

Cazenovia Zoning Board of Appeals

Meeting Minutes

March 23, 2026

Members present: Thomas Pratt; David Silverman; Gary Mason; David Vredenburg; Luke Gianforte; Joseph Juskiewicz, Alternate Member; Michael Palmer, Alternate Member

Members absent: None

Others present: Wendy Loughnot; Chuck Ladd; Abby Cordes; Shawn Patane; Charlene Patane; Deborah Amidon; Paul Amidon; Linda Yates; Michele Austin; Jim Austin; Sheila Fallon

T. Pratt called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Roll was taken and all members were present.

Motion by L. Gianforte, seconded by G. Mason, to approve the February 23, 2026 meeting minutes was carried unanimously.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Monday, April 27, 2026.

The next regularly scheduled work session will be Tuesday, April 21, 2026.

T. Pratt stated all requested information must be received prior to the work session for consideration.

T. Pratt asked that the rustling of papers, the clicking of pens, and other background noise be limited for the benefit of the recording.

T. Pratt said regarding public speaking, please come forward, provide one's name and address, present to the Board not the Applicant(s), refrain from asking questions but rather make statements, and refrain from repeating items if they have already been stated once during the time for public comment.

T. Pratt asked those in the audience to sign the sheet that had been provided to record attendance.

Maples of Madison County, LLC - #20-1291 – Special Use Permit Renewal – 2412 US Route 20 East,

T. Pratt explained this was a special use permit renewal in the Rural B Zone for a bandstand and for outdoor events originally issued in 2020. He asked Mr. Ladd if he had inspected the property and if there had been any complaints.

C. Ladd answered he had and there were no complaints.

Motion by D. Silverman, seconded by D. Vredenburg, to approve the special use permit the bandstand and outdoor events for another year with the original and subsequent terms and conditions was carried unanimously.

Jerabek, Eric - #98-117 – Special Use Permit Renewal – 1639 Delphi Road, Cazenovia

T. Pratt said this was a special use permit renewal for the keeping of farm animals in the Rural A District which was originally approved in 1998. He asked Mr. Ladd if he had performed an inspection and if there had been any complaints.

C. Ladd said he had performed an inspection and there had been no complaints.

Motion by D. Vredenburg, seconded by L. Gianforte, to approve the special use permit with the original terms and conditions for another year was carried unanimously.

Cordes, Abby - #26-1616 – Special Use Permit/Short-term Rentals – 2008 Stanley Rd, Cazenovia (David Vredenburgh)

Abby Cordes was present to represent the file.

T. Pratt explained the project was for the operation of a Short-Term Rental (STR) in the Rural A Zone. He asked Mr. Ladd if he had reviewed the application.

C. Ladd affirmed he had reviewed the request and found it to be an acceptable application.

T. Pratt asked Ms. Cordes to display the submitted floor plan and site plan drawing.

D. Vredenburgh felt the application was in order with a couple items to be addressed by Mr. Ladd, one of which was the authorization for Mr. Ladd to perform the necessary inspection for the Short-Term Rental.

L. Gianforte stated he also reviewed the application and believed it was “pretty cut and dry.”

J. Juskiewicz had no further comments, nor did M. Palmer, G. Mason, or D. Silverman.

D. Vredenburgh had a question regarding a pool that was crossed off the survey submitted and asked if the pool had been removed. He also asked about a shed that was located on the drawing.

A. Cordes answered the pool was gone. A shed remained on the property however.

T. Pratt reminded Ms. Cordes she was responsible for the site as well as the tenants regarding any noise issues or if any events were to occur. He said she was to be the one to take care of any issues (related to guest stays) – “first and foremost.”

A. Cordes expressed understanding and consent.

T. Pratt said quiet hours were to be from 9:30PM to 7:30AM.

T. Pratt stated (exterior) lighting was expected to be dark-sky compliant, low level, (and shielded).

T. Pratt asked if a recent inspection had been done for the septic system.

A. Cordes responded she had it pumped in the fall (of 2025).

T. Pratt informed her proof of capacity and pumping would be required (as part of the permitting process).

T. Pratt said one parking space was to be provided for every bedroom being rented. He asked the number of bedrooms that would be used.

A. Cordes answered three (3) bedrooms would be available.

T. Pratt asked if she had three (3) parking spaces.

A. Cordes answered she had five (5) spaces.

T. Pratt asked if there was a drawing in the submission showing the parking.

A. Cordes had sketched the dimensions of the parking area on her survey created by Michael J McCully on 06-25-24 entitled *Location Survey on Park of Lot 22 of the 4th Allotment of the New Petersburg Tract Known as No 2008 Stanley Road, Town of Cazenovia, County of Madison, State of New York*. She pointed on the drawing where there was 30 feet which would accommodate three (3) cars to the west of the 2-car frame garage and a turnaround to the north of the 2-car garage that would accommodate two (2) more cars.

T. Pratt said the maximum number of guests would be six (6) since there were three (3) bedrooms.

T. Pratt repeated there were to be no events, no signs, no noise.

T. Pratt asked if Ms. Cordes or an agent on her behalf would be available within 30 minutes (to respond to any issues or complaints).

A. Cordes said she would be staying two (2) miles away when her home was rented.

T. Pratt repeated Ms. Cordes would be responsible at all times.

A. Cordes expressed understanding and assent.

T. Pratt did not anticipate any increased traffic impacts or environmental issues.

T. Pratt asked if the operation would be limited or year-round.

A. Cordes answered it would be open year-round but because it was her primary residence, she did not intend to rent it more than 40% of the time. She explained she desired to rent it for additional income, but she also wanted to live there.

T. Pratt confirmed Ms. Cordes understood an inspection would be performed by Code Enforcement and among the items needed would be fire extinguishers, signs for exiting, contact information, smoke detectors and carbon monoxide detectors. He said the house number would need to be visible for 911 purposes, the electrical system would need to have a recent inspection, and there were other items that Mr. Ladd would be requiring.

A. Cordes responded, "Sure."

T. Pratt said the Board would also require that Ms. Cordes have the names of all the guests during the stays.

A. Cordes replied, "Okay."

T. Pratt said any pets staying with guests would be required to be on a leash and controlled.

T. Pratt repeated there was a second part to the permitting process that required the Code Enforcement Officer's inspection and another application would need to be submitted for the operation of the Short-Term Rental.

A. Cordes was agreeable to the subsequent inspection.

G. Mason asked if Ms. Cordes would have an alternate responsible party if she were out of town (during guest stays). He said he would like that person's name on file and the phone number on file.

C. Ladd said he would make sure that was provided before he issued the Short-Term Rental Operating Permit.

D. Silverman clarified that Ms. Cordes would accept a call from the Town of Cazenovia if she were out of town and a problem arose and the secondary person were also unavailable, saying she would still be "in charge."

A. Cordes affirmed she would.

Motion by D. Vredenburg, seconded by L. Gianforte, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

T. Pratt invited comments at this time.

Paul Amidon of 2004 Stanley Road said he and his wife were Ms. Cordes' closest neighbors and they were happy to be present to support her.

D. Amidon said Ms. Cordes had "put a lot of work into the place," and they were happy with her work and to have her as their neighbor.

D. Silverman said a previous applicant had neighbors who had an issue with guests potentially bringing pets and he spoke about the importance of addressing those issues.

A. Cordes said her house rules would impart the requirement of dogs being on a lead or leashed at all times.

Linda Yates at 2063 Stanley Road understood this was the time for comments rather than questions but wondered if she had questions, who she should ask, and wondered how long the file would be open for neighbors to review.

T. Pratt asked if Ms. Yates had any particular concerns.

L. Yates answered the Airbnb aspect was new to the neighborhood and thought it might take away (from the neighborhood). She said she was "on the fence" and was unsure of what she wanted. She said noise was obviously a concern, as was light, and the age of guests who would be renting and the potential for

parties. She spoke about an incident in the past when a rental at another home in the area got out of hand. She also spoke about the potential dangers for walkers because of unfamiliar drivers on the hill. She wondered if caution could be conveyed to renters. She had a host of other questions, but thought if she could review the file, she could talk directly to Ms. Cordes. She thought renting only 40% of the time was better than someone who rented it and did not live there.

A. Cordes responded she was happy to address any issues at this time or to talk with Ms. Yates in private.

A. Cordes explained one may use a variety of settings to make reservations through Airbnb so the setting she chose requires guests to tell her the reason for their coming to the area and who will be in their party and the number of people coming. She said she does not allow children in the party because of the antiques in her home. She stated she was able to select who she allows to stay in her home. She also felt the cost of the stay was another way to vet guests. She also explained hosts are required to create their own list of house rules which are posted with the listing through Airbnb. She said those were printed in multiple locations throughout the house as well. Her guests would have to confirm their consent to the rules before booking the stay. Noise and quiet hours, no parties, no unregistered guests were all items addressed in her house rules.

A. Cordes said she has a small round firepit which was within the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Code which would be the only outside fire allowed. She believed the fire could not be more than 3-feet high and contained in a 2-foot firepit.

G. Mason said another applicant set an age requirement of 25 years of age. He clarified he was not saying Ms. Cordes needed to set an age requirement, but he wanted it known that could be done. He said that made neighbors more comfortable with that proposal.

L. Yates asked how the neighbors could contact Ms. Cordes if she were out of town and the neighbors wanted to report issues.

A. Cordes said she would be happy to give Ms. Yates her phone number.

Michele Austin of 2060 Stanley Road said she and her husband own the property down the hill from the proposal. She said they would probably be most affected by sound since a row of trees between the properties had been removed. She said they hear music at night. She said light shines into their home in a hallway where their bedrooms are located, so that was a concern they had with guests who may not know that should be curbed. She said the property was also often used by hunters which was another issue. She said their land was posted, but she was concerned about hunters' use of the land and the safety issue. She said the buses do not come down the street so children have to walk to Ridge Road in the mornings and the afternoons when darkness can be an issue, and said short-term renters may not know the danger for students and people walking their dogs on the road which was only partially plowed.

M. Austin also asked about the new survey referred to earlier in the conversation saying there was a question regarding who planted the trees that were removed between the homes.

A. Cordes asked if Ms. Austin was not at home when she had a conversation about the trees being removed.

M. Austin responded that now the sound and light have no buffer in the open area created by the tree removal.

A. Cordes said she visited a couple times to make sure the Austins knew that was the plan and to get their approval for it.

T. Pratt said the issues come back to noise, events, and lighting. He suggested perhaps shielded lights should be installed to replace those on the side of the house (facing the Austins).

T. Pratt noted it sounded like Ms. Cordes was more than happy to be contacted if there were any issues, and he repeated she must be the first to be contacted, not the Town.

A. Cordes said she understood and she was “on board.”

T. Pratt asked if there were any others in favor of or opposed to the proposal.

Hearing no other comments, motion by D. Vredenburgh, seconded by L. Gianforte, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

W. Lougnot then led the Board through the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF) for the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) for this Unlisted Action, finding all impacts to be either small or none.

T. Pratt said in review of the special use permit, the main question for the Board was whether it would have an impact upon the neighborhood – either environmental or physical.

T. Pratt said the following would be conditions if approved:

- 1) Number of guests to be 2/bedroom, not to exceed 6;
- 2) no events, no sign,
- 3) someone must be able to respond to issues within 30 minutes and must be responsible for issues during rentals, and Ms. Cordes will provide the name of the back-up person if she is unable to do this herself;
- 4) inspection will be done by Code Enforcement and anything that does not comply must be repaired or modified;

5) the septic system must be inspected, proof of capacity must be provided, and the system must be pumped every two (2) years;

6) all guests will be listed on bookings;

7) a second notification of the neighbors will not be necessary during the permitting process since they were notified for the special use permit application;

8) pets will be controlled, leashed, or contained in some manner.

G. Mason said regarding the complaint by the neighbor regarding the light shining into her home, he suggested Ms. Cordes change the light that affects that neighbor. He also understood the concern regarding hunters renting the space. He felt if six (6) guys were renting during hunting season, Ms. Cordes might want to remind them to stay on her property. He felt those valid concerns should be addressed.

T. Pratt asked if additional conditions should be added for those issues.

G. Mason did not think there should be conditions for the concerns he mentioned, but he felt those issues should be considerations for Ms. Cordes as she operates her business.

A. Cordes responded, “Sure – absolutely.”

Motion by L. Gianforte, seconded by D. Silverman, to appoint the Zoning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of SEQR, to affirm the Matter an Unlisted Action, and to make a Negative Declaration based upon the Board’s review of the SEAF, and to approve the special use permit as most recently submitted and with the above-referenced conditions was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	No
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
David Vredenburgh	Voted	Yes
Luke Gianforte	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

T. Pratt explained a second application must to be submitted with the associated fee and the Code Enforcement inspection, saying this approval was pending Mr. Ladd’s approval.

Patane, Shawn & Charlene - #26-1619 – Area Variances – 4761 Ormonde Drive, Cazenovia (Luke Gianforte)

Shawn and Charlene Patane were present to represent the file.

T. Pratt explained the Patanes were requesting an area variance for front yard setback relief in the lake watershed. The amount of relief was 12.2 feet or 2.2 feet for a garage addition, depending on whether one measured from the property line or from the center line of Ormonde Drive. The General Municipal Law Recommendation Report (GML) from Madison County Planning Department had been received March 18, 2026 identifying no County impact. The property was .77 acres.

L. Gianforte elaborated that the Applicants want to redesign the garage to fit their cars and to have extra space for other items, and the driveway will be reconfigured as well. They were able to keep the percentage of overall impervious surface area the same (with the proposed improvements). They were also able to preserve almost all the trees in front of the house. He felt the impact was minimal for the proposal overall with a small amount of relief needed between the house and the road. There would be no request for relief on the lake side.

S. Patane said they tried to be as cautious as possible (when creating the proposal). He noted the driveway and house are about seven (7) feet lower than the road (which also helps lessen the visual impacts).

T. Pratt asked if they had considered other locations.

S. Patane displayed some aerial photos of the property. He showed how heavily treed the area was along the road. He pointed out an area where there was a stone wall. He believed a prior approval was given for another area however that would have involved the removal of several trees and all the blacktop in front of the house. They did not want to locate it in the open space to the south because that would encroach on their neighbor on that side. They also would not want to “bury” the front entrance behind a garage.

T. Pratt asked about tree removal for their proposal.

S. Patane said only one (1) tree would need to be removed to straighten the driveway.

T. Pratt asked the function of the space.

S. Patane said it would be garage and storage for the off-season for the kayak, paddleboards, patio furniture, etc.

T. Pratt asked about the setback relief being sought.

S. Patane said 50 feet from the property line was a requirement; they would be 47.8 feet so they would need 2.2 feet of relief.

T. Pratt asked if that measurement was to the eave or the foundation.

S. Patane said that would be to the foundation.

T. Pratt asked for the calculation to the eave.

S. Patane believed that the eave would probably be 18 inches to match the rest of the house on that end, so the relief would be 4.2 feet, so he thought 5 feet of relief was prudent. He said the other consideration was measuring 85 feet from the centerline of the road, but the centerline of the road was not exactly known, but he thought it would be about 15 feet of relief from that dimension.

T. Pratt advised the dimension be considered 5 feet from the 50-foot measurement from the property line.

T. Pratt recalled the impervious surface area was about 17% and the allowed percentage was 10%, so he stated that would have to be addressed by the Planning Board.

T. Pratt believed the Applicants had shown that the addition would still be in line with the adjacent houses.

S. Patane said they had created an aerial view showing the line of homes on either side of theirs and illustrating how this addition would not protrude beyond the homes next to theirs.

T. Pratt expressed approval.

T. Pratt said the Board would require the surveyor to locate the setback, and then return to locate the foundation, and Mr. Ladd would need to witness both those locations.

T. Pratt said any exterior lighting would need to be dark-sky compliant, shielded, and low level.

D. Silverman felt the Applicants had answered all the concerns. He said they had done a good job.

G. Mason agreed and felt the survey would ensure that the addition location would be verified. He repeated the Planning Board would have to address the impervious surface issues. He said he had no other questions.

M. Palmer agreed with Mr. Mason.

J. Juskiewicz thought the Applicants had done a good job addressing the concerns, and he had no issues with the proposal.

D. Vredenburgh said the Applicants had not addressed the addition on the south side of the house, the garden room.

S. Patane said they would be addressing that part of the proposal with the Planning Board since it does not affect any setback issues.

T. Pratt believed that would be located about 35 feet from the property line.

S. Patane responded it would be 35 – 37 feet from that boundary.

D. Vredenburg asked how much the garage addition would extend.

S. Patane answered it would be partially torn down so approximately 9' X 38' would be removed and 24' X 39' would be added, so he thought it would extend 15 – 16 feet.

T. Pratt repeated the variance would be 5 feet of relief from the 50-foot setback from the property line.

D. Vredenburg double-checked the calculations to ensure adequate amount of relief would be stated.

S. Patane said the calculations would need to be adjusted for the eave dimension.

D. Vredenburg said the surveyor will measure from the foundation.

T. Pratt believed the 5-foot relief should be adequate.

L. Gianforte had no other comments or questions.

Motion by L. Gianforte, seconded by G. Mason, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

T. Pratt invited comments at this time.

Hearing no comments, motion by D. Silverman seconded by G. Mason, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

W. Lougnot said this would be a Type II Action in regard to SEQR.

T. Pratt then led the Board through the five (5) considerations regarding area variances. He said regarding alternate solutions, others had been considered but the need to remove more trees made them a greater environmental impact than the proposed.

T. Pratt asked if the relief requested was substantial. He felt in this case about 10% of relief was needed which he felt was minor.

T. Pratt stated it was a self-created hardship.

T. Pratt said the Board had talked about the impact on the neighborhood, which he felt was not much, and he thought it actually would be a benefit to the neighborhood.

T. Pratt did not feel this would be an undesirable condition.

T. Pratt asked if anyone had any other thoughts.

The Board did not.

T. Pratt then listed the conditions he had identified which were:

- 1) exterior lighting shall be low level, dark-sky compliant, and shielded;
- 2) design shall comply with the Town and New York State Codes; and
- 3) the Planning Board will review impervious surfaces and impervious conditions.

Motion by L. Gianforte, seconded by G. Mason, to approve the area variance for five (5) feet of front yard setback from the property line along Ormonde Drive for the garage addition as most recently submitted and with the above-referenced conditions was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
David Vredenburg	Voted	Yes
Luke Gianforte	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

The Applicants were then instructed to attend the May 7, 2026 Planning Board meeting to review the site plan application for this project.

Motion by G. Mason, seconded by L. Gianforte, to adjourn the meeting at 8:19 p.m. was carried unanimously.

Sue Wightman, Zoning Board of Appeals Secretary – March 24, 2026