

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

Present:

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

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

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

Minutes

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

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

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

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

Attorney Advice Session

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

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

The Board returned at 7:22 pm.

Public Hearing Continuance

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

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

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is for proposed shoreline improvements on a preexisting nonconforming lot of 7683SF. The variances requested are for minimum lot size, maximum lot coverage, and maximum onshore structures for a lot with Lake frontage between 100 and 200 feet is 600SF, whereas the proposed onshore structures are increasing to 764SF. Board Members conducted a site visit on November 15, 2025. The Applicant’s Design Professional was present.

The Public Hearing was opened at the previous months meeting. Before reopening the Public Hearing, Chair Rhoads asked the Applicant’s Design Professional to review the application.

Engineer, Tom Trytek was present to represent the Applicant. Mr. Trytek worked with the Applicant to reduce the total combined square footage of the onshore structures to 597SF, eliminating the need for a variance for maximum onshore structures.

Mr. Trytek fulfilled an additional request made by the Board in regard to reaching out to the Onondaga County Health Department about the existing steel holding tank on the property. He also contacted Rich Abbott from the City of Syracuse Water Department. Both parties responded back to him stating that they had no issues in regard to the existing holding tank system, provided they weren’t making any modifications to the building and as long as the sewage disposal facilities are maintained in a sanitary condition. If the system was found to be inadequate, then modification would have to be performed. Overall, they have no objection to the proposal at this time. Chair Rhoads confirmed that the Board was in receipt of the responses from the County Health Department and City of Syracuse water Department and that they were entered into the record.

Member Condon asked if there were any letters about the project received from neighbors. Mr. Trytek had not received any. Member Condon then asked if the neighbors had received Public Hearing Notices. Planner Barkdull confirmed that the notices were sent to neighbors and that no responses were received.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Eggleston stated that he commented on this application at the Planning Board meeting that he was asked to look at the property. He suggested to the property owners that they hire an engineer for the project because the site was extremely eroded. Mr. Eggleston also said that he appreciates the Coye family who lived in this location until their late 90's, and that they had maintained the property up until the last few years.

Mr. Eggleston stated that he appreciated that the Applicants have worked with the Town to reduce the number of variances. This is a very expensive, necessary project, probably more than they anticipated, and he appreciates the fact that they have been able to make reductions which ultimately reduced the number of variances requested. The Applicant has been able to salvage a property that was otherwise in severe danger of catastrophic failure. The Applicant has put in a lot of work and is making an investment for the betterment of the Lake.

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

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

Record of Vote

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

FACTORS CONSIDERED IN CONTEMPLATING THE AREA VARIANCES:

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

Yes No

Reasons: No, by unanimous vote as reflected below. The ZBA found that the requested

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

QUESTION 1 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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

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

QUESTION 2 RECORD OF VOTE

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

3. Whether the requested variance is substantial: Yes No

Reasons: Yes, by unanimous vote as reflected below. Board Members found that the proposed variance is substantial. The minimum lot size in the LWOD is 20,000SF, whereas this lot is 7,683SF. The existing ISC is 36.2% where 10% is allowed, and the existing TLC is 44.1% where 20% is allowed. The proposed lake yard setback is 14 feet where 100 feet is required. The property is also

noncompliant in regard to the side yard setbacks and front yard setbacks. The Applicant is requesting a variance for preexisting nonconformities which are being reduced slightly or maintained. Outside of the shoreline stabilization the requested variance would be substantial.

QUESTION 3 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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

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

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

Two (2) Board Members found that the requested variance would produce an undesirable change to the neighborhood or nearby properties, based on the following factors. The shoreline is eroding and currently unsafe for access to the water and the dwelling is very close to the shoreline embankment. However, there have been no plans presented at this time to improve the overall property, its septic system, or the water runoff which has been a factor in the eroding shoreline. This may have an adverse impact on the environmental conditions of the neighborhood, primarily the lake. The proposed variance, outside of shoreline stabilization, will have an adverse effect. The drawings lack rainwater mitigation so the water that runs off the steep driveway will then run over and behind the new seawall. This application was a missed opportunity to decrease ISC on the lot. The existing lot has 36.2% ISC where 10% is allowed by Code. There is more room for reduction in ISC as the driveway is 1590SF, making up over 13% of lot coverage. There was a small sunroom removed prior to this application and the concrete slab still exists. Removal of the slab could have

further decreased ISC. The existing septic steel holding tank has a negative potential impact on the property and lake. The proposed shoreline stabilization project does not involve any modifications to the existing dwelling size or total number of bedrooms. Tearing down part of the structure is a modification to the existing dwelling, and adding shoreline structures to the property is more than a shoreline stabilization.

QUESTION 4 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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

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

QUESTION 5 RECORD OF VOTE

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

DETERMINATION OF ZBA BASED ON THE ABOVE FACTORS:

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

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

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

STANDARD CONDITIONS:

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

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

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

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Public Hearing

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

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

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC

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

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

Mr. Eggleston stated that nothing had changed with the plans. This is a simple lot line relocation. Joyce Paddock lives in front (Lot 1) and the old barn on her property had been replaced with the newer pole barn which she no longer needs to use. Mrs. Paddock’s son and daughter-in-law live in the house behind her (Lot 2) and they do utilize the barn and would like to include it in their property.

Mr. Eggleston and the Applicant put together the best possible lot line relocation to achieve this benefit while leaving the properties as conforming as possible. The barn will go from the back yard of Lot 1 to the front yard of Lot 2 after the lot line relocation and because it is an accessory structure which will be in a front yard, it would require a 120-foot front yard setback. If this lot were on a private road, only 30 feet would be required. There will be no physical changes to the property, and the existing vegetation will remain to shield the view of the barn from the road.

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

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

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Ketchum and seconded by Member Condon to consider the proposed action as a Type II SEQR action as per section 617.5(c)(12) and not subject to SEQR review. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

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

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

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

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

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

Record of Vote

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

FACTORS CONSIDERED IN CONTEMPLATING THE AREA VARIANCES:

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

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

QUESTION 1 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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

Reasons: No, by unanimous vote as reflected below. Board Members found the benefit sought by the Applicant cannot be achieved without the granting of an area variance. Discussions with the Applicant’s architect suggested that many attempts were made on this application to come up with a solution that would allow for the pole barn currently owned by the Lot 1 owner, to be owned

by the Lot 2 owner. This proposal is the most feasible option and therefore requires a variance. Trying to accomplish a 120-foot front yard setback while maintaining 2 acres on Lot 1 could result in a much more irregular shaped lot. A lot line relocation will incorporate a greater portion of the driveway easement within Lot 2.

QUESTION 2 RECORD OF VOTE

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

3. Whether the requested variance is substantial: Yes No

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

QUESTION 3 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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

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

QUESTION 4 RECORD OF VOTE

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

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

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

QUESTION 5 RECORD OF VOTE

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

DETERMINATION OF ZBA BASED ON THE ABOVE FACTORS:

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

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

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

STANDARD CONDITIONS:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECORD OF VOTE

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

Initial Review

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

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

Present: Meghan Wing, Applicant
Owen Wing, Applicant

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is for a proposed deck and patio on a nonconforming lot.

Applicants Meghan and Owen Wing were present and represented themselves.

Ms. Wing stated that they have an existing deck that is old and needs to be replaced. They are hoping to remove the existing deck and replace it with a new deck and add a patio in the pool area. The variances being requested are for ISC and lot coverage.

The reason for the increase in ISC is because they are hoping to install an impermeable patio which would increase the existing nonconforming ISC of 16.4% up by 1.2% to 17.6%. Current code allows 15%.

Member Ketchum asked what material they were planning to use that would make the patio impermeable.

Ms. Wing stated that they did not want to install a permeable patio due to the stones that would make their way into the pool. Mr. Wing added that based on his understanding of the code, a permeable patio would require a greater distance between the pavers which would create a tripping hazard

Member Condon asked if the new deck would be the same size as the existing deck. Ms. Wing stated that the new deck would be a bit smaller.

Mr. Wing explained that the current deck butts into the pool area, so the deck railing doesn't meet current pool code. Their proposal would result in everything being brought up to code in regard to pool safety laws. They will also add #2 stone between the house and patio to aid with water runoff and because of the nonconforming state of the ISC. There is also a tile drain proposed for that area.

A meadow implementation plan was included in the application. They will be replacing the grass in their front lawn with a native flowering meadow. The meadow will be professionally installed by EcoScape Design and will aid in the absorption of water on the property.

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

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

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

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

The configuration of the permanent dock they are proposing is no larger than it currently is today and is essentially the same configuration you see on the Lake in the summer as a temporary condition. They see an improvement in that they will not have to bring dock sections and a hoist up onto the shoreline for the winter months and boathouse will become one that is usable.

The shoreline is very protected with a stone-lined edge. There is native vegetation backing up to it and the great lawn in the front of the house has meadows to further help with runoff. The Applicant is trying to reduce the impervious coverage on the property. In the planning process, they just couldn't get around the 204-foot variance for the boathouse. With the existing boathouse being primarily on land and in such a shallow area of the Lake, they would have to bump it out in order to make it functional.

Vice Chair Palen asked what the dimensions of the boathouse would be.

Ms. Gagliano responded that the boathouse would be 22 feet wide and 32 feet deep, adding that the main part of the dock would be 6'10" wide with the bump out at the end for docking a boat. She stated that they think it is important to widen the section of the dock at the corner of the boathouse for safety reasons and noted that at the site visit, Board Members would feel how tight it is to the edge of the boathouse. That portion would be 9 feet wide.

Member Condon asked about the size of the existing boat house and if they planned to use steel piles. He also asked what the height of the proposed boathouse would be.

Ms. Gagliano stated that the existing boathouse is 262SF and that they would be using steel piles. She added that they aren't removing the section of the existing dock along the existing boathouse or the existing foundation wall. By utilizing what already exists, there will be less disturbance to the site and Lake. The height of the new boathouse would be 15 feet maximum. With the rail system they plan to install, you don't need much height. Contractor Phil Ricklefs has looked at the site and taken measurements.

The Applicant was asked to provide drawings of the existing boat house as well as a proposed demolition plan.

Vice Chair Palen recommended that the Applicant request letters of support be submitted by the neighbors.

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

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

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

Record of Vote

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

Discussion

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

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimie Case
ZBA Clerk

Meeting Attendees:

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

Beth Estes
Owen Wing, Applicant
Meghan Wing, Applicant

Meeting Attendees Via Zoom:

Councilor Mark Tucker
Jill Marshall, Applicant