

**TOWN OF SKANEATELES
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MEETING MINUTES OF**

November 13, 2012

Present:

Dave Graham
Denise Rhoads
Jim Condon
James Lanning
Debbie Williams, Codes Enforcement Officer
Scott Molnar, Attorney
Karen Barkdull, Secretary

Also Present: See attached list.

The meeting commenced at 7:00 p.m. The next regularly scheduled Zoning Board of Appeals meeting will be held on December 4, 2012. Site visits will be conducted on December 1, 2012 by the Zoning Board of Appeals beginning at 9 a.m. Previous distribution to the Board of the regular meeting minutes of October 2, 2012 were executed and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Member Lanning and seconded by Member Condon to accept the October 2, 2012 minutes with minor corrections. The Board having been polled resulted in favor of said motion. Vice Chair Rhoads abstained from the vote due to her absence at the October 2, 2012 meeting.

Previous distribution to the Board of the regular meeting minutes of October 23, 2012 were executed and all members present acknowledged receipt of those minutes.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Member Condon and seconded by Vice Chair Rhoads to accept the October 23, 2012 minutes with minor corrections. The Board having been polled resulted in favor of said motion.

Initial Review

Applicant: Bruce Parker

Parker Family Limited Partnership
5891 Bennett's Corner
Camillus, New York

Property:
1427 Thornton Heights Rd
Skaneateles, New York
Tax Map # 057.-01-10.2

Present: Brian Manthey, Architect

The applicant is proposing a two story detached garage on Thornton Heights Road. The property is located on two parcels with separate tax map numbers and with Thornton Heights Road, a private right-of-way, running through it. For purposes of zoning, the two lots will be treated as one lot totaling 26,878SF, meeting the minimum lot area for a non-conforming lot. The proposed

25'x28' garage will be located on the west side of the road aligning with the dwelling to reduce shade fall on the neighboring property. The proposed side yard setback is 10' from the property line whereas 20' (20% of the lot width of 100') is required. The garage has a proposed front yard setback of 25' due to the steepness of the topography whereas 30' front yard setback is required. The lake front parcel has 50' of lakefront, under the 75' minimum lake frontage allowed for a nonconforming lot.

The proposed 751SF garage will increase the total cumulative footprint from 3.7% to 6.5% and over the 6% cumulative footprint allowed for this nonconforming lot located within 1000' of the lake line. The second floor is classified as potentially habitable and included in the footprint calculations. The design of the second floor of the proposed garage includes a deck with French door access.

It was recommended that the applicant consider adjusting the location of the proposed garage to remove the two setback variances. . A Zoning Board of Appeals site visit will be conducted on December 1, 2012.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Vice Chair Rhoads and seconded by Member Condon to schedule a Public Hearing on ***December 4, 2012 at 7:10 pm***. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

Public Hearing

Applicant: Richard & Alison Conley
4234 Browsing Lane
Marcellus, New York

Property:
1719 Russells Landing
Skaneateles, New York
Tax Map # 063.-02-06.0

Present: Alison Conley, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Architect

No one requested the public hearing notice to be read. This notice was published in the *Skaneateles Press* on November 7, 2012. All members of the Zoning Board of Appeals attended the site visit. The Onondaga County Planning Board correspondence dated October 3, 2012 recommends the following modification: The applicant is required to obtain any necessary approvals and/or permits required by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation and the City of Syracuse Department of Water. The City of Syracuse Department of Water defers comment pending the issuance of a NYSDEC permit for construction activity below the mean high water mark of Skaneateles Lake in their correspondence dated September 5, 2012.

The detailed drawing 2 of 2 dated October 15, 2012 was submitted reflecting a planting plan for soil stabilization. The applicant has recently purchased the cottage on Russells Landing and the waterfront is in dire need of repair as the piers for the dock have been compromised by the April 2011 storms. They would like to enlarge the dock with a 12'x 12' section added to the dock and shed near the shoreline in addition to repairing the structure. The repairs would include repairing the access stairs and retaining wall as well as the dock. The dock will be replaced down to the piers with the height of the dock reduced to the flood plain level, placing it two feet above the water rather than the existing four feet above the water.

Z.B.A.11.13.2012

Also proposed are replacement steps to the waterfront and to add a permeable path to the parking area from the dwelling. The lot is 17,856SF and requires a variance for a lot under 20,000SF. The application is also requesting a special permit for redevelopment from the Planning Board as the existing impermeable surface coverage is 16.2% with a proposed impermeable surface coverage of 16.1%. The applicant will be making a contribution to the Town Land and Development Acquisition Fund to mitigate for the impermeable surface coverage over the 10% allowed. The application to the DEC has been pending since September 15, 2012 with no action taken to date by the DEC.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Vice Chair Rhoads and seconded by Member Lanning to declare this application to be a Type II action not subject to SEQR review. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

At this time Chairman Graham opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the application. There was no one who wished to speak in favor of the proposal. Chairman Graham asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition, or had any other comments. There was no one who wished to speak in opposition or had any other comments. Letters of support for the proposal from the neighbors to the north and south have been submitted.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Member Condon and seconded by Vice Chair Rhoads to close the Public Hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

At this time Counsel Molnar reviewed with the Board the statutory criteria set forth in Town Code Section 148-45D (a-e) for an Area Variance. Counsel stated that in making their determination the Zoning Board of Appeals is required to consider certain factors, which are:

1. **Whether an undesirable change would be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties:** No. The proposed repairs and improvements are for the dilapidated dock and waterfront and do not include any changes to the dwelling. The property is similar in size and character to neighboring properties in the area and the improvements to the waterfront will enhance the area.
2. **Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by a feasible alternative to the variance:** No. Any change on this nonconforming lot of less than 20,00SF requires a variance and the most feasible modification for safe access.
3. **Whether the requested variance is substantial; within 200 feet of Skaneateles Lake, any area variance that enlarges a building or enables it to encroach into a required lake yard shall be presumed to be substantial because of the cumulative risk of degradation of the lake posed by granting individual variances. This presumption is rebuttable:** No. The applicant is requesting the minimal variance in their proposal as the lot size is the only variance required and is not substantial.

4. **Would the variance have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental condition in the neighborhood; within 200 feet of Skaneateles Lake, any area variance than enlarges a building or enables it to encroach into a required lake yard shall be presumed to have an adverse environmental impact because of the cumulative risk of degradation of the lake posed by granting individual variances. This presumption is rebuttable:** No. Due to the steep bank, the proposed lowering of the dock will provide safer access to the waterfront and the additional enhancements will not adversely affect the environment.
5. **Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created:** Yes. However, there is significant dock damage and soil erosion that the applicant will be improving.

WHEREAS, in review of the above 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. Based on the Board members' site visits and discussions before the Board at the public hearing the benefit to the applicant outweighs the detriment to the community and will not have significant adverse impacts on the character of the neighborhood or the physical or environmental conditions of the property

WHEREFORE a motion was made Chairman Graham and seconded by Member Lanning, that this application be **APPROVED** with standard conditions and additional special conditions:

SPECIAL CONDITIONS: The ZBA finds that the following conditions are necessary in order to minimize adverse impacts upon the neighborhood or community, for the reasons following:

Condition No. 1: That the Site Plan drawing 1 of 2 dated August 23, 2012; the Site Plan drawing 2 of 2 dated October 15, 2012; and narrative dated September 4, 2012 prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, Architect, be followed in all respects; and

Condition No. 2: The applicant shall comply with all conditions imposed by the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board in connection with issuance of the Special Permit and/or site plan approval; and

Condition No. 3: The applicant shall obtain any approval necessary from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation; and

Condition No. 4: An as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

Record of Vote

Chair	David Graham	Present	[Yes]
Vice Chair	Denise Rhoads	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present	[Yes]
Member	James Lanning	Present	[Yes]

Public Hearing Continuance

Applicant: Michael & Carol Parker
3406 West Lake St
Skaneateles, New York
Tax Map # 049.-02-04.1

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect

The public hearing had been closed by motion of Chairman Graham and seconded by Member Lanning with unanimous affirmance of said motion at the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting of October 2, 2012.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Vice Chair Rhoads and seconded by Chairman Graham to declare this application to be a Type II action not subject to SEQR review. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

At this time Counsel Molnar reviewed with the Board the statutory criteria set forth in Town Code Section 148-45D (a-e) for an Area Variance. Counsel stated that in making their determination the Zoning Board of Appeals is required to consider certain factors, which are:

1. **Whether an undesirable change would be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties:** No. The 5.5 acre lot is one of three in the neighborhood that are larger lots with larger homes. The requested variance of 65SF will not negatively impact the neighborhood.
2. **Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by a feasible alternative to the variance:** No. The applicant and her design professional has revised their proposal to reduce the requested variance from 494SF to 65SF of the proposed deck located less than 30' from the south property line at the suggestion of the Board.
3. **Whether the requested variance is substantial; within 200 feet of Skaneateles Lake, any area variance that enlarges a building or enables it to encroach into a required lake yard shall be presumed to be substantial because of the cumulative risk of degradation of the lake posed by granting individual variances. This presumption is rebuttable:** No. The applicant has made several attempts to reduce the variance, with the stairs moved from the southwest to the southeast and not encroaching in the south setback and creating a second egress for the dwelling.
4. **Would the variance have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental condition in the neighborhood; within 200 feet of Skaneateles Lake, any area variance that enlarges a building or enables it to encroach into a required lake yard shall be presumed to have an adverse environmental impact because of the**

cumulative risk of degradation of the lake posed by granting individual variances. This presumption is rebuttable: No. There is little impact to the environmental conditions of the neighborhood by the granting of the variance.

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created: Yes.

WHEREAS, in review of the above 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. Based on the Board members' site visits and discussions before the Board at the public hearing the benefit to the applicant outweighs the detriment to the community and will not have significant adverse impacts on the character of the neighborhood or the physical or environmental conditions of the property

WHEREFORE a motion was made Chairman Graham and seconded by Vice Chair Rhoads, that this application be **APPROVED** with standard conditions and additional special conditions:

SPECIAL CONDITIONS: The ZBA finds that the following conditions are necessary in order to minimize adverse impacts upon the neighborhood or community, for the reasons following:

Condition No. 1: That the Site Plan drawing 1 of 2 and 2 of 2 dated September 28, 2012 prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, Architect, be followed in all respects; and

Condition No. 2: The applicant shall relocate the existing shed to 10' from the south property line; and

Condition No. 3: An as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

<u>Record of Vote</u>			
Chair	David Graham	Present	[Yes]
Vice Chair	Denise Rhoads	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present	[Yes]
Member	James Lanning	Present	[Yes]

Public Hearing

Applicant: John Priest
3790 Ashworth Drive
Cincinnati, OH

Property:
1787 Russells Landing
Skaneateles, New York
Tax Map # 063.-03-07.0

Present: John Priest, Applicant; Robert Eggleston, Architect

No one requested the public hearing notice to be read. This notice was published in the *Skaneateles Press* on November 7, 2012. All members of the Zoning Board of Appeals attended the site visit. The

Z.B.A.11.13.2012

Onondaga County Planning Board correspondence dated October 3, 2012 recommends the following modification: The applicant is required to obtain any necessary approvals and/or permits required by the New York State Department of Environmental conservation and the City of Syracuse Department of Water. The City of Syracuse Department of Water has no comments regarding the proposal in their correspondence dated September 28, 2012.

CEO Williams stated that per New York State residential code on existing buildings, the State will allow 6'8" existing ceiling height as potentially habitable space. Any proposed areas considered not potentially habitable will need to have a ceiling height of less than 6' 8" in height.

Mr. Eggleston stated that new buildings defined as habitable space with 7' ceiling height; however after the building is completed the building would fall under the existing building category and a ceiling height of 6'8" or greater would be considered habitable. The drawings for the proposed garage will be modified to reflect the ceiling height under 6'8".

The applicants own a 22,000SF lot that is 75' wide on Russells Landing. It is a ranch style home with walkout basement that is located on the edge of the bank. The lot is nonconforming as it is located in the LWOD and less than 40,000SF, and proposed construction within 1000' of the lake line. The total footprint and floor space of all principal and accessory buildings shall not exceed 6% and 10% of the lot area respectively, whereas the site plan shows the proposed 576SF garage to increase the existing footprint of 8.3% to 10.5%, and the existing floor space of 14.4% to 17%.

They are proposing a detached two-car garage as there is no viable way to incorporate the garage attached to the dwelling. The proposed garage is placed within the existing driveway; no increase in impermeable surface coverage will be incurred. Existing impermeable surface coverage is 21.4% with a proposed 19.9% impermeable surface coverage. Reductions in the size of the driveway with the removal of the turnaround, removing a shed and slate patio, and replacing the impermeable steps to the lake with permeable steps are proposed to reduce the impermeable surface coverage. The applicant will be making a contribution to the Town Land and Development Acquisition Fund to mitigate for the impermeable surface coverage over the 10% allowed. The minimum side yard setback of this nonconforming lot is 15' whereas the applicant is requesting to place the proposed garage 10' from the south property line.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Vice Chair Rhoads and seconded by Member Condon to declare this application to be a Type II action not subject to SEQR review. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

At this time Chairman Graham opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the application. There was no one who wished to speak in favor of the proposal. Chairman Graham asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition, or had any other comments. There was no one who wished to speak in opposition or had any other comments. Letters of support for the proposal from the neighbors to the north and south have been submitted.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Member Lanning and seconded by Vice Chair Rhoads to close the Public Hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

At this time Counsel Molnar reviewed with the Board the statutory criteria set forth in Town Code Section 148-45D (a-e) for an Area Variance. Counsel stated that in making their determination the Zoning Board of Appeals is required to consider certain factors, which are:

1. **Whether an undesirable change would be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties:** No. The proposal is in keeping with the properties in the neighborhood and will produce a desirable change. There are other nearby year round homes that have detached garages and the proposed garage will be appropriate to the neighborhood.
2. **Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by a feasible alternative to the variance:** No. The dwelling is located on a nonconforming lot in the Lake Watershed Overlay District and there is no alternative than to pursue a variance for the garage. The applicant has revised his request to reduce the scope of the variance requested and placed the proposed garage over existing tarvia to assist in the reduction of impermeable surface coverage.
3. **Whether the requested variance is substantial; within 200 feet of Skaneateles Lake, any area variance that enlarges a building or enables it to encroach into a required lake yard shall be presumed to be substantial because of the cumulative risk of degradation of the lake posed by granting individual variances. This presumption is rebuttable:** No. As the property is located in the Lake Watershed Overlay District it is considered substantial; however the applicant's variance request is minimal. The proposed garage will be located over existing tarvia with the side yard setback variance revised from 5' to the south property line to 10' from the south property line. Reduction in impermeable surface coverage with the removal of the shed, portion of the driveway and replacing impermeable surface walkways to permeable walkways will improve the property.
4. **Would the variance have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental condition in the neighborhood; within 200 feet of Skaneateles Lake, any area variance than enlarges a building or enables it to encroach into a required lake yard shall be presumed to have an adverse environmental impact because of the cumulative risk of degradation of the lake posed by granting individual variances. This presumption is rebuttable:** No. The impermeable surface coverage will be reduced from 21.4% to 19.9% with reduction in the driveway, replacement of impermeable walkways to permeable walkways and removal of the slate patio will enhance the environmental conditions of the neighborhood. The proposed garage will be located over 150' from the lake yard.
5. **Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created:** Yes.

WHEREAS, in review of the above 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. Based on the Board members' site visits and discussions before the Board at the public hearing the benefit to the applicant outweighs the detriment to the community and will not have significant adverse impacts on the character of the neighborhood or the physical or environmental conditions of the property

WHEREFORE a motion was made Vice Chair Rhoads and seconded by Member Condon, that this application be **APPROVED** with standard conditions and additional special conditions:

SPECIAL CONDITIONS: The ZBA finds that the following conditions are necessary in order to minimize adverse impacts upon the neighborhood or community, for the reasons following:

Condition No. 1: That the Site Plan drawing 1 of 2 dated October 22, 2012; the Narrative dated October 22, 2012 prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, Architect, be followed in all respects; and

Condition No. 2: That the Site Plan drawing 2 of 2 prepared by Robert O. Eggleston be updated and submitted to reflect the correct interior building height of 6' 7 1/2" as proposed on November 13, 2012; and

Condition No. 3: The applicant shall comply with all conditions imposed by the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board in connection with issuance of the Special Permit and/or site plan approval; and

Condition No. 4: Applicant shall obtain a foundation only permit and provide a foundation location survey to the Codes Enforcement Officer confirming location prior to continuing construction of the structure; and

Condition No. 5: An as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

	<u>Record of Vote</u>		
Chair	David Graham	Present	[Yes]
Vice Chair	Denise Rhoads	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present	[Yes]
Member	James Lanning	Present	[Yes]

Public Hearing

Applicant: Larry & Lynne Meeske
3610 74th Street
Moline, Illinois

Property:
2332 Thornton Grove South
Skaneateles, New York
Tax Map # 056.-03-13.0

Present: Robert Eggleston, Architect
Z.B.A.11.13.2012

No one requested the public hearing notice to be read. This notice was published in the *Skaneateles Press* on November 7, 2012. The City of Syracuse Department of Water commented that the City of Syracuse and County Health Department must issue written acceptance of the onsite wastewater treatment system in their correspondence dated September 26, 2012. All members of the Zoning Board of Appeals attended the site visit.

The property is 12,944SF with 50' width on Thornton Grove with a small 854SF dwelling. The original cottage was modified in the 1970's with a small addition built slab on grade. The two bedrooms are very small and the applicant would like to modify the existing two bedrooms into one bedroom on the first floor and an additional 414SF second story for the location of the second bedroom and loft. The septic system is being reviewed to comply with current requirements including an alarm for the pump chamber. The front part of the 1930s cottage roof is 6.5' in height and the applicant would like to raise and replace the roof reversing the gable.

The existing shoreline structures of 113SF with 400SF allowed, and the applicant would like to add a permeable patio and concrete steps within 50' of the lake. The existing dwelling is 33' from the lake and the proposed addition is 56' from the lake line and requires a variance. The height of the building within 50' of the lake requires a variance. The footprint will remain the same with the living space increasing from the existing 854SF to 1268SF whereas 1294SF is the maximum square footage allowed.

Impermeable surface coverage will be reduced from 25.3% to 20.2% and the applicant is obtaining Planning Board approval for a special permit for redevelopment. The applicant will be making a contribution to the Town Land and Development Acquisition Fund to mitigate for the impermeable surface coverage over the 10% allowed. Open space is increasing from the existing 74.3% to 76.6%; however under the minimum 80% allowed.

Chairman Graham inquired if the narrowed driveway will have proper drainage in the plans. Mr. Eggleston stated that the plans will take that into consideration and that boulders are located near the driveway turnaround and leach field to control the drive and parking areas.

Mr. Eggleston stated that they have had communication with the OCDOH regarding the existing septic system and that they have recommended small enhancements to the system. They will do a final inspection and approval once the work is completed.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Vice Chair Rhoads and seconded by Member Condon to declare this application to be a Type II action not subject to SEQR review. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

At this time Chairman Graham opened the public hearing and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the application. There was no one who wished to speak in favor of the proposal. Chairman Graham asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition, or had any other comments. There was no one who wished to speak in opposition or had any other

comments. Letters of support for the proposal from the neighbors to the north and south have been submitted.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Member Lanning and seconded by Vice Chair Rhoads to close the Public Hearing. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

At this time Counsel Molnar reviewed with the Board the statutory criteria set forth in Town Code Section 148-45D (a-e) for an Area Variance. Counsel stated that in making their determination the Zoning Board of Appeals is required to consider certain factors, which are:

1. **Whether an undesirable change would be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties:** No. The changes requested are in keeping with the neighborhood and will have a positive effect on the neighboring properties. There are similar cottages on lots of this size and the proposal is for a small addition that will maintain two bedrooms in compliance with the septic system.
2. **Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by a feasible alternative to the variance:** No. The dwelling is located on a nonconforming lot in the Lake Watershed Overlay District and there is no alternative than to pursue a variance for the addition.
3. **Whether the requested variance is substantial; within 200 feet of Skaneateles Lake, any area variance that enlarges a building or enables it to encroach into a required lake yard shall be presumed to be substantial because of the cumulative risk of degradation of the lake posed by granting individual variances. This presumption is rebuttable:** No. The footprint of the cottage will not change with the proposed addition. The modification to the roof will provide more lake visibility to the applicant and the 414SF addition will not further encroach the lake.
4. **Would the variance have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental condition in the neighborhood; within 200 feet of Skaneateles Lake, any area variance that enlarges a building or enables it to encroach into a required lake yard shall be presumed to have an adverse environmental impact because of the cumulative risk of degradation of the lake posed by granting individual variances. This presumption is rebuttable:** No. The impermeable surface coverage will be reduced from 25.3% to 20.2% with reduction in the parking and turnaround area, and the applicant is prepared to make a contribution to the Town Land and Development Rights Acquisition Fund. The site plan also reflects boulders in place to control the defined parking areas.
5. **Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created:** Yes.

WHEREAS, in review of the above 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. Based on the Board members' site visits and discussions before the Board at the public hearing the benefit to the applicant

Z.B.A.11.13.2012

outweighs the detriment to the community and will not have significant adverse impacts on the character of the neighborhood or the physical or environmental conditions of the property

WHEREFORE a motion was made Vice Chair Rhoads and seconded by Member Condon, that this application be **APPROVED** with standard conditions and additional special conditions:

SPECIAL CONDITIONS: The ZBA finds that the following conditions are necessary in order to minimize adverse impacts upon the neighborhood or community, for the reasons following:

Condition No. 1: That the Site Plan drawing 1 of 2 dated October 15, 2012; Site Plan drawing 2 of 2 dated September 4, 2012; the Narrative dated October 16, 2012 prepared by Robert O. Eggleston, Architect, be followed in all respects; and

Condition No. 2: The applicant shall obtain all necessary approval from the Onondaga County Department of Health for the on-site wastewater treatment system; and

Condition No. 3: The applicant shall comply with all conditions imposed by the Town of Skaneateles Planning Board in connection with issuance of the Special Permit and/or site plan approval; and

Condition No. 4: An as-built survey be submitted to the Codes Enforcement Officer with verification of conformance of completed project within (60) days of completion of the project.

	<u>Record of Vote</u>		
Chair	David Graham	Present	[Yes]
Vice Chair	Denise Rhoads	Present	[Yes]
Member	Jim Condon	Present	[Yes]
Member	James Lanning	Present	[Yes]

Public Hearing Continuance

Applicant: Victory Sports Medicine
791 East Genesee St
Skaneateles, New York

Property:
Cherry Valley Turnpike
Skaneateles, New York
Tax Map # 042.-01-13.1

Present: John Langey, Legal Counsel

At the request of the applicant, the Public Hearing Continuance will be adjourned until the regularly scheduled Zoning Board of Appeals meeting on December 4, 2012. No comments will be accepted at the meeting tonight; however, letters regarding the project can be submitted to the Town Hall until December 3, 2012.

WHEREFORE a motion was made by Vice Chair Rhoads and seconded by Member Condon to continue the Public Hearing on ***December 4, 2012 at 7:20 pm***. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmance of said motion.

Discussion

Applicant: John Cherundolo
4443 Dolomite Drive
Syracuse, New York 13215

Property:
West Lake Road, Route 41A
Skaneateles, New York
Tax Map # 061.-01-12.1

The Zoning Board of Appeals will send a letter to the applicant requesting that he submit revised plans as discussed in May 2012 or submit a letter of withdrawal of the application.

Discussion

Cornell University Cooperative Extension has scheduled a Skaneateles Lake Watershed Official Meeting at Niles Town Hall on Tuesday, November 27, 2012. Please inform the office if you expect to attend the meeting so that a reservation can be made.

There being no further business a motion was made by Vice Chair Rhoads and seconded by Member Lanning to adjourn the meeting. The Zoning Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at 8:19 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen Barkdull