

**VILLAGE OF CAMILLUS  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES (as Planning Board)  
PUBLIC HEARING  
March 25, 2021**

Zoning Board of Appeals

Present: Chairman Betty VanGelder  
Christopher Fletcher  
James Miller

Attorney: Robert J. Allan

People in attendance –  
Bill Reagan  
Sergey Germakovski

Village Board of Trustees

Present: Mayor Richard Waterman  
Deputy Mayor Martin Rinaldo  
Trustee Ann Eckert  
Trustee Michael McBride  
Trustee Brian Raichlin (absent)

Attorney: Robert J. Allan

Chairman VanGelder of the Zoning Board of Appeals opened the meeting at 4:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Upon motion of Mr. Fletcher, seconded by Chairman VanGelder and unanimously approved representing the Zoning Board they moved to waive the Notice of Public Hearing.

**VILLAGE OF CAMILLUS BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
VILLAGE OF CAMILLUS ZONING BOARD  
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that the Board of Trustees of the Village of Camillus and the Village of Camillus Zoning Board of Appeals, Onondaga County, New York, will conduct joint Public Hearings to consider the related petitions by Sergey Germakovski for a subdivision of land and for a side yard area variance for the unimproved real property known as 107-109 Glade Ridge Court, Camillus, New York.

The requested subdivision would provide for a two-family attached townhouse on the existing lot. The requested side yard variance would reduce the outside required side yards from 20 feet to 10 feet.

The Public Hearing will be held at the Village Hall, 37 Main Street, in the Village of Camillus, New York, on March 25, 2021 at 4:00 p.m. at which time all interested parties will be heard.

Information regarding the proposed applications is open to inspection at the Office of the Village Clerk by appointment, and communications in writing in relation thereto may be filed with the Village Clerk or Zoning Board of Appeals either before or at the Hearing.

March 15, 2021

RICHARD A. WATERMAN  
Mayor, Village of Camillus

Mr. Germakovski addressed both Boards stating he is requesting a subdivision and also a side yard variance. He stated there was a covenant in place when the homes in Timber Ridge were built that requires any new construction match the neighboring buildings. The two closest buildings are one story two-family patio homes. Unfortunately, there is not enough width for the building. This is why he is requesting the variance from 20 feet to 10 feet on both sides of the building. The way the lot is shaped he needs this variance to fit the building on the lot. He would like to get the variance before he gets the subdivision so he can plan accordingly.

Attorney Allan stated that he feels Mr. Germakovski will know today if he is getting the variance. The final subdivision will not be made today. Mr. Germakovski had a map in his packet Attorney Allan asked if the Boards could consider as a preliminary plat that they could be acting on tonight? Mr. Germakovski stated yes. Attorney Allan stated in 30 days when he comes back with a subdivision map prepared by his surveyor the Board does not want to see the building included on the map, only the subdivision line. Attorney Allan stated the final subdivision map will have to be filed in this office and also the County Clerk's office.

Mr. Miller asked what the dotted line indicates on the map. It is labeled "building line". Mr. Bill Reagan, code enforcer stated that line is the set back.

A discussion was had regarding where the driveways were located on Mr. Germakovski's plan. The driveways were located in the center of the two patio homes. Mr. Miller did not feel the driveway should be located perpendicular to the building because of the curve in Glade Ridge Court. Trustee McBride asked how wide the driveway will be. Mr. Germakovski stated two cars wide. Trustee McBride stated the cars will have to be at an angle. Mr. Miller stated the drivers will have a difficult time as they are backing out they will have to turn the car. They will not be able to drive straight out. This is a unique lot. Trustee McBride stated the Board could grant a variance for the sideline as far as they need to go. That would restrict the variance to this building not any other building. If you look at the drawing and go 35 feet off the right and left property line and the variance would be from the street to 87.83 feet (122.83 minus 35 feet) that would allow him to build

. Mr. Reagan stated we could grant the variance on the condition of getting detailed scaled drawings with the exact dimensions from the surveyor.

A motion was offered by Trustee Eckert who moved for its adoption, seconded by Mayor Waterman to waive the reading of the Notice of Public Hearing.

The voting was as follows:

Richard Waterman

Mayor

Voted – Yes

Martin Rinaldo	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Ann Eckert	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Michael McBride	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Brian Raichlin	Trustee	Voted – (absent)

Attorney Allan stated the first step is to have the Planning Board review the SEQRA form. He read the question from the Short Environmental Assessment Form Part 1 as follows:

1. Does the proposed action only involve the legislative adoption of a plan, local Law, ordinance, administrative rule, or regulation?  
No.
2. Does the proposed action require a permit, approval or funding from any other government Agency?  
No.
3. a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action? .39 acres  
b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed? .09 acres
4. Check all land uses that occur on, are adjoining or near the proposed action:  
Answer Residential (suburban)
5. Is the proposed action,
  - a. A permitted use under the zoning regulations?  
Yes.
  - b. Consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan?  
Yes.
6. Is the proposed action consistent with the predominant character of the existing built or natural landscape?  
Yes.
7. Is the site of the proposed action located in, or does it adjoin, a state listed Critical Environmental Area?  
No.
8. a. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels?  
No.  
b. Are public transportation services available at or near the site of the proposed action?  
Yes.  
c. Are any pedestrian accommodations or bicycle routes available on or near the site of the proposed action?  
No.
9. Does the proposed action meet or exceed the state energy code requirements? If the proposed action will exceed requirements, describe design features and technologies:  
Yes.

10. Will the proposed action connect to an existing public/private water supply?  
Yes.
11. Will the proposed action connect to existing wastewater utilities?  
Yes.
12. a. Does the project site contain, or is it substantially contiguous to, a building, archaeological site, or district which is listed on the National or State Register of Historic Places, or that has been determined by the Commissioner of the NYS Office of Parks, Recreations and Historic Preservation to be eligible for listing on the State Register of Historic Places?  
No.
- b. If the project site, or any portion of it, located in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory?  
No.
13. a. Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency?  
No.
- b. Would the proposed action physically alter, or encroach into, any existing wetland or waterbody?  
No.
14. Identify the typical habitat types that occur on, or are likely to be found on the project site.  
Suburban.
15. Does the site of the proposed action contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered?  
No.
16. If the project site located in the 100-year flood plan?  
No.
17. Will the proposed action create storm water discharge, either from point or non-point sources?  
No.
- a. Will storm water discharges flow to adjacent properties?  
No.
- b. Will storm water discharges be directed to established conveyance systems (runoff and storm drains)?  
No.
18. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that would result in the impoundment of water or other liquids (e.g., retention pond, waste lagoon, dam)?

No.

19. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the location of a active or closed solid waste management facility?

No.

20. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the subject of remediation (ongoing or completed) for hazardous waste?

No.

A motion was offered by Trustee McBride, who moved for its adoption, seconded by Trustee Rinaldo, to wit:

Whereas the Village Board of Trustees determined, based on the information above, that the proposed action will not result in any adverse environmental impact.

The voting was as follows:

Richard Waterman	Mayor	Voted – Yes
Martin Rinaldo	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Ann Eckert	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Michael McBride	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Brian Raichlin	Trustee	Voted – (absent)

The resolution was duly adopted.

A motion was offered by Mr. Miller, who moved for its adoption, seconded by Chairman VanGelder, to wit:

Whereas the Board of Zoning Appeals determined based on the information above that the proposed action will not result in any adverse environmental impact.

The voting was as follows:

Betty VanGelder	Chairman	Voted – Yes
James Miller	Member	Voted – Yes
Christopher Fletcher	Member	Voted - Yes

The resolution was duly adopted.

A motion was offered by Trustee McBride, who moved for its adoption, seconded by Trustee Eckert, to wit:

Whereas the Village Board of Trustees authorize to refer the Application for a sub-division to SOCPA (Syracuse Onondaga County Planning Agency). The voting was as follows:

Richard Waterman	Mayor	Voted – Yes
Martin Rinaldo	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Ann Eckert	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Michael McBride	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Brian Raichlin	Trustee	Voted – (absent)

The resolution was duly adopted.

A motion was offered by Trustee McBride, who moved for its adoption, seconded by Trustee Rinaldo, to wit:

Whereas the Village Board of Trustees approved the preliminary plat plan submitted. The voting was as follows:

Richard Waterman	Mayor	Voted – Yes
Martin Rinaldo	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Ann Eckert	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Michael McBride	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Brian Raichlin	Trustee	Voted – (absent)

The resolution was duly adopted.

Attorney Allan stated that when Mr. Germakovski comes back for the final approval he will have to bring a subdivision map prepared by a surveyor.

Upon motion of Mr. Miller, seconded by Chairman VanGelder and unanimously approved the Board of Zoning Appeals moved to reduce the outside yard variance from 20 feet to 10 feet contingent of the approval of the Village Boards approval of the final subdivision map.

Upon motion of Chairman VanGelder, seconded by Mr. Fletcher and unanimously approved the meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

A motion was offered by Trustee Eckert, who moved for its adoption, seconded by Trustee McBride, to adjourn this meeting at 4:50 p.m. The voting was as follows:

Richard Waterman	Mayor	Voted – Yes
Martin Rinaldo	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Ann Eckert	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Michael McBride	Trustee	Voted – Yes
Brian Raichlin	Trustee	Voted – (absent)

The resolution was duly adopted.

Sharon Norcross  
Village Clerk/Treasurer