

Town of Cazenovia Planning Board

Meeting Minutes

August 4, 2022

Members Present: Robert Ridler, Chairman; Anne Ferguson; Jerry Munger; Dale Bowers; Thomas Clarke; Gerald Rasmussen; Mary Margaret Koppers; Jon Vanderhoef

Members Absent:

Others Present: John Langey; John Dunkle; L. McEwan van der Mandele; Douglas Brackett; Mark Chambers; Marcin Marchewka; Arthur Bigsby; Bruce Schaffner; Michael Palmer; Jo Anne Gagliano; Chris Montonte; Richard Ruggaber; Dawn Schmidt; Joanne Race; Bryan Wendel

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

Roll was taken.

After a bit of confusion, it was clarified that:

the next regularly scheduled meeting will be Thursday, September 1, 2022;
the next regularly scheduled work session will be Thursday, August 25, 2022; and
the next deadline day will be Wednesday, August 17, 2022.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by A. Ferguson, to approve the July 7, 2022 meeting minutes was carried unanimously.

comfortable with the Board's conditional approval of the project upon final receipt of SHPO's information.

A. Ferguson asked the Board to move the file farther down the agenda awaiting Mr. Brackett's arrival.

*Lockheed Martin Corp -- Site Plan Review – 1633 Grassy Lane Road, Cazenovia
File # 22-1436 (Jerry Munger)*

Mark Chambers and Marcin Marchewka of C&S Engineers were present to represent the file.

M. Chambers explained Lockheed Martin has an existing site on the property. He stated they have a tower on that location.

A. Ferguson asked the type of tower.

M. Chambers answered it was a target tower. He explained that across the valley there was a radar with "soccer ball looking containers." The radar sends signals across the valley to the target tower to test the accuracies of the radars, different weather conditions, and the like. He said the reason they would like to have the different, multiple locations (on the Cazenovia site) was to test radars at different locations to test their accuracy before they go into production, and they will be tested to see how fast they can go from one location to another. He repeated there was an existing tower site at the end of Grassy Lane. They would like to add one to the north, and two (2) more points with exact coordinates.

J. Munger said he visited the site with people from C & S and Lockheed Martin. He said from the existing location of the antennas the first new test area would be about 50 meters, with the second being another 50 meters beyond the first new area, and the third being another 50 meters beyond the second new area. He explained the concrete pads they propose to install would accommodate a portable unit that they would move between the test pads.

A. Ferguson asked the height of the unit.

J. Munger believed that when the antenna was extended, the height would be 30 feet. He remarked it would not be as tall as the existing permanent structure on site.

It was explained that when the unit was not being used, the antenna was kept in the down position.

A. Ferguson asked the dimensions of the portable unit.

J. Munger described it as the size of a small table, and he likened it to the size of the conference table they were using.

M. Chambers added there were outriggers which helped support the unit when it was in the upright position.

T. Clarke asked about the amount of land disturbance they anticipated.

M. Chambers and M. Marchewka were unsure of the exact amount, but they said it would be over an acre and acknowledged they would need a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

J. Munger said the proposal was for a gravel road bed between the various pads they hope to install. He also understood that across the valley a second dome would be built.

M. Chambers said the domes were located in the Town of Pompey and they had that part of the project approved in Pompey last month.

T. Clarke asked if the project involved wetlands.

M. Chambers assured him there were no wetlands involved.

R. Ridler asked the total acreage of the (Cazenovia) parcel.

J. Munger said they had recently acquired three (3) additional acres, which the Board had approved, which resulted in the parcel being about 60 acres.

R. Ridler saw no impervious surface area issue.

A. Ferguson asked if a public hearing would be beneficial.

J. Munger did not think one was necessary. He elaborated that the property was located on the side of the steep hill, quite a bit to the north, and he did not believe he had ever noticed the existing antennas, which were quite a bit higher than 30 feet.

J. Langey asked Mr. Chambers how long the existing equipment had been on the site.

M. Chambers responded, "At least 20 years."

D. Bowers said the subdivision had been done in 1984, and that was when the land had been purchased.

J. Dunkle asked if the drawing was an exact depiction of the grading.

M. Chambers indicated that it was.

J. Dunkle noted they would be cutting into the side of the hill with slopes on either side, so he predicted there would be a fairly big footprint in terms of tree clearing and land clearing to get the level pad in place. He said there was potential for a visual impact not, from the targets themselves, but from the land clearing.

J. Langey asked if Mr. Dunkle had reviewed the plan.

J. Dunkle replied he was seeing it for the first time.

J. Langey asked if a storm water maintenance agreement would be needed.

J. Dunkle said it would depend upon what the Applicants propose.

M. Chambers said they would attempt to keep the storm water area as small as possible and acknowledged he would need to find a creative way to accomplish that.

J. Dunkle asked about the slopes.

M. Markhewka believed the grades were 2-on-1.

J. Dunkle believed all the lines shown would represent cleared land. Because they would be building on the side of the hill, they would need to be concerned about erosion control and stabilization.

J. Langey asked if Mr. Dunkle could have comments for the next meeting.

J. Dunkle asked if the Applicants had a strategy for storm water management.

M. Marchewka said they were working on that, and they hope to capture the runoff in swales.

M. Chambers described it as a work in progress.

J. Langey asked if there was a fence around the facility.

M. Chambers affirmed there was.

J. Langey asked the height of the fence.

M. Chambers answered, "Six feet."

J. Langey asked if there was barbed wire on top of the fence.

M. Chambers said there was.

J. Langey asked if there was any placarding of any information for emergency workers.

M. Chambers said there was on the Pompey site, but did not believe there was on the Cazenovia site.

J. Munger said there was a locked gate where one enters the site from Grassy Lane that denotes it is private property, but had no emergency information.

T. Clarke believed a key needed to be provided to the fire department for the gate.

R. Ridler asked if there would be power to each of the test sites.

M. Chambers said there would be power.

J. Munger added there was power to the site now.

J. Dunkle asked if it was overhead or underground.

M. Chambers responded it was underground.

J. Langey advised a set of plans be given to the local fire department upon approval.

T. Clarke said the local rescue should have them as well.

A. Ferguson asked if the details would be submitted by the next work session.

It was clarified that the next deadline was August 17, 2022.

M. Chambers said they would see how far they would get for the next deadline.

J. Dunkle said his initial comments were the Board needs a SWPPP, they need to know how the Applicants will deal with post-construction storm water runoff, and in particular how they will avoid creating erosion on the side slope. He asked the natural slope of the area.

M. Chambers responded, "Very steep." He said they were 2-on-1's in some areas and 3-on-1's in others. He remarked the north side was steeper than the south side.

J. Dunkle said it would be good for the Board to know how many acres of trees would be removed in order to accomplish this.

R. Ridler added they would like to know what will replace the trees; he assumed it would be grass.

T. Clarke asked if the portable unit would be stored on site.

J. Munger said it stays on site and it's there now. He explained in addition to the permanent antenna structure that exists, there is a pad that a portable unit sits on now.

J. Langey asked if a generic description of the equipment could be provided for reference in a resolution, so the purpose of an approval would be clear, realizing it (equipment) might be upgraded or changed with time.

M. Chambers said they could provide that and said they have product information data sheets.

J. Munger thought a picture of the unit would be helpful.

M. Chambers said that would be included.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by A. Ferguson to continue the file was carried unanimously.

*Bigsby, Mary -- Site Plan Review – 2015 Preston Road, Cazenovia
File # 22-1437 (Thomas Clarke)*

Bruce Schaffner, the builder for the Bigsbys, was present to represent the file and Art Bigsby was present in the audience.

T. Clarke said the Bigsbys want to add a seasonal room to their house.

B. Schaffner explained they are proposing a 3-season, 13' X 15' attached porch built on posts with no foundation.

J. Langey said this would be a Type II Action.

T. Clarke said the impervious surface area would increase from 9.2% to 9.4% which was fine. He said the Madison County General Municipal Recommendation Report was good.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by D. Bowers, to approve the site plan as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

*Palmer, Michael & Tracy -- Line Change – 1571 Dam Road & Dam Road
File # 22-1438 (Dale Bowers)*

Mike Palmer was present to represent the file.

D. Bowers asked Mr. Palmer to explain his project.

M. Palmer displayed the drawing drawn by Michal J. McCully Land Surveying PLLC submitted to the file July 20, 2022 and indicated approximately where the lot line had been which bisected part of Mr. Palmer's Lake frontage and part of Mr. Griffiths' parking area. He said this posed no problem for the last 30 or so years, but now that the Griffithses are selling their property, he and they would like to adjust the property line to match the way the property has been used. He said there was some confusion because there was a quick-claim deed and a warranty deed involved that do not correspond. He said the new buyers for the Griffiths' property "are happy with this line," and the Griffithses want to sell their property.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by T. Clarke, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQOR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the Board's review of the SEAF, and to move the file to a public hearing at the next meeting was carried unanimously.

At this time, Mr. Palmer was given instructions to notify the neighbors within 500 feet of the two (2) properties regarding the upcoming public hearing. He mentioned he will need to also do a line change in the Town of DeRuyter to finalize the transaction because the properties are part of both Townships.

*EBAC, LLC/Owera Vineyards -- Site Plan Review – 5276 East Lake Road, Cazenovia
File # 22-1428 (Robert Ridler)*

Jo Anne Gagliano, Chris Montonte, Richard Ruggaber, and Dawn Schmidt of EBAC, LLC were present to represent the file.

R. Ridler noted the file was “building every day,” and he wanted it to be known that all the emails and letters submitted to the file were reviewed by the Board and were being taken into consideration as the Board conducted their review of this application.

J. Gagliano introduced their team. Dawn Schmidt is the General Manager of the facility; Chris Mononte had attended several meetings and was the one who presents the financials for the annual review.

J. Gagliano summarized the proposal explaining the tent was at the end of its lifespan, having been used ten (10) years and the preference was to replace it with a building to mitigate the sound and do other site improvements to mitigate lighting and head light issues. The tent operates as an outdoor venue and operates Sunday – Thursday from 11:00 A.M – 5:00 P.M., and Friday – Saturday 11:00 A.M. – 10 P.M. They also request an adjustment to the hours of operation since it would become an indoor venue with an extension of weekday hours targeting the corporate event market. The Tasting Room was another facility on site that operates as an indoor venue with no restricted days or hours within that structure. The outdoor component of the Tasting Room venue operates daily until 9:00 P.M. and has no outside amplified music.

There was discussion clarifying there was no restriction of hours for the activities within the Tasting Room.

J. Langey explained the resolution for the Tasting Room was done early in the history of the endeavor, but when noise and other issues surfaced, subsequent resolutions for approvals on the other side of the property became more restrictive as the Planning Board “drilled down” regarding hours of operation.

J. Gagliano reviewed requests the Board had made at the last meeting which included more information regarding bookings, a reconsideration of the revised hours, a response to comments made by the Board and by the neighbors, and a comparison (of hours of operation and offerings of events) of local venues and wineries in particular.

J. Gagliano distributed and submitted a new summary of hours for the tent area with a column for the current approved tent hours which have been in place since 2012, a column for the approved 2015 building hours which were never implemented, a column for the initial request for hours within the proposed new structure this year, a column of a revised request for hours for that structure made 7/7/2022, and a column of the latest request submitted this evening.

J. Gagliano said they now propose to be closed Mondays and Tuesdays in the proposed building. The two (2) days they hope to promote corporate events and operate within the proposed building were Wednesday – Thursday 10:00 A.M. – 9:00 P.M. The hours of those nights currently were 11:00 A.M – 5:00 P.M. For Fridays and Saturdays they would stay open until 10:00 P.M. but they would open at 10:00 A.M.

rather than 11:00 A.M which would only increase operation one hour each day from the current time they operate within the tent. Sundays they now propose to close at the current time which was 5:00 P.M. but would open an hour earlier – 10:00 A.M rather than 11:00 A.M. The Board had asked if Sunday evening hours needed to be increased and they have agreed to continue to close at 5:00 P.M.

J. Gagliano said they were asked if the facility could be closed for a day to offset the increase in activity the rest of the week, and they have proposed to close the building two (2) days a week. She said another question they were asked was if there was flexibility in expanded hours Sunday – Thursday, and they determined Wednesday and Thursday hours were necessary for corporate events, but demonstrated they were flexible Sunday – Tuesday.

J. Gagliano said another question they were asked was if the new building would operate 12 months per year. She said it would, but they would now agree to have a maximum of four (4) events per months January – March.

J. Gagliano said they were asked how they propose to overcome the winter conditions for the driveway traffic, and answered the facility was currently open in the wintertime and has been well maintained as has been the road, saying they have not had any “slippery” issues.

J. Gagliano said there was a question regarding bookings when the (weekdays) hours were extended on a trial basis. They were also asked to provide bookings for multiple years, and those were provided.

J. Gagliano was asked the reason for the proposal and “the end game plan.” She answered the reason for the proposal “was truly about the replacement of the tent.” She said the tent could be replaced (by another tent) but after ten (10) years of sound issues she thought now was the time to address those issues and to improve the site with new technology for lighting and other solutions for issues. She said it was hard to predict the end game, speaking about the pandemic and the outdoor eating it spawned, but said the end game was for it to be a winery as it was today, but she could not predict the extent of its longevity.

Regarding a summary of the hours, Ms. Gagliano said the main focus of the request was to promote corporate events Wednesdays and Thursdays by extending the hours one (1) hour in the morning and three (3) hours in the evening [Ms. Gagliano mistakenly said it would be three (3) additional hours in the evening, but it would actually be four (4) hours more those evenings]. Friday – Sunday the hours would only increase by one (1) hour in the mornings. She said they had done a great deal of research and had a great deal of discussion to determine how to accommodate what they are trying to achieve.

J. Vanderhoef asked if there would be any occupancy changes associated with the new building or if any new parking would be needed.

J. Gagliano responded it would be essentially the same size. She said it would never exceed the amount allowed by the building code.

J. Munger said one of the issues was the inability to control noise outside the existing tent especially upon the departure of guests. He asked if there was any plan or had Oweria utilized any additional security personnel other than the existing staff to attempt to control that issue. His point was that the new building would not control the issue in the parking lot as parties continue after events. He asked if there was any consideration of hiring or providing additional security.

J. Gagliano asked Ms. Schmidt to address the procedure in place.

D. Schmidt explained that many weddings have a sparkler exit for the bride at the end of the reception, and in the current tent this can only be done outside the limited space. She said within the proposed building she would have the space to accommodate the bridal exit, which would curb the outside noise. She said she needed additional space to be able to contain the noise from the departure of the bride and groom.

R. Ridler questioned if the noise could be contained.

D. Bowers interjected the Vineyard would be required to contain it.

J. Gagliano said the plan for the building has a vestibule apart from the seating area of the party for that purpose.

J. Munger repeated his query about the use of additional security personnel other than Oweria employees and if that might be a consideration for the future in order to contain noise and control patrons leaving the venue. He spoke about the need to police behavior in the parking lot and to expedite patrons' leaving.

A. Ferguson said voices carry so drinking in the parking lot, rowdiness, and profanity should be curtailed.

D. Schmidt believed the rowdiness starts as guests wait for the bridal exit; she did not believe there was an issue with guests "hanging out in the parking lot." She said she does not allow that. She said she has had additional security people for a few parties in 2015/2016 but those were special circumstances. She said they were open to discuss the option, but she did not feel that would be a necessity with the building.

R. Ridler said he worked event security for 15+ years and understood the challenges involved. He said the two (2) key elements were to have the inside staff monitor and manage the consumption of alcohol, and to ban alcohol in the parking lot. He said the Board has had “folks up there kind of monitoring some of the events” and some of the issues in the parking lot were a result of alcohol being consumed there.

D. Schmidt said she and her team do not allow over-consumption inside or alcohol to be taken outside the tent. She spoke about the training her bartenders receive and the caution they take regarding overserving. She said she has had to “grab bottles from people before.” She stated that has been done and currently was being done.

R. Ridler stressed the necessity. He said there “was no margin for error.”

D. Schmidt indicated those safeguards were not randomly exercised but said there were times when people brought alcohol in their vehicles, and she could not control that.

D. Bowers countered they could, however, monitor the parking lot. When that situation occurs, someone at Owera would be required to act, whether it be hired security or staff.

D. Schmidt agreed, saying she has made people “dump out” alcohol that has been brought onto the property.

D. Bowers stressed the need for vigilance.

D. Schmidt asserted she was.

A. Ferguson wanted to note that survey data regarding wineries in Upstate New York, regarding their hours, had been submitted, and while most of them did not have events or weddings, those who did typically closed by 9:00 P.M. She expressed pleasure with the reduction in hours of operation being proposed.

J. Gagliano said they too had done research and asked Ms. Schmidt to discuss her findings among her contacts in the industry.

D. Schmidt said she has been in the events business for 30 years. She looked on Wedding Wire which was an avenue for advertising weddings and marketing venues. On it she found 41 wineries in NY, and she called seven (7) that were comparable and loosely in the vicinity. She found some operated until 1:00 A.M. (City Winery in Montgomery, NY), some weddings were held until 11:00 P.M. (Deer Run Winery, Geneseo, NY), with some ending at 10:00 P.M. because of Zoning which mandated that end time throughout the county (Once Finger Lakes, Penn Yan, NY). She noted Quincy Cellars (Ripley, NY) had no specific start or end times. Red Maple Vineyards allowed

receptions to continue until 11:30 P.M. and offered an after-party until 12:30 A. M. with Sunday events ending at 11:00 P.M.

T. Clarke asked if the wineries mentioned were in residential areas or commercial areas.

D. Schmidt was unsure but offered to get that information.

J. Langey asked if the information had been submitted to the file.

D. Schmidt answered she had just gathered her data and was happy to submit what she had at this time. She added she had only contacted seven (7) wineries but would be happy to “do any of the others.”

J. Langey told Mr. Montonte that he and Supervisor Zupan would like to meet with him to “get caught back up on the numbers.” He knew Mr. Montonte was willing to do that and he wanted to make “a concrete date and time to do that.” He asked Mr. Montonte to contact him at his office and he would make the arrangements with Supervisor Zupan. He invited Chair Ridler to attend as well.

A. Ferguson asked if they would be reviewing 2021.

J. Langey affirmed that was the year, saying he knew the last couple of years were not necessarily representative of a typical year, but they needed to resume a tight schedule to resume those meetings since the pandemic.

C. Montonte said they had briefly talked in May.

J. Gagliano asked the year that was discussed in May, wondering if it was 2021.

C. Montonte thought it was 2021 when Mr. Muserlian “got back.”

J. Langey said they had been meeting on a regular basis until the pandemic shut the building down, and they needed to get back on that schedule going forward saying the question (regarding source of income) was legitimate. He repeated his request that Mr. Montonte contact him next week.

C. Montonte responded, “Will do.”

R. Ridler asked if there had been a discussion about total number of weddings per year.

J. Gagliano said if one looked at the records provided, one could not predict the number, but one could see the number for each (past) year. She estimated them to be 30 – 40 events, weddings and all facility events combined. The Barrel Room and the Tasting Room events were included on the list of events.

A. Ferguson asked the number of events anticipated for this year.

D. Schmidt thought approximately 80 - 90 events.

R. Ridler asked of those 90 events, how many were weddings.

D. Schmidt responded the majority of the events were weddings since she did not have the hours to host corporate events. She stated she would like to build that part of the business. She estimated that they have 25 weddings at this time, with some being make-up events from 2020.

D. Bowers commented that weddings seemed to be the biggest offender and wondered if they would consider capping the number of weddings booked. He said he did not personally see the need with the revised hours requested, which he felt was "a huge concession," and was unsure how much more they could ask of the Applicants but going forward capping the number of weddings was the only other consideration he had. He expressed appreciation for the closure Mondays and Tuesdays in the new building and for the ending time remaining at 5:00 P.M. on Sundays.

A. Ferguson noted, too, that the increase in the morning hours would not increase the number of weddings that could be hosted.

D. Bowers commented there were not weddings every Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. He visited the facility a weekend when there was only one (1) wedding. He commented that could not be predicted. He felt the building would "handle the biggest objections out there." But in conjunction with the building there would need to be policing outside the building, saying he had witnessed "more than just spill-over" loud, boisterous exchanges. He understood the challenges, but that noise was an offensive situation.

M. Koppers believed she must have visited "at a very bad time." She said she felt afraid during her visit and left. She said a member of the wedding party tried to break into another car, there was excessive profanity, and likened it to "sitting outside a bar." She said there was "a bad drunk" present and she left with the decision she would not return to witness the venue's events alone in the future. She pointed out this was taking place in a residential area.

D. Schmidt responded that she could not claim people did not "get out of hand," but she could assert that she has removed people from the property in the past and she has called law enforcement, saying she has done her best for nine (9) years to control situations for the benefit of the Town and the neighbors. She said she been conscientious and deliberate "about doing the right thing."

M. Koppers stated during her encounter there was no one monitoring the parking lot.

She recalled her visit was Saturday, July 23rd.

D. Bowers indicated the Applicants have heard the Board's concerns and anticipated their response to the problem as part of the development of their proposal.

J. Langey said the Applicants were hearing comments from the Board and at a future meeting they would hear comments from the public. He said what works the best was when comments were absorbed by the Applicants and they returned with a written, concrete response planned so that if there were a favorable vote for the proposal, those responses would be incorporated into the written approval. He counselled that would be a better situation than having the Board impose conditions on the Applicants. He explained the Applicants' solution of problems as part of their proposal would enable the Board to approve the proposal since it would solve the problems. He was certain the public would have many other comments and suggested the Applicants react to those comments in a positive way.

J. Gagliano asserted they know what the issues have been and said that was why she encouraged hearing comments now, saying the more information they have, the better they can solve the problems. She said solving environmental issues would be the easy part of the process for her, but they need to understand operations, agreeing with Mr. Langey that they need information to pinpoint issues to create a plan to maintain the issues. She felt the last three (3) meetings have been helpful.

J. Langey also requested updates for the proposed building materials.

J. Gagliano expressed understanding that the building must contain sound, but she did not think they were to that point in the process, noting that all the details of this building would differ from the 2015 building. She knew they had some work to do.

D. Bowers thought it would be safe to say the Board was in favor of moving forward with the building based upon what has been said and upon the revision of hours. He said the Board needed to let the Applicants know if they should pursue the building or to replace the tent.

J. Munger was hesitant to endorse the building until he had greater assurance that the noise complaints would be solved (outside the structures).

R. Ridler believed Ms. Schmidt would return with a plan regarding that issue.

T. Clarke said before he made a decision (regarding the tent versus the building) he would like to know the zoning classification of the wineries that Ms. Schmidt presented.

J. Gagliano elaborated that they attempted to use local comparables as well a more wide-ranging comparison, such as the Finger Lakes.

A. Ferguson said a member of the public compiled a comparison of 47 wineries in a survey, and she believed only 15 host events, and of those 15, 13 close by 9:00 P.M. That document listed the type of neighborhood in which the wineries were located – rural, residential, or commercial.

D. Schmidt asked if it noted the size of events.

A. Ferguson answered, "Yes."

J. Langey said as the Board continues to receive comments, he suggested the Applicants obtain copies as well to read and see what the neighbors are experiencing so the Applicants can trouble-shoot and address the issues prior to any public hearing.

J. Gagliano asked how they could be sure they received the (entire) record.

She was told that Mr. Muserlian has been included in all email circulation of the neighbor comments.

G. Rasmussen said he agreed with the comments already aired by other members, thinking noise levels were critical issues, agreeing it was not just the building associated sound, but also the noise of patrons leaving the building and preparing to leave the site. He opined that would be an important part of the planning as they endeavored to make it compatible with the neighborhood.

M. Koppers agreed and asked if any positive comments had been received from an Owera neighbor.

J. Langey said those comments were helpful to hear, but the decision was not based upon support or opposition "by a show of hands."

M. Koppers noted other projects received declarations of support and often those were sought if a project might be considered controversial.

D. Schmidt recalled that, at the beginning of the endeavor, support was submitted.

D. Bowers believed letters of support could be provided (now) by the Applicants if it was requested.

J. Langey advised against soliciting opinions.

J. Gagliano questioned who could be considered a neighbor.

D. Bowers indicated the term was not easily defined.

R. Ridler noted a couple letters received question percentages (regarding revenue), which he felt Mr. Langey had touched upon earlier, but he wanted it to be clear that issue was not part of the Planning Board’s purview. He said those questions can be raised, but it would not be the Planning Board who would address them.

J. Gagliano believed the Planning Board would just address the site plan approval.

J. Langey interjected they would review the site plan with conditions designed to ensure the public and the neighborhood would be fully protected from deleterious impacts.

J. Gagliano expressed agreement.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by T. Clarke, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler asked that those in attendance sign the sign-in sheet to aid in the recording of the minutes.

*Brackett, Leslie & Douglas -- Site Plan Review – 5090 Lakewood Way, Cazenovia
File # 22-1424 (Anne Ferguson)*

D. Bowers noted Mr. Brackett had not arrived.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by D. Bowers, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by T. Clarke, to adjourn the meeting at 8:39 P.M. was carried unanimously.