

Cazenovia Zoning Board of Appeals

Meeting Minutes

September 27, 2021

Members present: Thomas Pratt; David Silverman; Gary Mason; David Vredenburgh; Luke Gianforte, Alternate Member

Members absent: Val Koch

Others present: Roger Cook; John Langey; John (Andy) Breuer; Darlene Levinson; Matthew Vredenburgh; Jack Cushman; Linda Cushman; Kyle Reger; Robert Ridler; Jerry Munger

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

Roll was then taken. In Val Koch's absence, Luke Gianforte was asked to act as a voting member for the meeting.

Motion by G. Mason, seconded by D. Vredenburgh, to approve the August 23, 2021 meeting minutes was carried unanimously.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Monday, October 25, 2021.

There will be a work session Tuesday, October 19, 2021.

T. Pratt asked that the rustling of papers and the clicking of pens be curtailed to ensure the recording of the meeting will be optimum.



Stearns, Melvin - #05-250 – Special Use Permit Renewal – 2639 Mill Street, New Woodstock

T. Pratt explained this was a special use permit renewal for the keeping of dairy goats since 2005. He asked Roger Cook if his inspection found any complaints.

R. Cook responded there had been no complaints explaining that at this time there were no goats on the premises, but Mr. Stearns was preserving his right to have them in the future by continuing the special use permit.

Motion by D. Silverman, seconded by G. Mason, to renew the special use permit with the same terms and conditions as previously approved was carried unanimously.



*Breuer, John (Andy) & Amy - #21-1370 – Area Variance – 1130 Tunnel Lane, Cazenovia
(David Silverman)*

David Silverman recused himself for this application.

Andy Breuer was present to represent the file.

T. Pratt said the property was in the lake watershed and the Applicants were seeking an area variance for the lake set back. He explained the information to be discussed was received earlier today, so the Board would not be taking action this evening. Mr. Breuer was present to give the Board an overview of the revised proposal which the Board would discuss in greater depth at the next work session.

A. Breuer disbursed copies of the materials he had emailed earlier today. He said there was an existing home on the site which was about 23 feet from the water. His request was to double the footprint by constructing a new home. Addressing the question posed earlier regarding permeability, he has recalculated the impervious surface calculation page of the site plan review application. The new construction would have an overall percentage of 5.90 and the current overall percentage was 4.60.

T. Pratt asked the size of the parcel.

A. Breuer estimated the lot to be 4.9 acres.

A. Breuer then referred to the drawing entitled *A 03 Existing and Proposed Site Sections 1130 Tunnel Lane Breuer Camp* created by Aras Design which illustrated the existing site section and the proposed in relation to the existing utility pole between the house and the driveway.

A. Breuer said the house had been reduced three (3) feet from north to south (parallel to the lakefront), 84' to 81' so the percentage of open shore would be 70.5%.

A. Breuer explained an item he was asked to address was the option of putting the power lines underground or moving them (farther from the house). He elaborated about his difficulty working with National Grid and said the utility company's comment was that the request was uncommon. Chris Gorman, the National Grid Community Representative, believed the cost would "be approaching six figures" and would not include the multiple tele-com lines sharing the poles in question with each utility needing to coordinate separately (and at additional costs).

J. Langey interjected that he had worked on a similar situation involving the utility company in Skaneateles and "got no where." He felt his experience was indicative of the difficulty pursuing this option.

A. Breuer elaborated about what would be involved. He remarked he was not opposed to doing it but felt it would be "logistically challenging."

T. Pratt asked about an overlay of the existing footprint found on the drawing entitled *A 01 Site Plan 1130 Tunnel Lane Breuer Camp* by Aras Design.

A. Breuer indicated that was the original house plan for reference and not a suggested design. He also explained that there was more property on the site than was shown in the site plan drawing, so that was why the impervious surface percentages were lower than they appeared on the sheet.

Returning to the subject of National Grid, Mr. Langey suggested Mr. Breuer contact Carlos Gavilondo and advised Mr. Breuer to email him to obtain Mr. Gavilondo's email address.

A. Breuer responded he would prefer not to incur the cost or the "hassle." He said the proposed house was designed not to have many views of the hill where the power line was located.

T. Pratt asked the distance between the power line and the house.

The current house was 28 feet from the pole. A. Breuer said the proposed house would be 13' 9" from the pole measuring from the first floor and 23' from the second floor.

T. Pratt questioned the adequacy of the distance.

A. Breuer said they endeavored to be conscientious about the distance required to accommodate a lift to frame the home. He believed the length of the arms of the pole was equal to the space the utility company required as an easement.

T. Pratt then viewed the drawing entitled *A 02 Proposed Floor Plan 1130 Tunnel Lane Breuer Camp* by Aras Design.

A. Breuer remarked it was an efficient footprint since it was not extended in length.

T. Pratt invited comments from the Board, realizing the members had not had much time to examine the new material.

A. Breuer said he was happy to return for the October 19th work session.

D. Vredenburg believed the Board was still thinking about moving the power line back so that the house could be located farther from the lake. He did not think burying the power line was necessary, but moving it away from the lake was an option.

A. Breuer responded that to move the line would result in the power line being shaped like a “u” around his property.

T. Pratt remarked he “was okay with that.”

G. Mason indicated the size of the relief being requested, which amounted to about 77%, was very substantial, which was one of the criteria the Board had to consider. He noted the new plan still required the same amount of lakeside relief as the previous proposal.

D. Vredenburg remarked it was not unusual for the neighborhood, however, believing there were “half a dozen” other homes to the north that were no farther than 30 feet from the shore as well.

T. Pratt questioned the need for the dining area shown on the floor plan which faced the lake.

A. Breuer indicated he could not imagine going to all the effort and not having it the way he wanted. He explained this was to be a home he and his wife “could age in.” That was the reason a master bedroom was on the first floor. He said it was not lost on him that the variance was significant and he appreciated the Board’s consideration. He repeated that he would gladly attend the work session if the Board thought it was time well spent.

T. Pratt responded that he thought that would be good and would give the Board time to think about the new proposal.

A. Breuer extended the offer for the Board to visit the site, saying there would be someone on site until October 15th.

T. Pratt and asked if there was anyone wishing to comment in favor of or opposed to this proposal at this time.

There were no comments.

A. Breuer noted his neighbors to the south, Kevin Clark and Mike Haynie, submitted a letter of approval August 19th, and his two neighbors to the north, Sharye Skinner and the Baldwins, have expressed their support.

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

T. Pratt said the Board would see Mr. Breuer on October 19th.

*Levinson, Darlene - #21-1378 – Special Use Permit (B&B) – 1560 North Lake Road, Cazenovia
(Thomas Pratt)*

Darlene Levinson was present to represent the file.

T. Pratt said the special use permit was to operate a Bed and Breakfast (B & B). He asked Ms. Levinson to explain her proposal.

D. Levinson said she would like to offer a place for people to stay while they are visiting Cazenovia for various events by offering a part-time B & B at her home. She said she and her son live at the property. She would operate the B & B May 1st – October 31st. There would be no alteration to the exterior or the interior of the home that would change the character or appearance of the residential premises. When they have guests, they plan to be on the premises from 7:30 P.M – 7:30 A.M. They do not want a sign (advertising the B & B). The maximum number of overnight guests would not exceed six (6). No pets would be allowed. There would be no events or meetings. Guests would be asked not to have more than four (4) vehicles. She explained there was room for six (6) vehicles in the large driveway if needed, but she would strongly discourage that many since the driveway would be crowded. That would leave two (2) spots for her vehicles (in the driveway) and there was a 2-car garage available as well. She said there would be no recreational vehicles, trailers, or campers. A register of all guests with their permanent addresses and dates of their stays would be maintained and be made immediately available if needed. She advertises primarily with VRBO and by word of mouth. Proof of general liability insurance has been provided.

J. Langey said the statement that they, the owners, plan to be on the premises should be changed to state that the title-owner will be on the premises, since that was a requirement of the special use permit.

D. Levinson expressed agreement.

T. Pratt further elaborated that Ms. Levinson herself must be on the premises.

D. Levinson assented.

T. Pratt said for the Board's benefit he took a photograph of Ms. Levinson's driveway to show the parking area available. He agreed that four parked cars would be preferable.

D. Levinson said she read in the Code that six (6) spaces must be provided for six (6) guests, but she would rather restrict parking to four (4) vehicles.

T. Pratt verified that Ms. Levinson would limit her guests dependent upon the number of cars the guests would have.

D. Levinson said that was correct.

T. Pratt asked about the septic system and the well.

D. Levinson had both.

T. Pratt remarked that Mr. Cook will have to ensure that those would be adequate. He asked Mr. Cook if he had any concerns about that.

R. Cook answered he did not. He said only the existing bedrooms in the house would be used, and the septic system should have been designed for that number.

T. Pratt verified no sign would be installed, a register would be maintained, and Ms. Levinson would be available at all times during guest stays.

D. Levinson agreed.

T. Pratt cautioned if there were an issue or a problem, Ms. Levinson would be the one to be called to address it.

D. Levinson agreed.

T. Pratt said no one would be staying above the second floor.

D. Levinson indicated that was the case.

T. Pratt said traffic impacts and environmental impacts should be minimal. He noted Ms. Levinson said there would be no changes to the building.

D. Levinson indicated all that was true.

D. Vredenburgh appreciated the clarification regarding parking since the drawing was not to scale. He understood six (6) cars could be accommodated if the garage were used in addition to the driveway spaces.

G. Mason said the important component was that Ms. Levinson be on site, and that she understood the necessity of that requirement.

Motion by G. Mason, seconded by D. Vredenburg, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

Susan Kennedy of 1514 Owahgena Terrace asked to speak. She said she bought the property in August of 2020, so being new to the neighborhood she had some questions about the whole process.

T. Pratt explained that questions should be asked of the Board not of the Applicant, and he informed Ms. Kennedy the Board preferred to have statements about the proposal which they would take into consideration. He also asked that remarks be stated just once.

S. Kennedy asked that the permitting process be explained. She asked about enforcement of any broken promises on the part of the Applicant. She said potential noise was a concern. She asked who should be called if that were an issue. She heard the Owner would need to be present from 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M. but asked who should be notified after those hours.

T. Pratt said Roger Cook, the Code Enforcement Officer, was the person to call to report issues. He explained that was the enforcement mechanism.

J. Langey further explained that ideally the neighbors would be able to work things out among themselves. Understanding that the potential for noise could be an issue, he said the rules governing the operation of B & B's "were designed to tamp that down." He said if an issue could not be resolved directly between neighbors, Mr. Cook was the next step in the code enforcement process.

S. Kennedy wondered what takes place if an issue were to generate many complaints.

R. Cook explained that B & B's (now being permitted) were subject to an annual review. He said if over the course of a year there were numerous complaints, the Applicant would be asked to come back before the Board and the Board had the power to revoke the permit.

J. Langey used the special use permit renewal that was done at the beginning of this meeting as an example of the process, saying if there had been complaints, the Board might potentially pause before renewing it.

S. Kennedy expressed thanks for the clarification.

S. Kennedy said she heard the requirement of the Owner to be present while guests were staying but wondered about supervision overnight.

It was explained that the Owner would be present 7:00 P.M. – 7:00 A.M., not 7:00 A.M. – 7:00 P.M.

S. Kennedy remarked that it was difficult to hear in the audience. She thanked everyone for their time.

T. Pratt said to that point, there were to be no events, no parties, and Ms. Levinson should know what is taking place during her guests' stay.

T. Pratt asked if there were any other comments in favor of or in opposition to the application.

No one else spoke.

Motion by G. Mason, seconded by D. Silverman, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

J. Langey lead the Board through the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) using the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF). There were no impacts identified except small impacts upon the intensity of the use of land (Item 2) and a small impact resulting in the impairment of the character or quality of the existing community (Item 3).

G. Mason said it was stated that Ms. Levinson only wanted to operate the B & B from May 1st – October 31st. He wanted her to understand that if the Board made that a condition, she could not host outside that timeframe.

T. Pratt reiterated that Ms. Levinson would be locked into the dates she provided.

D. Levinson explained the only other times she might have guests interested in staying would be over the holidays and she would not be present during those times. She asked if she could change that at an annual review, but then decided she would not need to.

J. Langey said as part of the resolution he would create for the proposal, he would use the standard conditions used for recent B & B approvals, many of which had been discussed, that the Town statutes mandate and require by law. He asked if there were any other specific conditions the Board would like to place in addition to the operation being May 1st – October 31st.

T. Pratt asked Mr. Langey to list the standard conditions that would be required.

J. Langey said the standard conditions were:

- 1) The title owner shall live and reside on the premises from 7:30 P.M. – 7:30 A.M. and be available at all times during the transient occupancy.
- 2) No alterations to the exterior or interior of any principal or accessory structure shall be made.
- 3) Maximum number of overnight guests shall not exceed two (2) per bedroom and in no instance shall exceed a total of six (6) overnight guests be permitted.

T. Pratt asked if they should identify that at this location there would only be four (4) cars allowed.

D. Levinson asked about her two (2) cars or if she had other personal visitors.

R. Cook said the number stated should include the Owners' vehicles.

J. Langey said six (6) total cars would be the maximum parked and two (2) cars could be kept in the garage. He explained B & B parking should not resemble a parking lot for a commercial endeavor. Continuing the conditions, he said,

- 4) Only breakfast shall be offered to guests subject to Health and Fire Code regulations.
- 5) No events, meetings or other activities for folks who are not overnight guests.
- 6) The special use permit would be issued on an annual basis: renewal requests must be submitted within 60 days before expirations.;
- 7) Owners/Applicants must demonstrate appropriate available on-premises parking, which they just discussed with the 6-car limitation.
- 8) No recreational vehicles, campers, or trailers shall be allowed, as was stated in Ms. Levinson's business plan.
- 9) No B & B lodging shall be located above the second floor.
- 10) The Owner/Applicant shall maintain register of all guests staying at the facility, including their permanent addresses and the dates of their stay. The register shall be immediately available to the Town upon request.

J. Langey said the Owner should also check with Madison County about the collection of occupancy taxes. He said if Ms. Levinson was working with VRBO or any like agencies, they would inform her about that.

- 11) The Owners must stay current with their real property taxes and assessments and must be in compliance with building codes.
- 12) The Owner must maintain the required insurance, which he saw Ms. Levinson had provided, for at least \$1,000,000 of personal injury coverage.
- 13) There would be provisions for physical inspections regarding the condition of the property as needed.

J. Langey asked about the inspection of the septic system's adequacy for the number of guests.

R. Cook said there was an inventory of what was installed.

J. Langey said he would use the standard condition that the septic system would be sufficient for the number of guests accommodated.

T. Pratt noted and clarified there would be no signage or alterations.

R. Cook explained that the Code requires there be no alterations which would change the residential character. He said not that the Applicant was asking, but she could make alterations to her dwelling, just not ones that would change the residential character. He wanted that clarification to be understood.

Motion by G. Mason, seconded by D. Vredenburg, to appoint the Zoning Board of Appeals 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 and to approve the special use permit for a Bed & Breakfast establishment per the code and with the conditions mentioned above, to be reviewed annually as most recently submitted was carried as follow:

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

Ms. Levinson was informed about the process for paperwork and inspections.

J. Langey reminded her of the importance of the annual renewal application.

*Cushman, Jack & Linda - #21-1385 – Area Variance – 4182 NYS Route 92, Cazenovia
(Thomas Pratt)*

Jack Cushman and Matthew Vredenburg was present to represent the file and Linda Cushman was in attendance.

David Vredenburg recused himself as a voting member for this application.

T. Pratt said the application was to construct a garage on the property, in front of the house, within 100-foot lake set back, and requiring set back relief from the road as well. The proposal was discussed at the last work session. He asked Matt. Vredenburg to give an account of what they propose.

M. Vredenburgh said they are now proposing a one-story addition based upon comments they were given at the work session when they proposed a two-story addition. The addition would be attached to the existing garage and would require two variances. Since they would be attaching the addition, they would be no closer to the lake than the principal structure, but they would be modifying an existing, non-conforming structure so they need the variance for lakefront relief. The second variance would be for 7' 5" set back relief from the road. The structure would be 42'7" from the highway boundary; they would be 94 feet from the center line of New York State Route 92.

M. Vredenburgh created a photo simulation of how the addition would look from a west elevation and a south elevation. He said passersby would be able to now see the lake over the top of the one-story addition, which also creates an enclosure for Mr. Cushman's privacy. The south view shows how the addition would look from the driveway.

J. Cushman said the view from the west was the view from his yard; he said the view from Route 92 would be elevated.

M. Vredenburgh added that Mr. Cushman plans to plant some understory vegetation at that level that in time would further conceal the structure.

J. Cushman displayed the survey of the property which showed an area of the driveway that he had previously removed in the general location of the addition.

G. Mason asked about the walkway between the existing garage and the new addition.

M. Vredenburgh explained the convenience of the walkway which would enable one to exit the existing garage and access the driveway area without having to walk around the new structure.

J. Cushman said it would encroach on the driveway somewhat which Mr. Pratt had mentioned in another discussion.

T. Pratt asked if the color would match the existing house.

M. Vredenburgh answered, "Correct."

T. Pratt asked the effect on impervious surface area.

M. Vredenburgh responded the overall increase would be .6%. He said that increase would include the pool surround from the previous Zoning Board of Appeals approval.

T. Pratt asked about lighting.

M. Vredenburgh, checking with Mr. Cushman, believed the only additional lighting would be over the garage door and would not be on the road side of the structure. He stated that whatever was used would be dark-sky compliant.

D. Silverman thought this location was much better (than the previous request which was closer to Route 92). He felt the addition would “fit in with the current residence architecturally.” He felt the one-story addition would work well from a visual viewpoint.

T. Pratt agreed the visual impact from Route 92 was softened by a one-story addition (versus a two-story addition).

D. Silverman understood the advantage of the walkway, noting the small space between the addition and the grade.

T. Pratt asked if this new design was longer than the two-story version.

M. Vredenburg answered it was the same location but was somewhat enlarged. (The proposed length according to the drawing entitled *C-100 Cushman Residence 4182 Route 92, Town of Cazenovia, Madison County, New York Site Plan – ZBA* that he created September 22, 2021 was 35 feet at the longest and 21 feet at its widest.) He said if the size was an issue, they could reduce it.

L. Gianforte asked where the garage door would be located and verified it would be a standard size for a one-car garage.

It would be on the east side of the addition (the lake side) and it would be only one door.

T. Pratt asked what would be stored in the addition.

J. Cushman answered the snow blower, lawn mowers, tools, jet skis, kayaks, pool equipment, etc.

D. Silverman commented that one could never have enough room. He said he had no issue with the structure as portrayed in the photo simulation.

L. Gianforte asked about the roofline as it would appear from the step-back section.

M. Vredenburg said they had not “worked that level of detail out yet, but it would not be any higher.” He said that was a good question. He assured it would not look different from the western perspective. He said it would have an even ridge. He added it would match the style of the house.

T. Pratt noted it was a hip roof.

D. Silverman asked if they should “nail down” the height of the addition.

T. Pratt believed they should.

M. Vredenburg estimated it would be 15’ – 16’ for the single-story design.

T. Pratt asked the dimensions.

M. Vredenburg said it was 21 feet wide and 31 feet long with a bump-out of four (4) feet. He said the details of the shape may need to be “worked out,” but it would not get bigger and may be smaller.

J. Langey asked the maximum height agreed upon, thinking he had heard 20 feet.

T. Pratt thought 15 feet was the acceptable height.

M. Vredenburg wanted to be sure they could match the architecture of the house.

T. Pratt said they would use the same pitch that was on the main house.

M. Vredenburg did not want to assign 15 feet as the maximum height and then have to reapply if they needed a couple inches.

T. Pratt thought 15 feet was a safe number.

G. Mason commented the one-story proposal was a significant visual improvement. He wondered how the footprint compared to the previous submittal.

M. Vredenburg indicated the changes using the drawing. He said originally it was 21' X 31' but now they have the bump to the north, which they could eliminate if needed. He explained they tried to close any gap that might be seen between the two structures.

J. Cushman said he had not discussed the addition of a second garage door with Mr. Vredenburg, but he was hoping he could have a regular sized garage door and a smaller 6-foot door on the east side of the building.

T. Pratt responded that was a Planning Board matter, and that Board could address the request.

J. Cushman also thought he might like to reduce the bump out area on the east side.

T. Pratt said if that were the case, they would want to ensure the roof ridge line and the eave line would be the same all the way around.

J. Cushman said the setbacks would remain the same, however.

T. Pratt then addressed the amount of setback relief required. He noted 26' 10" of lakeside setback was required, and 7' 3" of roadside setback was required.

M. Vredenburg said 7' 5" was required for the roadside.

Because the addition was connected to the primary structure, it was determined no relief would be required for the positioning of the addition in front of the house.

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

T. Pratt invited comments at this time.

There were none.

T. Pratt asked if the Board needed or wanted any additional information from the Applicants or if the Board was comfortable with the proposal as it was presented.

G. Mason had hoped the dimensions would be finalized before they passed the proposal to the Planning Board. He expressed approval of what was now proposed. He approved of the gap between buildings being closed and the visual appearance.

T. Pratt repeated that it was much softer than what had been previously proposed, finding it to have less environmental impact.

L. Gianforte wondered if a condition could be included to keep the design of the addition visually tight to the existing garage, so the sections appear connected rather than detached.

M. Vredenburg said they could also plant a couple dogwoods as screening as well. He said they could discuss that with the Planning Board.

D. Silverman expressed his desire to move the file forward believing it was architecturally pleasing.

T. Pratt thought any reservations the Board might have about the proposal could be addressed as conditions.

Motion by D. Silverman, seconded by G. Mason, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

J. Langey lead the Board through the SEAF for the SEQR. He reminded the Board that they had completed the SEQR process for this project (for the first application for the garage and pool), but now the Board would review the impacts for this most recent proposal. All items were found to be of no impact except the proposed action would create a small material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulation (Item 1); the proposed action would have a small impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (Item 4); the proposed action would cause a small increase in the use of energy (Item 6); the proposed action would result in a small adverse change to natural resources (Item 9); and the proposed action would result in a small potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems (Item 10).

T. Pratt then considered the criteria for the granting of area variances. Concerning an undesirable change to the neighborhood, he commented that it was much softer than previously proposed and thought it was an unobtrusive change. Concerning an alternate solution, he said the location to the (existing) building made it convenient. Concerning whether the variances would be substantial, he calculated that the lakeside variance would be about 25% and the roadside variance would be about 15%. Concerning environmental and physical impacts, he said impervious surface area would be increased, but not significantly. Concerning the issue being self-created, he found it was.

T. Pratt then addressed conditions for an approval.

1) Impervious surface area should remain equal or be better than the existing.

2) *Lakefront Guidelines* should be taken into consideration to ensure impervious surface impacts will be minimized.

3) There would be no second floor for the addition.

4) Lighting would only be on the driveway side, and it would be shielded and dark-sky compliant.

T. Pratt asked if there was a light on the road side of the existing garage.

J. Cushman said there was, over a door on that side.

T. Pratt wanted to make sure that existing light was dark-sky compliant and shielded as well.

5) The colors of the addition, shingles and siding, should match the house.

J. Langey added that:

6) the new portion of the structure would be architecturally compatible with the main house,

7) the addition of shrubs for screening, and

8) the height of the addition would not exceed 15 feet.

T. Pratt asked if additional screening would be necessary. He believed dogwood shrubs were mentioned.

After more discussion, T. Pratt thought that might be an item addressed by the Planning Board during site plan review.

J. Langey eliminated that item from his list of conditions.

Motion by D. Silverman, seconded by G. Mason, to appoint the Zoning Board of Appeals 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 and to approve the area variances as most recently submitted and with the aforementioned conditions was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Luke Gianforte	Voted	Yes
David Vredenburgh	Voted	Recused
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

The Applicants were instructed to attend the next Planning Board meeting.

J. Cushman thanked the Board for rejecting the proposal to construct a detached garage closer to the road feeling this proposal was superior.

D. Silverman commented it was a beautiful plan.



Motion by G. Mason, seconded by L. Gianfore, to adjourn the meeting at 8:42 p.m. was carried unanimously.

Sue Wightman, Zoning Board of Appeals Secretary – September 28, 2021