ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Town of Salina
October 19, 2026

A regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals was held on Monday, October 19, 2026 at the Salina Town Hall, 201 School Road, and Liverpool at 6:30 P.M. Those present were:

Chairman	Mike Gunther
Member	Richard Hunter
Member	Jeannie Ventre [Excused]
Member	Michael Brigandi
Member	Bill McGillivray
Member	Tom Vona
Attorney	Kevin Favreau, Esq.
Secretary	Nancy O'Neil
Engineer	Jake Okun
Code Enforcement Officer	Michael Sheldon

Mr. Gunther welcomed those in attendance and explained the purpose of the meeting – to hear three area variances and a site plan review before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Gunther announced Mr. Kevin Favreau as the representing attorney and Mr. Jake Okun as the representing engineer for tonight's cases.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Gunther entertained a motion to approve the minutes of October 5, 2026. Mr. Hunter made a motion, and the motion was seconded by Mr. McGillivray. It was unanimously carried by the remaining board members.

NEW BUSINESS < AREA VARIANCE>

043.05-08.0 DAVID M. LUNDEN, 235 PATRICIA DR.
ZONED R-1, 2ND WARD
CASE# ZB-26-44 Applicant is seeking relief from the Town Zoning Ordinance(s) 235-7 D. (4) to construct a front porch with an 18-foot front yard setback.

The Director has determined the application will not comply with the Zoning Ordinance requirement(s), because the proposed porch would have an 18-foot front yard setback where 25 feet is required. The Director recommends the board act on the application based on the information submitted at the hearing and the information submitted with the application. The Director also requests that the following conditions be attached, should the application be approved: that the building permit must be approved within 30 days of the date of the variance approval. That all work must be completed within the time that the permit is granted for. Unless these conditions are complied with the variance shall expire. A survey plan has been included detailing out where the porch will be located, a disclosure affidavit has been notarized and signed, a survey affidavit and a letter of mailing to adjacent tax map properties. Type 2 Action.

Mr. David Lunden and his son Jon Lunden of 235 Patricia Dr. present to the Board; Mr. Jon Lunden will be doing the construction for the build: 1) no other feasible means. The current stoop is too small, this is only way by creating space outdoors by adding the porch. 2) no, will not cause an undesirable change to the neighborhood or detriment to nearby neighborhood properties. Granting the variance will enhance the home. 3) The variance request is not substantial, they are requesting an additional foot beyond the current allowed 5' x 7' depth. 4) no, it will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood. Adding the porch will only impact the front yard of the home. 5) the alleged difficulty is self-created; the desire to have outdoor livable space while enhancing the front of his home. Type 2 action.

Mr. Lunden states that the front stoop started to fall apart. He feels this design will conform to neighboring properties in his community.

Mr. Brigandi asks the applicant what materials the deck will be constructed of. Mr. Jon Lunden states that he will be constructing the deck of PVC decking made by Timber Tech.

Mr. McGillivray questions if the bottom of the deck will be enclosed to prevent wild animals. The bottom will be fully enclosed, no overhang with stairs off to the left to the driveway.

Mr. Gunther asks Mr. Lunden if adding the porch will make him feel than the previous porch. Mr. Lunden states that they would always use the garage as their common entrance because the previous porch was not safe. The new porch will be much safer for anyone approaching their home.

No comments from Mr. Favreau.

No comments from Mr. Sheldon.

Mr. Gunther asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak for or against this project. None Noted.

Mr. Gunther closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Hunter summarized ZB-26-44 Mr. David M. Lunden of 235 Patricia Dr. 043.-05-08.0 Applicant is seeking relief from Town Zoning Ordinance(s) 235-7 D. (4) to construct a front porch with an 18-foot front yard setback where 25 feet is required. Based on the testimony given and the exhibits offered it is hereby resolved that the applicant has demonstrated that the area variance sought will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or be a detriment to nearby properties. It is the only method of obtaining the benefits sought. It is not substantial to the neighborhood. It will not have an adverse effect or impact on the environmental conditions of the neighborhood or district, it is self-created and is not a determining factor. I therefore move based on the forgoing that the variance applied for be granted with certain conditions and the granting of the above variance are conditioned upon the following: 1) all improvements are to be constructed and to located in accordance with the exhibits submitted herewith in support of the application 2) that the permit must be obtained within 30 days of the date of the variance approval 3) that all work must be completed within the time that the permit is granted for. 4) Unless these conditions are complied with, the variance shall expire.
Mr. Hunter made the motion, and Mr. Brigandi seconded the motion. Mr. Gunther polled the board members.

Mr. Vona	Yes
Mr. Brigandi	Yes
Mr. Hunter	Yes
Mr. McGillivray	Yes
Mr. Gunther	Yes

Mr. Gunther stated it is adopted and passed.

NEW BUSINESS <AREA VARIANCE>

074.-03-01.0 **GREGORY SGROMO, 6701 BUCKLEY RD.**
ZONED RROD, 4TH WARD
CASE# ZB-26-39 **Applicant is seeking relief from Town Zoning Ordinance(s) 235-31 B. (1); 235-16 D. (3) to repurpose an existing building and create a new residential multi-family use with 1.5 parking spaces per swelling unit and 40% lot coverage.**

The Director has determined the application will not comply with the Zoning Ordinance requirement(s), because the multi-family residential use would allocate 1.5 parking spaces to each dwelling unit where 2 spaces are requires and have 40% lot coverage where a maximum of 30% is allowed. The Director recommends the board act on the application based on the information submitted at the hearing and the information submitted with the application. The Director also requests that the following conditions be attached, should the application be approved: that the building permit must be approved within 30 days of the date of the variance approval. That all work must be completed within the time that the permit is granted for. Unless these conditions are complied with the variance shall expire. A there is a site plan describing the project, and then an affidavit of mailing to adjacent tax map properties that we are going to consider this variance and site plan review, a survey affidavit and a letter of mailing to adjacent tax map properties.

Mr. Gunther states in the file there is a resolution from Onondaga County Planning Board. The final statements it says the Board encourages the Town and applicant to modify the site plan and coordinate with the adjacent land owner along Buckley Square to improve and enhance landscape screening for adjacent residential use.

OLD BUSINESS <SITE PLAN>

074.-03-01.0 **GREGORY SGROMO, 6701 BUCKLEY RD.**
ZONED RROD, 4TH WARD
CASE# SITE-26-15 **Applicant is seeking site plan review for a re-development of a vacant, former hotel into 87 apartment units and a restaurant.**

Mr. Gunther explains in the folder for the site plan is the same findings from the Planning Board, a more detailed map of the project, as well as the affidavits and mailing to adjacent tax map properties,

and a short EAF. He confirms that the Town is the Lead Agency and has considered the SEQRA requirements.

Mr. Sgromo states he will be providing the Town with a full development package for updated lighting, patios for the rentals and the restaurant, fencing, and dumpster enclosure. He is in front of the board tonight for 2 variances; parking, one and a half spaces per unit and a reduction of the roof coverage on the site. The center portion of the hotel is completely covered they would like to reduce coverage by 40%. Mr. Sgromo adds that they did a review from the County comments, lighting by the Thruway will have to be reviewed by them.

Mr. Sgromo presents the five criteria to the Board: 1) the parking is not feasible; it is a pre-existing non-conforming lot fully built out and cannot accommodate two spaces. The land is not available, the alternative design would be to reduce design such as the patios without reducing the size of the existing building. The site is pre-existing, non-conforming, and fully developed. Applicant is proposing to reduce the impervious area opening the interior roof structure of the building and putting and interior courtyard that is heavily landscaped and not pervious. 2) It will not create a detriment to nearby properties or undesirable changes to neighborhood character. The site was previously occupied by a transient hotel with daily occupation by a variety of visitors. By creating a stable apartment setting with on-site amenities it will improve the neighborhood. Allowing the building to remain vacant is currently a detriment to the neighborhood. 3) The requested variance is not substantial. Most communities calculate 1.5 parking spaces as two parking spaces create additional impervious parking space that is underutilized. This project is converting a former abandoned hotel to a repurposed viable building with more green space, permeable soils and architectural improvements. 4) Apartments are more stable land use than a hotel. The vacant building serves as a detriment to the community, adaptive reuse will improve the neighborhood and the environment, this is the intent of the Comprehensive Plan and the Repurposing and Reuse Floating Overlay District. The environmental and neighborhood impacts of a self-contained, stable apartment building are less than a hotel or a vacant building/site. 5) The existing non-conforming building and site are pre-existing. The applicant has made every effort to reduce site coverage and revitalize the building and site. The conditions are existing and were not created by the applicant, this site was abandoned and will be converted into a viable use.

Mr. Sgromo adds that the patios will have much more details; a little bit smaller, landscape around them with fences around and in between them for privacy. He adds that they are working on an interior layout of the front of the building where the restaurant will go and the amenities for the apartments. He states that they are in the same number range for the square footage.

Mr. Okun expressed areas to address; erosion and sediment control plans. He states that on the short EAF there is an existing stormwater conveyance collection on advance system that will need to be reviewed. He reminds the applicant that the area of disturbance is listed as .98 acres, if it exceeds an acre or more they will have to provide a stormwater pollution prevention plan. He asks for more of a completed site plan and adds that the Town of Salina requires an estimate of the project schedule. Mr. Okun would like the applicant to provide a preliminary estimated construction schedule and coordinate with National Grid, OCWA and the Metropolitan Wastewater Treatment Plant because it is anticipated that the water and waste water usages will go up. He suggests that the applicant coordinate with Centro because of their proximity to a public transportation stop.

No comments from Mr. Favreau.

Mr. Sheldon identifies that the plan shows 194 total parking spaces but only includes 5 handicap spaces where 6 spaces are required. All access aisles must be eight feet wide, all access aisles must be the same size as a standard parking space. Mr. Sheldon expressed concern regarding the placement of handicap accessible parking near the restaurant, the current placement may lead to restaurant patrons occupying those spaces before residents arrive. He recommends distributing more accessible parking around the building for residents.

Mr. Hunter verifies that the applicant plans for 87 one and two-bedroom apartments. 1-bedroom apartments will be 560-740 sq. ft. 2-bedroom apartments will be 813-936 sq. ft. Mr. Sgromo states that the he developer is planning 131 parking spots based on a rate of one and half spaces per unit. The property currently has approximately 250 parking spaces available. He states plans involve moving parking away from the building and patios and towards the outer edges of the property where possible and additional ADA spaces and miscellaneous markings will be added to the layout. Mr. Sgromo clarifies that there are 63 parking spots needed for the restaurant and 131 spots for the apartments.

Mr. Brigandi asks if there is a restaurant interested in the potential location. Mr. Sgromo adds that there is a restaurant that would like to enter this location. Mr. Brigandi expresses his concern with the size of the projected apartment sizes and that the characteristic of studio living, he feels that larger

layouts are necessary to encourage stable long-term residency young couples and families. Mr. Sgromo feels that the well-designed square units can be highly functional and maintain high occupancy even at higher price points. He adds that some families might use the two-bedroom units, but it is not the primary focus of the development. Mr. Brigandi is concerned whether the current square footage constitutes a significant detriment to the Town's goals.

Mr. McGillivray inquires how many one-bedrooms and two-bedroom units. (75) 1-bedroom and (12) 2-bedroom units. Mr. Sgromo states that many reasons why they cannot expand the units, there are many load baring walls on the existing building.

Mr. Sheldon addresses parking for the workspace/conference business center in the 5 thousand sq. ft. space, he is concerned this will bring outside people other than residents. Mr. Sgromo states this area is a common space for residential use and if the Board wants to put a restriction on this they may.

Mr. Gunther asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak for or against this project.

Ms. Anna Pavia of 97 Patricia Dr. asks how the lighting and parking will affect hers and neighboring property. The noise from the patios and how it will affect their backyards. She questions if there are plans for a safety of noise barrier.

Ms. Kristine White of 241 Patricia Dr. has concerns of the placement of the driveway onto Buckley Rd. and if it will be the existing driveway. She questions the roadway that is utilized for the senior living apartment building and if they will be sharing that same entrance onto Buckley Rd. Ms. White questions the patios and the parking spaces and if they will be able to accommodate emergency vehicles. She also states her concern of the proposed size of the apartment units.

Mr. Gunther confirms that plans for emergency vehicles are developed in coordination with the local fire department to ensure proper ingress and egress.

Mr. David Stott of 4885 Driftwood Dr. feels that something is better than nothing. He expressed concern regarding the small square footage of the proposed apartments, noting that residents find the efficiencies unacceptable. He suggests increasing the size of one-bedroom units from 560 sq. ft. to approximately 700 sq. ft. by modifying construction walls to create larger living spaces.

Mr. Clifford Gale of 6727 Buckley Rd. expresses his concern with landscape barrier for privacy or a sound barrier and how lighting will be positioned. He questioned if there have been any traffic studies done. Mr. Gale highlighted existing traffic difficulties on Buckley Rd. noting that rush hour congestion makes accessing driveways challenging.

Mr. Shane Murphy of 5079 Constitution La. expresses his concerns regarding the impact of a proposed development on local property values and his desire to protect existing investments and maintain high property values in the area.

Mr. Sgromo addresses the residential concerns. Driveways may be slightly reconfigured depending on feedback from the County DOT. A traffic analysis submitted roughly a year and a half ago indicates that traffic levels will be similar to previous plans. The current plan for apartments and a restaurant is expected to result in less traffic than the original hotel proposal. The lighting project will replace old fixtures with lower mounted fixers to improve light distribution and existing LED lights will be evaluated for compliance with "nice guy" standards to ensure they are not tilted incorrectly. He adds that an eight-foot fence is being considered along the thruway to serve as a sound barrier. Mr. Sgromo states fencing will be considered along the access road to prevent neighbor headlights from shining into nearby homes and noise from patios will be managed internally by addressing complaints immediately to prevent disturbances to neighbors.

Mr. Brigandi states he would like to see the size of the one bedroom larger.

Mr. McGillivray questions of the units will have in suite laundry or if the laundry will be a laundry facility. Mr. Sgromo did not have full details at this time.

Mr. Sheldon feels that further time is needed for a parking analysis.

Mr. Vona questions patio availability and if they are particular to each unit. Mr. Sgromo states that they are only available to specific units that have an access door to the patio, whether it is a 3-foot glass door or a sliding patio door. He adds that they will be partitioned off on the sides for privacy.

Ms. Carrie Frank of 507 Berwick Rd. S. feels the builder should consider senior housing for this project due to the lack of availability in the area. Mr. Gunther adds that current regulations prevent the

developer from officially designating the project as a senior living center although seniors would be welcome to in the development.

Mr. Gunther makes a motion to hold over the area variance until further information, Mr. Hunter seconds the motion. It was unanimously carried by the remaining board members.

Mr. Sheldon agrees.

Mr. Favreau agrees.

NEW BUSINESS <SPECIAL PERMIT>

091.-01-27.1 RYAN MCGOWAN, 922-924 OLD LIVERPOOL RD.
ZONED C-2, 3rd WARD
CASE# SITE-26-17 Applicant is seeking a special use permit to operate an indoor golf training and simulator facility.

Mr. Mike Gunther explains in the file there is layout of the facility with simulators and a disclosure affidavit that is signed and notarized

Mr. Ryan McGowan explains SimGolfNow as a self-service indoor golf training simulator facility. The project aims to provide a space for local families, golfers and the community to engage in recreation during the winter months. It serves golfers who currently lack indoor options during the six months of winter. The central location is expected to attract visitors from surrounding areas to the Town of Salina.

Mr. McGowan explains that the facility will be an unmanned format without food or beverage services. Users must book appointments online and create an account, they will receive a 6-digit door code. The access code is only valid for a window of 10 minutes before and 10 minutes after the scheduled appointment time. They currently have three existing locations in the Rochester area with plans to expand to the Liverpool area. This Liverpool facility would feature 540 sq. ft. private rooms that can accommodate approximately eight people each. The two rooms can be booked together to host up to 16 people with a lobby for parties. the business model focuses on private practice rather than the social bar atmosphere found in traditional golf simulators. Mr. McGowan highlights that the privacy of the two bays provides a safe space for women, who make up 30% of their current clientele. He also adds that there is a plan to allow local businesses to sponsor holes via simulator software to benefit the community.

Mr. McGowan explains that the technology tracks putting automatically using sensors located above and beside the user, some locations offer physical turf areas for putting. The high-end technology allows users to simulate various distances, including chipping ranges from 10 to 50 yards.

Mr. Hunter questions the hours and availability. Mr. McGowan states that currently their hours are 5am to midnight. Some special permissions can be granted recurring clients.

Mr. Brigandi questions if there are bathrooms located on the premises. Mr. McGowan states that there are two bathrooms available and they have a hired cleaning crew for the facility.

Mr. McGillivray questions if two different parties go during the same time. Yes, they can. Mr. McGillivray is concerned if a scuffle potentially breaks out. Mr. McGowan states that he has never had any issues but if there is they can call 911.

Mr. Stott adds that it is an exciting idea and the Town of Salina needs a facility like this.

Mr. McGowan explains some of the sessions for weekday and weekend rates. The Board agrees that this is an exciting project.

Mr. Gunther closes the public hearing.

Mr. Brigandi made a motion of the special use permit; the motion was seconded by Mr. McGillivray. It was unanimously carried by the remaining board members.

Mr. Sheldon confirms that there is a key to get into the building, for the fire department if there is a need. He states that there is a dead bolt and a code to enter. Mr. Sheldon addresses the parking requirements. Mr. Gunther proposed that the number of parking spots required for the be determined in coordination with the Planning and Development Office. Mr. Favreau notes that the parking requirements can be handled as a condition will be added to the permit requiring a reasonable number of parking spots as determined by the Planning and Development Office. If the require number of spots is deemed problematic, the applicant may return to the board to request a variance.

Mr. Gunther moved to formalize the agreement that the determination of parking spots would serve as a binding condition of the motion. It was unanimously carried by the remaining board members.

NEW BUSINESS <SPECIAL PERMIT>

057.-03-09.1 ELIZA POTEKHIN, 5406 & 5408 SOUTH BAY RD.
ZONED C-3, 3RD WARD
CASE# ZB-26-18 Applicant is seeking a special use permit to operate a fitness studio.

Mr. Gunther states that in the file there is a survey affidavit, a disclosure affidavit and a signed short EAS.

Ms. Eliza Potekhin is seeking a special use permit to operate a fitness studio focused on group classes. She plans to provide a welcoming, community-oriented environment for all body types and ages. The business model focuses on guided group classes rather than traditional gym machines to reduce intimidation and cost. The classes will consist of step-up classes, low-impact workouts, and dance classes featuring worship songs. The target audience will be men, women and children within the local area. Ms. Potekhin plans to operate seven days a week, early morning sessions and weekend sessions. She plans to utilize the existing lot for parking, the estimate need is 15 to 20 spaces.

Mr. Gunther asks the Board if they have any further questions. None noted.

No input from Mr. Favreau.

No input from Mr. Sheldon.

Mr. Gunther makes a motion to approve the Special Permit, Mr. Hunter seconds the motion. It was unanimously carried by the remaining board members.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Gunther entertained a motion to close the Zoning Board of Appeals at 8:21 pm. Mr. Hunter made the motion; it was seconded by Mr. Vona. The motion was unanimously carried. The meeting was adjourned.

Prepared By: _____
Nancy O'Neil, Secretary