

Cazenovia Zoning Board of Appeals

Meeting Minutes

July 27, 2020

Members present: Thomas Pratt; David Silverman; Joseph Anderson; James Wigge;
Val Koch, Alternate Member

Members absent: Gary Mason

.

Others present: Roger Cook; John Langey; Charles Stormon; Michael Kenney; Kevin Nickels;
Steven Nickels; Kevin Dudley; Laurie Dudley; John Perriello; Susan Perriello;
Bonnie Capone; Kristi Andersen; Kyle Reger; Jimmy Golub; Robert Lloyd; Andy
Adriance

T. Pratt called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. He stated, “Welcome to the July 27, 2020 Meeting of the Town of Cazenovia Zoning Board of Appeals, 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. 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 Zoning Board of Appeals Secretary. Attendance will be taken and votes will be conducted by roll call. When possible, the Board members and applicants are asked to state their name each time they speak for audio recording purposes. The public may be participating. When public speaking is allowed, speakers are asked to please state their name and address for the audio recording every time they speak. Please provide statements, please do not ask questions, and please address the Board, not the applicant. Please do not repeat the same ideas if they have been stated once. In an attempt to maintain orderly discussion, participants may be muted until it is their turn to speak and they will need to use the raised hand symbol to be recognized. Other than times allowing for public comment, the public is asked to remain silent during the proceedings.”

Roll call vote was then taken. Gary Mason was the only member absent.

Val Koch was a voting member in Gary Mason's absence.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Monday, August 24, 2020.

*Stormon, Charles & Gyata - #19-1259 – Area Variances – 1766 US Route 20 West, Cazenovia (James Wigge) **

Charles (Chuck) Stormon and Michael Kenney, Kevin Nickels, and Steven Nickels of Nickels Energy Solutions, LLC were present to represent the file.

T. Pratt said the Applicants were seeking a special use permit to install a ground mount solar array in the lake watershed. He said the area variance was to install the array in the front yard instead of the back yard.

J. Wigge said Mr. Pratt had requested information regarding the circumstances for placement behind the house as opposed to the area proposed in front of the house. He wondered if the results had been submitted, saying he had not seen that information.

T. Pratt said he had not seen that information either. He said it was a request for a shadow study or at least a solar study for the rear of the house that would explain to the Board why the array could not be located behind the house in any configuration. He said the Board would like to see that before they make any decision regarding the area variance.

J. Wigge asked for clarification for the positioning, wondering if it would be on the north side or the south side. He noted the south side had the protection of the trees.

C. Stormon shared his screen showing the drawing from Nickels Energy Solutions, LLC dated 2020-03-31 Sheet S1 Project # NES-I1924701 Project Address: Charles Stormon 1766 US Route 20 W Cazenovia, NY 13035. He said that was a map of the proposed project showing the location of the house and barn and the proposed location in regard to those buildings. He said the pink line was a trench that was cabling. He said it was the only location that would be feasible because there is a septic leach field on the east side of the house and the well is located on the west side of the house. He said any trenching from those areas to get to the utility entrance on the north side of the house would disturb either the well or the leach field.

J. Wigge asked where the driveway was located.

C. Stormon said the driveway runs from Route 20 along the property line between their two parcels saying they own 24 acres east of the driveway depicted in the drawing as well as 15 adjacent acres west of the driveway. He indicated where the driveway turns to connect to the house. He repeated they chose the location proposed because it would not disturb the septic leach field, the well and it would not interfere with any neighboring property owner's viewshed. He said no one would be able to observe the array without coming onto the property.

T. Pratt said he was still concerned with the issue that it would be impossible to locate the array in the rear without interfering with the septic or the well without verification. He said the Board needed to be shown how efficiency would be affected and how other issues would come into play. He said he understood that the location proposed was where the Owners would like to put it and it is likely that would be the best location, but since the Board was being asked to "go against the Town Code" he needed something more compelling, that would be evidence, that the proposal will not work in the back yard.

J. Wigge asked Mr. Stormon the depth of the foundation.

C. Stormon asked the Solar Installers to answer the question.

M. Kenney answered the ground mount would not use a concrete foundation. It would use an earth anchor that would be driven into the ground at each post. He said they would not dig a hole nor put a foundation into the hole. He said the earth anchor would be attached to cabling which would be used to anchor the ground mount into it.

J. Wigge asked if the earth anchor would have an impact on the leach field.

C. Stormon shared the drawing again and said the concern with the leach field would be the trenching for the cable, not for a foundation for the solar system. He said the proposed cable run would not impact anything, but if they relocated it anywhere else, the trenching for the cable would interfere with either the well of the leach field.

J. Wigge asked if the trenching would be deeper than 18 inches.

C. Stormon responded by saying the limestone shelf was about 18 inches down. He said they sit on the saddle between the top of the hill and the bottom of the hill, and with the very little topsoil, there is quite a bit of water that moves across the property in the springtime, so it would not be possible to dig a deep trench.

J. Wigge explained his question was how deep the trench would need to go.

C. Stormon asked the Installers to answer that.

M. Kenney said 18 inches would be the minimum depth to meet Code.

T. Pratt said he believed the Stormons' other piping was lower than 18 inches. He said usually water is at four (4) (feet).

C. Stormon said their septic pipe was "pretty close to the surface." He said there were a lot of challenges on the site because of the shallow depth of the topsoil. He repeated the proposed location would enable them to have trenching that meets Code, and if the Board wanted the location to be further towards the south, he did not think the project would be possible at all.

T. Pratt repeated the need for information showing the Board that was the case. He thought there might be a shadow issue as well and stated that was why he had asked for a shadow study or information regarding impact of trees against the sun like the information that had been submitted for the proposed location. He explained he needed that information before he could give an approval for putting the panels in the front.

J. Wigge believed Mr. Silverman had a concern about the reflection of the panels.

D. Silverman said the main concern was the view from Route 20. He said the placement obviously would not affect any neighbors being such a large property and being so far from the road. He said the last time he visited the site the location had not been staked, but he believed there were trees that would shield the array from Route 20. He asked if there would be a tree barrier to protect the glare one might have from the vantage point of the lake.

C. Stormon responded that entire edge of the property is heavily treed and cannot be seen from the lake at all. He said furthermore the reflective side of the panels would face "straight south."

T. Pratt said he had an aerial view of the property that would aid in the discussion.

C. Stormon quit sharing his screen so Mr. Pratt could share the aerial.

T. Pratt showed the density of the trees along the property facing the lake. He also pointed out the row of trees along Route 20 noting the clearing at the driveway entrance. He did not know if that would be an issue.

C. Stormon asserted all the panels would facing south.

D. Silverman said since the Applicants need to provide further evidence for the placement, it would be helpful to have the proposed location marked so that he can make a better determination.

C. Stormon responded he appreciated the consideration saying he would be happy to accommodate the request.

R. Cook said regarding the leach field area, he would not want to see anything placed in that area. He said whether it was just a stake or not, he would "want to keep that area free and clear."

J. Wigge and T. Pratt expressed agreement.

T. Pratt verified the leach field was to the east of the house, but he was wondering about the cleared area quite a bit further to the south of the leach field, the well, and the house. He asked Mr. Stormon if this would be a rack system that would be stationary.

C. Stormon said that was correct. They had modified the original proposal that was requested in 2019.

T. Pratt verified the maximum height would now be ten (10) feet.

C. Stormon affirmed that was correct as well.

T. Pratt reminded the Board the foliage in the summer is not the same condition in the winter and that the low angle of the sun may contribute to more glare in the winter months as well, but he noted that those considerations do not pertain to this project.

K. Nickels interjected that the back of the solar array will have zero glare.

T. Pratt said he would expect that.

Motion by J. Wigge, seconded by J. Anderson, to open the public hearing was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Val Koch	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

T. Pratt asked if there were any comments in favor of or opposed to the proposal.

There were no comments at this time.

T. Pratt said the public hearing would be left open while Mr. Stormon marks the proposed location of the array and while the Board awaits more information regarding the backyard location.

C. Stormon expressed his willing consent.

Motion by D. Silverman, seconded by J. Wigge, to continue the file and the public hearing was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes

Val Koch	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

*Dudley, Kevin & Laurie - #20-1284 – Special Use Permit – 4523 East Lake Road, Cazenovia (Joseph Anderson)**

Kevin and Laurie Dudley and Michael Kenney, Kevin Nickels, and Steven Nickels of Nickels Energy Solutions, LLC were present to represent the file.

T. Pratt said the Applicants were seeking to install a ground mount solar array in the lake watershed as well and he displayed a slide showing the survey, the site plan, an aerial photograph, and four photographs of the site facing east, south, west, and toward the garage. He mentioned the General Municipal Law Recommendation Report (GML) had been received from the Madison County Planning Department.

J. Anderson visited the site today and said it was remote in considerations of sight and sound while being close to the Village (of Cazenovia). He said there are trees on the east, south and north that are 50 – 60 feet tall. Along the road, on the west, was an eight (8) foot tall fence. He said one would not be able to look into the property far enough to see the array. Mr. Dudley had set up a mock placement of the array, and Mr. Anderson checked to see if the array would be visible from the lake or from East Lake Road, stating it would not be from either vantage point. He said it would conform to the setbacks required. He said the utility line would be buried as required. He concluded he was “having trouble finding fault with that location.”

Referring to the aerial photograph, T. Pratt asked J. Anderson what the white structure was to the north of the house, wondering if that was the mock-up.

J. Anderson said that was a temporary garden. He said the location of the array would actually be north and a little east of that, closer to the tree line.

T. Pratt wondered if one was driving north on East Lake Road would one notice a glare from the array between the garage and the fence, but thought that would not be case with the placement further to the north. He commented that the Planning Board may want to verify that. He also noted that the trees along the south side of the property (along Seven Pines Drive) appear to be deciduous so in the winter the screening may be less, and the lower angle of the sun may be a consideration for the Planning Board as well.

J. Anderson believed a shade study had been done as part of the application establishing how much energy would be produced from the array, and in the proposed location it was expected to be more than 100% of the energy required. He thought many of the trees were evergreens and arborvitae.

D. Silverman visited the site yesterday and noticed the temporary garden. He said he did not see the staged site but added he had not been looking for it. He said it was obvious that the site was dense and remarked that in the wintertime “we don’t see much sun,” but knew the issue needed to be addressed. He noted the thickness of the growth from the lake side as well as the roadside. He did not think the condition would change for quite some time and said it “was a beautiful site.”

J. Wigge agreed. He said returning to the issue Mr. Pratt raised about glare, one could easily test that by putting up a mirror and observing the reflection from the mirror in passing. He felt that was a safety issue.

J. Anderson said it was his understanding that arrays take in light rather than reflecting light.

J. Wigge asked if there was any reflection at all.

M. Kenney answered the reflection would be 2%. He confirmed solar panels are designed to absorb the light and not reflect it. He referred to an article from Energy.gov about studies done at airports where it was found the issue of glare was not a concern for pilots.

D. Silverman commented on the solar panels at Hancock Airport. He asked if the material they would use would be similar to the high-end material used commercially.

K. Nickels said the products they use for all their installations are known as “Tier 1 Products.” They have a 25-year performance warranty on panels and invertors. They have a black frame finish. He said the manufacturer’s data sheets were included in the plan sets for the Dudleys as well as the Stormons.

Jimmy Golub said when the Town Board fashioned the law (for ground mount solar arrays to be allowed in the lake watershed) they were thinking about this project and making a pathway for people with similar situations.

Motion by J. Anderson, seconded by D. Silverman, to open the public hearing was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Val Koch	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

J. Anderson expressed his approval of the project saying this being among the first, he “could not think of a better spot for this particular array to demonstrate whether it would work or not because of the way the property is set up and sited.”

K. Nickels said for both projects, the racking structure that they have designed for the systems was the “most removable racking solution for a ground mount that is out there” because they avoid all the poured concrete.” He said that was something to keep in mind because different solar companies could approach other projects with a different strategy. He recommended removability be a consideration for the Town in the future seeing how prudent the Town has been in its analysis for granting solar permits.

T. Pratt expressed his agreement.

L. Dudley wanted to clarify the white building (seen in the aerial photograph) was a temporary greenhouse which they erect in the summer. She said along the road, where there was no fence, there are only evergreen trees, with no deciduous trees are in that area. She said the fence was solid wood, eight (8) feet tall. She also said one could not see the lake from her property, not even in winter. She said Seven Pines is located behind them with another property with a house, driveway and trees behind theirs.

Motion by J. Anderson, seconded by J. Wigge, to close the public hearing was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Val Koch	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

J. Langey then performed the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) by evaluating the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF) with the answers regarding impacts to all eleven items being either “no impact or small impact.”

T. Pratt reminded the Board as a special use permit, the Board needs to evaluate if the project fits in relative to its surroundings and if the Board sees any issue associated with it. He said the second question would be if the Board would want to impose any additional requirements as part of the resolution.

Motion by J. Anderson, seconded by J. Wigge to appoint the Zoning 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, and to approve the special use permit for ground mount solar as submitted carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Val Koch	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

*Perriello, John & Susan - #20-1288 – Area Variance – 5784 Ridge Road, Cazenovia
(Thomas Pratt)*

John and Susan Perrillo were present to represent the file.

T. Pratt said the Perrillos were seeking an area variance for a 24' X 36' foot barn as an accessory building that would be located in front of the residence, approximately 900 feet from the (Ridge) road. He displayed a slide showing the survey. He believed the site had several trees in addition to the long driveway. He asked that the Applicants to explain why they want the structure to be located where they have chosen and any contributing issues as well as the distance the structure would be in front of the residence.

J. Perriello estimated the location of the barn to be 50 – 75 feet from the (southwest) corner of the garage. He said the driveway is 800+ feet long off Ridge Road in a wooded area. He explained the reason they would like to site the barn in the location chosen was because it is a naturally flat area with good drainage. Also, because of the length of the driveway, snow removal would be a consideration. He said the topography east of the house slopes considerably. Also, the septic field is located in the southeast corner of the house. Northeast of the house is a geo-thermal field. To locate the structure behind the house, they would have locate it off to the side which would require several trees to be removed and a significant amount of fill to be brought to level it.

T. Pratt asked if it could be located closer to the house.

S. Perriello explained that between the proposed structure and the house they would like to have a turn-around area in the driveway because it is a flat area and because it would be to the side. She said otherwise the turn-around area would have to be in front of the house where the ground begins to slope steeply to the north.

T. Pratt asked if the garage was near where they would like to install the turn-around area.

J. Perriello affirmed it would be.

T. Pratt asked about a small feature called a Utility Pedestal on the site plan by Michael J. McCully Land Surveying PLLC dated 05-01-20.

J. Perriello explained that was a transformer where they buried the electric line along the driveway.

T. Pratt presumed one could not see (the proposed accessory structure) that far back into the property from Ridge Road. He said when he looked down the driveway from the road, he did not think he would see the proposed structure.

J. Perriello elaborated by saying even in the wintertime one could not see the house.

J. Wigge said it was one thing looking at the driveway on the plat, but its length was particularly appreciable in actuality. He did not think the general public or anyone driving along Ridge Road would have any issue or hardship as a result of the location.

Motion by J. Anderson, seconded by J. Wigge, to open the public hearing was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Val Koch	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

T. Pratt asked if there was anyone wishing to speak for or against this project.

Hearing no comments, motion by D. Silverman, seconded by J. Anderson, to close the public hearing was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Val Koch	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

T. Pratt reviewed the five criteria for the granting of area variances. He asked if the proposal would provide an undesirable change to the neighborhood. He said the area was very isolated, not visible from the street or anywhere in the neighborhood, so he did not find it to make any impact on the neighborhood. He said the answer to the next question about there being an alternate solution was that they are restricted by the septic system, the geo-thermal field, the sloping land, and the placement of the turn-around so there does not seem to be a solution that would place the structure behind the house or closer to the house. When considering if the relief requested would be substantial, he said it would be approximately 10% of relief. In regard to physical or environmental impact, he did not see any. The final question was whether the hardship was self-created. He said it was, but he did not feel it was significant.

J. Langey said for the purposes of SEQR this was considered an Unlisted Action and he reviewed Part 2 of the SEAF finding all answers to the questions being “no or small impact” based on the discussion the Board had already had.

Motion by J. Wigge, seconded by J. Anderson, to appoint the Zoning 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, and to approve the 50’ – 75’ area variance for the structure to be located as depicted in the submitted plans in the front yard was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Val Koch	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

*Capone, Bonnie – #20-1289 – Special Use Permit – 1636 Peth Road, Cazenovia
(Gary Mason)*

Bonnie Capone was present to represent the file.

T. Pratt said the application was to build a second accessory structure in the lake watershed and displayed a site plan with an aerial view as well as a photograph of a structure. He said there was an existing 12’x 20’ foot building. He expressed interest in the details of the proposed building in terms of

color and characteristic. Referring to the aerial photograph, he asked Ms. Capone if the location of the second building would be behind the first structure to the south.

B. Capone said that was correct.

T. Pratt asked if the photograph of the structure was the existing structure.

B. Capone said the existing structure was a shed. The photograph was a representation of what the second accessory shed would look like.

T. Pratt asked if there was any way the two buildings could be combined into one structure.

B. Capone said the buildings were two different sizes. The first building has vinyl clad siding and she did not think they could be leveled evenly. She said she planned to have 8' – 10' of gravel between the two buildings.

T. Pratt asked if the property slopes.

B. Capone answered there was some sloping toward East Lake Road when the first structure was installed. She was unsure if there was sloping for the second building because it currently is "full of brush."

T. Pratt asked what Ms. Capone would be putting in the building, asking if it was for storage.

B. Capone affirmed it would be for storage. She further explained that part of the area was cleared when they built the house for the well driller, but once the well was installed, they let the area grow back.

J. Anderson asked if the proposed building would be visible from Peth Road.

B. Capone did not think it would be. She said it would be green (in color).

J. Anderson asked if the photograph (of a green structure on the slide the Board was viewing) was a representation of what will be installed.

B. Capone answered, "Yes."

J. Anderson remarked that it "was not a pretty building."

J. Wigge agreed. He said when he drove by on Peth Road he could see the existing storage building.

B. Capone said, "Yes." She said the second building would be to the south.

J. Wigge thought the proposed building would be visible from Peth Road.

V. Koch asked about the roofing material, saying it looked like stretched canvas.

B. Capone said it was. She said one could have an 8-millimeter canvas that would need replacing every couple of years, or one could get a much thicker canvas that should last 15 years.

V. Koch said his concern was that in 8 -15 years the canvas will need replacing and how would the Board be certain the replacement will be done when it becomes necessary.

B. Capone said she would not let the roof get to the point of disrepair since she will be using the building for storage and she would not want the roof “to be breaking down.”

V. Koch asked if there was a reason Ms. Capone chose this type of material instead of a shingled roof that would last 30 years or a steel roof that would last 50 years.

B. Capone responded this was the building that was presented to her and she believed it would have a “good super-structure.” She said it would have 2 ½ inch steel pipe holding it together.

T. Pratt believed the walls would not be traditional, framed walls.

B. Capone said that was right. She said the front and the back wall would traditionally framed covered with Texture 1-11 (T1-11).

T. Pratt asked about the material on the sides, asking if it would be rubber.

B. Capone answered it would be a very thick canvas, stabilized by turning it under and screwing it to the braces on the inside of it.

J. Wigge asked if the choice of the particular roof was economic or functional.

B. Capone called it functional.

J. Wigge asked if the choice was economic, being cheaper.

B. Capone answered, “Kind of, but it seems to be efficient also.” She felt the option of buying a roof that lasts for 15 years would be efficient.

T. Pratt thought the Board was asking about the option of putting on a traditional roof with plywood and shingles and infilling the side walls with a more traditional framing approach for appearance sake, asking how Ms. Capone would feel about that option.

B. Capone believed that would cost her “a lot more.”

D. Silverman addressed Ms. Capone saying from an economic standpoint, costs will most likely increase over the course of 15 years and with the swift passage of time, he thought she would be presented with an issue. He said when he visited the site yesterday, he noticed the other shed “looked to be in top shape.” He remarked this proposal was not as appealing in appearance as some of the other recent proposals. He said he was not sure what control the Board would have over that, but the Board does have the authority to vote in favor of or against the proposal.

B. Capone did see Mr. Silverman come but was unable to meet him before he left.

B. Capone repeated the structure seems stable. She said the steel pipe that would be the super-structure would be screwed to 6" X 6" 's; she said there was a "decent" 4 X 6 grid floor; the pipes would be braced on the inside with 2" x 4" 's screwed into them. She repeated it seemed like a very stable structure.

T. Pratt agreed it would be stable, but it was more of an appearance issue for the Board. He wondered if Ms. Capone would mind taking another month and considering a more traditional framing approach with side walls and a roof that the Board could consider. He asked if Ms. Capone objected to that.

B. Capone indicated she was unsure if she could financially consider that option.

J. Wigge said it "was relevant" in his mind "that the building integrates with the rest of the area." He was not convinced that this building does that. He shared concerns with some of the other Board members that the appearance may suffer as time passes. He felt "the application deserves sufficient scrutiny that it is going to last."

T. Pratt asked if Ms. Capone was agreeable to taking another month to see what she can do to improve the appearance, so the Board would be more comfortable with the proposal, and that she possibly look at traditional framing.

B. Capone assented.

T. Pratt said he would take a motion to open the public hearing at this time which would be left open until the next meeting.

Motion by V. Koch, seconded by D. Silverman, to open the public hearing was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Val Koch	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

Jimmy Golub said he was probably the closest neighbor, and he has looked at the site and he does not think it would be visible to him. He said it was similar to a coverall barn which is seen at a lot of dairies. He said he cannot speak to the aesthetics, but he knows it would be very secure, and believed it to be a very good structure. He said he would not mind having it next to him. He said he also knows the Capones would take care of it.

Motion by J. Wigge, seconded by J. Anderson, to continue the file and the public hearing until next month was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Val Koch	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

*Madison County Distillery, LLC – DBA Maples of Madison County - #20-1276 – Special Use Permit –
(Thomas Pratt) 3868 Stone Quarry Road, Cazenovia*

T. Pratt said the application was for a special use permit in the Rural A District with the Wellhead Protection Overlay and the Commercial Overlay Districts. He noted there was no one present to represent the file. He said the Board would hold the file until next month to give the Applicant time to do additional work preparing for next month and the Board was also waiting for Madison County to respond to the request for Lead Agency for SEQR. He noted New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) did respond to the request this afternoon. However, because the County has not responded the Board still would not be able to act in Lead Agency capacity at this time.

Motion by V. Koch, seconded by J. Anderson, to continue the file was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Val Koch	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

Motion by J. Anderson, seconded by J. Wigge, to adjourn the meeting at 8:41 p.m. was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Val Koch	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

T. Pratt noticed Mr. Cook had a matter he wanted to discuss before adjourning.

R. Cook asked if the Board had given any consideration to the site visit to the Bed & Breakfast next to Meier's Creek (formerly Empire Brewery).

T. Pratt replied he would contact the members to coordinate a time in the coming week.

Sue Wightman, Zoning Board of Appeals Secretary – July 28, 2020

*Note: It was determined July 28,2020 that neither Stormon nor Dudley will require site plan review.