

Village of Skaneateles
Planning Board Meeting
March 7, 2024
Skaneateles Village Hall

Consideration of Sketch Plan Review in the matter of the application of Devin Daly to develop the 6 lot Orchard Road Extension subdivision on the parcel bearing tax map number 003.-05-06 adjacent to 131 and 132 Orchard Road and 100, 102, 104 and 106 Packwood Place in the Village of Skaneateles.

Present: Stephen Hartnett, Chairman
Connie Brace, Member
Albert Giannino, Member

Riccardo Galbato, Attorney for the Planning Board
John Crompt, Code Enforcement Officer
Ian Carroll, Municipal Planning and Development Coordinator
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Bob Eggleston, architect, on behalf of the applicant
Ed Reid, PE, on behalf of the applicant

Mary Sennett, Village Mayor
Tyde Richards, Village Trustee

Excused: Melissa Komaneky, Member
Jeff Liccione, Member

At 7:37 pm, Chairman Hartnett then called for the Daly proposed subdivision at Orchard Road.

Attorney Galbato recapped this application which proposes a six lot subdivision. He questioned whether Mr. Daly is a trustee of the trust and able to sign the application? Mr. Eggleston replied that Mr. Daly has signing authority. It was later stated that he is a Trustee.

Mr. Eggleston presented that the applicant and his team have had conversations and a workshop with Village staff. He presented this subdivision as similar to Ramblewood with the lots arranged on a cul de sac. The lots are laid out with close to 160 feet of frontage and have 19,000

to 24,000 SF. A nondevelopable portion is in the flood plain and wetland area that also contains the City of Syracuse and Niagara Mohawk easements.

Mr. Eggleston continued that uses the B District design standards and the six lots would use the same cross section for roads, utilities, and trees per DMO Posella's recommendation. According to Mr. Eggleston, Mr. Daly intends to maintain the town parcel and erect a pole barn for his use. That makes the 40 foot access and drainage easement necessary for his access to that parcel, even though it was established that the applicant has an 18 foot easement from Old Seneca Turnpike. Mr. Eggleston said the Town requires 30 feet right of way for driveway and 66 feet for a road.

Mr. Eggleston continued saying that the Town zoning offices are not interested in coordinated review under SEQRA, but as an interested party. He asserted that the Town does not want to lose their access to Orchard Road. He then questioned the ability for the Village to create a nonconforming condition in the Town? Mr. Eggleston argued that the applicant and the Town have rights that must be preserved during the subdivision process. Atty. Galbato advised the Board that Mr. Eggleston is incorrect.

Attorney Galbato said that he cannot advise the Board to approve or look favorably toward the proposed sketch plan, based on his review which is limited to the proposed 40 foot access easement to the town parcel. The Village has no obligation to consider an impact on the Town outside the Village. He continued that the proposal creates a 40 foot access easement to the Town parcel. Atty. Galbato reminded Mr. Eggleston that he had been instructed in a January 29, 2024 email, that the Village requires an isolated cul de sac termination for Orchard Road. To allow access to the Town parcel does not provide any Village oversight as to how that parcel may or may not be developed. It jeopardizes the residential neighborhood of the Parkside Village subdivision. The Town parcel could be agricultural, could be commercial, could be residential or could be municipal without any oversight by this Board or the Village Trustees, or the Village engineer to approve drainage, traffic, etc. on the Parkside public roads. In fact, the parcel could be purchased, or taken by eminent domain by the Town; the Town recently declared itself as immune from Village Zoning regulations. He said that normally good planning often includes the use of hammerheads for future road extension if adjacent land is developed. However, in this case the adjacent land to the north is in the Town, with the burden falling to Village streets.

Mr. Galbato quoted from Village Code Section 190.1, "It is declared to be the policy of the Planning Board to consider planned subdivision plots as part of the orderly, efficient and economical development of the Village. This means, among other things, that land to be subdivided shall be of such character that it can be used safely for building purposes without danger to health or peril from fire, flood or other menace; that proper provision shall be made for drainage, water supply, sewerage and other needed improvements; that all proposed lots shall be so laid out and of such size as to be in harmony with the development pattern of the neighboring properties; that the proposed streets shall compose a convenient system conforming to the Official Map and shall be properly related to the proposals shown on the Comprehensive Plan and shall be of such width, grade and location as to accommodate the prospective traffic, to facilitate fire protection and to provide access of fire-fighting equipment to buildings; and that

proper provision shall be made for open spaces for parks and playgrounds.” Section 225-6. E. when it defined the B District “Residential B District. The purpose of this district is to define and establish regulations for areas of the Village containing land adequate for the construction of mixed single-family and multifamily residential development. The purpose of these regulations is to promote the orderly development of the Village compatible with its existing character and attractiveness.”

Atty. Galbato suggested that the Planning Board consider turning down the sketch plan based on the Board’s limited review of the 40 foot access easement or request that the applicant modify the sketch plan to eliminate that aspect of the proposal, so the Board could consider other portions of its review.

Chairman Hartnett said that the Board has a duty to protect residents of the Village. Permitting access to the Town parcel could negatively affect residents of Parkside and adjacent streets.

Member Giannino, “I live on West Elizabeth Street and it’s not just the Parkside residents who are concerned about that development. I move to deny the sketch plan as submitted.” Chairman Hartnett seconded the motion. Upon the unanimous vote of the members in favor of the motion, the motion was carried 3 – 0.

This matter was concluded at 7:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards