Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals May 22, 2013

- The meeting of the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals was convened at 7:30 P.M. by
- 2 Chairperson Mary Sirois. Present at the meeting were Board members, John Wisor, Roy
- 3 Hogben, Don Eckrich, and Dolores Adler; Code Enforcement Officer Marty Moseley; Village
- 4 Attorney David Dubow; Applicant: Joan Foote and Jack Rueckheim from Bolton Point

6 Sirois appointed Roy Hogben as an acting member due to the absence of Board member Patrick Gillespie.

Dubow indicated that he does occasionally represent Bolton Point in addition to the Village of Lansing, and has done so in the past.

Public Hearing to Consider:

Sirois opened the public hearing to consider Appeal No. 2013-01, Southern Cayuga Lake Intermunicipal Water Commission (Bolton Point Water District), to construct an accessory structure. An area variance is required because the proposed accessory structure would be out of compliance with Section 145-39 E(2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Village of Lansing Code. The property is located in the Low Density Residential District, Tax Parcel No. 42.1-1-37.1.

Moseley indicated that he had received the proof of mailings for the public hearing.

Moseley noted that a General Municipal Law 239 –l, -m, and –nn is not required, but was requested of the Tompkins County Planning Department. Moseley indicated that the Tompkins County Planning Department has provided a response that indicated that there is no negative or county wide impact for the proposed project. Moseley indicated that the Town of Lansing has sent a response as well, which indicates that the Town of Lansing has no issues with the proposed project.

Rueckheim indicated that approximately 7 years ago Bolton Point started treating the potable water with chlorine dioxide, on a trial basis. This has not transitioned into a permanent treatment of the water. Rueckheim added that the chlorine dioxide needs to be separately stored from other chemicals that are used. The purpose of the separate building is to separate the chemical when being stored and allowing enough chemical to be stored during the winter months because the delivery vehicle could not traverse down the road to the pump house due to the incline and conditions. Rueckheim indicated that they would be requesting to exceed the 10% lot coverage, the side yard and front yard setbacks, and the minimum street frontage. Rueckheim noted that the building does have what may be considered to be street frontage, but it is not a public road and is minimal. Rueckheim noted that for transportation of the chlorine dioxide a hazmat truck driver would be needed, and they would like to keep the chlorine dioxide close so that Bolton Point staff would be able to move it easier and safer. Rueckheim added that the treatment with the chlorine dioxide has been successful. Rueckheim indicated that the building is approximately 192 square feet.

42 43 With no further input from the public, Wisor moved to close the public hearing, Seconded by 44 Hogben; Ayes by Sirois, Wisor, Adler, Eckrich, and Hogben. 45 46 47 Adler asked about spill response. 48 49 Rueckheim indicated that they follow spill response regulations with the New York State Sanitary Code and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Department. 50 51 The Board worked through the Short Environmental Assessment Form (EAF). After discussion, 52 the Board completed the EAF, after which they determined that the proposed action will not 53 result in any significant adverse environmental impacts. 54 55 Eckrich moved the following SEQRA resolution: 56 57 58 VILLAGE OF LANSING BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS RESOLUTION ADOPTED ON MAY 22, 2013 FOR THE SEQR 59 REVIEW OF APPEAL NO. 2013-01 60 61 62 Don Eckrich 63 *Motion made by:* 64 Motion seconded by: _____Roy Hogben 65 66 **WHEREAS**: 67 68 A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Appeal No. 69 2013-01, Southern Cayuga Lake Intermunicipal Water Commission (Bolton Point 70 Water District), to construct an accessory structure. An area variance is required 71 because the proposed accessory structure would be out of compliance with Section 72 145-39 E(2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Village of Lansing Code. The property is 73 located in the Low Density Residential District, Tax Parcel No. 42.1-1-37.1; and 74 75 B. This proposed action is an Unlisted Action for which the Village of Lansing Board of 76 77 Zoning Appeals is an involved agency for the purposes of environmental review; and 78 C. On May 22, 2013, the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals, in performing the 79 lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in 80 accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law -81 the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"), (i) thoroughly reviewed the 82 Short Environmental Assessment Form (the "Short EAF"), Part I, and any and all 83 other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its 84 environmental review, (ii) thoroughly analyzed the potential relevant areas of 85

86 environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR 87 Section 617.7(c), and (iii) completed the Short EAF, Part II; 88 89 *NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:* 90 91 92 1. The Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals, based upon (i) its thorough review 93 of the Short EAF, Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted 94 with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review, (ii) its thorough 95 review of the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the 96 proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including 97 98 the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), and (iii) its completion of the Short EAF, Part II, including the findings noted thereon (which findings are 99 incorporated herein as if set forth at length), hereby makes a negative determination 100 of environmental significance ("NEGATIVE DECLARATION") in accordance with 101 SEQR for the above referenced proposed action, and determines that neither a Full 102 Environmental Assessment Form, nor an Environmental Impact Statement will be 103 required; and 104 105 2. The Responsible Officer of the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals is hereby 106 authorized and directed to complete and sign as required the Short EAF, Part III, 107 confirming the foregoing NEGATIVE DECLARATION, which fully completed and 108 signed Short EAF shall be attached to and made a part of this Resolution. 109 110 111 The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows: 112 113 114 AYES: Mary Sirois, Don Eckrich, Dolores Adler, John Wisor, and Roy Hogben 115 NAYS: none 116 117 The motion was declared to be carried. 118 119 120 Based on the Board working though the variance criteria, Wisor moved the following variance resolution: 121 122 VILLAGE OF LANSING BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS RESOLUTION ADOPTED ON 123 124 MAY 22, 2013 FOR APPEAL NO. 2013-01 125 126 127 *Motion made by:* John Wisor 128

Dolores Adler

Motion seconded by: _____

129130

WHEREAS:

A. This matter involves consideration of the following proposed action: Appeal No. 2013-01, Southern Cayuga Lake Intermunicipal Water Commission (Bolton Point Water District), to construct an accessory structure. An area variance is required because the proposed accessory structure would be out of compliance with Section 145-39 E(2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Village of Lansing Code. The property is located in the Low Density Residential District, Tax Parcel No. 42.1-1-37.1; and

B. On May 22, 2013, the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals held a public hearing regarding such action, and thereafter thoroughly reviewed and analyzed (i) the materials and information presented by and on behalf of the applicant(s) in support of this appeal, (ii) all other information and materials rightfully before the Board, and (iii) all issues raised during the public hearing and/or otherwise raised in the course of the Board's deliberations; and

C. On May 22, 2013, the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals determined that the proposed action is an Unlisted Action for which the Board is an involved agency, and in performing the lead agency function for its independent and uncoordinated environmental review in accordance with Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law - the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQR"), the Board (i) thoroughly reviewed the Short Environmental Assessment Form (the "Short EAF"), Part I, and any and all other documents prepared and submitted with respect to this proposed action and its environmental review, (ii) thoroughly analyzed the potential relevant areas of environmental concern to determine if the proposed action may have a significant adverse impact on the environment, including the criteria identified in 6 NYCRR Section 617.7(c), (iii) completed the Short EAF, Part II; and (iv) made a negative determination of environmental significance ("Negative Declaration") in accordance with SEQR for the above referenced proposed action and determined that an Environmental Impact Statement would not be required; and

D. On May 22, 2013, in accordance with Section 712-b of the Village Law of the State of New York and Village of Lansing Code Sections 115-14 and 145-74 A(1), the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals, in the course of its deliberations, took into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the area variance is granted as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals hereby makes the following findings with respect to the specific criteria for such area variance as set forth in Section 712-

175 b of the Village Law of the State of New York and Village of Lansing Code Section 145-74 A(1): 176 177 178 Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or detriment to nearby properties will be created by granting the 179 area variance. 180 181 Finding: 182 No, because due to the location there are no residences in the immediate 183 proximity of the property and none are permitted in that area, and there is 184 185 also an existing fence that encompasses the existing property. 186 187 188 Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method 189 feasible for the applicant to pursue other than an area variance. 190 191 Finding: 192 No, because the impending mandates for the new chemical treatments 193 194 resulting in the need for the related accessory building would not be able to achieve compliance with the Village regulations due to the size and nature of 195 the new building and the existing lot. 196 197 198 199 200 Whether the requested area variance is substantial. 201 Finding: 202 203 Although the requested area variance may be considered substantial in terms of the overall scope of the variance, the actual effect of the variance is not a 204 substantial impact on the area. 205 206 207 Whether the proposed area variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the 208 physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district. 209 210 Finding: No, the accessory structure will have little or no adverse effect or 211 impact on the area, and presumably the new accessory structure will facilitate the 212 new chemical treatment requirements and thereby have a favorable 213 environmental effect based on the purpose of the building. 214 215 216 Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created. 217 218 Finding: 219

220 No, because the site was in existence prior to the Village being created and the chemicals that need to be stored to be added to the potable water are being 221 mandated, which was not foreseeable when the original facilities were built. 222 223 224 225 226 2. It is hereby determined by the Village of Lansing Board of Zoning Appeals that the following variance is **GRANTED AND APPROVED** (with conditions, if any, as 227 indicated), it being further determined that such variance is the minimum necessary 228 and adequate to grant relief and at the same time preserve and protect the character 229 of the neighborhood and the health, safety and welfare of the community: 230 231 Description of Variance: 232 A variance has been granted to permit the construction of an accessory building 233 approximately 12'x16' and not to exceed approximately 8' in height, which building will 234 be allowed to be placed in part within the side and front yard setback areas 235 approximately 2' from the side and front boundaries, allows for the lot coverage to 236 exceed 10%, allows for the lot not to meet the minimum road frontage requirements for 237 Low Density Residential District, and allows, if necessary, for the accessory building to 238 encroach on the rear yard setback area. 239 240 Conditions of Variance: 241 242 None 243 244 245 246 *The vote on the foregoing motion was as follows:* 247 248 249 AYES: Mary Sirois, Don Eckrich, Dolores Adler, John Wisor, and Roy Hogben 250 251 252 NAYS: none 253 254 The motion was declared to be carried. **Approval of the Minutes** 255 None 256 257 Adjournment: 258 There being no other business, Eckrich moved to adjourn at 8:18 P.M.. Seconded by Hogben. 259 Ayes by Sirois, Adler, Wisor, Eckrich, and Hogben. 260