



**Notable Questions/Comments/Clarifications** include:

- Applicants are technically seeking a 20-foot Variance – on the front & side.
- Original application included a cantilevered porch with an awning; however, this was purely a design detail & the **Applicants** are willing to forego it.
- Discrepancy regarding where measurements are from – shortest point/eaves
- The application is for 1,510 sq ft of additional living space – applicant clarifies location of well and septic. **Andy** states concern with the size of the home and references the tax roll/comps. The **applicants** believe an addition of this size would be advantageous for the Town & its subsequent effect on the tax roll.
- **Applicants** don't want to put the garage on the other side of the house because of the driveway, they would need a Variance regardless of what they tried to put where & felt the location of the proposed structure looked more fluid with the pre-existing structure. Due to the current layout of the site, it isn't possible to extend off the back.
- Management of ground water/drainage on the East side of the structure
- Type II for SEQR – pre-existing structure.

MOTION to close the Public Hearing: **Motion** made by **Kylie**, seconded by **Herman**.

*All ayes.*

MOTION CARRIED

## **Public Meeting**

The **Applicants** procure structural examples they've pulled from neighboring properties, stating they've used these garages/layouts as templates for designing their proposal. There is a shed on the property they have already moved to come into compliance, but the goal is to remove this completely and use that area for a garden. **Herman** points out to the **Board** the new structure would be further off the road than what is currently there & reminds the **Board** the **Applicant** could bypass the ZBA all together by making a submission to the County for the driveway & put the project, size as proposed, on the other side of the existing structure – though the **Applicants** do not want to do so as they don't feel it would blend architecturally with the existing structure or surrounding homes. Included in the application is a plan for a "swim spa", which upon further review, **Andy** surmises would also need a sizeable Variance.

Several **Board** members voice concern with the size of the proposed project. **Andy** also has concern with granting the 20-foot variance, as that would stretch and effectively wall off the entirety of the neighboring property to the East, with two stories. It's confirmed that while two-family dwellings are prohibited in the Lake district, this does not meet the criteria for such. **Jim** questions **Max** about fire code verbiage, r/e minimum distance between garages (due to their higher "fire risk") – **Max** is going to research this further. **Mr. Basile** is willing to concede slightly on size by adjusting the depth of the garage, i.e. making the garage 2 cars wide by 1.5 cars deep. **Herman** points out, in the interest of side setbacks, the parcel to the East is a non-conforming lot, so future buildability would be complex, if possible, at all.

**Andy** states he would like to see a more detailed site plan, to include surrounding parcels.

There was confusion regarding whether this application needed County referral due to its proximity to a county road (Crooked Street) or whether the ZBA had a waiver. **Andy** was contacting the County for clarification, though the Board voted to submit, and subsequently Table the Application, pending County review/waiver.

MOTION to Table: **Motion** made by **Jim**, seconded by **Herman**.

*All ayes.*

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION to Adjourn: **Motion** made by **Herman**, seconded by **Dave**.  
*All ayes.*

MOTION CARRIED

Respectfully Submitted,

Marlene R. Neahr