

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MEETING MINUTES OF
June 4, 2024**

Present:

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

Chair Rhoads opened the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting at 7:00 pm.
Member Kiefer was not present.

Minutes

Previous distribution to the Board of the regular meeting minutes of April 2, 2024, and May 7, 2024, 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 April 2, 2024, 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	David Palen	Present [Yes]
Member	Kris Kiefer	Absent [X]
Member	Dave Lee	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]

At this time, Chair Rhoads tabled the acceptance of the May 7, 2024, minutes to the July 2, 2024, meeting for additional time to review.

Public Hearing

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: Katie Sincebaugh, SPACE Architectural Studios

This application is for a proposed second story addition to an existing one-story garage. The applicant is requesting a variance for floorspace and front building height.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked if the applicant was present. Katie Sincebaugh of SPACE Architectural Studios was present to represent the applicant. Ms. Sincebaugh stated that there had been no changes to the application since the last meeting and offered to review the proposal with the Board. Chair Rhoads noted that the existing garage which the applicant was proposing to modify, had suffered extensive roof damage due to fallen trees during recent storms, and that the applicants were requesting to rebuild that with a second story to be used primarily as storage.

A site visit was conducted by Board Members on March 15, 2024, at the time that Zappia’s original, and entirely different application was being reviewed.

At this time, Counsel Molnar informed the Board that while preparing the minutes from the May meeting, it came to light that a motion had been made to bring this matter to public hearing. However, this was not followed by a second or a vote on said motion to publish the public hearing, as required.

Counsel Molnar then recommended, to cure the jurisdictional defect, that the Board entertain a motion nunc pro tunc, to authorize the publication of the public hearing notice and bring the matter to public hearing that day.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Ketchum and seconded by Member Lee to authorize the publication of the public hearing notice and bring the matter to public hearing at that time, June 4, 2024, at 7:01 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	David Palen	Present [Yes]
Member	Kris Kiefer	Absent [X]
Member	Dave Lee	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]

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 Vice Chair Palen and seconded by Member Lee 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 Ketchum and seconded by Member Lee 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. No comments were made.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Lee and seconded by Vice Chair Palen 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 148-8-9-A.1.g.i.b – Nonconforming Floorspace, and Section 148-8-4-B - Nonconforming Height. 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 VARIANCES:

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 requested, as amended, will not produce an undesirable change to the neighborhood. The project calls for the addition of a second floor to an existing garage, with no change to the footprint of the structure. Building floorspace will increase by 405.3 square feet. Access to the second floor will be from an internal stairway, not visible from the road. Due to the slope of the land, the proposed additional height of the garage should not impose any changes in lake views from neighboring homes. The current condition of the garage structure is in need of repair, so the granting of the variance, and repair of the structure would improve the aesthetics of the property and neighborhood. In looking at neighboring properties with similar structures, the proposed changes will not be significantly different from other properties in the neighborhood. The modified plan reorients the structure so that the roof pitch faces the east which is more appealing and less invasive looking.

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 nonconforming lot within 1000 feet of the Lakeline, which also encroaches into the required front yard setback. Consequently, any additional floorspace or change in height would require a variance.

3. Whether the requested variance is substantial: Yes No

Reasons: No. The proposed construction is on top of an existing garage with no change in building footprint. Impermeable surface coverage would remain the same. Building floorspace will increase by 405.3 square feet, a 1.07% increase in actual floorspace.

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 ZBA found that the proposed variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood. There will be no increase in building footprint, impermeable surface coverage, or lot coverage. There will also be no change or impact to drainage, vegetation, or the overall environment. No plumbing will be added to the structure that might impact the septic system. Any additional runoff from the roof may need to be addressed. Removal of the exterior side staircase and landing/deck will have less of an impact.

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

Reasons: Yes, based upon the foregoing listed factors.

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 (4-0) 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 April 17, 2024, and Narrative dated February 26, 2024, accompanying the April 17, 2024, Site Plan, prepared by Bill Murphy Jr., of SPACE Architectural Studios, Licensed Architect, be complied with in all respects; and
2. That verification of conformance of completed project be certified by Bill Murphy Jr., of SPACE Architectural Studios, Licensed Architect, within (60) days of completion of the project with verification submitted to the Town, in lieu of the Applicant providing an as built survey of the completed project.

MEMBER NAME	RECORD OF VOTE		
	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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> (Absent)
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"/>

Public Hearing

Applicant: Collin & Melissa O'Toole
43 Jordan Street
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Property: 2621 Benson Road
Skaneateles, NY 13152
Tax Map #055.-01-03.3

Present: Collin O'Toole & Melissa Severance O'Toole, Applicants
Tom O'Toole, Represented Applicants
Janice Miller, Architect

This application is for the proposed change of use of an existing pole barn from personal use to service business use, and a required side yard setback variance. Applicants, Collin & Melissa O'Toole were in attendance, as was their architect, Janice Miller. Collin's father, Tom O'Toole, was present and represented the applicants.

Chair Rhoads stated for the record that in 2023, the applicant had applied for and received a building permit to construct a storage barn for residential use. The barn was constructed 50.1 feet from the south property line which complied with residential use which requires 30 feet. The applicant, however, intends to use the barn for a landscaping business which is commercial use. A commercial use property requires a 100-foot side yard setback. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a variance of 49.9 feet for side yard setback. The applicant is in the process of constructing a single-family home on the lot which his family will occupy. Chair Rhoads noted that as discussed during the Board Members' site visit, a site plan and application to the Planning Board for a Special Use Permit is required.

Chair Rhoads then asked the applicant if an application had been submitted to the Planning Board. Clerk Barkdull stated that the application was almost complete.

Tom O'Toole stated that they were waiting for the new proposed site plan with topography to complete their application to the Planning Board. Currently, they only have topography on the site plan with existing structures.

Tom O'Toole stated that when their original site plan for the pole barn was submitted in the Fall of 2022, there was never any intention of residential use as Collin always intended to store business equipment and materials in the structure. He expressed their uncertainty over how or where there was a misunderstanding regarding use of the property and pole barn and that when the building permit was issued, they built 50 feet from the south side yard where they were told 30 feet was required. They were unaware of any need for a 100-foot setback which is the reason they are seeking a special permit and side yard variance.

Chair Rhoads asked Clerk Barkdull about the timing of the Planning Board application in respect to which month's agenda it would fall on. Clerk Barkdull stated that for any Planning Board application to be accepted, it must be complete. She suspected that a submission would be made that week. Clerk Barkdull added that the deadline for Planning Board submissions for the June meeting had passed but she was still willing to add their application to the June agenda.

At this time, Chair Rhoads stated that under the circumstance of the pending application to the Planning Board, the ZBA was going to open the public hearing since it had been advertised. They would then carry the public hearing over to the next month. At that time, the Planning Board would have the application before them and the ZBA could proceed with moving forward.

A site visit was conducted by Board Members on May 15, 2024. The applicant 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 Lee 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 Vice Chair Palen 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 asked if there was anyone who would like to speak in favor of, against or had any questions regarding the application.

Bob Eggleston - 1391 E Genesee Street, Skaneateles

Stated that he is an architect and was hired by Vasile's to review and respond to the O'Toole application from a technical variance standpoint. He submitted a letter to the ZBA on May 9, 2024, which he summarized.

Stated that, regarding the O'Toole property, a five-acre lot of this nature is an appropriate mixed-use property. The Vasile's also have a mixed-use property with a business and residence on it. Their predecessors established the business and went through the special permit process ahead of time and agreed to restrictions to make it compatible.

Thinks a nice aspect of the Skaneateles Zoning Law is that it allows for a mixed-use concept. Adding that he himself has a mixed-use property. Mixed use of the O'Toole property makes a lot of sense, but it is disappointing that O'Toole's situation got to this point before being called out on his planning and decision making. The entire situation could have been simplified had the applicant been more up front with the Codes Office, as they could have been better directed. He added that he understands how complicated zoning law can be when unfamiliar with it, but the barn could have been built at 100 feet, and they would not need to be before the ZBA.

Mr. Eggleston concluded by stating that the issue is not the building itself and the fact that it is 50 feet off the property line instead of 100 feet. The issue instead lies in the use of the property and making the use appropriate for a mixed-use lot. Not having gone through the special permit process created a disadvantage because there were no appropriate guidelines. He added that even if it were a home occupation business as opposed to service or commercial, site plan review would still be required since the structure was more than 1,000 square feet.

Mr. Eggleston stated that as part of his letter, he came up with nine recommendations that would or should be imposed by the Planning Board and could be imposed by the ZBA as reasonable conditions for use of the property.

1. Staggered double row of evergreen spruce trees along south property line, 6 feet tall at planting (In that trees were removed up to and over the south property line). Mr. O'Toole stated they would be adding more plantings at the May 7th meeting.
2. Bio-swales be placed to control runoff from house and barn/parking area, per the Town's Small Scale Stormwater Management Guidelines. Both commercial and residential applications would be required to do so.
3. Commercial activities on site occur only between 7:00 am and 5:00 pm, Monday-Friday. Noted that he appreciates that Mr. O'Toole stated this for the record at the May 7th meeting. It is very reasonable, and he would like to see that codified into the approval.
4. That the driveway extends no further south than the south edge of the barn entry doors on its east and west side and extend no farther east and west than required turning radius for vehicles stored in the barn.
5. Outside parking of vehicles, equipment, or location of mulch bins be on the north side of the barn, 100 feet from the south property line.
6. No exterior lights located on the south side of barn and only dark sky compliant exterior lights be located on the other sides of the house and barn.
7. No excessive noise from commercial or recreational vehicles, or dogs barking on days of scheduled events or evening or night hours for the occupants of the Vasile's house.
8. No open fires or burning Wednesday through Sunday, no burning of debris from jobsites.
9. Bushes at the SE corner of the property be removed for safe sight line from 2595 Benson Road's exiting driveway and allow for reasonable view of the 'Aster Sign' from the road.

Collin O'Toole confirmed that the bushes had been removed from the SE corner. He stated that his neighbor had vandalized and taken down the bushes.

Vice Chair Palen asked Mr. Eggleston if Mr. O'Toole had access to his letter.

Tom O'Toole stated they were not in receipt of the letter.

Mr. Eggleston stated that he and his clients were in favor of granting the variance so that the O'Toole's are allowed to use the property for commercial use, in that there would be appropriate guidelines established with approval.

Chair Rhoads thanked Mr. Eggleston for his comments and for representing both sides, as he knows the Code well. Many of the comments were relative to the Planning Board which they would review upon receipt of the O'Toole's application. The ZBA would then have access to the Planning Board's comments as well as the comments of the Town Engineer and Town Planner on the application.

Tom O’Toole - 4259 Wiggins Road, Owasco

Stated that he respects all questions that have been asked but none of those questions had been addressed to him. Again, noting that he respects the concerns and that they are being addressed by himself and his son Collin.

The mulch bunks had been moved and were added to the new site plan. The greenspace will also be added to the site plan. A privacy fence is planned for the south property line to hide implements in rear parking area, which is being reduced in size on the site plan as well.

Stated that they are trying to comply, be good neighbors, and follow ordinances and guidance from the ZBA and Planning Board.

Stated that when they purchased the land, they had 24 hours to make a sealed bid at auction. He had called Clerk Barkdull and the Codes office to see about the possibilities with the property. Mr. O’Toole added that building the barn was always about the business and he doesn’t understand how it ended up being perceived as residential use. The original site plans even showed mulch bins. Now they are trying to do the right things to correct the issue.

Heather Vasile - 2679 Benson Road, Skaneateles

Stated that O’Toole’s property is beautiful and great but if you lived next door, you might think differently.

Collin O’Toole stated that no one lives next door, on said property.

Stated that she and her husband have always been in favor and support of Collin’s business. They are all frustrated that the situation got as far as it did. She noted that all they have done is ask questions such as “what is allowed?”.

Stated that like the O’Toole’s, she too is from the neighborhood. She grew up there. The situation has been frustrating, but she wants to get along and be able to work together because that’s what a neighborhood should be about.

John Vasile - 2679 Benson Road, Skaneateles

Stated that the issue is not how close the barn is to their property line. The issue is more so the excessive driveway and mulch pits which are all you can see across the property line. If the structure were 100 feet off the property line, there would not be an issue. Everything needs to go 100 feet away.

Stated that his daughter graduates in a year and the property could be where she lives.

Chair Rhoads asked if Mr. Vasile was saying that he wanted the barn moved or if they wanted to see screening as Mr. Eggleston suggested.

Heather Vasile, wife of John Vasile, clarified that the barn can stay. However, the O'Toole's took the woods down on and across their property line which made so they wanted to see some screening established. They would like to see screening like what Mr. Eggleston suggested.

Tom O'Toole stated that the south end of the property, between the barn and property line is already in the process of being altered. The gravel has been removed and topsoil will be spread to allow for 50 feet of grass which was requested by the ZBA.

Chair Rhoads confirmed that at the site visit, Board Members and the applicant discussed how that space should be an open green area, whether it be grass or trees and that the mulch bins be moved.

Lisa Eldred - 2737 Benson Road, Skaneateles

Stated that she has lived on Benson Road for 40 years. Mrs. Eldred asked the Board if this type of situation (regarding special permit and mixed-use properties) is something that was going to be enforced even with established businesses. She added that there are businesses up and down Benson Road and wanted to know if this would be enforced for all going forward.

Counsel Molnar stated that a service business, under the code, requires a special permit to operate. There are other home occupations that do not require a special permit, the use is as of right, so the circumstances vary by parcel and by type of service business or occupation. Additionally, the Code Enforcement Office would receive a complaint and the complaint would be followed up on, and then a determination would be made if a service business is operating in a residential neighborhood. Without a special permit, there would be action required by the Code Enforcement Office. A special permit would be required, an application would be required, and it would have to come before the Board.

Mrs. Eldred asked if a complaint would be required to initiate an investigation.

Counsel Molnar stated that generally speaking, yes. The same thing is true on the lake. If there is a problem one way or another, the complaint will generate a review and an investigation by the Code Enforcement Office.

Mrs. Eldred stated that she lives about 4/10 mile away from the O'Toole property, which she thinks is well manicured, the white fence is beautiful, and everything is kept pristine. She is in favor of the proposal.

Dirk Young (Twin Birch Dairy) - 1001 Lacy Road, Skaneateles

Stated that he is the owner of Twin Birch Dairy and farms neighboring land. He noted that he likes the tree removal that the O'Toole's have done.

Mr. Young stated that O'Toole's are a good young couple trying to get a start. Though they might have "screwed up" a bit. He added that he does not fully understand the scenario between O'Toole's and Vasile's as the two sides have vastly different stories and viewpoints of the conflicts. He is however, in support of the O'Toole's application.

Chair Rhoads asked Mr. Young if his property was the one that backs up to the rear of O'Toole's.

Mr. Young replied to Chair Rhoads, confirming that is his property.

Sharon Ross - 399 Glenbrook Drive, Auburn

Stated that she is the mother/mother-in-law of Heather & John Vasile and that she also grew up in that neighborhood.

Ms. Ross addressed Tom O'Toole saying that she can relate with him in how much they care about their kids and want them to succeed.

Ms. Ross stated that what her daughter, Heather, has mentioned has been negative, noting that she used to be a schoolteacher and the situation sounds like something she would have dealt with regarding the behavior of an errant student. She hopes that it will stop. She stated that she is unsure if the ZBA can handle something of this nature.

Chair Rhoads stated that she sympathizes with the situation, but the ZBA can only look at the variance.

Tom O'Toole addressed Ms. Ross, stating that he would be happy to take a call or answer any questions. He agrees there has been some "silliness" in behavior, but a lot of that has been reactionary. The DEC, Sheriffs, Codes Enforcement, and police keep showing up to the property and shrugging their shoulders. He thinks if they work together as neighbors in a friendly, professional manner, there should not be an issue.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked if there was anyone who had not spoken yet that had questions or comments regarding the application, noting that the public hearing would be carried over to the July 2, 2024, meeting, allowing another opportunity to speak on the application. There were no additional speakers.

At this time, Counsel Molnar recommended that the Board adjourn the public hearing and reopen it the following month.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Ketchum and seconded by Vice Chair Palen to continue the public hearing on July 2, 2024, at 7:20 p.m. 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	Absent [X]
Member	Dave Lee	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]

Initial Review

Applicant:	Wilson & Elizabeth Patton 1225 Hencoop Road Skaneateles, NY 13152	Property:	1225 Hencoop Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map #055.-03-14.4
------------	---	-----------	--

Present: Wilson & Elizabeth Patton, Applicants

This proposal is to replace a 112 square foot shed with a 576 square foot shed, in the existing location. The applicant is requesting a variance for residential side yard setback as the proposed shed is larger than 200 square feet, with a proposed location which lies 5-10 feet from the property line where 30 feet is required.

Applicants, Wilson & Elizabeth Patton were present and represented themselves. The Patton's stated that their lot is heavily wooded, making relocation of the shed a challenge. After looking at all possible locations on their property, they ultimately prefer the existing location as it would prevent the excessive clearing of trees. The existing location would still require minimal tree removal, but Mr. Patton explained that aside from a few small saplings, the only other clearing of trees would be dead elms which were already needing to be removed. Other possible locations on the property would require the applicant to remove mature, healthy sugar maples and other existing plants. Mr. Patton stated that they would like to avoid this option as the lot being heavily wooded is something that they enjoy about the property. The proposed shed would be used for storage of items such as garden tools and bicycles.

Chair Rhoads asked the applicant about the property to their west, noting the structure near the property line shown in the aerial image. Mr. Patton stated that the property is owned by James Nocek and that the structure, which was a shed, no longer exists.

Member Ketchum asked what else lies to the west of their property line. The applicant explained that Mr. Nocek’s land continues further west, also running behind their lot, ending up at 41A. The 100+ acre lot is heavily wooded until you reach Anyela’s Vineyard on 41A, which is owned by Mr. Nocek.

Member Lee requested that the applicant provide drawings of the proposed shed to get a building permit. The proposed shed is a prebuilt wooden double-wide structure which would be delivered in two sections and fitted together. Mr. & Mrs. Patton had a copy of the plans in hand. Clerk Barkdull made copies for the file and all Board Members.

Board Members will conduct a site visit on June 12, 2024, at 6:45 pm.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to schedule a Public Hearing for July 2, 2024, at 7:02 pm.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Ketchum and seconded by Vice Chair Palen to schedule a public hearing for July 2, 2024, at 7:02 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	David Palen	Present [Yes]
Member	Kris Kiefer	Absent [X]
Member	Dave Lee	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]

Initial Review

Applicant:	Richard & Marie Garlock 81 Alexander Street Princeton, NJ 08450	Property:	1777 Russells Landing Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map #063.-03-05.0
------------	---	-----------	--

Present: Bob Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC

This application is for proposed renovations to a dwelling and detached garage on an existing nonconforming lot in the RF LWOD district. The applicant is requesting an area variance for redevelopment of a 17,590 square foot lot where 20,000 square feet is required. Bob Eggleston of Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC represented the applicant.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the Garlock’s recently purchased the property, which is in severe disrepair. They would like to make improvements to the house and detached garage. The proposed improvements will be no more nonconforming than what is existing. The existing shed, which is nonconforming in that it sits less than 1 foot off the property line, will be removed, reducing the ISC

by 1.7%. In remodeling the house, the applicant is proposing to construct a small addition for a new front entrance. The addition will be the same size as the shed which the applicant has proposed to remove from the property. The applicant would also like to clean up the existing decks to make them more useful.

The existing detached garage has a loft with low headroom. A dormer will be added to one side of the garage to improve this lack of headroom. Mr. Eggleston stated that while the property is currently nonconforming with side yard setback, building footprint, and living space, there would be no increase to any of that- This application came before the ZBA only because they would be redeveloping a lot that is less than the required 20,000 square feet.

Member Lee asked Mr. Eggleston what the garage was currently being used for. Mr. Eggleston stated that the space is used only as a garage in its current state. The applicant plans to turn the lofted area into additional living space. It will not be a full apartment, but a place for the Garlock's three adult sons to stay when they are visiting from out of town.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked the Board if there were any other questions for Mr. Eggleston. There were none.

Board Members will conduct a site visit on June 12, 2024, at 7:00 pm.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to schedule a Public Hearing for July 2, 2024, at 7:10 pm.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Lee and seconded by Member Ketchum to schedule a public hearing for July 2, 2024, 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	David Palen	Present [Yes]
Member	Kris Kiefer	Absent [X]
Member	Dave Lee	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]

Discussion

The next ZBA Meeting will be held on July 2, 2024, at 7:00 pm.

There will be a joint Village & Town meeting about the Parks Project on Thursday, June 20, 2024, at 7:00 pm.

The next P&Z Staff meeting has been moved to Thursday, June 27, 2024, at 6:30pm.

There being no further Board business, a motion was made by Member Lee and seconded by Vice Chair Palen to adjourn the meeting. The Zoning Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimie Case
ZBA Clerk

Meeting Attendees:

Katie Sincebaugh, SPACE Architectural Studio	Kayla Evans
Janice Miller, Architect	Todd Evans
Collin O'Toole	Steve Brown
Melissa Severance O'Toole	Bob Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer
Tom O'Toole	Architects
Connor O'Toole	Heather Vasile
Jack Severance	John Vasile
Dirk Young, Twin Birch Dairy	Shari Ross
John Karlik	John Yuvro
Kira Karlik	Elizabeth Patton
Lisa Eldred	Wilson Patton

Meeting Attendees Via Zoom:

Councilor Mark Tucker
Don Kasper
Mike/Krissy Drake