

# Town of Cazenovia Planning Board

## Meeting Minutes

December 4, 2025

Members Present: Robert Ridler, Chairman; Anne Ferguson; Linda Cushman; Dale Bowers; Thomas Clarke; Roger Cook; Eric Jerabek; Thomas Schepp, Alternate Member; Jerry Munger, Alternate Member

Members Absent:

Others Present: John Langey, Esq; John Dunkle; Chuck Ladd; Jesse Holmes; Matthew Critz; Juanita Critz; John Henneberg; Shirley Henneberg; Matthew Vredenburgh; Aron Kolb; Holly Hoehner; Nicholas Bobbett; Matthew Potteiger; Sheila Fallon

-----

R. Ridler called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M.

Roll was taken.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Tuesday, January 6, 2026.

The next deadline day will be Wednesday, December 17, 2025.

The next regularly scheduled work session will be Tuesday, December 30, 2025.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by L. Cushman, to approve the November 6, 2025 meeting minutes was carried unanimously.

**HEARINGS**

*Holmes-Acre Holdings, LLC – Minor (1 New Lot) Subdivision – Damon Road, NW*  
*File # 25-1590 (Roger Cook)*

7:32 PM

Jesse Holmes was present to represent the file.

R. Cook asked Mr. Holmes to explain his proposal.

J. Holmes explained they were subdividing approximately four (4) acres to build a house for a family member on the lot (which is approximately 62 acres).

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by L. Cushman, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler invited comments at this time.

Hearing no comments, motion by T. Clarke, seconded by R. Cook, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

Motion by R. Cook, seconded by A. Ferguson, to approve the 1-new 4.6-acre lot subdivision as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

-----

*Critz Farm Real Estate, LLC – Minor (1 New Lot) – 3146 Thompson Road, Cazenovia*  
*File # 25-1602 (Thomas Clarke)*

7:34 PM

Matthew and Juanita Critz were present to represent the file.

T. Clarke said Mr. & Mrs. Critz have a 73-acre parcel that they would like to split into a 60-acre parcel and a 13-acre parcel.

Motion by E. Jerabek, seconded by T. Clarke, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler invited comments at this time.

Hearing no comments, motion by T. Clarke, seconded by A. Ferguson, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by A. Ferguson, to approve the 1-new lot subdivision as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

-----

*Henneberg, Shirley & John – Minor (1 New Lot) Subdivision – 2001 Delphi Road  
File # 25-1604 (Eric Jerabek) 7:35 PM*

John Henneberg was present to represent the file and Shirley Henneberg was in the audience.

E. Jerabek explained the Hennebergs would like to create a 30-acre lot for John Henneberg and his family to use (from the 97-acre parcel). He said there was adequate road frontage and everything seemed to be in order.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by E. Jerabek, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler invited comments at this time.

Hearing no comments, motion by E. Jerabek, seconded by R. Cook, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

Motion by E. Jerabek, seconded by T. Clarke, to approve the 1-new lot subdivision as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

-----

*Cunningham, Phil with PT Holdings of Cazenovia, LLC – Minor (2 New Lots) Subdivision  
File # 25-1605 (Anne Ferguson) 3295 Cobblestone Drive & Line Change with Route 20 E  
7:36 PM*

Matthew Vredenburgh was present to represent the file.

A. Ferguson explained the application was to create two (2) new lots and for a line change.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by L. Cushman, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler invited comments at this time.

Nicholas Bobbett of 3583 Cobblestone Drive said he was not objecting to the proposal but he asked to see where the lots would be created on Cobblestone Drive and particularly in relation to his property.

The drawing created by Matthew Vredenburg Landscape Architecture dated October 22, 2025 entitled *P-200 Cunningham Subdivision Cobblestone Drive, Madison County, NY Sketch Plat* was displayed for Mr. Bobbett to see.

M. Vredenburg explained that currently there was one (1) large lot and the Owner was keeping some property to stay with his business building while creating two (2) new building lots.

N. Bobbett asked where the building envelopes were located for the new lots.

M. Vredenburg showed him where those were located on the drawing and explained the lot sizes as well as the line change for what was known as *Existing Lot 3*.

M. Vredenburg explained the line change was between Lot 3 and a 200-acre parcel that connected to US Route 20, and saying that lot was entirely within a conservation easement.

N. Bobbett clarified that one new lot would have access from Moseley Road, and the other would have access from Cobblestone Drive and be across the road from his property.

M. Vredenburg responded that development on the new parcels would have to undergo site plan review.

N. Bobbett said he just wanted to see what was being proposed and thanked the Board for their time.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by L. Cushman, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler believed the Town of Nelson needed to be informed of this proposal.

J. Langey confirmed that had been done.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by E. Jerabek, to approve the 2-new lot subdivision and the line change as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

-----

*PT Ventures of Upstate NY, LLC – Minor (4 New Lots) Subdivision – 2778 East Road*  
*File # 25-1606 (Roger Cook) New Woodstock, NY 7:39 PM*

Matthew Vredenburg was present to represent the file.

R. Cook explained this proposal was to create four (4) new lots from property also owned by Phil (Cunningham) near the Hamlet of New Woodstock.

R. Ridler believed it was the gravel bed property.

R. Cook confirmed it was the gravel bed formerly owned by Zupans (which is approximately 224 acres).

Motion by R. Cook, seconded by T. Clarke, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler invited comments at this time.

Hearing no comments, motion by E. Jerabek, seconded by L. Cushman, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

R. Cook asked if Madison County approvals for driveways should be included in an approval.

(M. Vredenburgh recalled a discussion with Highway Superintendent Bryan Smith about the driveway location and the he was looking for verification for the culvert size. Later Mr. Vredenburgh realized he was confusing this project with the Cooley application discussed later in the evening. So those driveway locations were made a condition of this approval retrospectively.)

Motion by R. Cook, seconded by E. Jerabek, to approve the 4-new lot subdivision as most recently submitted conditioned upon proof of the approval by Madison County for the driveway locations was carried unanimously.

-----

*Chiarello Family Trust/Ronald & Patricia Chiarello — Minor (1) Subdivision –  
File # 25-1607 (Rober Cook)                      2378 & 2382 Damon Road, New Woodstock*

7:42 PM

No one was present to represent the file.

R. Cook explained there was no plat yet and the Owners asked to continue the file until the January meeting.

Motion by R. Cook, seconded by T. Clarke, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

**LAND DISTURBANCE/SITE PLAN REVIEW/SUBDIVISION**

*Duke, Spencer & Danielle — Site Plan Review – 4310 Route 92, Cazenovia  
File # 25-1565 (Linda Cushman)*

7:43PM

No one was present to represent the file.

R. Ridler read the email that was received from Mr. Duke this afternoon at 3:57 PM, reading, "Thank you for your letter dated November 21, 2025. I just received this letter today (December 4) as Danielle and I have been traveling. As I believe you are aware, Barclay Damon withdrew themselves as legal counsel on October 30 before the November Board Meeting. Our intent is to use lawn seed in the area of the yard where there is currently wood chips. Do we need to keep file #25-1565 open if that is the only change that we are seeking? If yes, can we get an approval from the Board for file #25-1565 on the condition that we will not add/modify any drainage? Thank you for your time and consideration."

R. Ridler asked for Mr. Langey's thoughts.

J. Langey believed what initiated this site plan review was when Mr. Ladd discovered that Mr. Duke had done something on his property that looked like trench work that would affect drainage, so Mr. Duke's project was stopped and Mr. Duke was told to come to the Planning Board. Mr. Langey asked Mr. Dunkle if he had visited the site.

J. Dunkle affirmed he had visited the site with Mr. Ladd and with the contractor who was employed by Mr. Duke at the time. He explained it appeared that there had been some manipulation of the landscape to concentrate drainage and to send it somewhere other than where it was draining before. The Applicant was informed that if drainage were altered to impact neighbors, the Board would be concerned. The plan presented at the time showed that drainage would be changed, and Mr. Dunkle advised the Board that they should not approve the changes because neighbors would be affected in a way that they had not been affected before. He believed what was in place now should be remediated, however, Mr. Dunkle did not know what was in place before this project had been undertaken.

C. Ladd interjected that he did know, and that some remediation was needed. He said if the trench that had been started was filled and restored to the way it was, Mr. Duke should be fine (to seed the area for grass).

J. Dunkle stated the drainage there was not ideal, but as long as Mr. Duke did not change the condition, the Planning Board would not need to be involved.

J. Langey elaborated that Mr. Duke's initial complaint was that his lot was unusable in some areas and Mr. Duke wanted his family to be able to use it – that was the reason for the changes that either Mr. Duke or his contractor had started at the time. However, those changes were never reviewed; and there had been multiple times when Mr. Duke failed to come (to a Planning Board meeting). He said it got to the point last month that the Board told Mr. Duke to either come now (to this meeting) or the Board would terminate the application for failure to prosecute it and then Chuck would cite Mr. Duke for violation of the Code for having modified his property without obtaining a site plan approval. Now it sounds as though Mr. Duke was asking to just seed his yard if that would be sufficient to resolve the issue.

J. Dunkle responded, “No,” saying it would not be sufficient because Mr. Duke must remediate the changes (to drainage) that he created by digging the trench. After remediation, seeding would be fine.

J. Langey offered to send a letter to Mr. Duke if the Board so wished. He explained another issue was that Mr. Duke, unlike other applicants, has not paid follow-up expenses associated with his application to date. He reported that Mr. Duke has objected to the idea that he should do what others in the Town have had to do. He felt he should send a letter to Mr. Duke with the understanding that a resolution would be subject to any expenses incurred by Mr. Dunkle or Mr. Ladd, or himself and that those must be reimbursed to the Town like any other Applicant.

The Board expressed their desire that Mr. Langey send a letter including the requirement for reimbursement (for professionals' fees).

A. Ferguson asked if the letter would advise Mr. Duke to consult with Mr. Ladd regarding what needs to be done.

J. Langey responded that would be good.

C. Ladd asked if the Board wanted Mr. Duke to apply for a land disturbance permit or if the Board thought Mr. Ladd's evaluation (of the completed work) would suffice.

The Board believed a land disturbance permit and the related \$50.00 fee should be required to be consistent with Town regulations.

L. Cushman asked if the remediation were done in conjunction with a land disturbance permit, would Mr. Duke have to return to the Planning Board.

J. Langey did not see the need for Mr. Duke to come before the Board, but felt letters should be sent to attain compliance.

J. Langey would communicate with Chair Ridler, Mr. Dunkle, and Mr. Ladd to ensure his letter captured all that Mr. Duke needs to do.

Motion by L. Cushman, seconded by A. Ferguson, to continue the file was carried unanimously. L. Cushman explained the reason for the continuance was in case Mr. Duke failed to comply (with written correspondence); she clarified Mr. Duke was not expected to attend the next meeting; however, this matter was not yet resolved.

-----

*The Lake House In Caz, LLC – Site Plan Review – 4273 Syracuse Road, Cazenovia  
File # 25-1596 (Linda Cushman) 7:51 PM*

No one was present to represent the file.

L. Cushman explained they were waiting for the replanting plan.

Motion by L. Cushman, seconded by T. Clarke, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

-----

*Hoehner, Tom & Holly – Site Plan Review – 5252 Owera Point Drive, Cazenovia  
File # 25-1594 (Robert Ridler) 7:52 PM*

Aron Kolb of Aron Kolb Architecture was present to represent the file with Holly Hoehner.

R. Ridler asked Mr. Kolb to explain the proposal.

A. Kolb said they had started with the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) in August and the ZBA requested they get an updated survey since the original survey was created in 1979 and there were some discrepancies between the survey and the actual site. The new survey enabled them to quantify the actual size of the site which allowed them to create more accurate site coverage percentages.

A. Kolb explained the scope of the project was to add a master bedroom extension, a single garage bay expansion toward the road, and a covered porch/deck toward the lake. The garage expansion toward the road and the neighboring property was a variance item as was the deck expansion.

A. Kolb displayed the drawing he created entitled *EX-S Existing Site Coverages Renovations to: Hoehner Residence 5252 Owera Point Drive Cazenovia, NY 13035* revised 10/23/25 and *S-1 Proposed Site Plan Renovations to: Hoehner Residence 5252 Owera Point Drive Cazenovia, NY 13035* revised 10/23/25 which showed the reduction of driveway coverage and resulted in a reduction in overall coverage from 17% to 15%, 932 square feet, to offset the proposed additions.

A. Kolb stated no work was planned in the 20-foot buffer. He reported that along the shoreline there was existing, mature vegetation. He said there were about 50 trees in that area and approximately 20 of them were 12 inches or more in diameter, and he said no work would be done in that area. He stated that along the south side of the property there were 6-inch diameter pine trees, three (3) feet on center along the whole side. He said one of the conditions of the ZBA approval for the garage was to add some green giant junior (arborvitae) as a vegetative buffer for the Zinzerlings who are the neighbors on that side and who have a wall of windows.

A. Ferguson mentioned if more work were desired, the Applicants would have to return for additional site plan review.

J. Langey noted the approval letter from the ZBA was included in the file and those conditions were in place for the project.

J. Langey then led the Board through the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF) for the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) and the Board found all the impacts to be either none or small.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by T. Clarke, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of SEQR and to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the review of the SEAF, and to approve the site plan as most recently submitted for the construction of a third bay addition to an existing garage, a master bedroom addition on the first floor, and the addition to the existing back porch was carried unanimously.

-----

*Cooley, Paul & Campagna, Alyssa – Site Plan Review – 5252 Cobblestone Drive*  
*File # 25-1609 (Dale Bowers)* 7:58 PM  
Matthew Vredenburgh was present to represent the file.

M. Vredenburgh apologized explaining that during discussion for the subdivision for PT Ventures of Upstate New York, R. Cook asked about sight distance (for driveways) and he explained that his mind went to a conversation he had with Bryan Smith for this

project. (So the driveway cut information for the New Woodstock project would need Madison County approval for the driveways, whereas this project would need Town approval for this driveway.)

There was discussion regarding the number of lots in the first Cobblestone Drive subdivision created by Phil Cunningham that have been sold and developed thus far.

D. Bowers said Mr. Vredenburg had discussed this project with the Board at the recent work session.

M. Vredenburg stated Mr. Cooley was proposing to build a house on this lot and showed where there was a conservation easement referring to his drawing created November 19, 2025 entitled *S-200 Cooley Residence Cobblestone Drive, Town of Cazenovia, Madison County, NY Site Plan*.

M. Vredenburg explained Phil Cunningham had cleared an access for some clearing of part of the lot and that location was where the permanent driveway would be requested and that Bryan Smith had verbally okayed. That was also where the culvert size that he had mistakenly alluded to earlier would be.

D. Bowers said Mr. Smith's written approval and details about both items would be a condition of an approval.

M. Vredenburg responded, "Yes."

A. Ferguson asked about the new house details.

The drawing created by Bruce Ward Architect, ALA dated April 22, 2025 entitled *Elevations & Sections Paul Cooley New Residence Cobblestone Drive, Cazenovia, NY* which was submitted with the application was reviewed.

A. Ferguson asked what material would be used for the exterior.

M. Vredenburg answered, "I do not know."

D. Bowers wondered if that detail were necessary, implying the material would not impact review of the site plan.

A. Ferguson explained that she was merely upholding the Board's responsibility to review the architecture.

D. Bowers noted it was conventionally framed.

There was some discussion regarding color.

J. Langey reminded the Board they had no control over colors, but noted Board suggestions have been agreed upon by many applicants.

A. Ferguson clarified her intention was to ensure the construction would be consistent with the rural character (of the neighborhood), and she felt it would be.

D. Bowers believed there was a question regarding the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (SHPO).

A. Ferguson asked where the archaeological buffer was.

M. Vredenburgh explained the project would be within the buffer but explained a letter from SHPO had already been received when the subdivision was created.

A copy of the letter had been submitted to the file November 20, 2025.

M. Vredenburgh read from the letter dated December 23, 2019 saying, "it is the opinion of OPRHP that no properties, including archaeological and/or historic resources, listed in or eligible for the New York State and National Registers of Historic Places will be impacted by this project."

D. Bowers asked Mr. Langey if the letter were sufficient.

J. Langey said it was.

J. Langey also said this was a Type II Action regarding SEQR.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by E. Jerabek, to approve the site plan as most recently submitted for the construction of a new home was carried unanimously.

-----

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by L. Cushman, to adjourn the meeting at 8:05 P.M. was carried unanimously.

Sue Wightman, Planning Board Secretary – December 4, 2025