Officer.
4. That the Applicant notify the Codes Enforcement Officer on completion of the footing, if applicable, of any project for which a variance has been obtained; and
5. That the Applicant provide an as-built survey to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project before a certificate of occupancy /certificate of compliance is issued.

**ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS:** The ZBA finds that the following additional conditions are necessary to minimize adverse impacts upon the neighborhood or community:

1. That the Site Plan dated November 17, 2025, with revision dated December 2, 2025, prepared by Tom Trytek, Licensed Engineer, be complied with in all respects.
2. That the Applicant strictly complies with any potential terms or conditions of Planning Board approval for a Special Permit; and
3. That in addition to obtaining all necessary permits and approvals from the Planning Board, the Applicant obtains approvals from any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or Application, including the approval of the Onondaga County Department of Health, as applicable.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

<b>MEMBER NAME</b>	<b>AYE</b>	<b>NAY</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice Chair DAVID PALEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Public Hearing**

Applicants: Joyce Paddock Heidi Ragusa  
4352 Vinegar Hill Road 4360 Vinegar Hill Road  
Skaneateles, NY 13152 Skaneateles, NY 13152

Properties: Lot 1 (Paddock) Lot 2 (Ragusa)  
4352 Vinegar Hill Road 4360 Vinegar Hill Road  
Skaneateles, NY 13152 Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #023.-03-10.1 Tax Map #023.-03-10.2**

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is for Request for setback variance necessary for an existing pole barn which would become nonconforming as a result of a proposed lot line relocation.

Board Members conducted a site visit on December 13, 2025. The Applicant’s Design Professional was present.

At this time Chair Rhoads asked if there was anyone who would like the Public Hearing notice read. No one requested the Public Hearing notice to be read into the record.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by **Member Ketchum and seconded by Member Condon** to consider the proposed action as a Type II SEQR action as per section 617.5(c)(9) and not subject to SEQR review. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to open the Public Hearing.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by **Vice Chair Palen and seconded by Member Kiefer** to open the Public Hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

At this time, Chair Rhoads then asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in favor of, against or had any comments regarding the application.

With there being no comments or questions, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to close the Public Hearing.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by **Member Kiefer and seconded by Member Condon** to close the Public Hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

<b>Record of Vote</b>		
Chair	Denise Rhoads	Present [Yes]
Vice Chair	David Palen	Present [Yes]
Member	Kris Kiefer	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present [Yes]

**FACTORS CONSIDERED IN CONTEMPLATING THE AREA VARIANCES:**

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

Reasons: No, by unanimous vote as reflected below. Board Members found that the requested variance would not produce an undesirable change to the neighborhood or nearby properties. This request is for a variance to allow a lot line adjustment reflecting the pole barn on Lot 1 to be annexed to the adjoining parcel, Lot 2. Both lots are currently owned by family members. There will be no visible impact and no physical changes to the properties involved other than the relocation of the property line and possession of the barn.

**QUESTION 1 RECORD OF VOTE**

<b>MEMBER NAME</b>	<b>AYE</b>	<b>NAY</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice Chair DAVID PALEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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: Yes  No

Reasons: No, by unanimous vote as reflected below. Board Members found the benefit sought by the Applicant cannot be achieved without the granting of an area variance. Discussions

with the Applicant’s architect suggested that many attempts were made on this application to come up with a solution that would allow for the pole barn currently owned by the Lot 1 owner, to be owned by the Lot 2 owner. This proposal is the most feasible option and therefore requires a variance. Trying to accomplish a 120-foot front yard setback while maintaining 2 acres on Lot 1 could result in a much more irregular shaped lot. A lot line relocation will incorporate a greater portion of the driveway easement within Lot 2.

**QUESTION 2 RECORD OF VOTE**

<b>MEMBER NAME</b>	<b>AYE</b>	<b>NAY</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice Chair DAVID PALEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. Whether the requested variance is substantial: Yes  No

Reasons: No, by unanimous vote as reflected below. Board Members found that the proposed variance is not substantial. A front yard setback of 30 feet is being requested where 120 feet is required, which may seem substantial. However, the subject’s frontage is on a 30-foot-wide easement, not a private road. If it were on a private road, the benefit sought would be allowed by right with a 30-foot setback. Doing this another way could potentially encroach more on the utility easement as well as the Lot 1 driveway turnaround.

**QUESTION 3 RECORD OF VOTE**

<b>MEMBER NAME</b>	<b>AYE</b>	<b>NAY</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice Chair DAVID PALEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

4. Whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district: Yes  No

Reasons: No, by unanimous vote as reflected below. Board Members found that the proposed variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. Since this request is for a variance to facilitate relocation of a property line, there will be no physical change to the property and no construction or site disturbance involved. Relocating the lot line for the current proposal is the most efficient way for Lot 2 to acquire the barn that currently sits on Lot 1 without any impact on the environment or expense

of constructing a new barn. Both lots are within the required ISC.

#### QUESTION 4 RECORD OF VOTE

MEMBER NAME	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice Chair DAVID PALEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created: Yes  No

Reasons: Yes, by unanimous vote as reflected below. The ZBA found that the alleged difficulty was self-created.

#### QUESTION 5 RECORD OF VOTE

MEMBER NAME	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice Chair DAVID PALEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### DETERMINATION OF ZBA BASED ON THE ABOVE FACTORS:

The ZBA, after taking into consideration the above five factors and ZBA deliberation thereon, upon a motion made by Chair Denise Rhoads, duly seconded by Vice Chair David Palen, and upon a unanimous (5-0) affirmation of all Members present as recorded below, approves the variances requested, and finds as follows:

- The Benefit to the Applicant DOES NOT outweigh the Detriment to the Neighborhood or Community and therefore the variance request is denied.
- The Benefit to the Applicant DOES outweigh the Detriment to the Neighborhood or Community

**REASONS:** In review of the stated findings of the Zoning Board of Appeals, the benefit to the Applicant, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood, or community, lies in favor of the Applicant. This decision is based on all the evidence presented in the Application, the Record, ZBA Member deliberation factors as set forth herein, as well as the Board Members' inspection of the property, and is conditioned as follows:

**STANDARD CONDITIONS:**

1. That the Applicant obtain any necessary permit(s) from the Codes Enforcement Officer or otherwise commence the use within one (1) year from the filing of the variance decision. Any application for zoning/building permit(s) shall terminate and become void if the project is not completed within the eighteen (18) months from the issuance of the permit(s).

2. That the Applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from the Planning Board and any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or Application.

3. That the Applicant obtain a Certificate of Occupancy and/or Certificate of Compliance, as required, from the Codes Enforcement Officer.

4. That the Applicant notify the Codes Enforcement Officer on completion of the footing, if applicable, of any project for which a variance has been obtained; and

5. That the Applicant provide an as-built survey to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project before a certificate of occupancy /certificate of compliance is issued.

**ADDITIONAL CONDITIONS:** The ZBA finds that the following additional conditions are necessary to minimize adverse impacts upon the neighborhood or community:

1. That the Site Plan dated October 24, 2025, with Narrative dated November 12, 2025, prepared by Robert Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be complied with in all respects; and

2. That the Applicant obtain Planning Board approval, and comply with any conditions imposed by the Planning Board.

**RECORD OF VOTE**

<b>MEMBER NAME</b>	<b>AYE</b>	<b>NAY</b>	<b>ABSTAIN</b>
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice Chair DAVID PALEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Initial Review**

Applicant: Meghan & Owen Wing  
3819 Sadler Road  
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Property: 3819 Sadler Road  
Skaneateles, NY 13152  
**Tax Map #033.-02-04.0**

Present: Meghan Wing, Applicant  
Owen Wing, Applicant

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is

Applicants Meghan and Owen Wing were present and represented themselves.

Board Members will conduct a site visit on January 24, 2026, at 8:30 am.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to schedule a Public Hearing for February 3, 2026, at 7:02 pm.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by **Chair Rhoads and seconded by Member Condon** to schedule a Public Hearing for February 3, 2026, at 7:02 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

<b><u>Record of Vote</u></b>		
Chair	Denise Rhoads	Present [Yes]
Vice Chair	David Palen	Present [Yes]
Member	Kris Kiefer	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present [Yes]

**Initial Review**

Applicant:	Soggygrass Holdings, LLC 3205 East Lake Road Skaneateles, NY 13152	Property:	3205 East Lake Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #040.-01-15.1</b>
------------	--	-----------	--

Present: Jo Anne Gagliano, EDR, DPC  
Jill Marshall, Applicant (via Zoom)

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is

Jo Anne Gagliano of EDR, DPC was present to represent the Applicant. Jill Marshall was present via Zoom.

Board Members will conduct a site visit on January 24, 2026, immediately following their 8:30 am inspection of the Wing property.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to schedule a Public Hearing for February 3, 2026, at 7:10 pm.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by **Member Kiefer and seconded by Member Condon** to schedule a Public Hearing for February 3, 2026, at 7:10 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

<b><u>Record of Vote</u></b>		
Chair	Denise Rhoads	Present [Yes]
Vice Chair	David Palen	Present [Yes]
Member	Kris Kiefer	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present [Yes]

**Discussion**

- The next ZBA meeting will be held on February 3, 2026, at 7:00 pm.
- The next P&Z Work Session will be held in February in person and via Zoom.

There being no further Board business, a motion was made by **Member Ketchum and seconded by Vice Chair David Palen** to adjourn the meeting. The Zoning Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at 8:19 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimie Case  
ZBA Clerk

**Meeting Attendees:**

Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC  
Tom Trytek, PE, TDK Engineering Associates, PC  
Jo Anne Gagliano, EDR, DPC

Beth Estes  
Owen Wing, Applicant  
Meghan Wing, Applicant

**Meeting Attendees Via Zoom:**

Councilor Mark Tucker  
Jill Marshall, Applicant