

Town of Cazenovia Planning Board

Meeting Minutes

December 3, 2020

ZOOM video <https://madisoncounty-ny.zoom.us/j/95180677001>

Meeting ID: 951 8067 7001

Or Dial by phone (no video)

+1 646-558-8656 US (New York)

Members Present: Robert Ridler, Chairman; Anne Ferguson; Jerry Munger; Dale Bowers; Hugh Roszel; Bryan Wendel; Thomas Clarke; Gerald Rasmussen, Alternate Member; Jon Vanderhoef, Alternate Member

Members Absent:

Others Present: John Langey; John Dunkle; Don Ferlow; Roger Cook; Richard Cote; Barbara Hile; Mary Foster; Gary Foster; Rick Ruggaber; Joanne Gagliano; Robert Seeley; Sam Woods; Gail Azeredo Woods; Bruce Race; Joanne Race; Brian Keeler; Michael Frateschi; Eric Kenna; Gary Brink; Dylan Brink; David Rufo; David Ginochetti; Therese Ginochetti; Lauren Ginochetti; Robert Giardino; Brian Manning; Leslie Tuttle-Ditrani; Matthew Vredenburg; Nate Hickey; Jeff Davis; Julian Clark; Zea Wright; Jason Maxon; Keith Thompsom; Laura Spring; Sue Smith; Jennifer Wong; Sarah Auchincloss; Gary Mason; Five Braccali; 315-569-1568

R. Ridler called the meeting to order at 7:32 P.M. He read the following announcements:

“Welcome to the December 3, 2020 Meeting of the Town of Cazenovia Planning Board, which has been legally noticed in the *Cazenovia Republican*, on the Town Website and outside the Town Offices.

This meeting is a virtual meeting as authorized by New York Executive Order 202.1.

This meeting is being recorded and will be made available on the Town’s website.

The public may be participating. When public speaking is allowed, speakers are asked to please state their name and address for the audio recording. Otherwise, the public is asked to remain silent during the proceedings.

Attendance will be taken, and votes will be conducted by roll call.

When possible, the Board members and applicants will be named while speaking for audio recording purposes.

Please note: The output of transcribing from an audio/video recording from Zoom, will be fairly accurate, although in some cases will be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting. If you should need clarification for something said, please contact the Planning Board Secretary.”

Attendance was taken by roll call. All were present.

Motion by H. Roszel, seconded by A. Ferguson, to approve the November 5, 2020 Zoom meeting minutes was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Thursday, January 7, 2021.

The next deadline day will be Monday, December 21, 2020.

The next regularly scheduled work session will be Wednesday, December 30, 2020.

HEARINGS

*Cote, Richard & Lisa -- Minor (1) Subdivision – 2964 Pompey Hollow Road, Cazenovia
File # 20-1282 (Dale Bowers) (Lots shared with the Town of Pompey)*

Richard Cote was present to represent the file.

D. Bowers reminded the Board that the Cotes own property that lies both in the Town of Cazenovia and in the Town of Pompey. They sought a subdivision in the Town of Pompey and have obtained that approval and they now were seeking to finalize the subdivision process with the Town of Cazenovia. He said the Board had no objections last month and they moved the application to a public hearing for this month.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by T. Clarke, to open the public hearing was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

There was no one present wishing to speak.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by H. Roszel, to close the public hearing was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes

Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by T. Clarke, to approve the minor (1 Lot) subdivision as most recently submitted was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

Hile, Barbara/ Brodock, Jonathan -- Line Changes – 5089/5157/5125 Temperance Hill, File # 20-1308 (Dale Bowers)

Barbara Hile was present to represent the application.

D. Bowers said the application was for line changes and that new maps have been received showing the lots numbered correctly. He explained the configuration of the proposed lots and said the purpose was to give the Applicants access to a strip of land on the other side of the owner between the Hiles’ two lots. He said he had spoken to a neighbor to the east of the property in question regarding vistas, etc. It was noted at the last meeting that measures had been taken when developing the land once owned by the Vadeboncoeurs to secure the vistas. He spoke with Mrs. Hile who assured him she has no plans of building a house but she could not comment on what her children would do in the future. She wanted it known she and her family had lived on the property a number of years, and they loved it and wanted to take care of it.

H. Roszel asked if the proposal was entirely within regulations.

D. Bowers affirmed that it was. He said it (restrictions) would be “over and above” Town regulations if the Applicant were to include a building envelope in the plan. He said the concern would be concerning the lot that has the house for sale; the property line extends back and if one were to build a house toward the back, it would impact the view for the neighbor to the east. Mrs. Hile said the existing house was recently completely renovated and she did not think one would want to tear it down, however

one cannot predict the future. He assured Mrs. Hile that any future new construction of a house on the lot would require site plan review.

B. Hile said everything that had been stated was “absolutely correct.” She explained to have the property lines configured as proposed would allow them to continue to be good stewards of the creek that flows through property in the Town of Pompey adjacent to this property in the Town of Cazenovia.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by H. Roszel, to open the public hearing was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

There was no one present wishing to speak.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by D. Bowers, to close the public hearing was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by A. Ferguson, to approve the line changes as most recently submitted was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

*Foster, Gary & Mary/Ridlon Living Trust --Line Change – 2082 Elm Street/
File # 20-13114 (Jerry Munger) & 2636 Railroad Street, New Woodstock*

Gary & Mary Foster were present to represent the file.

J. Munger said this was a simple line change. He explained the Ridlons were gifting a small piece of property to the Fosters which was part of a prior agreement with the prior owners (of the Ridlon property).

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by T. Clarke, to open the public hearing was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

There was no one present wishing to speak.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by T. Clarke, to close the public hearing was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by A. Ferguson, to approve the line change as most recently submitted was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes

Town of Cazenovia – Planning Board – Meeting Minutes – December 3, 2020

Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

*EBAC, LLC- Owera Vineyards -- Revisit Site Plan Review – 5276 East Lake Road
File # 16-1060 (Robert Ridler)*

(Bryan Wendel was recused for the proceedings. Gerald Rasmussen assumed the role of a Voting Member at this time.)

Joanne Gagliano of Environmental Design & Research, Landscape Architecture, Engineering & Environmental Services, D.P.C. (EDR) and Rick Ruggaber were present to represent the file.

R. Ridler said this was a re-application to create a tasting area to the west of the existing tasting building.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by T. Clarke, to open the public hearing was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Gerry Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

Sam (Charles) Woods said he and his wife Gail live at 5211 East Lake Road. He asked for clarification for the hours of operation for the proposed patio.

R. Ridler answered there had been no request to change the existing hours.

S. Woods asked what the existing hours were.

J. Gagliano said of June 2016 the hours in the interior and the exterior of the Tasting Room were until 9:00 P.M. No changes were requested since then. She said that was stated in the resolution created for the 2016 meeting.

S. Woods asked if the hours were the same for weekdays as they were for the weekend.

J. Gagliano and R. Ridler responded, "Yes."

H. Roszel asked Ms. Gagliano what time the opening hours were.

J. Gagliano was unsure of the opening hours and wondered if Mr. Ruggaber could answer that. She said she only knew that in the last resolution the hours were clarified to correspond with the hours in the building so that people could buy wine and sit outdoors anytime the building was open. There was no differentiation between the hours inside and the hours outside.

S. Woods asked for clarification that was true for the weekend as well.

R. Cook stated that was the time regulated whether it was Friday, Saturday, or Sunday; closing was 9:00 P.M.

J. Gagliano added the resolution from June 2, 2016 was "written that way."

S. Woods said he had read the resolution and could not ascertain if there was a differentiation between weekdays and weekends.

J. Gagliano said there was never a request for differentiation (in hours) for that building.

R. Ridler asked if that could be captured in the wording for the resolution for this meeting.

J. Langey said he could note no additional hours of operation were granted.

S. Woods asked about music wanting to ensure there would be only acoustic music, no amplified music.

J. Gagliano said no change for that was requested.

Joanne Race living at 5320 East Lake Road said her concern and question was regarding the use for the expansion area. She said it was her understanding that Owerá operates as a New York State Farm/Winery operation which must meet guidelines for predominance of products. She asked if the expansion area would be used solely for wine or for food. She asked how the predominance will be monitored. She said Owerá was no longer in a start-up phase, and she was curious as to how their use "gets monitored."

J. Langey said in the past the Applicant was required to meet with the Town Supervisor, a member of the Planning Board, the Code Officer, and himself to show their financials to demonstrate the preponderance that they are selling more farm product than they are gaining from events and things of that nature. He said this patio area discussion before the Board has no bearing on that aspect of the wedding venue Owera has on site. He said the patio area was previously approved and now the Applicants seek to convert the area to a grass surface, removing the (proposed) patio stone (from the proposal).

J. Race responded that she understood the patio area was not related to the events, but she was curious about the totality of all the operations, that wine (sales) outweighs food and liquor sold under their liquor license.

J. Langey said he understood but he did not want to confuse the rest of the public. He said there was an annual review, but because of COVID and the difficulty meeting in person at the Town Office, they were behind this year. He said he would contact the Town Supervisor.

J. Race asked if the documents from the review were made public and were part of a public record.

J. Langey answered some of the documents were deemed to be sensitive to the business entity from a competition standpoint.

J. Race asked if there were minutes stating the review took place and the general findings without compromising specific information.

J. Langey explained there were not minutes because reviews were not held as public meetings. He said those were not the types of meeting where minutes would be generated under the Open Meetings Law.

J. Race said during this pandemic time, their lives in the neighborhood have changed drastically which makes them more aware of the impact of the operation of Owera in their neighborhood during normal times, which she expects will resume in the future.

Bruce Race of 5320 East Lake Road asked about the proposed lights. He said he would appreciate having those lights be dark-sky compliant if they are included in the project, saying the lights currently on the property along the drive blind him in his backyard. He said he understands the area (proposed) outside will be for tasting, and he asked if it will be for eating as well.

J. Gagliano responded that the lighting proposed and approved in 2016 was a café-style lighting mounted on wooden posts. The posts would match the columns of the barn in character. The café stringed lights resembled an Edison bulb. Since that time,

they now propose a covered light. She said there have been advances in lighting since the prior approval and the light proposed now has a full shade over it so the bulb will not be seen at all and no light will be directed toward the sky. The Town received a package showing the new light design. She repeated the bulb would be covered and described it as being low-level having 7-watt bulbs commonly used residentially.

B. Race asked the height.

J. Gagliano answered the strings of lights would be 8 ½' from the ground hanging from wooden decorative posts which would be approximately 9' in height.

B. Race asked if there would be eating outside.

J. Gagliano answered one would be able to buy hor d'oeuvre-type fare in addition to wine and locally grown spirits such as cider or beer that is brought to the farm as well as cheeses, vegetables and fruits inside the building and one would then be able to eat that outside on the lawn area. She said one can do that presently. She explained the area approved in 2016 was used today, but it was used on the sloping lawn. The proposal was to level the lawn so one could safely sit with protection from the parking area and the slope.

B. Race said he would appreciate it if the lights could be lower. He said the lights that are there he "can see quite well." He said his question was whether they would be serving outside.

J. Gagliano answered, "No."

Brian Keeler of 5237 East Lake Road said he lives directly across from the Vineyard. He asked Mr. Langey if language could be included to limit the activity for these additional areas of use. He said there were two (2) proposals, one for a storage building, and he was confused about how that was being handled.

R. Ridler explained the storage building would be addressed as a second agenda item and as a separate application.

B. Keeler's concern regarding the patio was that it would accommodate more people for larger gatherings and that it would expand beyond the charter which was to have a tasting room and a sampling room. He would like to see language in the resolution that would limit the activities that could take place in the outside area to limit the exposure to the neighborhood noise, etcetera.

J. Langey said the things being talked about fall under the provision of the New York State Agriculture and Markets (Ag & Markets) Law regarding the appropriate use of the property as a farm/winery. He said in his discussions with the Ag & Markets

representatives, the owner has the right and the ability to serve the farm product, the wine, and the limited menu items to be consumed in the patio area. He did not believe a limitation could be placed restricting the consumption of the product on the site.

B. Keeler asked if a limitation could be placed to restrict the Owner from using the space as a wedding venue.

J. Langey responded that the Applicants have not asked to use the area for a wedding venue, so the existing approvals would stand today. He said Ag & Markets determined the tent area may have those limited events. He said the Town has spent a fair amount of time and money, including a court case, to uphold the conditions that are in place. He said the Town feels the conditions are proper and the conditions remain in place at this time. He repeated there was no request for a change to them in this application.

B. Keeler said his concern was that the Applicants “keep inching forward.” He felt the full intention for the property was not given initially, and that approvals have been sought “piecemealed.” He said that he would like to set the limits stating the uses for the property.

J. Langey said he appreciated the comments, and the public hearing was for people to be able to make those comments for the Board’s consideration. He stated to the Board the application before them was for a particular thing, the purpose was not to open the entire, original application and the prior changes that were now settled. He said the Board’s job was to determine if they want to grant the approval being sought at this time.

B. Keeler commented that the Board could levy new restrictions on the new application.

R. Ridler responded that the Board, based on Mr. Langey’s comments, should restrict their discussion to the application for the Tasting Room patio area (as submitted). He asked if there were any other comments for the application.

There were none.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by D. Bowers, to close the public hearing was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Gerry Rasmussen	Voted	Yes

Thomas Clarke Voted Yes.

Discussion followed regarding whether to perform a new SEQR review or to reaffirm the findings from the previous approval.

J. Munger believed grading would be done.

J. Gagliano explained they would be building a retaining wall around the low side of the slope, filling it with soil, then sodding the entire area and installing an ornamental planting and hedge around the entire lawn panel to contain the seating area from the parking lot and the slope. She said the original approval was for 2830 square feet of impervious hard service. The modification proposed would reduce the area to 1200 square feet of coverage which would be lawn resulting in a positive impact upon storm management as well.

R. Ridler clarified impervious surface area would be reduced.

J. Langey said the other item he had noted was that perhaps there should be language stating the stringed lighting would be extinguished at the close of business.

A. Ferguson thought it should be consistent with what was allowed for extinguishing the lights elsewhere on the property which she thought was one hour after closing.

J. Langey said if the Board were to approve the proposal, he would have the lighting material specifications listed in the resolution.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by T. Clarke, to reaffirm a Negative Declaration based upon the Board’s review of the SEAF and to reapprove the site plan as most recently submitted, conditioned as stated, and with the corresponding documentation was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Gerry Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes

*EBAC, LLC- Owera Vineyards --Site Plan Review – 5276 East Lake Road, Cazenovia
File # 20-1314 (Robert Ridler)*

(Bryan Wendel remained recused. Gerald Rasmussen continued the position of a Voting Member at this time.)

Joanne Gagliano of EDR, and Rick Ruggaber were present to represent the file.

R. Ridler said this was an application by Owera Vineyards for a storage building.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by H. Roszel, to open the public hearing was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Gerry Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

J. Langey asked Mr. Ridler if it would benefit the Board and those attending the public hearing if the Applicant’s representatives described the purpose of the application.

R. Ridler asked Ms. Gagliano to describe the application.

J. Gagliano said the proposal was for a 48’ x 104’ barn for the farm operation on an existing stone pad that was behind the production facility, east of the existing bonded storage barn and shop that were originally approved. This barn would be used to store farm tractors, machinery, miscellaneous wine-making equipment that was currently stored outside. Those items now outside would go into an interior building. The barn would be an Energy Panels Structure (EPS), post-frame, agricultural building with wood siding and a metal roof in colors to compliment the other buildings – natural wood, cream and slate. It would be part of the barn complex. The two (2) storage buildings would face each other and would both be behind the production facility.

D. Bowers asked about water and septic.

J. Gagliano affirmed there would not be water or septic; the building would be only for storage.

R. Ridler asked if there was anyone wishing to comment from the audience.

Hearing no comments, motion by H. Roszel, seconded by T. Clarke, to close the public hearing was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

J. Langey said he would treat this as an Unlisted Action although there was a solid argument that it was a Type II Action, and he led the Board through the SEAF. All answers were considered “no, or small impact.”

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by H. Roszel, to make a Negative Declaration based upon the Board’s review of the SEAF and to approve the site plan for an agricultural storage building for the types of storage listed by the Applicant’s representative and as most recently submitted was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

Lucas, David -- Site Plan Review – Barrett Road, New Woodstock
File # 20-1280 (Anne Ferguson)

Jeff Davis of Barclay Damon, LLP law firm in Syracuse, NY was present to represent as well as Michael Frateschi of TJA Clean Energy, LLC, and Eric Kenna of C & S Engineers, Inc.

A. Ferguson explained that the proposal was for a solar farm on approximately 76 acres in New Woodstock. About 26 acres would be used and disturbed, and of those 26 acres, 15 acres would be covered in solar panels. She said the Planning Board has completed much of its technical and regulatory reviews. A public hearing was now

being held to solicit public input to guide the Board in their further deliberations. The Public hearing will be kept open while continuing the file.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by T. Clarke, to open the public hearing was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

R. Ridler invited comments at this time.

David Rufo of 4823 Ridge Road said he felt this was a project that was safe for the environment, offered new, cutting-edge technology for Madison County, would allow “us to lead the way in clean energy solutions, and be responsible stewards for our local environment.”

Bob Giardina of 9 Hurd Street said he was in favor of the project. He said he was in the battery and electrical industry. He said these solar fields are eco-friendly with limited timelines associated with them, so when they end, there is a bond (to decommission) and the land can revert to agricultural land. He said he sees no downside to the project. There would be increased Town and County revenue. He said solar fields are growing across the United States of America because solar power works.

David Ginochetti of 2706 West Lake Road supported the solar project. He said they were “in the process of switching our organization over to solar energy and I wish we could purchase it locally.” He said in researching solar energy he learned it attracts bees for pollination and birds that would control insects, so it is environmentally friendly. He repeated he supported it.

Laura Spring of Ridge road supported the project. She said it would be a good project for the Town by increasing revenue. It would not produce noise, light, or odor, and no traffic would be generated.

Therese Ginochetti of 2706 West Lake Road was in favor of the project due to its sustainability. She said it would not “give off carbon emissions.” It would reduce the use of fossil fuels, and it would locally provide an alternate source of energy for the community. She also approved the restoration of farmland use once the project has run its course.

Dylan Brink of 2345 New York State Route 13, at the base of the solar field, said he was in favor of the solar project. He said he has been impressed with the solar company. He said they have made recommendations to the solar company to utilize as much of the farmland as possible and the company “has been very easy to work with” in trying to achieve that.

Lauren Ginochetti of 2706 West Lake Road was in favor of the project also. She said it would increase tax revenue for the County, Town and schools. Currently the Town receives a small amount of tax revenue from the landowner for the property, and this project would generate additional revenue that was not received in the past, repeating that it would generate funds for the County, the Town, and the schools.

Gary Brink of 2363 New York State Route 13 said they work the land and own the land all around the proposal. He thought it was a great project for the Town. He said it “would help upgrade some of the electric distribution in the area.” He said they presently rent the land that will be used for the solar farm from Mr. Lucas. He suggested they limit the amount of farmland the solar farm uses by reducing the number of trees proposed for screening. He stated the plantings would use extra farmland and would not enhance the viewshed significantly, saying most of the plantings will be below the horizon, and there was already an existing native hedgerow along one side. He said if the planting requirement could be removed, it would help him a lot and it would make the project better.

There was no one else in attendance wishing to speak.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by B. Wendel, to conclude public comment at this time while keeping the public hearing open for future meetings was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

J. Langey stated the Applicants were successful or were at least approaching success in gaining better access.

A. Ferguson said that was correct.

It was determined that further site plan review would be discussed at this time.

A. Ferguson said at the last meeting Ag & Market Items and Operational Items had been closed out, as were Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Items, and Items relating to the roads.

A. Ferguson said they had received the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) overview and reviewed it at the last meeting. Since that time John Dunkle performed a review and provided a list of 11 items for which he was awaiting updates or clarification. She asked if Mr. Frateschi could update the Board regarding those items.

M. Frateschi said their Engineer, Eric Kenna, had been working diligently through the SWPPP addressing many of the comments, but they have delayed resubmitting it to the Town until they could hear public comments at this meeting in case there were other items needing to be addressed. He said they wanted to minimize the number of modifications needed, so after this meeting, they should be close to finalizing the SWPPP.

M. Kenna added that the infiltration test had also been performed, hopefully there will only be one round of revisions.

A. Ferguson asked Mr. Dunkle about a DA map he referenced.

J. Dunkle explained it was the Drainage Area map, which was part of the SWPPP.

A. Ferguson asked if the Stormwater Maintenance Agreement was to be contained in the SWPPP or if it would be a separate document that would undergo legal review.

J. Dunkle said that would be a separate agreement that he and Mr. Langey would “work out” with the Applicants.

J. Langey added he has already started dialog with Mr. Kerwin on that.

A. Ferguson asked if there was an update from the Army Corp of Engineers (ACOE).

E. Kenna said the documentation was submitted November 2, 2020 and they were still awaiting a response.

A. Ferguson asked about the Road Maintenance Agreement.

M. Frateschi believed Mr. Langey and Mr. Kerwin were working on that as well.

J. Langey said they were and there had been no disagreement about that, so he “did not expect any bumps in that road.”

A. Ferguson noted the Board has received the application for the line change as it related to road and farm access. The line change will allow for additional access onto the lot. That application will be presented at the January 7, 2021 meeting.

A. Ferguson said, regarding tree removal and sight mitigation, at the last meeting they discussed options for minimizing the impact from Route 13 and they had not completely or successfully resolved that consideration. It was stated that any plantings might only improve the view 25% - 40% because of the landscape. She asked the Applicants to attempt to achieve that 25% - 40% reduction. She believed they needed to show the community that they have done all that they could possibly do to protect that viewshed. She found the argument that, based on one's driving speed, the view would only be seen for a short time to be specious. She asked that another 25 - 35 evergreens be planted on the subject property in that space be added to the landscaping plan to help mitigate the impact. She said she was inquiring if the Board concurred if the Applicants were agreeable to the recommendation.

M. Farteschi said there were some stormwater facilities proposed in that quadrant that could be worked around so as to provide some screening plantings. He wanted to raise the comments made by Gary Brink, who was "incredibly helpful" in "laying out the site." Regarding Mr. Brink's concerns about landscaping, Mr. Frateschi thought some of the plantings originally proposed to the north could be added to the south and would aid the buffering of the view from Route 13. Mr. Brink said Mr. Wright, the northern neighbor, already has ample screening on this property, and he indicated the proposed plantings might be a waste in that particular spot. Shifting plantings from the north end to the south end would also provide more farming space for Mr. Brink, as well as help the solar project.

A. Ferguson said assuming she spoke for the Board, she was open to that option and asked that the plan (101 C) illustrating that detail be updated for the next meeting to display what they would now propose in addition to what she has proposed. She thought Mr. Dunkle had additions he also wanted noted on the plan.

M. Frateschi responded, "Absolutely."

A. Ferguson asked that the drawing be dated and that the line change be included as well.

M. Frateschi said the purchase contract was executed so they were "good to go to move forward (with the line change)."

A. Ferguson believed Mr. Langey indicated the Decommissioning Agreement was still in progress.

J. Langey said that was true adding they have made substantial progress and he did not see the negotiation of the other documents “in jeopardy in any way,” saying they were going quite well.

A. Ferguson asked about the SEQR and the Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF).

J. Langey believed the Applicants have amended the FEAF and would speak to Mr. Kerwin about that more. He said the question was if they should fold all the details of the proposal (including the forthcoming line change) into one SEQR or if they should perform separate reviews. He felt all aspects should be combined into one SEQR resolution when the time comes, even though three (3) approvals were being sought. He concluded that “SEQR was well-underhand.”

E. Kenna said Mr. Kerwin had expressed that they would update the FEAF to add the subdivision information so that everything would be included on one form. He said they would also update some forms to ACOE and SHPO as well.

J. Davis agreed that rolling everything into one SEQR was “a cleaner process.”

J. Langey added that he and Mr. Kerwin have already talked about suggested findings needed to make a SEQR determination that can be proposed to the Board at a future meeting.

A. Ferguson asked Mr. Dunkle if he had “signed off on all the engineering specifications.”

J. Dunkle affirmed that was correct. He said what he was currently reviewing was the SWPPP.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by T. Clarke, to continue the file was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Gerald Rasmussen	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

LAND DISTURBANCE/SITE PLAN REVIEW/SUBDIVISION

*Ditrani, Leslie Tuttle -- Site Plan Review – 2836 Back Acres Road, Cazenovia
File # 20-1310 (Hugh Roszel)*

Leslie Tuttle-Ditrani was present to represent the file as was Brian Manning of Teitsch-Kent-Fay Architects, P.C.

H. Roszel said the Ditrani's have an old camp on a piece of property off West Lake Road. He explained that they would like to remodel a portion of the existing house. He said if one was looking east from the driveway toward the house, the section they would like to remodel was to the right of a porch. They want to remove what was there and rebuild on the same footprint making it two-stories, 23 feet high. They also propose to enlarge the kitchen four feet. To help mitigate (the increase in impervious surface area) they propose to remove a lean-to portion on an existing storage shed as well as a section of driveway.

B. Manning clarified that the portion of driveway to be removed was to offset improvements previously negotiated with the Planning Board for the wooden patio. It would not contribute to this current required offset.

H. Roszel asked if the porch (patio) would be installed at this time.

L. Ditrani explained that COVID prevented their getting a contractor to do the work this summer so they were hoping to include it as part of this new process.

Lengthy discussion followed regarding the timeframe to allow an extension for the previous patio approval, which was good for one year. It was eventually determined that the approval was granted in May of 2020, so that approval had not yet elapsed.

H. Roszel concluded that the patio project was a non-issue for the Board at this time and discussion returned to the additions currently proposed. He asked if anyone had any questions regarding the proposal or if anyone needed more information.

R. Ridler added that the proposal had been approved by the Cazenovia Town Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA).

A. Ferguson noted it would be a second floor (addition) close to the lake, which was not common, but she said she had no issues with it.

J. Langey said this would be a Type II Action in regard to SEQR.

R. Ridler asked if there needed to be any discussion regarding the lakeshore, asking if there was any modification there.

B. Manning asserted there were not.

H. Roszel assumed environmental measures such as having silt fencing during construction would be followed.

B. Manning affirmed they would.

H. Roszel asked Mr. Cook if he was missing any detail.

R. Cook said the ZBA declared their approval was for a single-family structure, and he felt reiterating that detail was appropriate for the Planning Board.

Motion by H. Roszel, seconded by D. Bowers, to approve the site plan for the single-family home as most recently submitted was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

*33 Rippleton, LLC/Meiers Creek -- Site Plan Review – 4025 NYS Route 13 South,
File # 20-1313 (Thomas Clarke) Cazenovia*

Matthew Vredenburgh OF MDVLA, Nate Hickey of Meiers Creek Brewery, and Jeff Davis of Barclay Damon, LLP law firm in Syracuse, NY were present to represent the file.

T. Clarke explained that the Meiers Creek Brewery had purchased the property next door previously owned by the Jody Reynolds. They proposed to build a 7200 square foot storage barn, a new driveway from Route 13 to the storage barn, a parking area next to the storage barn, and an access road from the Brewery to the storage barn. At the last meeting, Mr. Langey was having discussions with the Village Attorney concerning the Village's position on this matter. A letter was received from the Village ceding Lead Agency status to the Town Planning Board. Also, at the last meeting this was declared a Type I Action in regard to SEQR.

J. Langey clarified the Board had anticipated that this would be declared a Type I Action at this meeting.

T. Clarke said the Applicants completed (Part I) of the FEA. He said he had some questions about some of the answers given on that form. He said on page 3 under Project Details part C the question was, "Is the proposed action an expansion of an existing project or use?" The box was checked "No," but he felt it was an expansion of the existing use of the Brewery. He said the storage barn was being built for the storage of kegs and cans for the Brewery.

J. Langey thought the Applicants would be agreeable to amending that answer to "Yes." He did not think it would ultimately change the outcome of the environmental review. He said there was a symbiotic relationship between the two (2) properties with the main property being within the Village and the property in question being in the Town. He felt Mr. Clarke's suggestion was technically correct.

J. Davis expressed assent.

T. Clarke read on page 6 under e, "Will the proposed action disturb more than one acre and create stormwater runoff, either from new point sources or non-point source during construction or post construction?" He said the Applicants checked "No." He realized the disturbance will be less than one acre, but once the barn was completed with a loading dock and a parking area, he felt substantial runoff would be created.

J. Langey said the technical answer would be "No." if the disturbance was less than an acre, but the Board should recognize that the Engineer for the Town, the project engineers, and the design professionals will work together to examine the impact of runoff from the proposed improvements to address the concern.

R. Ridler asked about the runoff from the access road and also wondered if that was included in the calculation of the disturbance.

M. Vredenburg said that was included in all the areas calculated to be disturbed. He explained that they will keep the disturbance under the acre because they do not want to cross that threshold. He said if once they start grading they find they are exceeding their expectations, they will reduce the amount of pavement.

T. Clarke said he saw that they would be hooking to Village water. He asked if that would affect the land disturbance calculation.

M. Vredenburg answered that the house already was hooked to the water, so connecting it from the house to the barn should not create much additional disturbance.

T. Clarke said his last question regarding the FEA was on page 7 under j, reading, "Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels or

generate substantial new demand for transportation facilities or services?” He said he knows the proposal would not generate demand for transportation facilities, but he felt any increase in traffic would be considered substantial since there had not been traffic there prior to construction.

J. Langey said when one examines the DEC documents, when they get into the area of traffic, they address major projects with hundreds of vehicles or tractor trailer traffic “pouring in and out of it.” That being said, he felt the question raised by Mr. Clarke was a good one requiring more detail from the Applicants regarding the expected traffic in terms of types, times, and numbers.

T. Clarke commented the Bed & Breakfast next to the property will be impacted by any new traffic.

M. Vredenburg responded that he had spoken with Nate Hickey, who was in attendance, as well as Colby Clark who both work at Meiers Creek. They anticipate no more than five (5) vehicles per day. He added it would not increase traffic already going to the Brewery; it would be traffic that was diverted from the Brewery to the storage barn. He stated the hours of operation anticipated would be 8:00 A.M. – 5:00 P.M. Monday – Friday, so the traffic would not in the evenings or on weekends.

J. Langey asked if the five (5) vehicles would be five (5) tractor trailers?

M. Vredenburg answered, “Yes.” He said the driveway would not be used for the public or for patrons. Signs would be posted at either end stating it was private property and not for public use. He said the traffic would be truck traffic or sporadic employee use.

T. Clarke asked that Mr. Vredenburg indicate on the site plan where they would run the water.

M. Vredenburg shared his screen to show the Board on drawing L-100 where the water line would be run as well as the aerial view to give a perspective of the vegetation.

B. Wendel asked if that was the only house in the area that has Village water.

T. Clarke answered the Village water line extends to the old milk factory.

J. Langey asked if the Board wanted him to have the Applicant request and create a water district for the parcel to collect the water charges. He asked Mr. Clarke if the Village would do an extra-territorial water agreement with the Applicants.

T. Clarke said in the past the Village billed homeowners in the Town for Village water use, but he was unsure about the present practices.

J. Langey said he would talk to Jim Stokes, the Attorney for the Village, about the public water usage.

T. Clarke asked what the water would connect to at the barn, wondering if it would connect inside or outside, and how it would be used.

M. Vredenburgh answered the water would be used for a bathroom and likely a spigot. He said the spigot would be used to hose things off and to hose the floor.

T. Clarke said when he spoke with Colby Clark, they did not intend to have a bathroom.

M. Vredenburgh said since then, they revised the plan to include a bathroom for the employees.

D. Bowers asked if the building would have its own tank and field.

M. Vredenburgh said it would. He said there was a curve in the proposed driveway that would be an ideal location for those.

T. Clarke requested all those details be included on the drawing as well.

M. Vredenburgh said it was noted on the map and they would have to do the percolation (perc) test as well. He emailed a narrative shortly before the meeting addressing some of the issues raised during the work session which he felt would be helpful to the Board.

R. Ridler asked Mr. Vredenburgh and Mr. Langey if the narrative would be comparable to a business plan that would be worked into a resolution and retained in the file to memorialize the objective of the building.

J. Langey agreed a written narrative would be helpful.

R. Ridler asked Mr. Vredenburgh if that was what he provided.

M. Vredenburgh said that was correct.

R. Ridler read from the General Municipal Law Recommendation Report (GML), "Details on the height and elevations/appearance of the storage building were also not provided." He asked if Mr. Vredenburgh has provided those details at this point.

M. Vredenburgh responded they have not determined a specific height, but they knew the maximum height allowed was 35 feet. He said elevations were provided but they were not dimensioned, so he would provide the dimensions shortly.

T. Clarke noted the Wilson Farm, across the street from the proposal, was on the National Register of Historic Places In New York State under The Meadows Farm Complex and would require a notice seeking Lead Agency (from SHPO).

J. Langey said one of the items requiring Planning Board attention was the discussion of a list of Involved and Interested Agencies with the creation of a resolution stating the Board requests Lead Agency status for this Type I Action. He started a list of agencies and when the Board was ready for that discussion, he would take their input as well as the Applicants' to make sure he has covered all entities concerned.

T. Clarke asked Mr. Langey to discuss the list he had started.

J. Langey said for the sake of discussion he would not differentiate between Involved and Interested Agencies as he reviews his list, but all those he felt should be included were:

1. SHPO,
2. Ag & Markets,
3. Department of Health. He asked Mr. Cook if the DOH would need to sign off on the proposed septic system.

R. Cook said the DOH would only need to sign off it was a non-conventional system, but he thought the Town would want to see Deep Hole and Perc tests demonstrating the system will function where it was proposed.

J. Langey continued his list:

3. The Village of Cazenovia Planning Board. He said the letter from them stated they would need to amend their approval, so he included them as an Interested Agency.
4. The Village Board of Trustees. J. Langey said they would need to be notified due to the water agreement.
5. DEC, as a matter of course, and
6. NYS Liquor Authority, to be thorough.

J. Dunkle said to include New York State Department of Transportation (DOT) as well because of its being on New York State Route 13.

J. Davis requested Mr. Langey to send him the list after the meeting thinking many of the agencies listed would not have an approval function.

J. Langey repeated in creating the list he did not differentiate between Involved and Interested Agencies. For the Board's understanding he explained that Involved Agencies must grant an approval or a permit of some sort. He said very few of the Agencies mentioned would be Involved Agencies. He said he would send the

Applicants' attorney a draft of the document he creates before he sends it. He instructed the Board that the resolution for the action they will take at this time will state the Cazenovia Town Planning Board will make themselves Lead Agency, they will state this was a Type I Action, and they will provide the list of Involved and Interested Agencies, directing Mr. Langey to send the required notices.

A. Ferguson said she had questions if Mr. Clarke was finished with his questions.

T. Clarke said his last item was that he had spoken with the owner of the Bed & Breakfast who expressed some concerns, so he felt it would be appropriate to have a public hearing at some point to allow Mr. Krumsiek to speak.

A. Ferguson said she was seeking clarification from the November meeting regarding the parking situation. She said Mr. Vredenburg had included 25 parking spaces at the warehouse, (which she felt was a better description of the structure), as an afterthought. She asked him if that would be required parking for employees.

M. Vredenburg said it would not be and he said there would 16 spaces.

A. Ferguson was disappointed that the acquisition of additional property did not result in the Applicants improving, if not remedying, the current issue they have complying with parking at the main site in the Village. She explained the site plan approved by the Village allowed for 100 parking spaces, but to support the capacity at which the business was currently operating, they needed 200 parking spaces. She asked the Applicants if they were not going to use this opportunity (having acquired more property) how will they comply with the site plan restrictions.

J. Davis responded that the parking issue was a Village matter. He said at the Village meeting last month the members had the opportunity to speak and none of them opposed the proposal before the Town.

A. Ferguson countered that from the Town's perspective, the Town was being asked for "approval on a facility that is, in my opinion, greatly out of scale for the size of that lot." She said the building would be a warehouse. She said the impervious surface area would be 19.9% with optional parking spaces. She asked if the parking spaces would not be used to help alleviate the situation at the Brewery, why even have them. She said the Applicants were asking for an approval when they were not in compliance with their existing plan which makes her uncomfortable. She felt approving the project without addressing a problem that the Board knows exists would be masking the problem.

J. Davis said he disagreed with the statement that they were trying to mask anything. He said the proposal to the Town was in compliance with the Town Code. He said they would be in compliance with the barn, with the impervious surface coverage, etc...As

Mr. Vredenburg said, the parking had been a subsequent consideration, so it could be reduced or removed. He said it was created as an opportunity for additional employee parking.

B. Wendel asked if there was any consideration of converting all the employee parking at the Brewery into patron parking and having all employee parking at the new property.

A. Ferguson said that was what she was asking, saying otherwise they have paved empty spaces where trucks might be left standing when they could be mitigating some of the overflow.

B. Wendel said he and Ms. Ferguson felt the entire property should be annexed into the Village so it would fall under the guidance of the Village Planning Board. Be that as it may, he wondered if there was any thought of making the situation on the Village parcel better (by making better use of the Town parcel).

J. Davis said they could certainly discuss the option with their client. He felt mandating employee parking in that area in the winter when there was not a need for it would be a concern. He said he did not know if it would be a mandated employee parking area but the intent for the parking was to be employee parking only. He said on the Village lot there was a reason there was designated employee parking where it existed. He described it as being "on the working side of the house." He said the patron parking was closer to the front door rather than on the back side where there would be delivery vehicles. He said the prior owner did not want (patron) parking in that area and the present owner has continued with the prior practice. As Mr. Langey pointed out, to connect the road from the Village side to the Town side required them to amend their site plan with the Village, so the Village may ask the same questions that have been asked here. He agreed that the situation "is a little odd," but they have a Village plan and a request of the Town and they "hope they can all come together."

A. Ferguson said trucks would be coming to the proposed structure. She asked if that would eliminate the need for trucks to deliver at the Brewery and the loading dock there.

M. Vredenburg responded that it was his understanding that it would not eliminate the need, but it would reduce the number of vehicles traveling into the Brewery.

J. Davis elaborated that there would still be deliveries to the Brewery proper, but those deliveries would be fewer.

A. Ferguson asked if there were any plans for the Brewery to acquire the Bed & Breakfast (next door to the newly acquired Reynolds' property which is owned by the Krumsieks). She was concerned about there being a potentially segmented project.

J. Davis recounted before COVID when the Village had in-person meetings at the beginning of 2020, the prior owner of the newly acquired property (Ms. Reynolds) was quite vocal when the Village site plan was being discussed. After which the prior owner approached Meiers Creek asking if they would be interested in acquiring her property. That was how the acquisition came about, it was initiated by that prior owner. He said it was not something they were “searching to do” but it was advantageous for both property owners.

A. Ferguson asked Mr. Vredenburgh to include in the business plan the frequency of house guests, so the Board knows it won't “fall into the Bed & Breakfast category.”

A. Ferguson said it was mentioned that signs would be installed so guests would not use the driveway, and she wondered if perhaps a gate should be installed.

M. Vredenburgh asked if Ms. Ferguson thought patrons would use the road.

A. Ferguson said they could.

M. Vredenburgh said the entrance to the Brewery was on the north side of the Brewery with patron parking on the north side as well. He said to leave by the circuitous route would be about 1400 feet versus the 900 foot straight shot from the driveway, so he thought most people would take the direct exit onto Route 13. He said if going through the 4025 property were more direct, a gate would be a consideration.

A. Ferguson said in terms of the loading dock's visibility on the property from Route 13, she believed it was stated that there was a hedgerow there now. She believed the resolution should include the condition that the hedgerow should be maintained and be of a height to screen the loading dock from the road.

M. Vredenburgh believed that was a valid point. He said currently the proposed barn would be behind the house and behind another accessory structure as well as behind mature vegetation. He said there was mature vegetation that blocks views from the west. He said the barn cannot exceed 35 feet, but the trees were probably 50 – 70 feet in height. He agreed the trees were critical to screen the view. He said a reason they curved the driveway was to preserve vegetation and to locate the barn where it would be less visible.

A. Ferguson asked Mr. Hickey and Mr. Davis if there might be any consideration of reducing the size of the building, saying a 7000 square foot barn was a big barn.

T. Clarke added that when he spoke with the owner of the B&B his two concerns were the nearness to his property line and the size of the building.

A. Ferguson said she knew the use was agricultural, but she said the building was in a residential area and felt it was out of scale for the size of the property.

J. Munger countered that directly across the street at Meadow's Farms were loafing barns that were probably twice the size of the proposed structure.

A. Ferguson responded they were not on a parcel the size of the Reynolds' property. She said there was much more acreage at the Meadow's.

J. Munger said the location of the structures was all in a relatively small area on the property. He did not think the proposal was out of scale considering the neighborhood included the Meadow's barns.

J. Davis added the proposal does not exceed the coverage requirements. He said there was a reason for the coverage requirement, and they believe that was the size that supports the facility and best suits the operations.

J. Munger asked if the reason for creating the storage barn/warehouse was to free space at the Brewery.

M. Vredenburgh said it would free space, but it would also promote more efficient production.

J. Munger said the reason he posed the question was because he was wondering if freeing space within the Brewery was to create more dining space for the restaurant.

M. Vredenburgh answered it was not to his knowledge the reason, saying creating dining space had not been mentioned to him at all.

J. Davis said there were occupancy limits as well and asserted there was no plan or proposal to modify that. He said getting back to the proposed structure, it would contain farm equipment, equipment used to maintain the property, the farm brewery, etcetera, as well as storage. He elaborated that aluminum cans were becoming a commodity and buying things in bulk would be supportive of the facility in operations for cost purposes. He said in the current operations they could not store the bulk equipment that they would like to get.

D. Bowers understood there were 4 – 5 trucks that would come from Route 13 each day in addition to 16 parking spaces that would be used by employees who would also be encouraged to use the newly created egress at various times during the day and night. He felt that traffic would have an impact upon the B & B. He said that was his concern. He said they did not need to address the concern at this time, but he was expressing it.

J. Langey said the Board has given the Applicants a number of good comments regarding the application. He suggested the Board address the motion and the resolution declaring itself to be Lead Agency and to state this was a Type I Action with notification of Lead Agency status to:

1. SHPO
2. Ag & Markets
3. The Village of Cazenovia Planning Board
4. The Village of Cazenovia Board of Trustees
5. The DEC
6. NYS Liquor Authority
7. DOT.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by H. Roszel, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, for this Type I Action, and to have Mr. Langey prepare Lead Agency status notifications to the Involved and Interested Agencies as listed was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

R. Ridler asked Mr. Vredenburgh to supply the narrative of the business plan.

M. Vredenburgh replied it should already be in the Zoning Secretary's inbox. He asked if it would be appropriate to schedule the public hearing at this time.

A. Ferguson said she would like the Board to review the business plan and reach agreement about that before scheduling the public hearing.

T. Clarke added the response from SHPO should be received prior to the public hearing.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by H. Roszel to continue the file was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes

Thomas Clarke Voted Yes.

*Estate of Louise Clark/Custer, Adam -- Line Change – 2602 & 2596 McKinley St, NW
File # 20-1315 (Bryan Wendel)*

Julian Clark was present to represent the file.

B. Wendel explained that the property adjacent to the Estate of Louise Clark was owned by Adam Custer who has been using ten (10) feet of the Clark property for his driveway for a long period of time on a basis agreed upon by Mrs. Clark. Mrs. Clark's heirs now are trying to sell the property, so they plan to give ten (10) feet to the Custer property. He has been in touch with the Executor of Mrs. Clark's estate, Dayton Clark, who lives out of state.

J. Clark said he had nothing else to add.

Motion by B. Wendel, seconded by T. Clarke, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the Board's review of the SEAF was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

Motion by B. Wendel, seconded by T. Clarke to move the application to a public hearing at the next meeting and to continue the file was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

*Crawford Farms, LLC -- Line Elimination – 1904 Chard Road & 5008 East Lake Road
File # 20-1318 (Hugh Roszel)*

*Crawford Farms, LLC -- Site Plan Review – 1904 Chard Road & 5008 East Lake Road
File # 20-1319 (Hugh Roszel)*

Jason Maxon and Zea Wright were present to represent the file.

H. Roszel explained the Crawfords purchased property across East Lake Road from their residence which he called Lot 1 which had about three (3) acres. They then purchased the property directly north on the corner of Chard Road and East Lake Road which he called Lot 2 which has approximately 6 ½ acres. They would like to combine the two lots. Once that has been completed, they will not be able to have two residences on one lot, so they propose to remove the house on Lot 2.

A. Ferguson asked if they would remove the driveway after they demolish the house.

J. Maxon said the driveway would not be removed.

H. Roszel explained the driveway gives access to the barn.

Motion by H. Roszel, seconded by B. Wendel, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to affirm both the line elimination and the site plan review for the demolition of the house as Unlisted Actions and make a Negative Declaration based upon the Board’s review of the SEAF was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

Motion by H. Roszel, seconded by B. Wendel to move the line change application to a public hearing at the next meeting and to continue the file was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes

Town of Cazenovia – Planning Board – Meeting Minutes – December 3, 2020

Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

It was clarified that there was no immediate need to remove the house.

Motion by H. Roszel, seconded by A. Ferguson to continue the file for site plan review was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

H. Roszel asked that at the next meeting the approximate location of the wetlands be shown on the drawing to be submitted.

J. Maxon asked if that was to be added to the survey.

H. Roszel said, "Yes." He also informed Mr. Maxon that the application needs to be corrected to show the presence of wetlands on Part 1 of the SEAF.

J. Maxon said they would do that as well.

*O'Neill, John & Rebecca --Review Request – 5354 Indian Lookout Road, Cazenovia
File # 20-1320 (Dale Bowers)*

No one was present to represent the file.

D. Bowers said the Applicants wished to be continued until next month.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by H. Roszel, to continue the file was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler	Voted	Yes
Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes

Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

*Madison County Distillery, LLC – 2412 US Route 20 East, Cazenovia
(Bryan Wendel)*

B. Wendel explained that he combined the original resolution for the most recent approval with the proposed resolution, and he created a word document with changes and with reasons for the justifications provided by the Applicant for the purposes of comparison.

A. Ferguson elaborated that the site plan had been modified once already so some of those changes also appear in the document. She said some items in the resolution had two (2) levels of changes.

B. Wendel added the Applicant has not asked that not every item be changed, so some items remain as they originally were.

B. Wendel asked for clarification regarding what was being asked of the Planning Board by the ZBA.

J. Langey explained the ZBA was seeking Planning Board input because the Planning Board issued the original approvals. The ZBA was wondering how the parameters were set that are outlined in the resolution. He said the Planning Board’s role was advisory. He said the hot-button issue was amplified music and potential events, not dissimilar from Red Barn 20. He asked the Board if they attended the sound check that was performed, noting that Mr. Clarke did as a resident.

The Board plans to review the material created by Mr. Wendel and to discuss the matter at the December 30, 2020 work session.

J. Langey said he would try to attend that meeting to discuss his experience of the sound if he has no other conflicting meetings that night.

J. Langey reminded the Board a portion of the property was in the commercial overlay.

R. Cook believed the overlay was only over the first 200 feet of the property which ended about where the bridge was located. He believed the land that the Distillery proposes to use for the activities requested was out of the commercial overlay.

A. Ferguson expressed concern about the number of changes to the business plan.

B. Wendel believed new management was now involved.

R. Ridler informed the Board that they would have informal discussion and then a letter would be generated to the ZBA. Tom Pratt, the ZBA Chair, has repeatedly requested an historical perspective.

J. Langey said if he was unable to attend, according to his recollection, 90% of what was included in the resolution was at the Applicant’s request.

R. Ridler acknowledged Gary Mason as a representative for the ZBA in attendance.

*Crawford, Albert & Michelle – Site Plan Review –5039 East Lake Road, Cazenovia
File # 18-1192 (Robert Ridler)*

R. Cook said regarding the tree removal and replanting within the CEA for the Crawford new home approved last month, he plans to forward page 7 of the *Lakeshore Guidelines* which is very specific about cutting trees, even if diseased, with an outline of how many trees need to be planted as replacements to Jeremy Davidheiser. He felt the plan Mr. Davidheiser presented to the Planning Board did not give enough information, so he will request Mr. Davidheiser revise his drawing according the specifications on page 7 before he will allow any trees to be removed.

R. Ridler said that was what Don Ferlow had recommended as well.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by H. Roszel, to adjourn the meeting at 9:51 P. M. was carried as follows:

Robert Ridler

Voted

Yes

Town of Cazenovia – Planning Board – Meeting Minutes – December 3, 2020

Anne Ferguson	Voted	Yes
Jerry Munger	Voted	Yes
Dale Bowers	Voted	Yes
Hugh Roszel	Voted	Yes
Bryan Wendel	Voted	Yes
Thomas Clarke	Voted	Yes.

Sue Wightman, Planning Board Secretary – December 4, 2020