

Village of Skaneateles  
Planning Board Meeting  
December 7, 2023  
Skaneateles Village Hall

---

Public Hearing on Site Plan Review (demolition) and Area Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Cara & Terry Moran to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Front yard setback; Side yard setback, right; Both side yards combined; Minimum open area; and Percentage of structure width/lot width; and Section 225-69(D) Non-conforming Buildings, Structures and Uses, Extension or Expansion; to demolish existing 2-car detached garage and to construct an attached 2 story garage with bedroom suite above and to construct a 444 SF paver patio at the property addressed as 57 Jordan Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

Present: Stephen Hartnett, Chairman  
Connie Brace, Member  
Melissa Komanecky, Member  
Jeff Liccione, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board  
John Crompton, Code Enforcement Officer  
Ian Carroll, Municipal Planning and Development Coordinator  
Beth O'Sullivan, Deputy Zoning Inspector  
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Adrienne Drumm, Architect, on behalf of the applicants

Bob Eggleston, 1391 E Genesee St  
Clark Maher, 2 W Lake St  
Katie Hess, 34 State St  
Rene Ridgeway, 5 W Elizabeth St  
Helen Ridgeway, 5 W Elizabeth St  
Eileen & Michael Nelson, 40 W Genesee St  
Tom Fairhurst, 20 E Elizabeth St  
Jenna Quinlan, 9 Academy St  
Sue Edinger, Thornton Grove  
Bob Lotkowitz, Thornton Grove  
Andy Ramsgard, 61 E Genesee St  
Amy & Pat Schiek, 2876 County Line Rd  
Bill Murphy, 3 Fennell St  
Guy Donahoe, 4493 NW Townline Rd

Tom Billone, 20 E Genesee St

Excused: Albert Giannino, Member

At 7:10 pm, Chairman Hartnett called for the Moran hearing for 57 Jordan Street.

Attorney Galbato recapped the application to demolish a detached garage and construct an addition to the house containing an attached garage with bedroom suite above, requiring Site Plan Review and area variance recommendation.

**Chairman Hartnett, “I move to open the public hearing.” Member Komanecy seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor, the motion was carried 4 – 0.**

Ms. Drumm presented that this is an 1852 Italianate house, with a garage that was added in 1966. The renovation will be accomplished in a consistent style.

There were no questions from the Board and no one from the public wished to be heard. **Chairman Hartnett, “I move to close the public hearing.” Member Liccion seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor, the motion was carried 4 – 0.** Member Komanecy noted that several letters had been submitted by the applicants, including neighbors at 53, 59 and 62 Jordan Street.

Chairman Hartnett instructed those present that with one member not present, a 2 – 2 vote will fail to pass. Any applicants that wish to defer to a later meeting with a full board should make that request.

**Chairman Hartnett, “I move that the Planning Board declares itself lead agency under SEQRA and that the proposed project is an unlisted action under SEQRA which will not receive coordinated review. The Planning Board issues a Negative Declaration, in that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts, and authorizes the Chairman to sign the SEAF as completed by the applicant and now Part 2 by the Planning Board. Member Brace seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, the motion was carried 4 – 0.**

Under Section 225-30, the criteria for Site Plan Review are as follows: [Board’s findings are in BOLD].

*Criteria for site plan review. The Planning Board shall review the site plan and supporting data before approval is given and take into consideration the following objectives:*

*(1) Harmonious relationship between proposed uses and existing adjacent uses. **Adjacent uses are not affected. The location is actually farther away from the apartments.***

*(2) Protection of environmentally sensitive areas. **Not affected.***

*(3) Preservation of historic and/or architecturally significant structures and landscape features. **Not affected.***

*(4) Compatibility of the scale, design, materials and detailing of the proposed use with existing adjacent and nearby uses. **Appropriate.***

*(5) Maximum safety of vehicular circulation between the site and the street network. **No change.***

(6) Maximum adequacy of interior circulation, parking and loading facilities with particular attention to vehicular and pedestrian safety. **Not affected..**

(7) Adequacy of landscaping and setbacks in regard to achieving maximum compatibility and protection of adjacent residential uses. **Probably improved.**

(8) Applicable regulations of this chapter. **Yes.**

**“Member Brace said that she does not see a big issue with this application and moves to approve the Site Plan.” Member Komaneky seconded the motion, noting the drawings are dated 09.26.2023. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, the motion was carried 4 – 0.**

**Member Brace, “I move that the Board recommends to the ZBA that it grant the requested variances.” Member Komaneky seconded the motion.**

Under Section 225-57, the Planning Board realizes the elements of the balancing test that the ZBA will undertake, and furnishes its perspective below:

*In making its determination, the Zoning Board of Appeals shall take into consideration the benefit to the applicant if the variance is granted, as weighed against the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood or community by such grant. In making such determination the Board shall also consider and determine:*

*[1] Whether an undesirable change will be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties will be created by the granting of the area variance; **No.***

*[2] Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by some method, feasible for the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance; **No.***

*[3] Whether the requested area variance is substantial; **No.***

*[4] Whether the proposed variance will have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district; **No.** and*

*[5] Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created, which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance. **Yes.***

**Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, the motion was carried 4 – 0.**

This matter was concluded at 7:19 pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards