

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MEETING MINUTES OF
May 7, 2024**

Present:

Denise Rhoads, Chair
David Palen, Vice Chair
Kris Kiefer
David Lee
Sherill Ketchum
Scott Molnar, Attorney
Karen Barkdull, P&Z Clerk
Aimie Case, ZBA Clerk

Chair Rhoads opened the meeting at 7:00 pm.

Minutes

Previous distribution to the Board of the regular meeting minutes of April 2, 2024, was executed, and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes. At this time, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to table the acceptance of the April 2, 2024, minutes to the June 4, 2024, meeting for additional time to review.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Ketchum and seconded by Vice Chair Palen to table the acceptance of the April 2, 2024, minutes to June 4, 2024. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

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

Public Hearing

Applicant: Wayne & Susan LaFrance
2100 Lakeview Lane
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Property: 2125 lakeview Lane
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #057.-03-10.0

Present: Guy Donahoe, Donahoe Group
Wayne LaFrance, Applicant

This application is for the proposed construction of a new single-family dwelling on a vacant 0.72cre lot in the LWOD District. The applicant is requesting a variance for a watercourse setback, as a confirmed watercourse runs along the southern property line before entering Skaneateles Lake. Architect, Guy Donahoe addressed the Board, stating that the applicant was looking to develop a lot that they have owned for many years. Zoning has changed since the purchase, making the lot difficult to develop with the now required watercourse setback. Mr. Donahoe explained that the applicant was proposing to build in an east-west direction as opposed to a north-south direction to keep the development as far from the watercourse as possible. Aside from the proximity to the watercourse, the plans are otherwise conforming. Mr. Donahoe stated that when they met with the Planning Board, they were asked for stormwater mitigation to be incorporated into the plan. A revised site plan, detailing the newly added swale and bioswale was sent to the Town Engineer and distributed to the ZBA at the start of the meeting. Chair Rhoads stated that during their site visit, it was evident that the owner has maintained the watercourse in various ways including plantings, check dams, and the use of rocks. This watercourse has received more water than in previous years. The water runs under 41A, then continues north, picking up additional water from agricultural tiling and residential development. The influx of water that has been introduced to the ditch and watercourse has largely been the cause of the erosion that is evident.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked if there were any questions from the Board. Regarding the updated site plan received at the start of the meeting, Vice Chair Palen asked if the only addition was the swale and bioswale. Mr. Donahoe confirmed that this was correct, and that the swale would run between the lawn and the watercourse. Vice Chair Palen then asked what type of driveway they would be installing. Mr. Donahoe stated that it would be a grass strip driveway.

A site visit was conducted by Board Members on April 24, 2024, at 5:30 pm.

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 Kiefer and seconded by Vice Chair Palen 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.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Lee and seconded by Member Ketchum to open the public hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Chair Rhoads asked if any letters pertaining to the application were received. There were none. Chair Rhoads then asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in favor of, against or had any comments regarding the application. Several neighbors, as well as affiliates of the Skaneateles Lake Association who were in attendance either in person or via ZOOM, spoke on the application.

Kurt Werner of 2130 Lakeview Lane

Stated that his interest lies in protecting the lake, the quality of the water, and mitigating any negative effect that the proposal may cause. His family has historically been very active in preserving and protecting Skaneateles Lake. He referenced Section 145-5-4-1.4 Wetland and Watercourse Protection, noting that the entire proposed dwelling is within 100 feet of the watercourse. He believes that the hardship is self-created because the 100-foot rule was in place prior to LaFrance's purchase of the property.

Mr. Werner noted that the lot was cleared in 2022 and that a lot of earth was disturbed. Additionally, the silt fence was not attached below at all which allowed for any water and silt to run underneath. The ditch has areas of silt that have run through and straight into the pipe that feed the watercourse.

The septic drain field is mounded up. He is unsure of why but is concerned that runoff will travel directly downhill and into the watercourse.

Mr. Werner stated that he does not want to cause difficulties for Wayne- he has done a wonderful job with the house-but he believes that the lot is unbuildable under the restriction which Mr. LaFrance is seeking a variance for.

In terms of granting the variance, he asked that everyone do their due diligence and monitor implementation of silt fencing and runoff control and that the Town continually come back and inspect it, as he will do the same.

Mr. Werner credited neighbor Sharon Cross for her work on the plantings that have been put in place near the watercourse.

Vice Chair Palen asked Mr. Werner if he was speaking in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Werner replied stating that this was a difficult question. His intent is not to hurt Wayne. He is looking at the value of the lake to the entire community and does not want to see the brown plume that comes out after storms to worsen. He believes that the lot is a difficult one, but the house is marginally too big for the lot. He would at least like to see the due diligence of the ZBA and an engineer's assessment of proper drainage and runoff mitigation.

Mr. Werner asked if the bioswale was intended to drain into the watercourse.

Vice Chair Palen stated that the ZBA's role is to look at a variance for distance of the proposed dwelling to the watercourse and that a lot of the items discussed were Planning Board issues. He added that they could certainly continue discussing them though.

Jean Madigan of 2132 Lakeview Lane

Stated that she lives one lot over from the Werners. She asked that the Board take into consideration the effects this project could have on neighboring properties if not done properly. She shared an incident from 2017, during heavy rains, where runoff water from the ditch (on the west side) caused major flooding. Her basement flooded, electricity failed, and the house nearly came off its foundation. None of this was covered by insurance.

In 1936, her grandfather was the first to build on Lakeview Lane. The ditch was originally designed by an engineer to carry overland water- not collect all the excess drainage water from above that is seen today.

Mr. LaFrance agreed with Ms. Madigan's statement about the increase in water flow, adding that he has seen the main road become flooded from this excess water in the winter and that it freezes, causing cars to come sliding down sideways.

Over 25 years, the volume of water has increased dramatically, causing a substantial amount of erosion to the watercourse.

Ms. Madigan stated that rules are put in place for a reason- to protect the lake- and that we can't grant a variance every time, noting that this was nothing against Wayne. Her concern lies with the lake because its wellbeing affects all of us.

Wayne LaFrance of 2100 W Lake Road

Stated that he agrees with the concerns shared by neighbors in terms of the changes the water course has seen over the years. He has done all that he can to manipulate the site to mitigate the problems seen within the neighborhood.

He has contacted DOT, DEC, and other organizations, but no one wants to take ownership.

Mr. LaFrance noted that after large rain events, pent up water on fields travels into the tile lines instead of into the land, and natural springs below the surface. The water cycle has been interrupted. The increased water we see today is largely from the agricultural fields above.

To give an idea of how much power has accumulated behind the flow of water, large couple-ton boulders have been pushed off their foundation in large rain events.

Bob Eggleston 3441 Rickard Road

Stated that he is not affiliated with this project but has worked on other homes in the area. One of these homes is owned by the Heymsfeld's. They incorporated a swale and bioswale to improve a bad situation.

Mr. Eggleston believes that the Town should have different standards for different watercourses, noting that this is not Sucker Brook, it is seasonal and will dry up at times.

He did another project on the corner of the neighborhood where they also utilized bioswales. In this case, the owner ended up with a pond. This means the bioswale did its job of catching silt. They simply needed to have the bioswale cleaned out and it would continue functioning to serve this purpose.

Mr. Eggleston noted that Mr. LaFrance could have just let the conditions of the watercourse go. He instead tried to keep the situation under control. If the LaFrance's cannot develop this lot, they could move on to a different location, in which case, who knows what would happen to the condition and maintenance of the watercourse.

The proposed house is not huge and is, other than the watercourse setback, conforming.

The owner is willing to put money into the swale and bioswale, which will improve the current water situation.

With proper input from Codes enforcement and the Town engineer, the end product will be better than what currently exists today.

The Skaneateles Lake Association and other parties have done an awesome job of selecting concerned, sensitive areas to work on. Many of their projects have brought in engineers, created ponds, checks dams.

Frank Moses, Executive Director of Skaneateles Lake Association

Stated that he had no comment in favor or against the project. He was there to listen and to learn, as well as share thoughts and concerns.

There is an upcoming Nine Element meeting on May 21st, at 7:00pm, at The Lodge. He strongly encouraged attendance.

After hearing Mr. LaFrance speak, he wondered what could be done upstream to look at the more high-flow offline detention basins, stating that these were some of the projects they were looking towards to see if they could invest more in and were these chronic issues were.

The SLA has started a piloting program for property owners' associations that is a matching program for shared private road communities. The SLA would be happy to take things into consideration to mitigate these issues.

Adele Della Santina of 2120 Lakeview Lane (Via Zoom)

Stated that her family bought the property kiddy corner, and to the southeast about three years ago. And that they too were concerned about the ditch and watercourse and the apparent erosion. They had an engineer look at the site after the purchase.

Ms. Della Santina wanted to express to the LaFrance's that she was more than willing to help with the situation, given there is anything they can do to help catch more silt.

Guy Donahoe, Architect, of 4503 NW Townline Road

Vice Chair Palen asked is this proposal had gone to the Planning Board

Mr. Donahoe stated that it had. The design was within all maximum coverage guidelines. The Planning Board asked for a swale, and bioswale-this is not required but the Planning Board wanted to see these in the plan to help mitigate the issues discussed

Stated that he believes how the Town defines a watercourse has changed over the years. This is not a DEC class water site, which was the only type defined in the past. Due to water quality concerns, the Town has expanded its definition as to what a watercourse is.

Member Kiefer

Stated that he appreciates the job LaFrance’s have done in limiting the number of variances requested. He asked if they had taken into consideration, with Heymsfeld’s vacant lot to the north, shifting the development towards that lot and going for a side yard setback variance instead. Could this increase the distance from the watercourse?

Mr. Donahoe stated that He appreciated that thought, but they still wouldn’t be able to get the full 100 feet and they would have to request two variances.

Mr. Eggleston, who worked on the Heymsfeld project, stated thar their lot is mostly maxed out after their development.

Sought understanding on references to the date the 100-foot regulation was passed and the date of the purchase of the land. If a municipality were to render the value of a property completely negligible for a particular purpose, then there could be some sort of potential claim that could be brought about.

Counsel Molar stated that Member Kiefer had summarized this outcome well. He added that in zoning law the Town is not at liberty to create an unbuildable lot. At the time it was created, this lot was buildable. Here we are faced with a preexisting nonconforming lot. This is where the jurisdiction and authority of the ZBA comes into play to grant a variance from the strict rule of the law.

At this time Chair Rhoads asked if there were any other comments or questions. There were none.

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

Chair Rhoads asked that Counsel Molnar take the Board through the Statutory Criteria set forth in Town Code for an area variance. At this time, the Board reviewed the Five Criteria for the area variance concerning the applicable section of Town Zoning Code: Section 148-5-4-1.4 – Wetland and Watercourse Protection. Counsel Molnar stated when considering the benefit to the Applicant if the area variance is granted as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the

neighborhood or community, the Zoning Board of Appeals is charged with answering these five questions:

FACTORS CONSIDERED IN CONTEMPLATING THE AREA VARIANCE:

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

Reasons: No. The granting of the variance for the proposed construction of a single-family dwelling would not produce an undesirable change to the character of the neighborhood. The applicant and their Architect designed a home that fits well with the site. The proposed dwelling is similar in size to neighboring homes. The proposed development of this vacant lot is no different from how other properties in the neighborhood have been developed. The proposed development of this lot was designed to keep necessary variance requests to a minimum. The only variance being requested is for the watercourse setback, which is unavoidable. The proposal is to develop the property running in an east-west direction, as opposed to north-south, taking consideration of the views of neighboring properties. The applicant has owned the lot for many years and has diligently maintained the property and watercourse to aid in the prevention of erosion and water runoff. The proposed development of this lot would bring no negative change to the hydrology of the lot. Although a variance for watercourse setback is a critical one, the proposal includes the construction of a bioswale as a mitigating factor. The inclusion of the proposed bioswale is a benefit to doing this project in that it would create an overall improvement to the management of water runoff within the neighborhood.

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. This is a preexisting nonconforming lot. Due to the size of the lot and its proximity to the lake and the watercourse, a variance would be required for the construction of any structure over 600 square feet. The applicant and their Architect have shown diligence in their design to only request one variance.

3. Whether the requested variance is substantial: Yes No

Reasons: Yes. The requested variance is substantial due to the size of the proposed structure and its proximity to the watercourse. However, this has been somewhat ameliorated by the seasonal nature of the watercourse and through the proposal to include a swale along the south property line as well as a bioswale near the east property line.

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. The proposed variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood. Runoff from the lot would not be increased by the proposed construction and mitigating factors. The concerns discussed in the public hearing about building less than 100 feet from a watercourse, and the circumstances and incidents addressed were not related to whether a house has been constructed on the property or not. These issues and circumstances are tied to some of the runoff issues but could be mitigated by the proposed improvements to the lot so long as those same mitigating efforts occur throughout the construction process, so as not to create an adverse effect. The current watercourse is in good working condition. The mitigating factors the applicant has in place for the property and construction of the home include a swale along the south property line, a bioswale near the street line, and continued maintenance and stabilization of the existing watercourse. The awareness of the potential issues by the applicant, and the plans they have in place to mitigate these potential issues show their diligence in continuing to address issues, should any occur. Proper modifications must be made and built into the construction plan to ensure that runoff from the roof of the proposed new structure and any other hard surfaces such as a driveway is properly mitigated.

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

Reasons: No, by majority vote, according to the votes reflected below.

One (1) ZBA Member found that the alleged difficulty was self-created.

Four (4) ZBA Members found that the alleged difficulty was not self-created. The subdivision was created prior to current zoning. It is likely that the Town did not intend to create an unbuildable lot. Per today's Code, this lot, which has never been developed, is preexisting nonconforming and any type of improvement would require a variance. The watercourse, which is situated to the south of the proposed structure was preexisting but has unfortunately been affected over the years by Route 41A roadway drainage improvements which ultimately routed an increase in waterflow to this watercourse. The applicant and their neighbors have done all they can in maintaining the issue of increased waterflow and aiding in the prevention of further erosion along said watercourse.

QUESTION 5 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member KRIS KIEFER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member DAVE LEE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DETERMINATION OF ZBA BASED ON THE ABOVE FACTORS:

The ZBA, after taking into consideration the above five factors, upon a motion made by Vice Chair David Palen, duly seconded by Chair Denise Rhoads, 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, 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 of any project for which a variance has been obtained; and

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 May 6, 2024, with Narrative dated March 22, 2024, prepared by Guy Donahoe, Licensed Architect, be complied with in all respects; and
2. That the applicant provide a Construction Sequence showing mitigation against stormwater runoff, to be reviewed by the Board Engineer and the Planning Board, and that it be approved.

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 DAVE LEE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Initial Review

<p>Applicant: Collin & Melissa O’Toole 43 Jordan Street Skaneateles, NY 13152</p>	<p>Property: 2621 Benson Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map # 055.-01-03.3</p>
---	---

Present: Collin O’Toole, Applicant
Tom O’Toole, Representing Applicant

This application is for the proposed change of use of an existing pole barn from personal use to service business use that requires a side yard variance. Applicants, Collin and Melissa O’Toole were represented by Collin’s father, Tom O’Toole. Their design professional, Janice Miller was unaware her client was scheduled to appear before the ZBA on this date. The applicant is requesting a change of use on the property they purchased in 2022 to continue running his service business out of the existing pole barn that was built in March of 2023. Since the building permit application for the pole barn indicated personal use, a 30-foot setback was initially approved, and the building permit issued. Now that the existing structure is being used for Mr. O’Toole’s service business, a variance is needed due to zoning law requiring a 100-foot setback for nonresidential structures on mixed use lots. The gravel driveway extends behind the pole barn for the purpose of pulling trucks and trailers around back and directly into the building, eliminating the need to back trailers in. This portion of the

driveway needed to be scaled back and the mulch/soil bins moved away from the property line. The applicant will also need to go before the Planning Board for a special use permit. The O'Toole's are also in the process of building their home on the lot. The dwelling plans are entirely conforming.

The property, which is situated in the Owasco Lake watershed, was farmed for decades. The land slopes from the northwest corner towards the southwest corner. This affects the neighboring property to the south in terms of where water naturally flows off the O'Toole's lot. The southwest corner has always been swampy and was never able to be farmed or tilled. The applicant has and plans to continue with tile work and French drains to help dry this area. Additionally, with the construction of the dwelling, the applicant has plans to add a berm and a swale once the ground is dry enough to complete such work. These plans are intended to mitigate further runoff issues, improving their property, and protecting the property to the south.

The applicant stated that their property is situated directly between two other businesses, which they were aware of upon purchasing the land. The neighbor to the south, the Aster Estates Weddings and Events is a wedding venue owned by John and Heather Vasile. Tom O'Toole stated that Collin had initially planned to allow the wedding venue to utilize part of his property for parking on the weekends. The Vasile's have communicated their thoughts and concerns regarding their business with the Town. The applicant has already made other improvements to the property in anticipation of building their future home there. Approximately thirty trees have been planted. In 2022, a permit was issued for the fencing installed along the front as well as a culvert and driveway. Once construction of the home is finished, final grading of the yard and landscaping will be completed. The O'Toole's stated that the goal is to build a beautiful place.

The applicant stated that they are trying to work through the concerns that have been addressed in a civil manner and while they do not understand where there is an issue, they are looking for guidance from the Board after presenting their information. Collin expressed his confusion over why a special permit for change of use is necessary given the fact that his intentions for the pole barn were, from the start, to use it for storing business equipment. All this equipment is owned by him and not his business. Additionally, his employees only report to work at that location and return the equipment at the days end, Monday through Friday. Clerk Barkdull offered examples of similar businesses in the area who have also had to go through the approval process. Although the applicant states the barn was always intended to be used for business, the building permit application submitted in 2022 did not indicate commercial use. This is where the need for the side yard variance and special permit came into play.

Board Members will conduct a site visit on May 15, 2024, at 5:30 pm. They will be looking at the metal pole barn and its distance from the property line.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to schedule a Public Hearing for June 4, 2024, at 7:02pm.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kiefer and seconded by Member Ketchum to schedule a public hearing for June 4, 2024, at 7:02 pm. 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	Dave Lee	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]

Initial Review

Applicant:	Joe & Marcia Zappia 2629 East Lake Road Skaneateles, NY 13152	Property:	2629 East Lake Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map # 037.-01-16.0
------------	---	-----------	---

Present: Bill Murphy Jr., SPACE Architectural Studio

This application was heard as an initial review of a previously denied application that had been revised and is to be reviewed as an entirely new application. The application is for the proposed second story addition to an existing one-story garage. The roof was damaged in recent storms and the applicant wanted to take the opportunity to create additional storage space on the property at the same time as repairing the roof. Architect, Bill Murphy Jr. addressed the Board, stating that he and his client took the feedback from the Board’s previous denial and significantly changed their application. The proposed roof pitch was significantly reduced, and they maintained the existing orientation of the roof pitch with the intent of having less impact on the roadside. They incorporated a shed dormer on only the west side, facing the lake so as not to be visible from the road. The overall height of the proposed changes to the structure has been decreased since their original proposal and the pitch has been changed from 12:12 to 8:12. They also removed the originally proposed exterior staircase and entry. The new site plan shows that the applicant would be giving up some garage space to move the staircase inside the structure. Member Ketchum asked about the height change. Mr. Murphy stated that the new proposal reflects a building height that is approximately 4.5 feet less than the original. He added that they also rotated the orientation of the building to make the structure narrower from the road. In the previous application, the orientation was closer to the road, was taller, and was more visible from the road. They chose to change the proposed roof ridge back to its original and existing orientation, with an increase in pitch to gain some attic space.

Board Members agreed that there was no need for another site visit.

Counsel Molnar recommended that the Board entertain a motion to accept this revised application as one that is substantially changed, according to the law, therefore making it new and different.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to accept this revised application as one that is materially different.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Vice Chair Palen and seconded by Member Kiefer to accept this **substantially changed application as materially different**.

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

On a motion made by Chair Rhoads to schedule a public hearing for this substantially changed application for June 4, 2024, at 7:01 pm, legal notice of a public hearing was published.

Discussion

The next ZBA Meeting will be held on June 6, 2024, at 7:00 pm.

P&Z Staff Meetings will be held on the third Thursday of every month. Clerk Barkdull stated that we are looking for one or two Members from each Board to attend either in person or via Zoom. Minutes will not be taken but there will be notes. She added that we are looking for discussion topics in addition to Shoreline, and that the agenda would be sent out later in the week. Counsel Molnar stated that the Boards should feel free to communicate through him.

The next P&Z Staff meeting will be held on Thursday, May 16, 2024, at 6:30pm.

There being no further Board business, a motion was made by Vice Chair Palen and seconded by Member Kiefer to adjourn the meeting. The Zoning Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at 8:29 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimie Case
ZBA Clerk

Meeting Attendees:

Bob Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects
Bill Murphy Jr., SPACE Architectural Studio
Guy Donahoe, Donahoe Group
Frank Moses, Executive Director at SLA
Collin O'Toole
Tom O'Toole
Wayne LaFrance

Heather Vasile
John Vasile
Sharon Ross
Kurt Werner
Kitty Robinson
Jean Madigan

Meeting Attendees Via Zoom:

Councilor Sue Dove
Councilor Mark Tucker
Lisa Wilsey
Connor O'Toole
Mike Drake
Adele Della Santina