

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

Design Standards Review [Section 225-17] and Area Variance recommendation in the matter of the application of Kristy & Jason Boyles to vary the strict application of Section 225-A5 Density Control Schedule for Rear yard setback and Minimum open area; to construct a new 4,916 SF single family dwelling with porches and attached 3-car garage on a vacant lot at the property addressed as 108 Sinclair 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

Bill Murphy, Architect, on behalf of the applicant

Bob Eggleston, 1391 E Genesee St
Clark Maher, 2 W Lake St
Katie Hess, 34 State St
Tom Fairhurst, 20 E Elizabeth St
Amy & Pat Schiek, 2876 County Line Rd
Guy Donahoe, 4493 NW Townline Rd
Tom Billone, 20 E Genesee St

Excused: Albert Giannino, Member

At 7:53 pm, Chairman Hartnett called for the Boyles matter for 108 Sinclair Street.

Attorney Galbato recapped the application to construct a new single family dwelling in Section 4 of the Parkside Village Subdivision. It requires design standards review and the CEO has determined that it requires area variances. A letter from TDK has been received regarding their review of the grading plan and the design has been reviewed by the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) of the Planning Board.

Member Brace, as chair of the ARC, reported, saying that the building as proposed is required to be compliant with the B District design standards as set forth in Village Code (Section 225-17). The proposal has several issues.

- First, the orientation of the house is angular to the streets, rather than being parallel to the street as defined in the design standards,
- Another is the proximity of the garage doors to Sinclair Street,
- The design as presented lacks detail on the materials to be used.

The ARC recommends that the application be denied. That finding makes other components of the application moot.

Mr. Murphy complained that the applicants were not asked for the materials, which will be no different from other Parkside homes – stone veneer, cedar clapboard, and white brick. Many houses ...; both streets are curving. His clients preferred to have the house face the whole neighborhood, and to have the back of the house improve the back yard. Mr. Murphy argued that either street could be the front yard. Member Brace noted that the design standards would have it face one way or the other.

Mr. Murphy asked if the Board can approve the house facing Orchard Road? Ms. O’Sullivan stated that the address – 108 Sinclair – determines the front yard. Mr. Murphy argued that there is a build-to line on two sides. Member Liccion noted that the curb cut is on Sinclair Street.

Mr. Murphy stated he has read the letter from TDK referring to the neighbor at Lot 29. The 4 inch line is outflow from the sump pump, while the 6 inch line is connected to the storm sewer. The lot drains from lower left to upper right.

Atty. Galbato instructed the Board that the reasons for having design standards were set forth in the resolution that enacted Section 225-17. The 108 Sinclair property is located in the B District and the subdivision formation requires approval by the ARC. The ARC finds that the proposed application does not meet the design standards, and it recommends denial of the application. Specifically, 225-17C(4) requires that the home be aligned with the build-to line. 225-17C(7) requires that the façade extend a minimum of 40% of the lot width, and 225-17C(1) requires the applicant to submit the proposed exterior materials. Further, that the columns are to be a classical column design.

Mr. Murphy asserted that that the façade is clearly greater than 40%. Member Brace said that the intent is to be parallel with the build-to line.

Chairman Hartnett stated that what the applicants have proposed is not acceptable. Mr. Murphy was asked if he wished to withdraw the application? After further discussion, Mr. Murphy requested a continuation to enable him to brief his clients.

Chairman Hartnett, “I move that the Board continues consideration of this application upon the request of the applicant pending receipt of modifications.” Member Komanecky seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the motion was carried 4 – 0.

This matter was concluded at 8:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards