

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MEETING MINUTES OF
March 3, 2026**

Present:

Denise Rhoads, Chair
Sherill Ketchum
Kris Kiefer
Jim Condon (*Via Zoom*)
Beth Estes (*Absent*)
Scott Molnar, Attorney
Karen Barkdull, Planner
Aimie Case, ZBA Clerk

Chair Rhoads opened the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting at 7:03 pm. Member Jim Condon was present via Zoom and would be listening in but not participating. Member Beth Estes was absent.

Minutes

Previous distribution to the Board of the regular meeting minutes of January 6, 2026, was executed, and all Members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Ketchum and seconded by Member Kiefer to accept the January 6, 2025, minutes as submitted. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

<u>Record of Vote</u>		
Chair	Denise Rhoads	Present [Yes]
Vice Chair	Kris Kiefer	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present [x] <i>Zoom/Abstain</i>
Member	Beth Estes	Present [No] <i>Absent</i>

Chair Rhoads stated that the Board would table the acceptance of the February 3, 2026, meeting minutes to the April 7, 2026, meeting.

Public Hearing Continuance

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

Present: Jo Anne Gagliano, EDR, DPC
Phil Ricklefs, Contractor, Ricklefs Contracting & Barge Service

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is a request for variances related to shoreline improvements, including the expansion/partial replacement of an existing boathouse. A variance is requested for a boathouse foundation exceeding the allowed 500SF. The Board received revised plans the previous week.

Jo Anne Gagliano of EDR, DPC was present with the Applicant's contractor, Phil Ricklefs.

Ms. Gagliano went over the revisions in the new set of drawings recently submitted. The changes were made after discussions with both the ZBA and the Planning Board. They were able to eliminate the offshore structures variance request for the dock as well as reducing the variance request for the boathouse. The length and width of the boathouse were made smaller, taking the foundation square footage from 704SF to 640SF.

At the last meeting, the Board requested some examples of the rail system, which was really driving the size of the building. Ms. Gagliano provided a cut sheet with the calculations indicating that just the carriage alone, and up to the markers on the sides of the boat is 11'4" and the opening was reduced to 12 feet, which is the narrowest they can do. Photos of what a rail system looks like were submitted along with the requested cut sheet. The architectural aspects did not change, other than the building was made a bit smaller. The aesthetics would remain the same.

The new cutsheet provided more detailed insight into the proposed dimensions of the boathouse and show the boat and motor for the rail system and inside the boathouse. Ms. Gagliano noted that since the motor cannot be placed in the water, it must remain on the deck area as proposed. They were able to lessen the interior deck area down to a 3-foot walk in front of the motor. Since the boat rests at an angle on the rail system, decking on both sides is important for loading. These side sections will be 4 feet wide, which should give a bit more room to maneuver the corners and hang select items on the wall.

Chair Rhoads thanked Ms. Gagliano, adding that the submitted pictures and illustrations were very helpful.

Ms. Gagliano stated that the Applicant's contractor, Phil Ricklefs was in attendance should anyone have questions regarding the equipment itself.

Board Members conducted a site visit on January 24, 2026. The Applicants were present.

Chair Rhoads stated that the Public Hering for this Application was opened at the previous month's meeting, at which time it was determined to be a Type II SEQR.

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.

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

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kiefer and seconded by Member Ketchum 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.

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 Ketchum to close the Public Hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

<u>Record of Vote</u>		
Chair	Denise Rhoads	Present [Yes]
Vice Chair	Kris Kiefer	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present [x] Zoom/Abstain
Member	Beth Estes	Present [No] Absent

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. A boathouse already exists at this location, and it will be replaced with a similar structure, which will complement the existing house. A temporary seasonal dock will be replaced with a permanent dock of sufficient length to accommodate shallow water conditions and safe day use. The new boathouse will eliminate a temporary covered boat hoist, which was used in previous years. The elimination of the covered boat hoist will improve neighboring views. The proposed boathouse will be consistent with the location and height of the existing boathouse and will not further impede existing views of neighboring properties. The property in question has 280.6 lineal feet of Lake frontage which will easily accommodate the size of the proposed boathouse. The requested variance of 140SF for the boathouse foundation is not inconsistent with what is seen in the character of the neighborhood and would not be a detriment to nearby properties. The Applicant has worked to eliminate one of the variances originally requested, which is appreciated.

QUESTION 1 RECORD OF VOTE

MEMBER NAME	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Via Zoom)
Member BETH ESTES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> (Absent)

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 existing boathouse is not sufficient to meet the needs of the modern-day boat or on-water experience. Given the shallow depth in this particular area of the Lake, the use of a rail system is necessary. The size of the boathouse has been reduced from what was originally proposed but is still sufficient enough to accommodate the rail system and the motorized equipment required to power it while allowing space for walk-around capability and storage. Indoor storage of Lake related gear will help keep the lake shore cleaner. The manner of construction proposed is such that it should avoid needing repairs due to potential future ice flows, providing stability and longevity.

QUESTION 2 RECORD OF VOTE

MEMBER NAME	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Via Zoom)
Member BETH ESTES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> (Absent)

3. Whether the requested variance is substantial: Yes No

Reasons: Yes, by a two to one (2-1) majority vote as reflected below, with ZBA Members' deliberations as follows:

Two (2) Board Members found that the proposed variance is substantial. The Applicant has worked to eliminate one of the variances requested and reduced the size of the boathouse, but it is still 140SF, over 20% more than what the code allows, which is substantial. There will be a 28% increase to the allowable boathouse size and a 40% increase to the existing structure. The concern of setting a precedent by granting this variance is assuaged by the consideration that the property in question has 280.6 lineal feet of shoreline which will easily accommodate the size of the proposed boathouse.

One (1) Board Member found that the proposed variance is not substantial. 140SF over the allowable 500SF for the boathouse is not a substantial request. The revised plans that the Applicant and their Professional presented eliminated one of the previously requested variances and reduced the size of the boathouse from the initial proposal. This is a larger home site of approximately 5 acres, with 280.6 lineal feet of shoreline.

QUESTION 3 RECORD OF VOTE

MEMBER NAME	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Via Zoom)
Member BETH ESTES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> (Absent)

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 requested variance would not produce an undesirable change to the neighborhood or nearby properties. During construction of the boathouse and dock, turbidity curtains will be placed to control sediment and protect water quality. Piles will be driven into the lakebed to provide structure support with the least amount of disturbance to the lakebed. The Applicant eliminated one of the variances requested, leaving only an excess of 140SF above what is allowed for onshore structures which will not have an adverse effect on the physical or environmental conditions. Although construction will require driving piles into the lakebed, which will be somewhat detrimental to the Lake, after the initial construction, once completed, this project will prevent the need for installing and removing a large temporary boat hoist and dock each year. This project will also provide a place for storing waterfront items and eliminate yard storage of a temporary hoist and dock throughout the offseason.

QUESTION 4 RECORD OF VOTE

MEMBER NAME	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Via Zoom)
Member BETH ESTES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> (Absent)

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"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Via Zoom)
Member BETH ESTES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> (Absent)

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 Member Kris Kiefer, and upon a unanimous (3-0) 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 February 24, 2026, with Narrative dated February 26, 2026, prepared by Jo Anne Gagliano, Licensed Architect, be complied with in all respects.

RECORD OF VOTE

MEMBER NAME	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Via Zoom)
Member BETH ESTES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> (Absent)

Public Hearing

<p>Applicant: Jane Walsh c/o Skaneateles Country Club 3339 West Lake Street Skaneateles, NY 13152</p>	<p>Property: 3339 West Lake Street Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map #049.-01-04.1</p>
---	---

Present: Zach Maslyn, General Manager/COO, SCC

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is a proposed lot line adjustment between Jane Walsh and the Skaneateles Country Club (SCC). A variance is requested for nonconforming road frontage on the Walsh lot. The minimum road frontage for a Town road is 200 feet whereas the proposed lot line adjustment will decrease the existing nonconforming lot frontage from 170 feet to 117.3 feet.

Zach Maslyn, General Manager/COO, SCC was present to represent the Applicant, Ms. Walsh, and the Skaneateles Country Club.

Mr. Maslyn stated that they are seeking a lot line adjustment, or what they are calling a land swap with the property owner, Ms. Walsh. The main reason for this is the transition that their (SCC) members make from the second hole inside of the property, then across the street to the third hole, and back across from the thirteenth hole to the fourteenth hole. The two SCC properties do not align which essentially causes a 45-degree angle which carts and pedestrians must traverse across the road. There are no options to the east of the Country Club drive to amend this safety issue. Additionally, the neighbor to the east has several large trees along the curve of the drive which reduce driver visibility while exiting.

The Skaneateles Country Club and Ms. Walsh are proposing a land swap which will transfer 1470SF from the eastern corner of the Walsh property to the Country Club which will allow them to alter their cart path to eliminate the need to cross the road at a 45-degree angle. That 1470SF will be returned

to the north side of the Walsh property, near the midway point. Once the cart path is altered to line up with the drive, the existing path which is the cause for safety concern, will be eliminated.

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 Kiefer to consider the proposed action as a Type II SEQR action as per section 617.5(c)(12) 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 Member Kiefer and seconded by Member Ketchum 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.

Scott Winkelman- 3415 Kane Ave, Skaneateles, NY 13152

Mr. Winkelman stated that he is a neighbor of the Country Club and is in favor of the proposal. Anytime neighbors can get together to improve stormwater, drainage, or safety is a positive thing.

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 Kiefer and seconded by Member Ketchum 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	Kris Kiefer	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present [x] <i>Zoom/Abstain</i>
Member	Beth Estes	Present [No] <i>Absent</i>

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

One (1) Board Member found that the proposed variance is substantial because although the variance will allow for only a 52.73-foot reduction to the road frontage on the Walsh property, which is existing nonconforming at 170 feet, it will become 82.73 feet shy of the required 200 feet. However, the safety of the golfers and staff traversing the roadway to access the western portion of the course outweighs this.

QUESTION 3 RECORD OF VOTE

MEMBER NAME	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Via Zoom)
Member BETH ESTES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> (Absent)

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. The granting of the area variance will actually improve the physical conditions of the neighborhood by better directing cart traffic from one part of the golf course to the other.

QUESTION 4 RECORD OF VOTE

MEMBER NAME	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Via Zoom)
Member BETH ESTES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> (Absent)

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

Reasons: Yes, by a two to one (2-1) majority vote as reflected below, with ZBA Members' deliberations as follows:

Two (2) ZBA found that the alleged difficulty was self-created.

One (1) ZBA found that the alleged difficulty was not self-created given the issues that the Applicant is trying to address and the safety benefits being sought, driven by some additional considerations of which are affecting the solution that the Applicant has identified.

QUESTION 5 RECORD OF VOTE

MEMBER NAME	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Via Zoom)
Member BETH ESTES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> (Absent)

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 Member Sherill Ketchum, and upon a unanimous (3-0) 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 Lot Line Relocation Plan dated September 19, 2025, prepared by Paul J. Olszewski, PLS, PLLC, with Area Variance Criteria Addendum submitted January 14, 2026, prepared by the Applicant’s representative, Zach Maslyn, General Manager/COO, Skaneateles Country Club be complied with in all respects.

RECORD OF VOTE

MEMBER NAME	AYE	NAY	ABSTAIN
Chair DENISE RHOADS	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Via Zoom)
Member BETH ESTES	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> (Absent)

Public Hearing

<p>Applicant: Mark V. Byrne 681 Old Seneca Tpke Skaneateles, NY 13152</p>	<p>Property: 3814 Fennell Street Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map #045.-03-22.0</p>
---	---

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is a proposed six-unit multi family dwelling in the HC District.

Design Professional, Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC was present to represent the Applicant.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the property currently has a single-family dwelling on it and the owner is proposing a six-unit townhouse project, which falls under multi family. There are a number of zoning criteria, of which most of them the Planning Board has the discretion to ultimately determine the appropriate density of the project. Before they get into any serious planning of the grading and stormwater management, there is one issue with the current code to which they need to find a solution.

The current code is under consideration for revision and states that they must have open space as part of the application. The green area shown on the drawings is the proposed open space and the yellow is the primary structure. The proposed drawings show a 30-foot setback from the primary structure to the open space on the same lot. If the open space is on the same lot as the primary

structure, a 100-foot setback is required. If the open space is on a separate lot from the primary structure, only a 30-foot setback is required.

Before subdividing the lot to create a flag lot, which would make the proposed 30-foot setback allowable, the Applicant chose to be proactive and request a variance from the ZBA so the site could remain a single lot. Although this section of the code is being considered for revision, the Applicant didn't want to wait as zoning amendments could take months.

Once they get into developing the site plan with grading and drainage, the specific criteria of the project will fall under the discretion of the Planning Board. They may ultimately reduce the plan to fewer units. Right now, they are focused on whether or not they need to do a subdivision before moving forward with site development.

The project will not be high density regarding ISC. They are allowed 50% ISC whereas they are proposing 20% ISC.

Mr. Eggleston noted that he and the Applicant initially had a workshop meeting with the Planning Board Chairman and the Town Planner during which their options were discussed. He believes their idea was favorably received. The proposal was also taken to the Planning Board informally at the previous month's meeting, which Mr. Eggleston characterized as reasonably favorably received with very minor comments.

Chair Rhoads stated that she understands the process they are going by and the reasons for it but has some concern over granting a variance without knowing the final proposed project in regard to an increase in the number of units or some other similar aspect. Although these are Planning Board issues, Chair Rhoads emphasized that the ZBA still takes some of these factors into consideration in their decision.

Mr. Eggleston informed the Board that they had received Health Department approval for the septic system. This was something they did not plan on proceeding without as it is important criteria. He is confident they can accomplish the engineering of the grading and stormwater management as they move forward after hearing the ZBA's decision. The Applicant is working with Plumlee Engineers. He added that the open space portion of the site would be preserved as a treed area as it is today.

Mr. Eggleston and the Applicant see being able to do this project as an asset to the community while providing alternate housing which is an important goal of the Comprehensive Plan. The Governor has even said more reasonable housing is needed. This would be reasonable market rate housing at a couple thousand dollars a month for a large two-bedroom apartment with a one-car garage. This cannot be found elsewhere in Skaneateles.

Member Ketchum questioned whether market rate today could be considered reasonable.

Mr. Eggleston clarified that these would not be \$5000 a month luxury apartments which are currently available in the Village.

Counsel Molnar requested to make a few points regarding some of the comments made. Concerning the ZBA's interest to know that this application will be brought before the Planning Board so that they're not approving a variance in a vacuum without an application pending, it was his recommendation to the Board that it make its deliberation and the conclusion conditional on an Application being presented to the Planning Board within a period of time; and that, furthermore, the application presented, if the Board is concerned about the number of units, size, and the overall density of the development, it was his recommendation that the Board consider a condition which

states that the variance is only approved for no greater than 6 units, as presented on the preliminary plan, such that if it changes over time it's going to change and become less than 6 units, not greater.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the Applicant would be open to those kinds of conditions. He is hoping to do it in two months but out of abundant caution, he noted a duration of six months would be a reasonable condition to accept to make a formal Application to the Planning Board.

Chair Rhoads stated that Member Condon was present via Zoom as a listening member but was unable to participate that evening. She recalled that he had informed her that he had further questions about the application before he would feel comfortable moving forward.

At this time, Chair Rhoads stated that she would like to open the Public Hearing, and depending on public comment, would like to carry the Public Hearing over to the following month's meeting.

Counsel Molnar agreed with Chair Rhoads' decision, adding that having a full Board available to deliberate on this application was very important.

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.

Counsel Molnar noted that although his recommendation to the ZBA is to consider this a Type II SEQR, his recommendation to the Planning Board would be to consider this an unlisted action and review it according to the short-form environmental supplied by the Applicant. This is because when the Planning Board is reviewing the design, and with engineering consultation available for the septic, the grading, all of the other plans when submitted, would be more intense and would be deserving of environmental review under SEQR as an unlisted action.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Ketchum and seconded by Member Kiefer to consider the proposed action as a Type II SEQR action as per section 617.5(c)(12) 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 Member Kiefer and seconded by Member Ketchum 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.

Marie Maher- 3808 Fennell Street, Skaneateles, NY 13152

Ms. Maher stated that being that she is a neighbor to this plan, she has concerns about the finer tuned details, as there's so much complexity to everything that's going to be under the earth right next to her window. She stated that she cannot fathom what difference the variance versus the subdivision would make. Without knowing more about the whole situation, she is opposed to the proposal moving forward until more details are made clear.

Melissa Zell- 1265 Oak Bluff, Skaneateles, NY 13152

Ms. Zell stated that she was present for another Application but questioned whether she had an accurate understanding of the two options regarding the open space

Design Professional, Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC was present to represent the Applicant. Applicant, David Marks was present via Zoom and his wife, Kristin Marks, was present in person.

Mr. Eggleston stated that this property, which has two small camps on it and the shared Oak Bluff driveway, was transitioning into the third generation of family ownership. There are a couple of existing decks and patios as well as existing shoreline structures.

The existing lakefront onshore structures are nonconforming at 612SF, whereas 400SF are allowed by current zoning laws. The lake frontage is just shy of 100 feet so only 400SF of shoreline structures are allowed as opposed to 600SF if they had just a few more feet of frontage.

There is a concrete area by the Lake and a seawall that is in reasonably good shape. There is also a small shed. The existing stairs to the Lake are situated at the north side of the property and are noncompliant in that they do not meet the required side yard setback at 15.3 feet where 20 feet is required. The stairs are very dangerous, being only 2 feet wide in places and they slope with the steps.

The Applicant would like to replace these stairs with a code-compliant set of stairs that meet the required setback. They would also like to construct a deck with a fence at the top of the stairs in that the family has small children and would like an area where they can sit and enjoy the Lake without the children having direct access to the water. The family intends to keep this as a seasonal cottage at this point.

The lakefront structures will increase from 612SF to 785SF. The existing impermeable coverage is 19.5% where 10% is allowed but roughly 4% of that is due to a portion of Oak Bluff Road traversing across the property, which the owners have no control of.

The existing total coverage is nonconforming at 22.3% where 20% is allowed and would increase to 23%.

The concrete area near the seawall could be removed to further reduce these nonconformities but it is questionable how advantageous this would be given the disturbance near the Lake that would require and the question of what to replace it with while avoiding washout. The concrete is currently providing protection for the area from wave action and washout.

Board Members will conduct a site visit on March 11, 2026, at 5:30 pm.

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

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

<u>Record of Vote</u>		
Chair	Denise Rhoads	Present [Yes]
Vice Chair	Kris Kiefer	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present [Yes] <i>Zoom/Abstain</i>
Member	Beth Estes	Present [No] <i>Absent</i>

Discussion

- The next ZBA meeting will be held on April 7, 2026, at 7:00 pm.
- Clerk Case stated that the March 20, 2026, P&Z Work Session indicated on the Agenda was an error and that scheduling for the next session was still in the works.
- The June ZBA meeting was rescheduled from June 2, 2026, to June 9, 2026, at 7:00 pm.

There being no further Board business, a motion was made by Member Kiefer and seconded by Member Ketchum to adjourn the meeting. The Zoning Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at 8:07 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimie Case
ZBA Clerk

Meeting Attendees:

Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC
Jo Anne Gagliano, EDR, DPC
Phil Ricklefs
Jon Ricklefs
Zach Maslyn, SCC
Kristin Marks, Applicant

Margaret Ryan
Ken Osmun
Michael Fogel
Scott Winkelman
Melissa Zell

Meeting Attendees Via Zoom:

Councilor Mark Tucker
Jim Condon, ZBA Member
David Marks, Applicant