

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

Present:

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

Chair Rhoads opened the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting at 7:03 pm. Vice Chair Palen was absent. Member Ketchum was present via Zoom. Codes Enforcement Officer, Robert Herrmann Jr., was in attendance.

Minutes

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

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Kiefer and seconded by Member Ketchum to accept January 7, 2025, minutes as submitted. The Board having been polled resulted in unanimous affirmation of said motion.

Record of Vote

Chair	Denise Rhoads	Present [Yes]
Vice Chair	David Palen	Absent
Member	Kris Kiefer	Present [Yes]
Member	Dave Lee	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes] (Via Zoom)

Public Hearing - Interpretation

Applicant:	Jolene Fitch Finger Lakes Fabrics, LLC 1400 East Genesee Street Skaneateles, NY 13152	Property:	1400 East Genesee Street Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map #042.-01-10.1
------------	--	-----------	---

Present: Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC
Jolene Fitch, Applicant

Chair Rhoads stated that this application is a request for code Interpretation, made by the Planning Board. Applicant, Jolene Fitch was present with Design Professional, Robert Eggleston of Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC.

Counsel Molar explained that the Planning Board had respectfully requested the ZBA provide an interpretation of Zoning Code Section 148-4-4.B.2, as well as review of the pertinent defining

paragraphs relative to the Highway Commercial Zoning District. That was not clear to the Planning Board when reviewing the code and it therefore felt that it was unable to make a determination until the ZBA weighed in and provided an interpretation of the pertinent section.

Finger Lakes Fabrics, LLC is located at 1400 East Genesee Street, formerly the Chase Design building, and, it has by way of a Special Permit resolution adopted by the Planning Board on November 15, 2022, permitted the owner, Ms. Fitch to operate a retail business, being a quilt and fabric store within the facility in an existing 6,500SF portion of the existing building, located in the HC District Zone. The Special Permit approval in 2022 was subject to various conditions, including that the narrative and detailed site plan dated October 3, 2022, prepared by the Applicant, Jolene Fitch, be strictly followed and that, in summary, is operation of a retail store onsite for fabric and quilting. The Applicant is now requesting that the Planning Board amend that previously approved Special Permit to also permit a lodging facility onsite for retreats to be held by the Applicant and the retail store, as an accessory use to the retail use. The question is whether or not that additional accessory use is permitted in the zone according to Town Code.

Counsel Molnar stated that he thinks it is important to recognize that the Applicant has provided a great deal of information on what the proposed lodging facility as an accessory use will be and what it will look like, adding that he defers to the Applicant to provide additional details for the public record.

Counsel Molnar provided an interpretation memo via email to the Board, copying the Applicant in, essentially providing his recommendation for review of the code section at issue as well as some of the defining factors for the Board's consideration when reviewing the facts in the public record made.

At this time, Counsel Molnar recommended to the Board that it conduct the public hearing and then subsequently digest that information. The public hearing would include the Board's deliberations on what is customarily incidental, to as part of the definition of accessory use, and also the facts and circumstances presented by the Applicant for use of this building in the HC Zoning District. Additionally, Town of Skaneateles CEO, Robert Herrmann Jr., was in attendance and wanted to make some statements for the Board's consideration so that at the close of the public hearing, the information could be collectively summarized and reviewed by the Board for a deliberation, and an interpretation resolution to be issued at the next available meeting.

Counsel Molnar added that he circulated to the Board, work done by Clerk Barkdull regarding the definition of accessory use and how it is and has been used in the HC District, starting from the inception of Town Code, in 1966, to present. Amendments were made in 1985, 1996, 2005, and 2020.

1966: The term "accessory use" means a use, not otherwise contrary to law, customarily incidental to the use of a building for dwelling purposes.

1985: A use, not otherwise contrary to law, customarily incidental to the use of a structure for dwelling purposes.

1996: A use customarily incidental and subordinate to the principal use or building, and located on the same lot with such principal use or building.

2005: A use customarily incidental and subordinate to the principal use or building and used in conjunction with such principal use or building.

Furthermore, the Highway Commercial section, which permits accessory use on Special Permit, etc. was also amended. At that time, the HC Zone had the same preamble, essentially as it appears today. Accessory uses customarily incidental to principal uses shown on the use table shall be allowed on the same terms as the principal uses, whether or not on the same lot, except as otherwise indicated on the Use Table.

2020: A use which is customarily incidental to and subordinate to the principal use of a lot or structure, located on the same lot as the principal use or structure.

Furthermore, Section 148-4-1. of the zoning code sets forth Section E; Uses that are customarily associated with specific principal uses are allowed on the same basis as the principal use (i.e., by right subject to Site Plan approval, or by Special Permit.)

Counsel Molnar then stated that what the Board can look to is whether or not a lodging facility is customarily incidental, or in other words, customarily associated with retail in the HC Zone District, and to recall that this is applicable town-wide to Skaneateles and the HC Zone District as well as other retail uses which may or may not come forward to request a similar, or even different association for an accessory use.

At this time, Counsel Molnar recommended that the Board hear from the Applicant on these issues, and in particular, what is customarily associated, or what is customarily incidental to the primary use.

Mr. Eggleston stated that after hearing comments from the Board at their site visit, they had provided new information which included a revised site plan. An egress door was added on the east side of the building, from the lounge/work area where a lot of the instruction activities would occur. The newly proposed door is close to and conveniently located near the proposed bedrooms. The bedrooms will have egress windows. It was commented on at the site visit that said egress windows have a legal 44-inch-high sill but might be difficult to get out of. The Applicant was agreeable, so they have now shown a small deck to come out on to make egress shorter. He continued saying that in his opinion, while they already had a proper size, and being less than 200 feet to a public way, the deck enhances that.

Mr. Eggleston also stated that a lot of information has been provided, as far as Code review. They have provided a pathway for Code compliance within the NYS Building Code. He noted that they usually fine tune aspects of building code compliance after receiving zoning approvals, but they have addressed some of the issues that were brought forward so they can show there is a pathway to have this be allowable within the space. They have a lot of information about parking, the facilities, and management. Mr. Eggleston noted that these were all Planning Board issues which they will look at under the Special Permit Application. Additionally, in the narrative and original site plan, the Special Permit was for retail, and in the narrative, it was stated that they do retail but also do group instruction, which is a permitted use under a service business. Mr. Eggleston wondered whether the

amended Site Plan application needs to be further modified to include that because it may not have been included in the original application.

Mr. Eggleston pointed out that as stated in the narrative, Ms. Fitch does both retail and group instruction. Currently, she is doing day seminars. She has also done retreats offsite just to be able to combine the lodging and function activities. Although Ms. Fitch could continue using remote lodging locations, she has explained the preference and convenience of having it all in one place. So really the reason they are in front of the ZBA is to review the definition of accessory use, which is customarily incidental and subordinate.

Mr. Eggleston stated that in making a lodging facility and accessory use, there is no question by the Planning Board and ZBA that the lodging dormitory style bedrooms are definitely subordinate to retail and the group instruction they have to add to the application to formalize. While a lodging facility itself is a permitted use, they could come in and ask for a hotel. Mr. Eggleston thought it made for a stronger application to make it an accessory because it would only be used in conjunction with the retreats. The space would not be rented out to the general public for weddings or holidays. Really, it comes down to the word “customarily” to the principal use.

Mr. Eggleston stated that in the last month, the Applicant had provided four examples in NYS and nearby, where there are similar establishments that have retail, group instruction, and lodging all in the same building, so one cannot say it has not been done. It has been done in other municipalities. Additional information was also provided before the meeting, and copies provided to the Board. A US map indicating approximately 100 retreats across the nation was also provided to show that these retreats are becoming more common. The Applicant provided letters of support from the public for the business, which were entered into the record. Mr. Eggleston highlighted where the authors cite examples of other facilities they have visited that have on-site dwelling accommodations with retreat. The purpose of these documents was to show that the concept does exist and is something that is evolving as do many other uses over time.

Mr. Eggleston stated that he appreciates Clerk Barkdull doing and providing research of the Town Code, starting with 1966. He noted that the word “customarily” has always been in the definition. He thinks the purpose of that is to give flexibility because of changing times- the way we live and think about things that evolves over time. While you do not find lodging in every retail store or group education service business you walk into, it is becoming more popular and is maybe a newer custom in the fact that it does not yet exist in our community, it does not preclude it from being a customarily incidental or subordinate use.

Mr. Eggleston asked the Board to consider what is “customarily” accepted? A controlled limited lodging facility, by having it an accessory use to a retail and group education service business is an appropriate subordinate use as opposed to the alternative of putting a firewall in and a hotel.

Chair Rhoads asked if this were a standalone building, would we still be here for an interpretation for accessory use. Mr. Eggleston stated that we likely would not be. He added that had they presented it as a separate primary building, you could have mixed use. They already have an office, retail, and warehouse uses within the building- It is mixed use building, which is allowed.

Chair Rhoads stated that she was thinking of some of the other properties like Pudder's, with a house and mini golf, the Sailboat Shop, the dermatologist & hair salon. So, there are properties that have multiple uses that are allowed in the Code, but they are for the most part separate buildings.

Mr. Eggleston stated that this is correct but also thinks they are treated as separate primary uses so they are not necessarily accessory uses. He used the example of The Sinclair, which purchased a house and had it turned into a lodging facility. They are separate buildings but used in conjunction. The lodging facility is also used for other purposes, so it appropriately is a separate primary use. Mr. Eggleston added that he knows of event centers that also provide overnight accommodations for the party, and it is common that you rent a facility and host a wedding, party, and sleep there. Some places even allow camping and RVs associated with event centers. He clarified that it is a transient dwelling as opposed to permanent (30 days or more).

Counsel Molnar commented on how the discussion provides context, which was appreciated. However, he recommended that the Board confine and limit its scope of interpretation of a lodging facility as an accessory use to a primary retail use. The conversation could go far and wide when talking about service business. He noted that if the conversation was moved toward a lodging facility as an accessory use to a service business, then it moves away from the focus which should be a lodging facility as an accessory use to a retail use.

Stating that there may have been an omission, Mr. Eggleston clarified that the context of the narrative is the group education, had that been permitted. He thought it was part of the original retail narrative, and that it is part of the conversation now. He added that if they had to, they would amend the Special Permit to include group education because it was not formally permitted. Because of service business use, not retail use, this is different than just a regular convenience store. He does not see having lodging in a convenience store as an accessory use. He added that it is retail that already has group instruction. Clerk Barkdull would have to pull the document and verify. Counsel Molnar did not recall it being listed as such.

Applicant, Ms. Fitch stated that you would be hard pressed to find any quilt centers anywhere without classrooms. Therefore, if service business use was not listed, it was omission because the education aspect of the business was planned since day one. Ms. Fitch also stated that if approved, she would challenge another business to show the amount of support that they had shown as far as other similar businesses having these things.

Ms. Fitch stated that in order to produce the 6-7 places that were retail commercial property with beds, which were provided to the Board, she did not have to do an exhaustive US search. The map provided only represents the businesses which signed up as members of the retreat site. Therefore, the map only represents a smattering of the number of sites across the US. Ms. Fitch added that from their perspective, it is common in fabric store/sewing sales to have this happen. She is not sure if the concern is that all these other retail businesses are going to want to put beds in their establishments is a concern, but if it is, she questioned whether the ZBA could make the stipulation that it has to be customary to their business.

Mr. Eggleston noted that in the definition "is subordinate and incidental to, not foreign to," from a precedent setting, it does not open the floodgates, it just allows the Planning Board to review the

appropriateness like they do of any Special Permit use i.e., what is appropriate, what is not appropriate, and shape the application accordingly.

Member Kiefer stated that from his perspective, the conversation had in a way crystalized. Is the key issue the Board is trying to interpret by looking at the definition of retail or is it customary to a fabric store that has quilting and group education? He expressed his concern with putting a hole in the interpretation of "customary" if the ZBA were to say any retail has some type of customary lodging facility associated with it. However, if the question is whether it is customary for a fabric store that offers quilting retreats to have this type of thing- that is very tailored, in his mind. Member Kiefer noted that he can get behind the research on what is customary in that they would not be putting a hole in the interpretation of that. Retail at large versus a fabric quilting store are two quite different things.

Counsel Molnar stated that he agreed, however, the Town Code and the use table includes retail, but does not include quilting. He added that quilting is a subset of what is retail, and the Special Permit approved for this site permits the sale of fabric and quilting supplies as the retail use. So, we do have a distinction in terms of an interpretation of the Code section because the section (Highway Commercial) use table does not include fabric stores and/or quilting.

Mr. Eggleston again stated that the quilting seminars are more of a service business, and they would correct the application to include that if necessary. He noted that this was in the narrative but was not called out as an additional use that needed to be included.

Counsel Molnar responded, stating that he recommends that and thinks it is important. If the Applicant is willing to volunteer that at least for the purposes of the record and confirm that, he thought it was a great idea.

Member Keifer commented that the 1966 version of the definition of accessory use refers to a customary and incidental to the use of a building for dwelling purposes. It seems like it started out as a lodging component and expanded with each revision. Member Lee said that when they first wrote that they were addressing home occupations and home accessory uses. Counsel Molnar reminded the Board of what the current zoning code states. An accessory use is a use which is customarily incidental to and subordinate to the principal use of a lot or structure, located on the same lot as the principal use or structure. It has moved away from the term dwelling.

Member Keifer asked if there is a risk that someone could be granted the use by right based on the interpretation. Counsel Molnar stated that that accessory uses that are customarily associated with specific principal uses are allowed on the same basis as the principal use (by right, by right subject to site plan approval, or by special permit.) In any case in the HC district retail and a lodging facility uses are by special permit, and would require an amendment to the special permit. A storage building and a small scale home occupation are allowed in the HC district by right.

At this time, Counsel Molnar recommended that the Board open the public hearing and nunc pro tunc conclude that which has already been presented for the Board's consideration. As the Board is using their appellate jurisdiction to make a determination of what the code means, it is not specifically an approval for the Applicant, and he recommended that the application is exempt from review under SEQR.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Ketchum and seconded by Member Keifer to consider the proposed action as a Type II SEQR action as per section 617.5(c)(37) and not subject to SEQR review. The Board having been polled resulted in the unanimous affirmation of said motion.

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

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

Bob Herrmann, Jr. Codes Enforcement Officer, said that that he relies on the use charts that are in the code. If the Zoning Code has a definition, then he uses that definition; otherwise, he goes through the common definition. The zoning code uses the term lodging facility and not lodging. It would be a facility and not an accessory use. The proposed two rooms is not defined well and the closest term that could be used is bunkroom. There are no facilities in it as they are offsite and just beds. It is not an apartment or a dormitory. Dormitories by definition are a longer stay such as a semester in college. He continued saying that it is not a permitted use, not in the Zoning Code, and should not have an interpretation.

Counsel Molnar stated that in 148-4-4.b, on the use table, he agreed with Mr. Herrmann that business uses include a lodging facility by special permit, and does not just say lodging.

Mr. Eggleston said that the definition of a lodging facility that says any hotel, motel, inn, or other establishment, other than a bed and breakfast, providing sleeping accommodations for transient guests, with or without a dining room or restaurant. He said in his opinion, "other establishment" opens the door. He continued saying that the key is "providing sleeping accommodations for transient guests" with or without dining rooms or restaurants. He said call it whatever, but in my opinion, they are saying it just needs to provide sleeping accommodations for transient guests as opposed to a permanent residence or dwelling that is long term. That is where hotels and motels are different than dwellings because they are transient versus permanent residence. He argued that a dormitory can be a transient occupancy if it is less than a month and can be a permanent occupancy if it is more than a month. A hostel is another establishment. I think when you look at the definition of lodging facility it says it provides sleeping accommodations for transient guests, which is all it says.

Chair Rhoads noted that the Town had received emails of support for the business that have been submitted to the record. Mr. Eggleston said that the special permit application had received a no objection letter from five immediate neighbors and that should be part of the record.

Member Ketchum asked that because the Board has to take every application separately subject to its own criteria, if the interpretation moves forward, it is a precedent set as they are not changing the zoning code. Counsel Molnar said that the interpretation would be of the zoning code section and uses in the Highway Commercial District. A primary use being retail and/or the service business use with the proposed lodging facility as an accessory use. That would be precedent setting for a retail use with service and/or lodging facility as accessory uses there as well. Member Ketchum said that every application thereafter could use this interpretation as their basis. Counsel Molnar agreed as this would be the basis for the Zoning Code that permits or does not permit.

Mr. Eggleston said that if he were to have a crystal ball, he could see an event center in the future that may want to add a transient lodging facility as an accessory use to the event center so that the wedding party could have overnight accommodations, which would be transient in nature as it would be less than thirty days. Is there a possibility of that applying to other applications, sure, but is it bad, I do not know as a lot of places have transient occupancy as part of a wedding facility. Is there a potential precedent, sure, but also every application is reviewed on its own merits of whether it is appropriate to the location and use as it would still need a special permit or site plan approval.

Member Ketchum said that it would never come before the Zoning Board of Appeals perse if the Board deems the interpretation to be in favor of the Applicant. It would go to the Planning Board or CEO for their application. She asked who determines the next application after this one that is similar to this one. Mr. Herrmann said that he has to protect the code as that is part of his job.

Member Kiefer said that his is grappling with the interpretation. He says that it tips the scale in favor of this going forward. The next one in front of the Planning Board will have to evaluate whether it is the right area or not as Mr. Eggleston has said. If the Planning Board were to deny it then there is already one that exists, and if I were representing them, I would say that this is article 78 ground. I now have some way to say your action was arbitrary and capricious, and why can I not have what they have. The pretext for denying me is not consistent with what you have allowed over here. There is greater weight given to the first one across the threshold because of the advantage it provides to the next one.

Counsel Molnar said that it was a fair point despite the fact that each application has its own unique factors and presents uniquely. Such as the Boards discussion of a service business or an event center (classified as a recreational business) seeking to modify their special permit to add a lodging facility. Despite the difference of each application proposes, precedent is being set by your interpretation of what the zoning code permits or does not.

Chair Rhoads said that when things come up it does give the opportunity for the Town Board to go back to the code and make it clearer if there is ambiguity. This may be an area that could be refined.

Member Lee said that you cannot foresee all of the unintended consequences of this, and it would come down to the Town Board to continue to review the Town Code to make revisions and definitions as needed. It would not necessarily sway his judgement in terms of making this definition the Board is being asked to do now.

Counsel Molnar said that if to the extent that a code section needs revision, it is entirely up to the Town Board and it is their prerogative to change it. It may be at the recommendation of the ZBA, the Planning Board or any other party. Counsel Molnar recommended that the application remain open until next month to provide time for any additional comments or questions that the Board may have after reviewing all of the submitted materials and comments. He will sift through the minutes and craft a draft resolution that leaves blanks for input from the Board for the next meeting.

WHEREFORE, a motion was made by Member Lee and seconded by Member Kiefer to carry the Public Hearing over to the March 4, 2025, ZBA Meeting, 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	Absent

Member	Kris Kiefer	Present [Yes]
Member	Dave Lee	Present [Yes]
Member	Sherill Ketchum	Present [Yes] (Via Zoom)

Initial Review

Applicant:	Jared & Mattie Tracy 1890 Sugar Maple Lane Skaneateles, NY 13152	Property:	1890 Sugar Maple Lane Skaneateles, NY 13152 Tax Map #034.-01-21.0
------------	--	-----------	--

Present: Michael DiPaola, TDK Engineering Associates, PE
Joe Durand, TDK Engineering Associates, PE

This application is for the construction of a 1,750 square foot storage barn and an 840 square foot attached garage located outside of the designated building envelope. Mr. DiPaola said that the storage barn would be for personal use and the attached garage would be attached to the existing dwelling by a breezeway. He said that the building envelope was designated by the HOA that was with the subdivision in 2006, called the Enclave in Skaneateles. He continued saying that the setbacks conform to the RR district setback that are not as strict as the HOA setbacks.

Counsel Molnar inquired if the HOA is active. Mr. Durand said that they are here because of that. When they began working with Mr. Herrmann, the HOA came up. The Tracy's are in a hybrid situation as the HOA was recorded but in discussions with Paul Curtin, who worked on the establishment of the HOA, the HOA is belly up as it is not funded, and the common areas are not maintained. Mr. Tracy owns this lot and the lot to the north that is on a private road which is part of the HOA but that he maintains. Mr. Herrmann had commented that the approved subdivision had established setbacks that were driven by the HOA. They are asking for variances on that criteria although they believe they conform to the RR district required setbacks.

Mr. DiPaola asked if the HOA is still active, and what setbacks they can use, the HOA established setbacks or the RR district setbacks.

Mr. Eggleston asked if he could speak as he was the design professional on record for the approval of this subdivision. He continued saying that the HOA has nothing to do with the setbacks. The setbacks were established by the zoning law. The 100 foot setback was established because of the requirement to be 100 feet from the watercourse for any building greater than 600 square feet. If the proposed attached garage was 599 square feet or less, then it could be 50 feet from the watercourse. The HOA has nothing to do with the setbacks, it has to do with the maintenance of the drainage facilities and the common areas. Another consideration should be given to the 1,750 storage building use because if it is for his contracting business then it should be 100 feet from the north property line.

Mr. Durand said that it would be for personal use and that the RR district allows for a 30 foot side yard setback. Mr. Eggleston said that the lot is a flag lot off a shared driveway that is off a Town road. The private drive maintenance would be indicated on the easement that would have been created. Mr. Durand commented that the conservation lot was sold and asked if they can do anything with it. Mr. Eggleston replied that they can farm it.

There are three variances that would be required, a watercourse setback, a setback to the east, and a setback to the north. Mr. Durand said that the watercourse is located outside of the property.

Mr. Durand asked about the HOA. Counsel Molnar said that part of the subdivision approval was that the Applicant was compelled to establish a HOA and utilization of the HOA to manage the common areas. During the process, the sponsor asked for relief and the HOA was not perfected; without the HOA being constituted with Board Members and used as a function to maintain the common areas. If the driveway is a private drive, between the three parcels, it is not HOA. The HOA does need to be reconstituted by all of the lot owners in the subdivision.

Mr. Eggleston commented that as the detached building is an accessory building it has to be back twice the front yard setback. Member Lee asked about the Town's role in the HOA. Counsel Molnar said that the New York State Attorney General controls the HOA as they are the ones that authorize the act and accept funds for properties. There has to be an HOA approval from the AG that permit the filing of the non-profit documents and filed with the county. The HOA has been filed with the state and county, but we have not been able to find any other documents over the years. There is a big gap there with a sponsor that filed for relief, and relieved of any financial or other obligations. The subdivision sat dormant for some time. The Town and the CEO have encouraged all of the lot owners in the subdivision to reconstitute the HOA and bring it forward so that it is actively managing the common areas.

Member Kiefer said that the Board typically does a site visit, but the Board is tasked with granting the minimum relief to achieve the benefit. There is now a fourth variance being added and the request is significant in terms of the breadth of what is trying to be accomplished. He suggested that the site plan could be redesigned and re-presented to the Board before a site visit is scheduled. Mr. Durand said that they will go back to the client to review the proposal. The application would need to be reviewed by the Planning Board due to the potential proximity of the garage in addition to the watercourse. Mr. DiPaola said that the watercourse is mostly dry during the year, and it was clarified that it is still considered a watercourse requiring the watercourse setback. Member Kiefer requested that a narrative be submitted with any updated site plan.

Discussion

The next ZBA meeting will be held on March 4, 2025, at 7:00 pm.

The next P&Z Staff meeting will be held on February 20, 2025, at 6:30pm.

There being no further Board business, a motion was made by Member Ketchum and seconded by Member Kiefer to adjourn the meeting. The Zoning Board of Appeals meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Aimie Case
ZBA Clerk

Karen Barkdull
Planning & Zoning Clerk

Meeting Attendees:

Robert Herrmann Jr., Town of Skaneateles CEO
Robert Eggleston, Eggleston & Krenzer Architects, PC
Jolene Fitch, Applicant
Lisa Russo
Michael DiPaola, TDK Engineering Associates, PE
Joe Durand, TDK Engineering Associates, PE

Meeting Attendees Via Zoom:

Sherill Ketchum, ZBA Member
Councilor Mark Tucker
Don Kasper