

**Town of Manlius  
Zoning Board of Appeals  
March 21, 2024  
6:30 PM**

The Town of Manlius Zoning Board held a hybrid meeting with in-person attendees and virtual attendees. The meeting was live streamed on the Town YouTube Channel. The recording of the meeting can be viewed here: <https://www.youtube.com/live/2MMbnMGKUaY?si=8MylUt-80UUz9f34>

Chairperson Karrie Catalino presided, and the following Board members present:

|        |              |                   |
|--------|--------------|-------------------|
| Absent | Member       | Clare Miller      |
|        | Member       | Tim Kelly         |
|        | Member       | Warren Linhart    |
|        | Member       | Eric Christensen  |
|        | Secretary    | Carrie Grevelding |
|        | Attorney     | Jamie Sutphen     |
|        | Code Officer | Tom Poitras       |

In Person Attendees: Richard Woodridge, East Syracuse.

Virtual Attendees: None

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM.

## Approval of Minutes – February 15, 2024

Member Kelly made a motion, seconded by Member Miller to approve the minutes of February 15, 2024, as submitted by Secretary Grevelding.

Ayes: Chairperson Catalino, Member Linhart, Member Miller, Member Kelly.

Nayes: 0                      All in Favor.                      Motion Carries.

Chairperson Catalino reviewed the application for 6785 Minoa Bridgeport Rd, East Syracuse.

## Legal Notice

Member Kelly made a motion, seconded by Member Linhart, to waive the reading of the public notice and it was carried unanimously.

Member Kelly made a motion, seconded by Member Linhart, to open the public hearing at 6:32 PM and it was carried unanimously.

Ayes: Chairperson Catalino, Member Linhart, Member Miller, Member Kelly.

Naves: 0                      All in Favor.                      Motion Carries.

**Richard Woodridge – 6785 Minoa Bridgeport Rd, East Syracuse, NY 13057 (Tax Map# 046.-01-03.0**

Mr. Woodridge started by stating he explored the option that was brought forth during the February 15<sup>th</sup> meeting regarding placing the garage on the left side of the house. This option was

not achievable due to there being two trees that would have to be removed and a 1.5ft elevation drop from the house to the road that would make the garage too high in the front to be functional.

After reaching out to Onondaga County Mr. Woodridge was not able to obtain a survey with the septic location due to the age of the residence. Mr. Woodridge stated he did some measuring and was able to determine the location of the leach field. With all this Mr. Woodridge brought forward his revised plan of reducing the size of the garage to 12' by 30' and moving it 22' off the road boundary line. Mr. Woodridge also brought forward the option of pushing the garage behind the tree to reduce the visual aspect of the garage.

Chairperson Catalino read an email that was received from neighbor Yvonne Wheeler with concerns that Mr. Woodridge's request still being a large variance but was happy to see that alternative options were presented.

Member Miller made a motion, seconded by Member Kelly, to close the public hearing at 6:44 PM and it was carried unanimously.

Ayes: Chairperson Catalino, Member Linhart, Member Miller, Member Kelly.

Nays: 0

All in Favor.

Motion Carries.

### **Board Questions**

Chairperson Catalino decided to proceed with the criteria questions for both options brought forward by Mr. Woodridge separately before making a final decision.

Chairperson Catalino proceeded with the board through the five (5) criteria questions: Option #1 reducing size of building to 12' by 30' and moving 22' off the road boundary.

- 1) Whether the benefit sought by the Applicant can be achieved by some other feasible method? The board answered yes, it could be moved to the side of the residence by removing the trees, or tandem with the existing garage.
- 2) Whether the Variance will result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or to nearby properties? The board answered yes. The garage would be in front of the house, located in the front yard, and not another one in the immediate area.
- 3) Whether the requested Variance is substantial? The board answered yes size of the variance is just below 50%.
- 4) As to whether the Variance will have an adverse effect on physical or environmental conditions? The board answered yes for physical due to the location of where the applicant wants to place the garage.
- 5) Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created? The board answered yes, they could build it in a different location on the property, not build or rent storage.

Chairperson Catalino proceeded with the board through the five (5) criteria questions: Option #2 Reduce the size of the building to 12' by 30' and move back 22' off the road boundary and behind the tree to reduce visual.

- 1) Whether the benefit sought by the Applicant can be achieved by some other feasible method? The board answered yes, it could be moved to the side of the residence by removing the trees, or tandem with the existing garage.
- 2) Whether the Variance will result in an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or to nearby properties? The board answered yes. Member Kelly stated yes but not as undesirable as option #1. The garage would be in front of the house, located in the front yard, and not another one in the immediate area.
- 3) Whether the requested Variance is substantial? The board answered yes size of the variance is just below 50%.
- 4) As to whether the Variance will have an adverse effect on physical or environmental conditions? The board answered yes for physical due to location of where the applicant wants to place the garage.
- 5) Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created? The board answered yes, they could build it in a different location on the property, not build or rent storage.

After both sets of criteria questions were completed a lengthy discussion was had with potential different options for Mr. Woodridge for placement of the garage. Mr. Woodridge thanked the members for their suggestions and stated that he would further review them and if he decided to move forward with any of them, he would be in contact with Secretary Grevelding to start the formal process again.

#### **Determination of ZBA Based on the Above Factors:**

The ZBA, after taking into consideration the above five factors for both Option #1 & Option #2, finds that:

     The benefit to the applicant **DOES** outweigh the Detriment to the Neighborhood or Community.

  X   The benefit to the applicant **DOES NOT** outweigh the Detriment to the Neighborhood or Community and therefore the variance requested is denied.

The ZBA further finds that a variance for the 18' front yard setback **DOES NOT** outweigh the Detriment to the Neighborhood or Community and therefore the variance requested is **denied**.

#### **Board Action**

Member Miller a motion seconded by Member Linhart that the Zoning Board of Appeals to deny the variance request for both alternative #1 and #2 at 7:19 PM.

Ayes: Chairperson Catalino, Member Miller, Member Linhart, Member Kelly.

Nayes: 0

All in Favor.

Motion Carries.

**Other Business**

Secretary Grevelding informed the members of two (2) upcoming Town Board Work Sessions that they have been invited to on March 27, 2024, and April 10, 2024. It was discussed that there will potentially be an additional ZBA Meeting on May 9<sup>th</sup> to discuss any feedback from the CODES Analysis.

**Adjournment**

With there being no other business, Member Kelly made a motion, seconded by Member Linhart, and carried unanimously, to end the meeting at 7:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Carrie Grevelding  
Zoning Board of Appeals