

Town of Cazenovia Planning Board

Meeting Minutes

October 2, 2025

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

Members Absent: Anne Ferguson; Jerry Munger, Alternate Member

Others Present: John Langey, Esq; Chuck Ladd; Theresa Setter; Amy Austin; Thomas Lampros; Maria DiElsi; Sheila Fallon

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

Roll was taken. Thomas Schepp assumed the role of a voting member in Anne Ferguson's absence.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Thursday, November 6, 2025.

The next deadline day will be Wednesday, October 22, 2025.

The next regularly scheduled work session will be Thursday, October 30, 2025.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by E. Jerabek, to approve the September 4, 2025 meeting minutes was carried unanimously.

LAND DISTURBANCE/SITE PLAN REVIEW/SUBDIVISION

*Duke, Spencer & Danielle – Site Plan Review – 4310 Route 92, Cazenovia
File # 25-1565 (Linda Cushman) 7:31PM*

No one was present to represent the file.

J. Langey spoke to Mr. Duke's attorney this afternoon and at this point in time they were not ready to come forward. He was told they will consult with their client and see how they want to proceed. He reported they asked for an adjournment.

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

*Holmes Acres Holdings, LLC – Minor (1 New Lot) Subdivision – Damon Road, NW
File # 25-1590 (Roger Cook) 7:32 PM*

No one was present to represent the file.

R. Cook said Jesse Holmes anticipated receiving the plat from the surveyor for the November meeting.

Motion by R. Cook, seconded by L. Cushman, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

*Austin, Eric & Amy – Line Elimination – 1572 Route 20 with Route 20, Cazenovia
File # 25-1591 (Anne Ferguson) 7:33 PM*

Amy Austin was present to represent the file.

R. Ridler asked Ms. Austin to explain the proposal.

Referring to the drawing created by Michael J. McCully Land Surveying, PLLC dated 06-19-16 entitled *Location Survey on Part of Lots 17, 18 & 19 of the Township Reservation – Cazenovia. Known as No. 1572 United States Route 20, Town of Cazenovia, County of Madison, State of New York* Ms. Austin pointed to the line they propose to eliminate to combine two (2) lots, (one of which contains the home).

T. Clarke asked the location of the property.

R. Ridler and A. Austin answered it was along Route 20.

A. Austin elaborated it was west of Cazenovia Lake as one headed toward Pompey.

T. Clarke asked if it was near Grassy Lane.

A. Austin answered it was.

R. Ridler elaborated that it was on the south side of the road.

J. Langey led the Board through Part 2 of the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF).

Motion by R. Ridler, seconded by E. Jerabek, 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 Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF), to move the file to a public hearing at the next Planning Board meeting, and to continue the file was carried unanimously.

Public hearing instructions were given to Ms. Austin at this time.

*The Lake House In Caz, LLC – Site Plan Review – 4273 Syracuse Road, Cazenovia
File # 25-1596 (Dale Bowers)*

7:36 PM

Theresa Setter was present to represent the file.

L. Cushman explained the general location of the property which is along New York State Route 92 toward the end of the lake. She explained the Applicant had removed some trees (without getting the necessary land disturbance permit) so the discussion would be about remediation. Looking at an aerial photograph in the file, L. Cushman asked Ms. Setter to explain where the house was located.

T. Setter pointed out the house and the trees that had been removed. She explained when she was given an estimate to trim the trees, limbs were lying on the ground created by fungi around the truck caused by moisture build up. She explained the house had been vacant for a period of time, so the trees had not had care. The tree consultant advised removing the trees rather than trimming them due to their condition. She was unaware she needed a permit for this work, and added she had three (3) other estimates, and none of them had mentioned the need for a permit.

T. Setter said she planned to plant new trees along the driveway, and she has had two (2) estimates for the creation of a planting plan. She assumed she would need to reschedule a return to the Board to submit that plan. She explained she was unsure of the next steps.

L. Cushman asked if Mr. Ladd had seen the trees that were near the house.

C. Ladd answered he had and he said the trees were enlarged and overgrown.

T. Setter introduced herself to Mr. Ladd, saying they had spoken on the phone, and then explained that there were 132 trees slanted toward the home on the hillside behind it they also were cause for concern. She was unsure of her plan for those trees, but stated a number of them were dead.

C. Ladd offered to meet with her the following week to talk about which ones she would like to remove.

T. Setter approved of the meeting.

L. Cushman recommended Ms. Setter return with the plan detailing where the new trees would be planted. She asked how many were removed.

T. Setter answered 11.

L. Cushman asked how many would be planted.

T. Setter responded at least 10. She said the plan for the trees in the back had not been tabulated, saying many of the pines were smaller trees but close together.

C. Ladd said Ms. Setter may not need to replace any of the trees she hopes to remove in the backyard for safety reasons.

R. Ridler asked that the plan include location and species.

T. Setter affirmed it would.

T. Clarke asked if any trees would be replaced that were around the house.

T. Setter responded that only one tree on the side of the house had been removed, otherwise no trees were taken down around the house. She said the plan was for trees in front of the house as well as a small Japanese maple.

L. Cushman instructed Ms. Setter to have new material submitted by the next deadline.

D. Bowers clarified the Board was seeking the location, size, and species of the proposed trees on the plan.

T. Setter responded, "Absolutely – very good," and thanked the Board.

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

*Lampros, Thomas & DiElsi, Maria – Site Plan Review – 2157 Rippleton Cross Road
File # 25-15600 (Robert Ridler) 7:41PM*

Thomas Lampros and Maria DiElsi were present to represent the file.

R. Ridler explained the Board would be discussing two (2) items for this application - a ground mount solar array, and the construction of a garage with a shed attached.

M. DiElsi said the proposed garage would be as described in the submitted narrative. She stated it would be a one-story structure and an existing garden shed would be incorporated into the design as pictured in the narrative received September 24, 2025. She elaborated that Mr. Lampros used a SketchUp application so the images and the numbers included in the narrative were exact.

M. DiElsi continued saying the roofing material would be an agricultural raised rib matching the roof of the house (patina green). The 2-door, 2-car garage walls would be close to the color of the house. She explained the existing shed was a dark hunter green and should complement the color schemes of the other structures.

M. DiElsi said the breezeway connecting the shed and the garage would be 10 feet and would have an enclosed roof of the same roofing material.

M. DiElsi asserted they were very aware of the wetland boundaries and the 100-foot wetland buffer on their property and stated all structures will be outside of the buffers. She concluded the placement would be “exactly as it should be.”

T. Lampros added the garage would be 20' X 30' and the shed was 10' X 20' with a 10-foot breezeway between the two.

M. DiElsi repeated that all the details were in the narrative submitted for the application.

Referring to the drawing submitted October 1, 2025 which T. Lampros created entitled *Maria DiElsi & Tom Lampros Residence & Farm 2157 Rippleton Cross Rd. Cazenovia, NY 13935 (sic)*, T. Lampros showed the location of the house saying the shed would be directly behind the house and the roof of the garage would extend from the garage to the shed.

R. Ridler asked if there were any questions regarding this part of the application.

The Board had no questions.

R. Ridler asked if Mr. Ladd had visited the site and if he was good with the proposal.

C. Ladd affirmed he had and stated he had spoken to Ms. DiElsie Wednesday about the details. He said he “had a good grip on what's going on.”

R. Ridler then turned the discussion to the solar array.

M. DiElsi said they had been very mindful of the Cazenovia solar guidelines, the wetland boundaries and buffers, and the Town regulations regarding the placement of the array behind the front line of the house. She explained the plan had been updated (October 1, 2025 submission) to show the line and the relocation of the array behind that line. She showed where a trench would be dug for the underground conduit.

M. DiElsi also noted that the elevation of the new location would be at least 10 feet below the elevation of the Rippleton Cross Road. She said if one were driving down Rippleton Cross Road, one would be hard-pressed to see the array. She said the array would be designed to be lower and longer than the usual assembly of panels.

M. DiElsi said the details regarding the helical piles for the array were included in the narrative she submitted for the file. She also spoke about the grasses pictured in the narrative as the proposed vegetative buffer. She said they have grasses at the end of their driveway which would be similar to those she would be installing. The grasses at the driveway were planted a couple years ago and were more than 5-feet tall. She explained they want to create a screen without shading the array.

T. Clarke commented that the grasses would “come down in the winter,” under a heavy load of snow. He said he has 10 – 12 varieties of grasses at his house.

M. DiElsi thought the variety she would use would “stay pretty erect.” She said they turn brown, but they stay up until she chops them in the spring. She elaborated that the variety she intends to use does not spread and stays in an erect clump, and said she would “do a tight planting.”

T. Clarke responded that all his many varieties are flattened by heavy snow.

T. Lampros thought the elevation would screen the array regardless of the grasses, saying they could not see the top of his 12-foot surveyors rod from the house which was the same elevation as the road.

M. DiElsi interjected that she was willing to do other plantings instead of grasses.

T. Clarke thought grasses could be approved and if they were not adequate, the plantings could be adjusted.

T. Lampros offered to set up a post with tape in the new location, similar to what he had created when Mr. Ridler visited, to help with the visual perception.

R. Ridler indicated that was not necessary. He believed the height of the array would not exceed 10 feet.

M. DiElsi replied, “That’s right,” and said that was also stated in the narrative.

T. Lampros added it would as low a profile as possible.

R. Ridler asked the Board if they had comments or questions.

R. Cook felt the Applicants had done a good job trying to adhere to the ground-mounted solar regulations. He said it was not stated that the array had to be hidden, and he thought the plan was good.

M. DiElsi repeated if there were a problem with the grasses, she would be happy to amend the plantings.

R. Ridler asked Mr. Langey, Mr. Dunkle, and Mr. Ladd if they had any issues with the proposal.

None did.

J. Langey explained this was a Type 2 Action in regard to SEQR.

Motion by R. Cook, seconded by T. Clarke, to approve the site plan for a garage with an attached shed connected by a 10-foot roofed breezeway, and a ground-mounted solar array as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler spoke about the Hoehner file that is still pending ZBA approval before the Board can do a site plan review.

Motion by E. Jerabek, seconded by T. Clarke, to adjourn the meeting at 7:55 P.M. was carried unanimously.

Sue Wightman, Planning Board Secretary – October 2, 2025