

Board Members:

Cheryl Erickson, Chair
James Dewar, Vice-Chair
Rich Nawrot
Ross Schoembs
Troy Scripture
Larry Bell, Alternate

Others Present:

Zoning Admin, Craig Leggett
Zoning Clerk, Julie Marinelli

Meeting to be Called to Order: 6:35

Pledge of Allegiance

Minutes Approval: For December 17, 2024: Minutes approved by Mr. Dewar and seconded by Mr. Schoembs

New Business:

File # 2025-01
Tax Map # 36.11-1-15
Erin Lynn and Adam Griffin
400 East Shore Drive
Adirondack, NY 12808

Chair Erickson reviews the following application: The applicant seeks an area variance from Section 6.10 – Schedule of Intensity and Dimensional Requirements for both a roadway setback and a shoreline setback. The proposed shoreline setback for the cabana is 6 feet, where 50 feet is required. The roadway setback variance request is for 35 feet 2 inches, where 50 feet is required. The shoreline setback variance request is for 44 feet, and the roadway setback variance request is for 14 feet 10 inches.

Chair Erickson calls the representative for the Griffins to the podium.

Representing the Griffins are project designer Arun Padykula from the Phinney Design Group and architect Jeff Anthony from Studio A. Mr. Padykula explains the project, noting that the Griffins are building a house at 400 East Shore Drive, directly across from the subject property. The project involves improving an existing structure on the lakeside to create a safe, up-to-code patio and dock for lake access. Mr. Padykula displays the plans and introduces himself and Mr. Anthony.

The Chair asks Mr. Padykula if he is authorized to represent the Griffins. He replies affirmatively and confirms that his name is on the application. He is an engineer with the Phinney Design Group. Brennan Drake, also present, adds that he is one of the partners of the Phinney Group and can vouch for Mr. Padykula's representation of the Griffins.

Mr. Padykula explains that the project includes the following: replacing an existing deck (32' x 9') with a new deck of approximately 700 square feet of similar structure. The project also involves replacing deteriorating wood stairs with dry-laid cut stone steps, equipped with handrails up to code. A pathway made of permeable pavers will connect the road to the patio. An existing eroded shoreline retaining wall will be replaced with a new stone retaining wall. They also plan to extend the patio with a new handrail and a new roadway retaining wall. Mr. Padykula shows photos depicting the erosion of the existing retaining wall and points out areas where it appears a retaining wall previously existed but has since eroded away. He explains that the new wall will help prevent erosion by counteracting the mean high-water mark.

He further adds that the project will address ongoing erosion visible along the parcel's hillside on East Shore Drive. Currently, no stormwater management exists, and the patio and stairs are unstable and non-compliant with code. All of these issues will be corrected by the proposed project.

Additionally, the applicant proposes adding a cabana on the patio to serve as a storage shed, under 100 square feet. A floating dock is also being proposed.

Chair Erickson asks if the cabana, including the eaves, is under 100 square feet. Mr. Padykula responds that he believes the overhangs are independent but will confirm with the APA. Chair Erickson suggests that the Board will communicate with the APA to **verify ???**. (It was later clarified that the roof with overhangs would be 14' x 14'.)

Mr. Padykula explains that the new retaining wall will be built behind the patio, with a 1-foot river rock swale and two culverts to manage drainage and road runoff.

The floating dock will have a hinge connection and a 36-foot cable handrail.

Chair Erickson asks about the width of the dock. Mr. Padykula believes it is 4 to 5 feet wide.

Mr. Nawrot refers to Photo #1, which shows the existing retaining wall, and asks if the existing footprint will remain and what materials will be used for the new wall. Mr. Padykula replies that it will be the exact same footprint and that poured concrete with a natural stone facing, similar to the house, will be used.

Chair Erickson asks about the grade behind the wall and whether fill will be used. Mr. Anthony responds that fill will be necessary and explains that it will be backfilled with #2 or #3 stone.

The Chair asks if the height of the wall will be the same as the existing one. Mr. Anthony replies that they are proposing to raise it by 6 inches to 1 foot to position it slightly above the mean high-water level.

Mr. Schoembs clarifies that the wall will be raised by 12 inches.

Chair Erickson asks how the mean high-water information was obtained. Mr. Anthony explains that a survey was conducted to determine the mean high-water line. Mr. Padykula adds that photos show the existing conditions of the mean high-water line. Mr. Anthony further states that the surveyors were specifically instructed to measure the mean high-water line.

Mr. Dewar asks about the rocks shown in one of the photos near the existing retaining wall and whether they will be used in the new wall. Mr. Anthony explains that stable rocks will not be moved, but similar rocks will be used in the reconstruction, incorporating stones from the general area. Mr. Padykula adds that some boulders from the excavation for the house will also be used, but boulders already part of the landscape will not be disturbed.

Mr. Dewar asks if any vegetation will be cleared. Mr. Anthony responds that no trees will be removed, but some brush will be cleared.

Mr. Drake notes that the project will help reinforce existing trees, as erosion has exposed the roots of some trees.

Mr. Nawrot asks if there was a retaining wall previously in the location of the new proposed wall. Mr. Padykula explains that it appears a wall once existed but has since eroded. He confirms that the new wall will be under 100 square feet.

Chair Erickson notes that since the wall is not attached it does not need a variance, but to not exceed 100 square feet.

Mr. Dewar asks whether the dock will be removed during the winter. Mr. Anthony confirms that the dock is floating and will be removed in winter, as floating docks are lightweight and easy to maneuver.

Mr. Nawrot asks if the pavers for the walkway would butt up to the edge of the roadway. Mr. Padykula responds that they would not, and there would be a strip of land between them.

Chair Erickson asks about the stairs, which were previously centered but will now be moved to the south. Mr. Anthony explains that moving the stairs will make access safer for family members, as the existing stairs currently lead to a steep drop in grade.

Mr. Dewar asks about the life of the porous pavers.

Mr. Anthony explains that the porous pavers are cement (eco-blocks) and adds that the pavers will be durable, with a gap between them. Fine crushed stone, which is permeable, will be used to stabilize the stone path.

Chair Erickson reiterates that the engineers and landscapers have designed the project to prevent water erosion. Mr. Padykula and Mr. Anthony confirm that the project is designed to address erosion issues. Additionally, they mention that the project will require permitting from the DEC and the Army Corps of Engineers due to work being done below the mean high-water mark.

Chair Erickson notes the pictures showing the water erosion of the existing wall.

She asks if anyone has further comments or concerns. There are no additional comments from the ZBA.

Chair Erickson requests a motion to deem the application complete.

Mr. Schoembs makes a motion, and Mr. Dewar seconds it.

Mr. Leggett informs the ZBA that the project has been reviewed by the APA, and they indicated it would be considered an aggregate project.

Mr. Leggett provides the ZBA with a table showing the setbacks for the individual components of the project as well as the aggregate setbacks.

Meeting adjourned 7:40 PM

Next meeting: February 25, 2025

Respectfully Submitted,

Julie Marinelli