

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
MEETING MINUTES OF  
November 4, 2025**

**Present:**

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

Chair Rhoads opened the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting at 7:01 pm.

**Minutes**

Previous distribution to the Board of the regular meeting minutes of September 9, 2025, was executed, and all Members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Vice Chair Palen and seconded by Member Condon to accept the September 9, 2025, minutes as submitted. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

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

Previous distribution to the Board of the regular meeting minutes of October 7, 2025, was executed, and all Members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Vice Chair Palen and seconded by Member Condon to accept the October 7, 2025, minutes as submitted. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

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

## **Public Hearing**

Applicant: Beth Endres/Skaneateles Dogs      Property: 1170 Heifer Road  
2132 Terrace Lane      Skaneateles, NY 13152  
Skaneateles, NY 13152      **Tax Map #061.-03-01.0**

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is for a proposed 8-foot-high fence for a dog care facility yard.

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

Mr. Eggleston stated that the Applicant has Planning Board approval for a Special Permit to create a facility for a dog daycare with overnight accommodations and an accessory apartment in the main structure. When there are overnight dog guests, a staff member will stay onsite in the apartment. The dog care facility is associated with Skaneateles Dogs, which has a brick-and-mortar location for grooming on West Genesee Street.

The Applicant is requesting approval for an 8-foot-high fence for the containment of dogs in the exercise yard of the new facility. The maximum allowed fence height is 6 feet, but some dogs are able to scale a fence of that height. The fence will be set back 25 feet.

Board Members conducted a site visit on October 25, 2025. The Applicant's Design Professional was present.

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

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

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

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Vice Chair Palen and seconded by Member Condon 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.

### **Dirk Young- 1001 Lacy Road, Skaneateles, NY 13152**

Mr. Young wondered what the Applicant plans to do about the water coming down off of the hill. He noticed that the excavation company covered up the 6-inch tile and, with the recent rain water started to boil up in that location.

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

Mr. Eggleston replied that the site will have two (2) bioswales for roof drain water with a mild swale along the property line to direct water into the road ditches on Heifer Road and Route

38A. The tile Mr. Young was referring to cuts across the northeast corner of the lot and should feed into the swale and be directed towards the street.

**Dirk Young- 1001 Lacy Road, Skaneateles, NY 13152**

Mr. Young replied that the swale is not deep enough to intersect the tile.

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

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

**Record of Vote**

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

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

1. Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance:

Yes ☐ No ☒

Reasons: No, by unanimous vote as reflected below. The ZBA found that the requested variance would not produce an undesirable change to the neighborhood or nearby properties. The property is a corner lot in a rural area, is surrounded by farm fields, and has no immediate neighbors. The facility is well designed with a barn aesthetic and fits well into the setting. A six (6) foot high fence is what the Code allows, and this request is for an eight (8) foot high fence which will not obscure or hinder any views. The property has been improved with two bioswales to manage stormwater runoff.

**QUESTION 1 RECORD OF VOTE**

**MEMBER NAME**

**AYE NAY ABSTAIN**

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

2. Whether the benefit sought by the Applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance: Yes ☐ No ☒

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

Code specifically references a maximum allowable fence height of six (6) feet, the intended use of the space as an exercise yard for a dog care facility deems the requested fence height of eight (8) feet as appropriate. Eight (8) foot high fencing is necessary for containing dogs to the yard as some dogs would be able to scale a six (6) foot high barrier. The additional two (2) feet in fence height ensures the safety of dogs as well as the community at large.

### QUESTION 2 RECORD OF VOTE

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

3. Whether the requested variance is substantial: Yes ☐ No ☒

Reasons: No, by unanimous vote as reflected below. Board Members found that the requested variance is not substantial. Fences, six (6) feet in height or less are allowed by Code and the two (2) extra feet being requested is not substantial given the use and rural setting of the property. An eight (8) foot high fence in a different location may be substantial in nature, but given the rural setting of this particular property, the request is not substantial.

### QUESTION 3 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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

Reasons: No, by unanimous vote as reflected below. Board Members found that the proposed variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. The property is in a rural location and is distant from neighboring homes. No heavy equipment or excavation will be required to install the fence. The property has already been improved with two (2) bioswales, a new septic, and a well. The ISC is conforming at 10%. The total lot coverage is 10.4%, which is well below the allowed 20%.

#### QUESTION 4 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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

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

#### QUESTION 5 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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

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

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

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

#### STANDARD CONDITIONS:

1. That the Applicant obtain any necessary permit(s) from the Codes Enforcement Officer or otherwise commence the use within one (1) year from the filing of the variance decision. Any

application for zoning/building permit(s) shall terminate and become void if the project is not completed within the eighteen (18) months from the issuance of the permit(s).

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

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

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

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

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

1. That the Site Plan dated September 16, 2025, with Narrative dated September 22, 2025, prepared by Robert Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be complied with in all respects; and
2. That the Applicant strictly complies with the Planning Board's approving Resolution dated May 21, 2024, granting a Special Permit.

#### 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"/> (Via Zoom)
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### **Public Hearing**

Applicant: The Colony Properties  
c/o Jess Hafner  
7690 Mountain Ash  
Liverpool, NY 13091

Properties:	Paul & Kathleen Leone 2559 East Lake Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #037.-01-27.1</b>	Paul & Kathleen Leone 2579 East Lake Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #037.-01-28.1</b>	Rusdee Paws, LLC 2583 East Lake Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #037.-01-25.1</b>
	Daivd & Beth Conley 2591 East Lake Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #037.-01-24.0</b>	Smalls Cottage, LLC 2599 East Lake Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #037.-01-23.1</b>	Daniel Fisher & Lori Rhulman 2605 East Lake Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #037.-01-22.1</b>

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is a proposal to unify shoreline fences amongst six (6) properties. The Applicants are requesting a setback variance for each of the six (6) lots.

Design Professional, Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC represented the Applicant.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the proposal was for six (6) properties within “The Colony”, owned by five (5) entities. The neighborhood traditionally has had an open backyard area where the owners were limited in dividing it up. Historically, the neighborhood was more communal in nature, consisting of larger summer homes which shared a tennis court and boathouse.

The challenge faced is regarding the steep cliff at the lake in that the property owners have young children and grandchildren. The concern is being able to put up unified fencing at the cliff that would connect across the property lines as to not have 2-foot gaps at the property lines due to setbacks. The purpose of the proposed fence is for the protection of children around the cliff.

They are proposing to install two-rail split rail fencing, standing about 3 feet high with the option of backing with wire mesh fencing. The wire mesh would be dark in color, making it barely visible. Some of the properties have existing fences, which are shown in green on the site plan. Indicated in yellow on the site plan is where they are proposing new fencing, and the blue dots indicate the locations needing a setback variance in order to avoid having a 2-foot gap.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the Hafner’s have not occupied their property regularly. They discovered a cap on the property and upon opening it they found that it was a well cap. The well will be filled in.

Member Condon wondered if the fencing will be installed on all six (6) properties at the same time. Mr. Eggleston clarified that each property owner would need to get their own building permit. He was unsure if they would all be installed immediately or at the same time.

Board Members conducted a site visit on October 25, 2025. The Applicant’s Design Professional was present.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Condon 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	David Palen	Present [Yes]
Member	Kris Kiefer	Present [Yes] (Zoom)
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present [Yes]

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

1. Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance:

Yes ☐ No ☒

Reasons: No, by majority vote as reflected below with ZBA Members' deliberations as follows.

Four (4) Board Members found that the requested variance would not produce an undesirable change to the neighborhood or nearby properties. The neighborhood consists of year-round and seasonal dwellings on relatively larger lots which face a drop-off to the lake. The requested variance will allow for the joining of individual lot fencing to provide a continuous fence across six (6) properties. The proposed fence will be 36-inch-high split-rail with some sections backed by 2x4 inch wire fencing for additional safety at the cliff. The proposed style of fencing will not affect sight or visual lines onshore or offshore. The steep bank has tall vegetation at the top which would prevent the fence from being seen from offshore for most of the year. There is existing split-rail fencing and metal estate fencing on three (3) of the six (6) properties which do not hinder views, and blend in well. Nearby property owners are in agreement with the proposal as they are all part of the shared application for a continuous fence to traverse across property lines.

One (1) Board Member found that the requested variance would produce an undesirable change to the neighborhood or nearby properties. The installation of a continuous 36-inch-high split-rail fence along six (6) lakefront properties that total over 1,250 lineal feet may set a precedent for future lakefront properties to create the same enclave environment. From a safety perspective, having a two (2)-foot-wide gap between the fences at each end of the properties does not necessarily create a safety issue. Four (4) of the six (6) properties have over 150 lineal feet of frontage, with three (3) having approximately 200 lineal feet, and one (1) having approximately 354 lineal feet. There will be ample fencing along each property line to prevent children and toys from reaching the lakeshore, especially if the fences are lined with 2x4 inch wire fencing, as suggested. As for the containment of dogs, many would be able to jump over three (3) foot high fencing and there are other mechanisms to contain dogs within a boundary. If approved, this may set a precedent for other neighborhoods to seek the same effect.

### QUESTION 1 RECORD OF VOTE

**MEMBER NAME****AYE****NAY****ABSTAIN**

Chair DENISE RHOADS

☐☒☐

Vice Chair DAVID PALEN

☐☒☐

Member KRIS KIEFER

☐☒☐

(Via Zoom)

Member SHERILL KETCHUM

☒☐☐

Member JIM CONDON

☐☒☐

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 majority vote as reflected below with ZBA Members' deliberations as follows.

Four (4) Board Members found that the benefit sought by the Applicant cannot be achieved without the granting of an area variance without the granting of an area variance. In order to create a continuous barrier along the shoreline bank, a variance eliminates the need for a two (2) foot gap between each lot. A variance would not be needed if the Applicant was not trying to achieve a continuous fence that traverses property lines. Only a building permit would be necessary if the fencing was installed with side yard setbacks which cause the two (2) foot gaps between properties.

One (1) Board Member found that the benefit sought by the Applicant can be achieved without the granting of an area variance. The Applicant(s) could install six (6) individual 36-inch-high split-rail fences, allowing for the 2-foot gap caused by side yard setbacks between each of the lots.

### QUESTION 2 RECORD OF VOTE

**MEMBER NAME****AYE****NAY****ABSTAIN**

Chair DENISE RHOADS

☐☒☐

Vice Chair DAVID PALEN

☐☒☐

Member KRIS KIEFER

☐☒☐

(Via Zoom)

Member SHERILL KETCHUM

☒☐☐

Member JIM CONDON

☐☒☐

3. Whether the requested variance is substantial:

Yes ☐No ☒

Reasons: No, by majority vote as reflected below with ZBA Members' deliberations as follows.

Four (4) Board Members found that the proposed variance is not substantial. A variance would not be needed to install fencing on individual lots. The request is to avoid having gaps between the lots along the steep bank. A one (1) foot side yard setback requirement between properties is minimal. The fence is an open design and three (3) feet in height. There are approximately twelve (12) feet worth of variance for the six (6) lots collectively.

One (1) Board Member found that the proposed variance is substantial. This request consists of six (6) variances wrapped in one application and would forever go with the land. If one property sells and the new property owner wishes to change their fencing, it would disrupt the continuity of the fence.

### QUESTION 3 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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. No heavy equipment or excavation is required to install the proposed fencing. Six (6) property owners have joined together to install split-rail fencing above the lake shore to address safety concerns regarding the steepness of the bank. The two (2) foot gap in fencing between each of the properties is the variance at issue, and they would otherwise be able to install the fence as a matter of right. The additional two (2) feet requested to close the gaps will have no substantial negative effect.

### QUESTION 4 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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

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

### QUESTION 5 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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

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

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

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

### STANDARD CONDITIONS:

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

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

1. That the Site Plan dated September 25, 2025, with Narrative dated September 25, 2025, prepared by Robert Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be complied with in all respects; and
2. That there is strict compliance with any conditions applicable to each of the individual properties by previously granted Special Permit; and
3. That the Co-Applicant owner of the parcel identified as Tax Map #037.-01-23.1 fill in, stabilize and secure the former well on the parcel.

### 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"/> (Via Zoom)
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Initial Review

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

Present: Tom Trytek, PE, TDK Engineering Associates, PC  
 Ryan Mott, Applicant (via Zoom)

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

Engineer, Tom Trytek was present to represent the Applicant. The Applicant, Ryan Mott was present via Zoom.

Mr. Trytek stated that this is a small sliver of a lot. The existing nature of the geology, in that it's an exposed shale bedrock condition, over time has created a real detriment along the shoreline. The location of the existing lake access is weathered and degrading. There is some substantial vegetation between the northern property line and the upper embankment where the existing deck is located. The rest, however, shows significant erosion.

The existing deck, which extends 28 feet and overhangs the lower shoreline wall by about 8 feet, is in a severely unstable condition. There is corrosion to the steel, timbers have rotted, support members are severely undersized, the railing system is too low, and that area of the embankment has significantly eroded. The proposed action is to completely remove what exists, then reestablish and stabilize the embankment area by means of removing the brittle, loose material and lining the front face of that with a cast-in-place concrete wall system. They will then reestablish a new safe

upper deck location which will only extend about 8 feet from the upper embankment area. Everything will be pulled back, making for a much safer condition.

Given the small size of the lot, any improvements will bring them above the allowable areas. They did try to stay within the same general footprint when designing what is being proposed. The Applicant removed a sunroom prior to the start of this planning process, which they do not intend to replace. This open space will allow for a drainage system which they are proposing to capture the water and direct toward the lake through a contained piping system.

Member Condon stated that there are multiple preexisting nonconforming conditions on the property. He asked why they wouldn't try to maintain what they already had and repair everything with the same exact footprint instead of adding 164SF over the allowable 600SF. He noted that the ISC is three times higher than allowed, even though it is being slightly reduced.

Mr. Trytek explained that they tried to stay within what exists and that because they went over by 164SF they reduced a portion of the driveway, removed a concrete sidewalk, patio, and fire pit. A sunroom was also removed prior to the creation of these plans.

Chair Rhoads wondered if it was necessary to have both an upper and a lower deck. Mr. Trytek explained that the lower portion is the shoreline area which is currently gravel. Leaving it as such would not be as safe as a platform to walk across.

Member Condon suggested using permeable pavers. Planner Barkdull noted that whether they use decking or permeable pavers, it would still be considered an onshore structure. Adding to Planner Barkdull's comments, Member Ketchum stated that changing it from decking to permeable pavers would not change the ISC.

Mr. Trytek stated that they could try to shave everything down, reducing the excess of 164SF that brings their proposal over the allowable 600SF.

Member Condon wondered where the existing septic system is located. Mr. Mott stated that the property has a holding tank.

Member Condon requested that the holding tank location be added to the site plan and for a letter from the county confirming that the tank is up to date. He also verified that drainage would be piped to the lake as opposed to free flowing over the embankment.

Mr. Trytek stated that this project is consistent with the area. He did a similar project at a neighboring property about 12 years ago.

Mr. Mott thanked the Board for considering their application. Their principal goal is safety while creating something that looks nice.

Board Members will conduct a site visit on November 15, 2025, at 9:00 am. Chair Rhoads is unavailable that morning and will conduct a site visit at a later date.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to schedule a Public Hearing for December 2, 2025, at 7:02 pm.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Ketchum and seconded by Member Condon to schedule a public hearing for December 2, 2025, at 7:02 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

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

### **Public Hearing Continuance**

Applicant:	Eugene & Tracy Franchini 1511 Quarry Stone Drive Elbridge, NY 13060	Property:	1417 Thornton Heights Road Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #057.-01-31.0</b>
------------	---	-----------	---

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC  
Eugene & Tracy Franchini, Applicants

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is for the proposed redevelopment of a nonconforming lot.

Mr. & Mrs. Franchini were present with their Design Professional, Bob Eggleston.

Chair Rhoads stated that the Public Hearing was opened at the previous month's meeting then carried over to this month due to a printing error which prevented the Public Hearing Notice from being published.

Mr. Eggleston stated that the property had been in the Franchini's family for about 60 years and they would now like to make it their summer retirement home. They were looking to replace the house with similar footprint and living space. To help improve the numbers and reduce some of the disturbance, they removed the originally proposed detached deck.

Member Condon reviewed the letter from the Onondaga County Health Department regarding the septic system.

Member Ketchum asked about neighbor letters. Mr. Eggleston confirmed that three (3) no objection letters were submitted. Clerk Case entered them into the record.

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.

A site visit was conducted by Board Members. The Applicant and their Design Professional were present.

This application was determined to be a Type II SEQR action as per section 617.5(c)(12) and not subject to SEQR review at the October 7, 2025, ZBA Meeting.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to reopen the public hearing.

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

Chair Rhoads stated that three (3) adjoining neighbors had submitted no objection letters which were added to the record.

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 Ketchum and seconded by Member Condon to close the Public Hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

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

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

- 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 nearby properties. The existing cottage is old and appears to be failing. The site structures (stairs, steps, retaining walls) are in poor condition. This is a particularly small lot in an area with other small lots, having a mix of seasonal and year-round homes. The proposed new structure is well designed and will enhance the look of the neighborhood. The proposed dwelling will have a slightly smaller footprint with reductions to most of the other nonconforming aspects of the property. There have been other projects and improvements made to similar nearby properties.

#### **QUESTION 1 RECORD OF VOTE**

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

- 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. Due to the size of the lot, any changes made would require a variance. The property is 0.18 acre and under 20,000 SF, with less than the required 75 feet of shoreline. The Applicant and their Design Professional have done a great job in reducing this project to the minimum required per Code.

### QUESTION 2 RECORD OF VOTE

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

3. Whether the requested variance is substantial: Yes ☐ No ☒

Reasons: No, by a (4-1) majority vote as reflected below with ZBA Members' deliberations as follows.

Five (5) Board Members found that the proposed variance is not substantial. The proposed structure will be built within the existing footprint, with a slight reduction of 57 SF. Six (6) of the existing nonconforming aspects of the property will be improved. Side yard setbacks and the lake yard will be made less nonconforming; building footprint will decrease by 0.7%; potential living space will decrease by 0.4%; Total lot coverage will decrease by 8.1%; ISC will decrease by 3.7%.

One (1) Board Member also found that the proposed variance is substantial. The many nonconforming aspects of the existing property being grandfathered, as well as the four (4) requested variances that would forever go with the property could be considered substantial. However, due to the overall improvement to the lot, including a reduction in six (6) existing nonconformities, addition of a new septic system, improved wastewater management, and erosion control, the substantial nature of the variance requested is ameliorated.

### QUESTION 3 RECORD OF VOTE

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

4. Whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or

environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district: Yes ☐ No ☒

Reasons: No, by unanimous vote as reflected below. Board Members found that the proposed variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. The dwelling and many of the site structures such as steps, stairs, and retaining walls are in disrepair and unsafe. The dwelling will be reduced from four bedrooms to three bedrooms, which may alleviate strain on the septic system and improve environmental conditions. The Applicant has received Onondaga County Health Department approval, dated June 8, 2021, for a new septic system. Stormwater and erosion control will be improved, and roof gutters will be added to further aid in managing runoff to the lake. Existing nonconformities of the property will be improved, including side yard setbacks, lake yard, footprint, floorspace, ISC, and TLC. The Applicant will be paying into the Town's LDRA fund to offset the nonconforming ISC.

#### QUESTION 4 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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

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

#### QUESTION 5 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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

The ZBA, after taking into consideration the above five factors and ZBA deliberation thereon, upon a motion made by Member Jim Condon, 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, ZBA Member deliberation factors as set forth herein, as well as the Board Members' inspection of the property, and is conditioned as follows:

**STANDARD CONDITIONS:**

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

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

1. That the Site Plan dated October 2, 2025, with Narrative dated October 2, 2025, prepared by Robert Eggleston, Licensed Architect, be complied with in all respects.
2. That in addition to obtaining all necessary permits and approvals from the Planning Board and any agency or authority having jurisdiction over the Property or Application, the Applicant also obtain Onondaga County Health Department septic approval; and
3. That the Applicant strictly complies with any potential terms or conditions of Planning Board approval.

**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"/> (Via Zoom)
Member SHERILL KETCHUM	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Member JIM CONDON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## **Initial Review**

Applicant: Jordan Road Town Homes, LLC  
Christopher Graham  
4302 Jordan Road  
Skaneateles, NY 13152

Properties:	Fox Run Crossing Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #018.-02-45.0</b>	Fox Run Crossing Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #018.-02-46.0</b>	Fox Run Crossing Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #018.-05-03.0</b>
	Fox Run Crossing Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #018.-05-04.0</b>	Fox Run Crossing Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #018.-05-05.0</b>	Fox Run Crossing Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #018.-05-06.0</b>

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is for a request to allow two-family dwellings to be built on six separate approved 0.50+ acre lots.

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

Mr. Eggleston explained that this is a three-phase subdivision, as shown in the plans. Although the entire subdivision has been reviewed by the Planning Board, only Phase 1 has been approved at this point. The Applicant has water put in place but has been waiting on paving the road for getting the utilities in place. Given the Governor's recent act of not allowing gas for new builds, these properties will be entirely electric.

This subdivision was created from one of the larger lots in the Hamlet District. The intent of the Applicant was to create reasonable-priced homes. They tried to incorporate more of a Hamlet feel to the plan. The development will be interconnected with walkways and Lauder Lane. There have been concerns from some members of the community about the proximity of this site to a farm. The nearby Lauder Lane neighborhood has not had any issues with farm odors.

Mr. Eggleston explained that the Town's Comprehensive Plan, especially in the Hamlet and Highway Commercial zones, looks to have alternative housing types, so they had discussed the option of apartments on some of the lots. If they were to merge the properties, they could have four (4) dwelling units per acre. Merging six (6) of the lots would allow them to create twelve (12) homes. The downfall to that is that a change in building code now requires new apartments and townhouses that have more than two (2) dwelling units to have sprinkler systems.

The Applicant would like to construct two-family dwelling units as they will be more proportionate in a neighborhood with single family homes. To do this, ½ acre per dwelling unit is required which is why a variance is being requested. The Applicant will initially own and manage the two-family homes as rentals but would sell as it would offer an opportunity for young families to buy a house and rent half.

Member Condon stated that if they constructed one-story as opposed to two-story homes the footprint would be greater, leaving less space for septic systems. Mr. Eggleston noted that these

would be two-family, two-bedroom structures, which is essentially the same as a four-bedroom, single-family as far as the septic goes. He added that the area is sandy, so they got very good perks on the lots. Additionally, zoning code allows for 60% ISC in the Hamlet. Each lot will get separate septic approval from the county. The subdivision already has municipal water and stormwater system in place.

With this site being a vacant lot, Board Members opted to conduct their site visits by each doing an individual drive-by.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to schedule a Public Hearing for December 2, 2025, at 7:10 pm.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Ketchum and seconded by Vice Chair Palen to schedule a Public Hearing for December 2, 2025, at 7:10 pm. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

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

### **Public Hearing Continuance**

Applicant:	James & Emily Johnson 1781 Russell's Landing Skaneateles, NY 13152	Property:	1781 Russell's Landing Skaneateles, NY 13152 <b>Tax Map #063.-03-06.0</b>
------------	--	-----------	---

The Board was not in receipt of any new submissions for the Johnson application. The Applicant and their Design Professional were not present.

Clerk Case stated that she had made contact with Johnson's Design Professional, Guy Donahoe. He stated that he had an onsite meeting set with the former and proposed builder, Jim Tracy, for Thursday, October 30<sup>th</sup> to verify the buildability of the proposed path over the bank. He added that he may be able to polish and send the plans by the following day. With the submission deadline for the November meeting having passed, Clerk Case told him that the Board would carry the Public Hearing over to the December meeting and he could submit his plans prior to that deadline.

Counsel Molnar recommended that the Board notify the Applicant and their Design Professionals that in the absence of a new submission for the December 2, 2025, meeting, that the ZBA would need to close the Public Hearing and move forward with deliberations.

At this time, Chair Rhoads asked for a motion to continue the Public Hearing at the next ZBA meeting on December 2, 2025, at 7:20 pm.

**WHEREFORE**, a motion was made by Member Ketchum and seconded by Member Condon to continue the Public Hearing at the December 2, 2025, ZBA Meeting. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

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

### **Discussion**

- The next ZBA meeting will be held on December 2, 2025, at 7:00 pm.
- The next P&Z Work Session will be held on November 20, 2025, at 6:30 pm in person and via Zoom.

Mr. Eggleston acknowledged that Dennis Dundon, who was previously a Member of the Board and then worked in the Codes Office prior to working at the Village, had passed away the previous week. Mr. Dundon spent many years of his life, both during his career and after retirement serving the community. Chair Rhoads stated that she appreciated Mr. Eggleston mentioning this and thanked him for this acknowledgement of Mr. Dundon.

The Board discussed the information regarding training opportunities that Clerk Case had sent out.

There being no further Board business, a motion was made by Member Kiefer and seconded by Member Condon to adjourn the meeting. The Zoning Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at 8:41 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimie Case  
ZBA Clerk

### **Meeting Attendees:**

Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC  
Tom Trytek, PE, TDK Engineering Associates, PC  
Eugene Franchini, Applicant  
Tracy Franchini, Applicant  
Dirk Young

### **Meeting Attendees Via Zoom:**

Kris Kiefer, ZBA Member  
Ryan Mott, Applicant  
Maria Garlock