

Town of Cazenovia Planning Board

Meeting Minutes

July 7, 2022

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

Members Absent: Gerald Rasmussen

Others Present: John Langey; John Dunkle; Robert Hollembaek; Catherine Savage; Glenn Savage; James McDonough; Douglas Brackett; McEwan van der Mandele; Mark Blanding; Jo Anne Gagliano; Chris Montonte; Richard Ruggaber; Berta Keeler; Bruce Race; Charles (Sam) Woods; Brian Bushneck; Tyler Bushneck; Kyle Reger; William Zupan

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

Roll was taken.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Thursday, August 4, 2022.
The next regularly scheduled work session will be Thursday, July 28, 2022.
The next deadline day will be Wednesday, July 20, 2022.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by M. Koppers, to approve the June 2, 2022 meeting minutes was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler asked that those in attendance sign the sign-in sheet and speak audibly for the recording of the minutes.

HEARINGS

*Hollembaek, Robert & Eileen -- Minor (1) Subdivision – 2186 Dqmon Road,
File # 22-1425 (Jerry Munger) New Woodstock*

Robert Hollembaek was present to represent the file.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by A. Ferguson, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

Referring to the drawing created by Michael J. McCully Land Surveying PLLC entitled *Subdivision on Part of Lot 67 of the Road Township – Cazenovia* dated 6/1/22 and corrected per the 6/15/2022 telephone call, R. Hollembaek explained the parcel was just short of 50 acres of land. A farmer currently farms a portion of the property and a tenant has lived on the other part of the property for six (6) years. He proposed a subdivision along the fence line/hedge row to sell 42 acres to the dairy farmer, and to sell 7.4 acres with the structures to the people currently living at the property.

Hearing no comments from the public, motion by J. Munger, seconded by A. Ferguson, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by T. Clarke, to approve the minor subdivision as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

R. Hollembaek was informed he would receive instructions via mail regarding the map filing process.

*Savage, Catherine & Glenn -- Line Change – 2529 Juddville Road & Juddville Road
File # 22-1427 (Gerald Rasmussen)*

Catherine and Glenn Savage were present to represent the file.

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

Referring to the drawing created by Michael J. McCully Land Surveying PLLC entitled *Lot Line Adjustment on Part of Lot 29 of the Gore Lincklaen Trust – Cazenovia* dated 05/12/22, C. Savage explained they own two (2) parcels and they were looking to move the lot line from the agricultural land to enlarge the land on which the house is

located (so all the structures will be on one parcel) so she can add a workshop on the enlarged space.

R. Ridler asked how the lot sizes would be changed.

G. Savage and C. Savage responded about ½ acre would be transferred.

Hearing no comments, motion by D. Bowers, seconded by T. Clarke to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

Motion by M. Koppers, seconded by A. Ferguson, to approve the line change as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

LAND DISTURBANCE/SITE PLAN REVIEW/SUBDIVISION

*McDonough, James & Pamela -- Site Plan Review -- 4555 East Lake Road, Cazenovia
File # 21-1395 (Thomas Clarke)*

James McDonough present to represent the file.

J. McDonough showed on his cell phone a photograph of the existing lake front and a video explaining half the lake front was cleared and he would like to clear the other half. He believed there was buckthorn that they would like to cut to grade, leaving the stumps. He said there was an approved site plan from about ten (10) years prior which was never executed, and he was wondering if that approval was still in effect.

The Board indicated the approval was no longer in effect.

J. McDonough responded if he wanted to do more work than clearing the brush, he would apply for a new site plan review, mentioning Jeremy Davidheiser would be designing the improvements.

J. McDonough said he had been given an approval for the removal of some other trees (see minutes from the November 4, 2021 meeting) and he would like to remove the brush in question at the same time.

T. Clarke elaborated there was an elm tree close to the dock which would remain, a couple honeysuckle bushes would be removed, some anemones would be weed-whacked, and a dead cherry on the northern shore line would also be removed.

A. Ferguson asked if any replanting would be part of the future site plan.

T. Clarke clarified that there would be no digging of the ground associated with this approval. Anything of that nature would be submitted when they devise a planting plan.

A. Ferguson asked if there would be replanting in the next proposal.

T. Clarke answered, "Yes." He said also part of the future proposal would be new steps to a new dock.

J. McDonough on his cell phone showed M. Koppers the scrub that he plans to remove.

J. Langey reviewed his notes, saying two (2) honeysuckle and a dead cherry tree will be removed and the elm tree will remain.

T. Clarke added that buckthorn will be removed as well, and the rest will be weed-whacked repeating no dirt removal will be done at this time.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by M. Koppers, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR), to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the Board's previous review of the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF), and to approve the site plan as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

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

Douglas Brackett was present to represent the file.

A. Ferguson said this application was for the construction of a garage involving the removal of part of a bedroom and changing the existing entryway, explaining the concern was to maintain if not lessen the current amount of impervious surface area which was 15%. She displayed the elevations which had been submitted with the application.

D. Brackett explained the original proposal was for the garage to be connected by a breezeway which required side yard setback relief. He pointed out the front of the building was behind the 500-foot line (from the lake) and stated less than 20% of the property was within 500 feet (of the lake). He said the impervious surface percentage for the existing condition was over 15% and Mr. Bowers had been kind enough to discuss the situation with them. They first endeavored to purchase more land from the

surrounding neighbors, but no one were willing, so they had to reduce the size of the garage from 28 feet to 26 feet and they had to move the garage into part of the existing house, sacrificing the bedroom for the garage. They also proposed to remove an existing patio replacing it with a deck in the back and to reduce the walkway made of pavers along the parking area and going to the front door from 4 feet to 3 feet (wide).

D. Brackett said he was unsure how to calculate the new deck, so he did one calculation as pervious and another as semi-pervious.

A. Ferguson responded the code requires the deck to be calculated as 50% impervious.

D. Brackett said using that set of calculations the overall impervious percentage would be 14.9%

A. Ferguson said she had no objection to the proposal and the modifications he will make. Her only concern was that the proposal was within 500 feet of a property listed on the National Register of Historical Places in New York State so she believed the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) needed to be notified.

J. Langey said unless the property were substantially contiguous to the proposal, that would not be necessary.

D. Brackett asked what would be considered, "substantially contiguous."

J. Langey answered if a property line were shared.

D. Brackett said that was the case.

J. Langey explained the need for the Full Environmental Assessment Form (FEAF).

It was noted Part One of the FEAF had been completed by the Applicant.

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by T. Clarke, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQOR, to affirm the matter Type I Action with SHPO as the only Interested Agency was carried unanimously.

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

*van der Mandele -- Line Change – 1496 US Route 20 West & Route 20 West, Cazenovia
File # 22-1430 (Mary Margaret Koppers)*

McEwan van der Mandele was present to represent the file.

M. Koppers stated the van der Mandeles currently own two (2) properties, one has 40.95 acres and the other has 10.02 acres. They are proposing to move the line to result in a 20.95-acre parcel and a 30.2-acre parcel.

Referring to the drawing by Michael J Mccully Land Surveying PLLC entitled *Line Change Mao of Lands of Lance & Dorothy Van Der Mandele* dated 05-16-2022, M. van der Mandele showed Lot 1 along New York (sic) Route 20 having 469 feet of road frontage and 18.77 acres. His home lot would increase to 31.140 acres and would extend to the land owned by the Cazenovia Preservation Foundation to the south. He showed where the percolation (Perc) test and the Deep Holes were located (on the vacant lot) on the drawing, mentioning a raised bed system would be required.

It was clarified that no new lots would be created.

Motion by M. Koppers, seconded by A. Ferguson, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the Board's review of the SEAF, and to move the file to a public hearing at the next meeting was carried unanimously.

Instructions were provided at this time for the public hearing notification for the next meeting

*Blanding, Mark -- Minor (1) Subdivision – 4676 Michigan Road, Cazenovia
File # 22-1431 (Jerry Munger)*

Mark Blanding was present was present to represent the file as was Karen Blanding, his realtor.

K. Blanding explained Mr. Blanding owned a parcel having 40.59 acres which he wanted to subdivide. On July 18th they have a surveyor coming to create the plat for the new parcel to have 250 feet of road frontage on Michigan Road which he would like to sell. The other half of the parcel where Mr. Blanding's home is located would be enlarged to 20 acres.

D. Bowers asked which property would be for sale.

K. Blanding answered the vacant parcel would be for sale.

D. Bowers responded that a perc test and Deep Hole test would need to be done (and included on the drawing).

K. Blanding said the perc test had been performed.

J. Munger asked the date the surveyor was coming, and then he asked the date of the next deadline.

It was repeated that the surveyor was coming July 18th and the deadline was July 20th. It was not believed that the survey would be completed by the deadline.

The need for the map was explained.

More discussion followed regarding the time frame for the public hearing.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by M. Koppers, to appoint the Planning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration based upon the Board's review of the SEAF was carried unanimously.

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

After the Applicants left the Board continued to discuss the time frame for the public hearing. It was decided that the public hearing should be published for the September 2, 2022 meeting to give the Applicants time to have their map completed.

The motion by J. Munger, seconded by A. Ferguson to continue the meeting was amended to move the file to a public hearing in September and was carried unanimously.

It was noted that the Applicants will be informed they do not need to attend the August 4, 2022 meeting.

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

Jo Anne Gagliano of EDR, and Richard Ruggaber of EBAC, LLC were present to represent the file, and Chris Montonte was in the audience.

R. Ridler said he wanted to note that there has been a lot of community input for this application, and he stated the emails and letters have become part of the record for the file and are available for review if needed.

J. Gagliano said last month they reviewed some site plan improvements as well as the replacement of the existing tent. In addition to the replacement of the tent, they would like to upgrade some of the infrastructure – lighting, and screening – that over the years has become an issue mentioned regarding every new proposal. As determined at the last meeting, those details could be discussed further as the project advances, but the focus of the discussion at this time should be about the proposed hours of operation, considering what other facilities are doing and revisiting the original request for hours. In the letter to the Board dated June 22, 2022 from EDR they described the events currently happening as well as the events booked in 2019, showing types of events, times of the events, days of the events, and number of attendees. They reviewed the data in an attempt to determine how they can promote the facility under the New York State Agriculture & Markets' (Ag & Markets) mission, but also will address the comments of the community.

J. Gagliano created a new document comparing the 2012 approved hours within the tent, the 2015 hours approved for inside the building, the 2022 request for hours inside the proposed building, and the revised 2022 request for hours inside the proposed building. She explained that the original request for 2022 was to be open 11:00 A.M - 10 P.M. based upon the use of the building being like that of the existing Tasting Room which has amplified music and thinking it would simplify operations if the hours coincided. Having been asked by the Board to reexamine the request for hours, they now were not asking for hours on Fridays or Saturdays that extend beyond the hours they were allowed (in the tent) which were until 10:00 P.M. She distributed the document to each of the members.

J. Gagliano said the hours for the tent in the resolution from 2012 when the tent was first erected were the current hours of operation. (Those hours are Sunday – Thursday 11:00 A. M. – 5:00 P.M., and Friday - Saturday 11:00 A.M. – 10:00 P.M.) She continued saying in 2015 there was an approval for a building to help with the sound issue.

A. Ferguson asked for affirmation that the 2015 proposed hours were never implemented.

J. Gagliano confirmed those hours, (Monday – Thursday 10:00 A. M. – 6:00 P.M., Friday – Saturday 10:00 A.M. – 9:00 P.M., and Sunday 10:00 A.M. – 5:00 P.M.) were not implemented because the building was never built. She added the tent use was considered outdoor use in the resolutions.

The third column listed was the original request for this proposal. The final column listed was the revised requested hours (which would be Sunday – Thursday 10:00 A.M – 9:00 P.M., Friday - Saturday 10:00 A.M – 10:00 P.M.).

J. Gagliano said they currently have operation on site at the Tasting Room that is open at the exterior until 9:00 P.M. seven (7) days a week, which was allowed in the past resolution. She created a document that compiled all the resolutions since 2008. She felt this document might be helpful to the Board as well. According to her research, the Tasting Room has never had specified hours for the interior. Reading from the resolution for the Tasting Room patio, it stated the patio can be used seven (7) days a week, ending no later than 9:00 P.M.; she added that no amplified music was allowed outside, but amplified music was permissible inside the Tasting Room.

J. Gagliano said the basis of the revised requested hours to be open until 9:00 P.M. during the week was because it would be consistent with the Tasting Room patio's current hours. She pointed out that the proposed hours would be for inside use whereas the patio hours were for outside use. She explained the goal to utilize more weekday hours was to host inside corporate events or conferences that would last through the evening, which she said they have not been able to attract. She had hoped Dawn Schmidt, an employee of the Vineyard, could attend this evening to answer more specific questions the Board may have regarding events and usage, however for personal reasons she could not be here tonight.

J. Gagliano said the hours set in 2015 were, as stated in the resolution, largely in response to the impacts of noise, traffic, and lighting. The improvements they propose now were to eliminate those issues for the community. The most recent request for hours would not extend the hours beyond those currently used on site. She said in 2015, they did request hours beyond what had been happening, so this proposal has been "pulled back from that." She said they are "comfortable" with the revised hours requested.

A. Ferguson countered that the revised request was for hours beyond the current hours of operation.

J. Gagliano clarified the hours would not extend later than the current hours for Fridays and Saturdays (in the tent) and no later than the hours currently allowed for guests on the patio (of the Tasting Room) Sunday – Thursday. She said at 9:00 P.M. there could be 60 people leaving the patio area and another 60 people leaving the interior of the Tasting Room. She said the difference would be that the guests would be inside a

building, and they propose to take care of the associated issues (when guests leave). She understood to be granted the requested hours, they “would have to do certain things,” and she said they are prepared to work on those items together (with the Board).

R. Ridler asked the occupancy of the Tasting Room.

J. Gagliano was unsure but said they could provide that to the Board.

There was discussion regarding the maximum number of people who have used the Tasting Room in conjunction with the patio.

R. Ridler asked if there had been a time when 64 people have used the patio area when another 64 people have used the interior of the Tasting Room, or when the Tasting Room has been reserved for 128 people.

J. Gagliano responded that could happen. She added that they, however, were not allowed to have two (2) events happening at the same time – one in the tent and one in the Tasting Room.

J. Munger questioned the relevance of having 128 people in the Tasting Room and on the patio in relation to the request for the hours of the new building.

J. Gagliano replied that the relevance that she noted was that the findings indicated that any impact to the community associated with the tent were lights, number of vehicles, and sound. She was not aware of complaints about these issues associated with the Tasting Room or the patio. She pointed out the patio area does not have a maximum occupancy; it has a number of seats.

J. Munger said the proposed building would potentially double the number of occupants currently using the Tasting Room and patio area, so he felt there would be impacts.

More discussion followed regarding the use of the Tasting Room and the events there.

J. Gagliano said they would have Dawn available to answer those questions.

There was also discussion about restricting the number of events happening simultaneously and how that is (currently) controlled and accommodated.

A. Ferguson questioned the motivation for expanding the hours of operation, the number of events, and the size of events that could be offered, hearing that the Applicants want to address the neighborhood’s concerns.

J. Gagliano said the Board may recall that after 2015, they were experiencing issues with not having midweek opportunities, so they were given a temporary extension of hours to 9:00 P.M. for Wednesday – Thursday, which was beneficial, having businesses promote their products while experiencing the Winery. She said corporate events differed from weddings and “round out” the use of the facility. She said the reason the (2015) building was not built was due to the reduction of hours for its use. She said they desire to build the building now to replace the tent to avoid complaints about sound, knowing it would mitigate noise because the music in the Tasting Room was not heard when the Board tested it.

A. Ferguson expressed understanding but she believed the motivation was event-related income, and she questioned how that compared to wine sales which were to be 51% of the total income of the Winery.

J. Gagliano did not presume an increase in events would change the ratio of earnings but noted the Board would have opportunity to review those numbers.

A. Ferguson understood the ease of having a set schedule of hours for the entire facility but felt the point was moot if events could not be concurrent. She also understood testing the expansion of hours to see how business could be generated, but she wanted to know “the end game here.” She wondered if in two (2) years they would be requesting to be open until midnight.

J. Gagliano responded they were endeavoring to research what they knew to work from experience, saying that was how they knew being open until 9:00 P.M. on weekdays worked. The request to continue to operate those extended hours, however, was denied.

T. Clarke noticed the Applicants seem to be investing all their time and energy into cultivating events while the growing capability seems to stay the same.

J. Gagliano countered there were more vines planted.

T. Clarke did not see that as part of proposals.

J. Gagliano said the Board does not need to give approval for vines.

T. Clarke responded that the visible efforts have been regarding the event center.

J. Gagliano asserted that events were how they promoted wine and said the biggest part of the business was the wine sales that happen at that facility and at other locations. She said the events inform people about Ower wine. She said the (financial) numbers for the farm have been reviewed. She said if there were a problem (hosting events versus wine sales) they would not have been able to meet the 51%. She

stated, "nobody wants to go till midnight." She said they compared the hours of "farms that do the same thing," - Red Barn 20, Critz (Farms), Meier's (Creek), Madison County Distillery and found they were all open until 10:00 P.M. on certain days.

A. Ferguson pointed out that those businesses were in different locations.

J. Gagliano agreed, saying some of those venues could probably be open later, but they close at 10:00 P.M.

A. Ferguson then asked about the promotion of wine with the request for additional corporate events.

J. Gagliano alleged using the facility, recognizing the experience, and drinking wine at those events promotes wine sales. She said wineries and distilleries promote sales through experience. She said that was the basis for the facility. She conceded they could make use of (another) tent, but felt it made sense to talk about a building which would remedy sound. She said they have had events this spring (in the tent) and was unsure if there had been comments or complaints about it, saying they were not aware of any. She said they were not aware of complaints associated with the patio or the veranda.

A. Ferguson believed people were hesitant to report complaints, feeling an official count of those (incidents) was not representative of the impacts. She commented that the sound from last weekend was "very loud," but she was unaware of any official complaints, however, she stated anecdotal reporting was received.

J. Gagliano asked if it was "music sound."

She was told it was "people sound."

M. Koppers said the Board has received letters citing dates of parties with loud base or "different problems."

J. Gagliano believed those were to be considered complaints.

M. Koppers responded they were not officially filed complaints but were included in comments from neighbors to be taken into consideration of this proposal. She said residents are not repeatedly calling to report problems, but residents want the Board to be aware they are still experiencing problems.

J. Gagliano concluded the building was necessary if there was still noise or sound that carries.

Returning to the comparison of hours of operation of the tent versus the proposed building's hours of operation, it was noted that some days the facility would operate five (5) additional hours.

R. Ridler asked if Ms. Gagliano was suggesting that the midweek events would generate significantly less activity than the activity associated with a weekend wedding.

J. Gagliano answered she was unsure if it would be less, but said it would be a different kind of event. She said she could not speak to them unless they were booked. She said people would not leave at the same time, for example, for a professional conference unless there were classes or seminars. She indicated the extended hours would give them an opportunity "for those things to happen." She was unsure if they would happen daily since they have not had that opportunity. She thought Dawn could speak to the number of requests they have received.

M. Koppers believed it would be useful to see statistics regarding the midweek usage during the season the Winery was allowed to have extended hours.

J. Gagliano said they would endeavor to get the booking for that season, noting it was "a while ago."

J. Gagliano reviewed the resolution and noted this extension of hours was within the tent, having a maximum of 125 guests. She repeated that in researching this project she found the same concerns were the issues of sound, traffic, and lighting. She determined the 2016 season bookings were needed for that data.

M. Koppers asked who saw the financials regarding wine sales.

J. Langey answered he, Bill Zupan (the Town Supervisor), and Roger Cook (the Codes Enforcement Officer) were the three (3) people he remembered.

A. Ferguson asked if they reviewed the financials of wine sales versus other income.

J. Langey said the Owera "financial folks" brought the books for review with the three (3) individuals he named.

J. Gagliano said that was a condition of the resolution.

M. Koppers asked if that review was performed annually.

J. Gagliano answered, "Yes."

J. Langey indicated COVID impacted the review.

J. Gagliano said one was not done last year but believed Chris Montonte provided the figures this spring.

J. Langey said he would check with Mr. Zupan to verify that since he did not recall.

A. Ferguson asked if upon that review it was determined that 51% of revenue source came from wine (sales).

J. Langey answered that the math shown to them did; he said obviously they did not review cash receipts, adding one would need to be a forensic account to truly know, but they examine the information provided.

T. Clarke asked if weekday, corporate events were full now.

J. Gagliano said there were none, saying there was no call for it, but noted there were numerous events.

A. Ferguson noted every Friday and Saturday were booked for the season.

M. Koppers noted the 2015 resolution addressed the number of acres that were planted for grapes. She asked the number of acres planted now.

J. Gagliano was unsure of the number but stated everything proposed was planted.

M. Koppers believed four (4) acres was to be increased to seven (7) acres.

J. Gagliano responded that some of the wines use grapes grown elsewhere in New York State.

A. Ferguson said it was her understanding that in 2020 it was ruled that all grapes needed to be grown on the premises.

J. Gagliano believed that applied to businesses started in 2020 or later, but businesses operating prior to 2020 were grandfathered.

J. Langey added that the wine producer was required to bear the financial risk of offsite growing according to Ag & Markets.

A. Ferguson asked the percentage of grapes grown on premise or if that could be provided.

J. Gagliano said they could get that.

R. Ridler asked the items the Board was asking Ms. Gagliano to provide.

J. Gagliano recalled the occupancy of the Tasting Room, the bookings for 2016/2017 corporate events during the extended midweek hours, as well as the percentage of grapes grown on premises.

A. Ferguson asked about flexibility, saying she was opposed to extending Sunday night hours because of children living in the neighborhood and the noise that might disturb them.

J. Gagliano requested all the concerns be outlined for them, saying the concerns were important and they wanted “to take them back” (for consideration).

A. Ferguson responded that it was an observation, not a concern, that most restaurants were closed Monday nights and wondered if the Winery would be willing to close on Mondays.

J. Gagliano asked if they were to consider closing in the building or the entire facility.

A. Ferguson said she had intended in the building but perhaps in the Tasting Room as well, saying it would give the neighborhood one day of respite a week to have quiet enjoyment of their homes.

J. Gagliano asked for other concerns.

T. Clarke said he was concerned about the extended hours Sunday – Thursday for the building.

M. Koppers said she was concerned about year-round activities.

J. Gagliano clarified the concern was regarding the proposed building.

D. Bowers asked if the Board could help Ms. Gagliano understand the concerns about the building if light and traffic issues were mitigated. He asked the Board what their concern would be.

T. Clarke said he was concerned about traffic particularly in the winter with snowbanks.

D. Bowers asked how that could be overcome. He wondered if Madison County found there to be more than adequate sight distance.

A. Ferguson said her concern would be the sustained level of activity in and out of the facility 12 months a year. She felt the volume of traffic on a consistent basis would become an issue. She said there could be 200 people leaving the site every night,

realizing it would occur in a compressed timeframe, noting it would be disruptive and would generate noise regardless.

T. Clarke said the study done in 2015 showed other venues typically closed at 6:00 P.M.

J. Gagliano asked if those were the current hours for those places, saying they researched only the local venues.

M. Koppers said the local venues were event centers, however, not wineries.

J. Gagliano responded they were places that could accommodate similar numbers of people.

M. Koppers thought one should compare wineries in the Finger Lakes, feeling they would be comparable businesses which she suspected were not open, having corporate events to advertise their products, and managed to advertise their product with different hours.

J. Gagliano said they could “look into” that too.

A. Ferguson said when they last surveyed the wineries in that area, they consistently closed at 6:00 P.M.

J. Gagliano asked if that was the time they closed on weekends.

D. Bowers conceded that research had been compiled quite a while ago.

J. Gagliano remarked, “A lot has changed.” She repeated they would investigate that and the Board could as well, to compare notes. She said Dawn could help them since she has those associations.

Motion by J. Munger, seconded by T. Clarke, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

J. Munger asked that the document Ms. Gagliano compiled using the past resolutions be emailed to the Town Office to be distributed to the Board members.

J. Langey said he had some legal advice to dispense to the Board if they had time.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by A. Ferguson, to adjourn the meeting at 8:38 P. M. was carried unanimously.

Per notes taken by Anne Ferguson, at 8:39 P.M. motion by D. Bowers, seconded by T. Clarke, to go into Executive Session for the purposes of attorney-client privileged advice was carried unanimously.

At 9:34 P.M., motion by D. Bowers, seconded by M. Koppers, to adjourn the Executive Session was carried unanimously.

Sue Wightman, Planning Board Secretary – July 8, 2022