

Town of Cazenovia Planning Board

Meeting Minutes

September 7, 2023

Members Present: Robert Ridler, Chairman; Anne Ferguson; Jerry Munger; Dale Bowers; Thomas Clarke; Gerald Rasmussen; Mary Margaret Koppers; Roger Cook, Alternate Member; Linda Cushman, Alternate Member

Members Absent:

Others Present: John Langey; Chuck Ladd; Nolan Kokkoris; Bryce McCullough; Tyler Hoffman; Brian Davis; Marie DiElsi; Thomas Lampros; Peter Muserlian; Rob Seeley; Jo Anne Gagliano; Seth Waltz; Scott Davis; Steve MacKnight; Alan Brandolini; Brian Keeler; Hollie Loson; Gail Azeredo Woods; Charles (Sam) Woods; Bruce Race; Joanne Race; Kyle Reger

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

Roll was taken.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Thursday, October 5, 2023.

The next deadline day will be Wednesday, September 20, 2023.

The next regularly scheduled work session will be Thursday, September 28, 2023.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by A. Ferguson, to approve the August 3, 2023 meeting minutes was carried unanimously.

HEARINGS

Dowling, Lee & Johnson-Dowling, Adrienne – Minor (1) Subdivision – 2074 Ballina Road, File # 23-1478 (Mary Margaret Koppers)

No one was present to represent the file.

R. Ridler believed the Applicants had more work to do for their project.

Motion by M. Koppers, seconded by A. Ferguson, to continue the file was carried unanimously.

Cecchi, Lawrence & Kathryn – Line Change – 2181 Ten Eyck Avenue, Cazenovia with # 23-1480 (Jerry Rasmussen) 4469 Lincklaen Road owned by Megan Burns)

Nolan Kokkoris, Esq. of Bond, Schoeneck & King, Plc. was present to represent the file.

Motion by G. Rasmussen, seconded by A. Ferguson to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

R. Ridler said the public hearing was being held for an application requesting a line change. He asked Mr. Kokkoris to explain the proposal.

N. Kokkoris said the line change was for the transfer of a piece of property slightly less than 2900 square feet from Megan Burns to the Cecchis. He said after the proposed lot line reconfiguration, both parcels will remain conforming in size. He explained the adjustment served the purpose of matching the boundary lines according to the maintenance of property by both parties.

R. Ridler asked if anyone from the public wished to comment about the application at this time.

There were no comments.

Motion by G. Rasmussen, seconded by A. Ferguson, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

Motion by G. Rasmussen, seconded by T. Clarke, to approve the line change as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

LAND DISTURBANCE/SITE PLAN REVIEW/SUBDIVISION

*Verizon Wireless/American Tower Corp/T-Mobile – Site Plan Review – 2775 Kiley Road,
File # 23-1481 (Thomas Clarke) New Woodstock*

Bryce McCullough of Centerline Communications was present to represent the file.

T. Clarke said T-Mobile would like to co-locate their equipment on an existing tower owned by Verizon Wireless.

B. McCullough said this would be the third addition to the existing tower. He said there would be supporting cabinets as well as a generation system.

J. Langey reminded the Board that the cell tower law encourages co-location, and that there are Federal Communication Commission (FCC) regulations that also dictate. He felt the application appropriately addressed how the proposal would not have a negative impact in the area.

T. Clarke visited the site with Mr. McCullough. He said the location was isolated and all the work would be within the confines of the existing fenced area.

B. McCullough added that there would be no extension of the tower; the T-Mobile array would be under the existing arrays.

A. Ferguson asked the size of the array.

B. McCullough estimated that it would be 20 feet wide on the tower and repeated it would be beneath the two existing arrays.

T. Clarke elaborated that their equipment would be at about 112 feet and the tower is 150 feet high.

R. Ridler asked what would be done on the ground.

B. McCullough said they would be within the confines of the existing compound. He said it would be the installation of a 10' X 15' pad and supporting cabinets.

T. Clarke explained the generator would be on the pad with the cabinets. He said the generator would have a 229-gallon fuel tank with self-contained spill.

M. Koppers asked if the pad would be new.

B. McCullough affirmed it would be.

T. Clarke asked since the site was isolated, with the nearest home being a good distance away, if the Board wanted to hold or forego a public hearing for this proposal.

A. Ferguson asked if the Board was required to have one for a cell tower.

J. Langey responded the public hearing was optional.

D. Bowers commented, "No need."

T. Clarke agreed saying he would recommend not holding a public hearing due to the isolated location.

J. Langey said this was an Unlisted Action in regard to State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) and led the Board through the second part of the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF), with all finding being either no impact or small impact.

Motion by T. Clarke, seconded by D. Bowers, 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 review of the SEAF, and to approve the site plan for T-Mobile colocation on an existing Verizon/American Tower Corp tower with support equipment to be placed on a 10' X 15' concrete pad as most recently proposed was carried unanimously.

*Hoffman, Tyler — Site Plan Review – East Lake Road, Cazenovia
File # 23 -1482 (Dale Bowers)*

Tyler Hoffman was present to represent the file.

D. Bowers explained where the property was located and said the site plan review was only for land disturbance at this time. He said the Applicant understood that when the plan for the home was developed, he would need to file another site plan review application with fees for an approval for the house.

A. Ferguson asked if the land disturbance would be for the driveway installation.

D. Bowers said it was and stated the location had been approved by Madison County. He said the Applicant would be clearing an area as well to better visualize how he would like to develop it.

T. Clarke asked about the General Municipal Law Recommendation Report (GML) from Madison County Planning Department that had mentioned the existence of wetlands on the site.

D. Bowers clarified that where the Applicants plan to do the land disturbance work, there would be no impact upon the wetlands.

M. Koppers asked to see the aerial photograph of the site.

D. Bowers explained the site was overgrown, but it could be seen where they should build, and where the septic system and the well should be located.

M. Koppers asked if the driveway was already in, since it was already located.

T. Hoffman said the driveway was not in, but pointed to the approved location for the driveway on the photo.

R. Ridler asked if Mr. Hoffman was familiar with the wetland location on the property.

T. Hoffman affirmed he was.

R. Ridler asked if Mr. Hoffman would be able to avoid the wetland area as he was disturbing the land.

T. Hoffman believed he would not be disturbing them.

A. Ferguson asked if the Board would be approving the land disturbance work rather than continuing the site plan review.

D. Bowers confirmed the site plan review at this time was merely for the land disturbance permit work.

J. Langey said this project was associated with the construction of a new single-family home, so it would be considered a Type II Action in regard to SEQR.

C. Ladd asked if site work was being done now, wondering if there was any grading on or any fill being brought to the site already.

T. Hoffman said there was material for the driveway on the site. He explained he was in the construction business and millings were brought to the site.

D. Bowers said there were two (2) piles of millings on the site.

C. Ladd asked if that was for the driveway only.

T. Hoffman answered it was just for the driveway.

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by A. Ferguson, to approve the site plan for land clearing for the future construction of a new single-family home was carried unanimously.

T. Hoffman was instructed to mark the driveway location for Madison County to assign a 911 number for the property and given the contact phone number for that assignment.

*Davis, Brian & Melissa — Site Plan Review – 4580 Fox Lane, Cazenovia
File # 23-1486 (Anne Ferguson)*

Brian Davis was present to represent the file.

A. Ferguson said the application was for a new house on a 6.7-acre lot in the lake watershed so there would be no issue relative to impervious surface coverage percentages. She did ask for clarification regarding how the house would be sited on the lot.

B. Davis said they marked the location of the house on a small copy of the survey and explained the location of the house in relation to Fox Lane and US Route 20.

A. Ferguson asked about the easement shown on the drawing, wondering if the property were land-locked.

B. Davis explained the easement was actually Fox Lane, which they shared with one other family, the Maiers.

R. Ridler asked if the other property shown on the drawing belonged to the Maiers.

B. Davis answered, "I believe so."

A. Ferguson questioned a notation she saw on the drawings created by Bruce Ward dated May 4, 2023 entitled *Brian and Melissa Davis New Residence on Fox Lane Cazenovia NY Timber Plan & Elevations Sheet No. 2* which read, "Confirm Mech./Bath Timber or No? Confirm 16" Drop At Garage Do They Want An Entrance Roof? Add Another Sheet For The Barn?"

B. Davis believed those were notes the Architect, Bruce Ward, had made for himself.

A. Ferguson asked about the location of the septic system and the well on the survey.

It was noted that the Sewage Disposal Plan created by Eric Buck had been added to the file after the initial submission and that drawing showed the location of the septic system and the well.

A. Ferguson asked about the siding material.

B. Davis answered it would be board and batten.

A. Ferguson asked if it would be natural wood.

B. Davis said it would be.

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

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by J. Munger, to approve the site plan review for a new single-family home as most recently submitted was carried unanimously.

C. Ladd asked Mr. Davis to submit a building application next.

*Lampros, Thomas & DiElsi, Maria — Site Plan Review – 2157 Rippleton Cross Road,
File # 23-1487 (Robert Ridler) Cazenovia*

Thomas Lampros and Maria DiElsi were present to represent the file.

R. Ridler asked them to explain their application.

T. Lampros and M. DiElsi submitted drawings from Adam J. Dorm of Northshore Engineering & Design Services entitled *Lampros/DiElsi Residence 2157 Rippleton Cross Rd Cazenovia, NY 13035 Madison County Tax Map ID: xx.xx-xx-xx* Sheets A-1 – A13.

M. DiElsi explained they would be building a house on their 22-acre lot. She said the driveway has already been installed and reminded the Board she and Mr. Lampros had received an approval from the Board in 2020 for a small straw bale cottage, but they had decided not to build that structure but to build this proposed, slightly larger home.

T. Lampros elaborated saying the soil was largely clay so they were having trouble finding an area on the site that would perc, so they looked at raised bed and sand mound systems, and have ultimately settled upon an enhanced treatment unit that will

produce essentially rain water quality water. He said they would be able to use that in a raised bed septic field. He said they are aware of their nearness to wetlands as well as having sensitivity to drought-like conditions, so they are endeavoring to be as responsible as possible regarding water use, saying that at some point they may reuse this water as gray water in the house. He said at this point they are planning on using a septic field in a raised mound. He said the site plan drawing showed the proposed location and the Professional Engineer (PE) visited the site a few days ago to “double check” the location.

T. Clarke asked if the septic system would discharge to the surface.

T. Lampros answered, “No; it would be a raised bed.”

M. DiElsie believed the Board had the particulars about the system itself.

C. Ladd asked if it would be a Busse system.

M. DiElsie responded it would.

T. Lampros elaborated about the workings of the system. He said the units would be serviced annually.

R. Ridler informed the Applicants they would need an approval from Madison County Department of Health (DOH) for the proposed septic system.

M. DiElsie said they submitted a copy of their application to the DOH and they were just awaiting the approval.

T. Clarke asked if John Dunkle had any comments about the system.

R. Ridler had not received any comments from Mr. Dunkle.

M. DiElsie stated the wetlands on the property had been delineated. She said the proposed house, garage, septic system, and future well would all be located within the area they were allowed to build.

R. Ridler asked about an existing well.

M. DiElsie said there is an existing well close to the road where there was once a house, but they would dig a new well close to the proposed house. She said they would probably use Shutes Water Systems once they have marked the exact footprint of the house and the septic system.

T. Lampros said because they have hit water after digging 3 – 4 feet, they plan to build from grade up, putting footers slightly below grade then mound in a berm around the house to provide a cross wall.

J. Langey said the last time the Board reviewed this project it was a Type II Action with conditions being:

- 1) compliance with the submitted plans,
- 2) approval from the DOH for the proposed waste treatment system,
- 3) compliance with any requirement pertaining to any DEC or ACOE wetlands, check zones, etc., and
- 4) any other provisions of Town Code.

He recommended if the Board move on this file, those same conditions be used.

T. Lampros said they would like to proceed with getting the foundation laid as soon as possible.

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

Motion by A. Ferguson, seconded by G. Rasmussen, to approve the site plan review for a new single-family home as most recently submitted and with the previous conditions as the former approval was carried unanimously.

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

Peter Muserlian, Seth Waltz of AVL Designs Inc, Steve MacKnight, the project architect in addition to Rob Seeley and Jo Anne Gagliano, Of Environmental Design & Research (EDR), were present to represent the file.

R. Seeley said following up from discussions from the work session they attended last week, they gave an overview of some of the work that has been done since the sound testing that they had done on site. He invited Mr. Waltz to walk the board through the work that he has done since that demonstration. He mentioned that Mr. Waltz has provided the information to the Town for the reviewing consultant as well.

Referring to the drawing created by MacKnight Architects for EDR entitled *Farm Marketing and Event Building 5276 East Lake Road Town of Cazenovia Madison County New York State First Floor Plan A-101*, Mr. Waltz said after they did their simulation testing the exterior doors, walls, and windows of the existing Tasting Center which is built similarly to the original design of the proposed building, they have recommended some

changes for the proposal. He said one change was reversing the exit path for guests, which does not relate to sound in the building, but did address a concern regarding ingress and egress. They recommended double acoustic doors. They recommended using Sound Transmission Class (STC) 40 Arcadia windows, which he described as ½ inch plate glass on the outside with an airspace and then ¼ inch glass on the inside. He said windows were always the weakest component of buildings.

R. Ridler believed none of the windows would open.

S. Waltz affirmed that was correct.

S. Waltz went on to say the location of the DJ or bands in the building should be farther away from the exterior of the building facing the adjacencies. He said the back side of the building would be shielded by some degree by the roof line. He showed inside the floor plan where the best option for the location of the DJs or bands would be.

S. Waltz said they then reviewed the structure of the building. He said STC does not include low frequencies, and since music played by DJs “is all about base,” they design structures with STC ratings to be higher than normal to accommodate those lower frequencies.

Referring to the drawing created by MacKnight Architects for EDR entitled *Farm Marketing and Event Building 5276 East Lake Road Town of Cazenovia Madison County New York State Wall Sections A-401*, Mr. Waltz recommended changes to the roof system using a layer of QuietRock 530 on the trusses. He explained QuietRock was a vibration isolation material. This would be a measure to keep low-frequency vibrations from getting into the trusses. For mass, another layer of 5/8 inch gypsum (gyp) would be added on top of the QuietRock. He said the resilient channel system originally proposed could be short-circuited by poor installation whereas QuietRock cannot. He said they increased the insulation to include 6” R19 for acoustic reasons.

S. Waltz stated they recommended a layer of QuietRock to the exterior wall as well, with a layer of ½ inch gyp. He explained the use of ½ gyp was due to the resonance of the exterior cladding so the masses would differ. They also recommended Rockwool insulation, which acoustically, is “almost twice as good as standard fiberglass” insulation. He explained it was a denser product and it did not shift as much over time.

S. Waltz pointed out where the vestibules were located and said where the high STC windows would be. He said the recommendations have been incorporated into the current design. He said based on that, they generated a series of sound pressure maps which he distributed at this time. He explained once they generate an assembly they apply it to a building. He elaborated they did two things. They took the existing tent and took the same sound pressure level that was done in the simulation and then generated the levels to the adjacencies. He said the numbers were unweighted.

The depiction showed levels in the 60 decibel (dB) range which was above the Town Code and which was also audible at low-frequencies different from what most people find acceptable. They then did it for the new building. He explained the Town Code was set up in dBA which was voice-range, not full-range. He said they calculated full-range for the new building and found it to be 40 db which he said would be $\frac{1}{4}$ as loud as what would emit from the tent. He said background noise was typically 30 -35 dB, so the sound would be barely above background noise. He said in a dBA scale, it would translate to 24, which would be dramatically below the Town Code. He did not expect it to be audible to the current adjacencies that are having problems now, even with doors opening and closing.

R. Ridler asked if near adjacencies would be neighboring properties.

S. Waltz affirmed it meant locations “off the property.”

S. Waltz said when they performed the simulations, they went to the front yards of neighboring properties. He said at the time there was some background noise from drizzling rain. He explained that the onsite test for the Board at the Tasting Room was to give them an idea of what the numbers represent.

A. Ferguson asked when they established the various ratings, how did they determine the level to use since it may change with each event. She asked if measurements would be taken at each event.

S. Waltz said he recommended a computer app which he demonstrated on his iPad. He said they do a lot of experiential testing where they “build things” and “test them when they are done.” He said they put a safety factor in. He said the noise the Board heard from the DJ sound they upped when they did these calculations. He said they recommend the levels be kept at that level. He elaborated that the way one would keep them to that level would be an app called a Traffic Light.

J. Langey asked the commercial name of the app.

S. Waltz answered, it's called a Duo Traffic Stop Light from Studio Six Digital. He said it sets up two (2) sets of criteria. He showed how it was tracking two (2) numbers at this time. He said one number includes low-frequency noise, the other number does not. He said the way it operates, as things get louder it shows a higher number. A threshold is set for voice level to track what would be considered bad for a DJ doing a voice-over.

R. Ridler asked if that level was 85 dB.

S. Waltz answered it was set for 90 dB turnover threshold for inside the building and set up where the DJ system would be; at the perimeter of the building it would be 85 dB or lower.

S. Waltz said when the threshold is exceeded, it not only shows a number, speaking about the one with the base included, it becomes red, and it sends an email to ownership letting them know management let it get above the maximum level. He explained that once the building was built, the device would be calibrated with an actual DJ. Once it's calibrated, it would be set up with the email triggers. If a complaint did occur, there would be a record of what was happening.

A. Ferguson repeated her question wondering if the device needs to be calibrated at each event.

S. Waltz answered, "No." He further explained that when the device shows green, that alerts one that one "is on the edge." He said the iPad would be sitting on a stand in front of the DJ with a microphone remoted in front of the speaker.

A. Ferguson asked if there would have an automatic shut-off.

S. Waltz said it could not. He understood Ownership would monitor and manage so sound would stay within the allowed levels. He said this was for these types of events to be held in a building of the proposed size, and he said the numbers set were reasonable because the building would "block an amazing amount of sound."

A. Ferguson said she also understood that Mr. Waltz was saying that the 50 dBA level enforced by the Town at this time was not an appropriate standard.

S. Waltz responded that was a voice measurement, and "everybody does this; it's New York State DEC Standard," using dBA, but as soon as base was introduced there were problems maintaining compliance. He said every town they have worked with has this (issue), and that was why they have "adopted other ways of dealing with the reality of what it sounds like."

R. Ridler asked if the measures discussed and the calculations determined will include controlling the base.

S. Waltz answered one of the measurements being monitored on the app was set on dBC which includes base, and the second runs on dBA which does not include base.

A. Ferguson asked if the calibration would be made after the building was built.

S. Waltz indicated it would and said they were considering doing a comparison within the tent after the building was built as well. He said he did not bring the calibrated microphone that plugs into the iPad. He said they do not just use "a random iPad microphone." He spoke about other situations they have helped with in Skaneateles and in Rochester. He remarked the bands are not "real happy" because when the

screen turns yellow they know they have to adjust their sound, usually having to reduce the base. He commented that vocals were not usually the problem.

S. Waltz stated architecturally, everything they asked for has been incorporated into the most recent plan. He said he knew the Town was considering hiring an outside consultant to review the plan. He added he talked with that consultant today and was told the data he sent the Town was what was needed.

R. Ridler added that in his conversations with the consultant, he would be reviewing noise emanating from the building, noise emissions to the community, and site features.

S. Waltz said one thing the consultant does that he does not do, is to take foliage into consideration when making calculations. He expressed his approval of the consultant's work. He asked if he should send his data or if the Town would send his data.

He was told the Town would send the data.

It was also confirmed the consultant has sent his commitment letter to the Town.

A. Ferguson asked if the air conditioning units would be mounted on the roof and if they would be running continually. If so, how would the system account for that noise, and how could that sound be mitigated for the neighbors.

S. Waltz said they had not been involved in anything pertaining to exterior condensers. He said that placement would not affect the interior measurements.

R. Ridler said the consultant would be examining that aspect as well.

P. Muserlian said they would be on the east side of the building on the ground.

S. Waltz believed if they were on the back side of the building, the building would be a good barrier.

M. Koppers asked how the measurements depicted in the sound measurement depiction could be weighted.

S. Waltz answered, "dBA, dBC, and db flat." He said once one gets to a certain level of sound, it must be measured in dBC. He repeated neighbors were hearing base, rhythmic music, and vocals from the tent,

R. Ridler said the Applicants would be focusing on dBC levels.

S. Waltz responded that was correct, since that was "the worst-case scenario."

S. MacCarthy said to follow up on the air conditioner question, the intent was to use the same units that are currently on site. To clarify, they would be on the east side of the building, but they would be mounted on the roof.

R. Ridler said then they will be on the roof, not on the ground.

S. MacCarthy said they were currently on the ground and they would be moved to the roof.

R. Ridler asked Mr. Waltz if that would change anything.

S. Waltz said typically the units would generate low-level sound which would blend with wind and traffic, so they wouldn't typically be noticeable like music. He did not think they would exceed New York State recommendation that it equal the level of distant background noise unless the air conditioners were to resonate and vibrate the structure thereby creating pitch. He said perhaps a vibration rail should be added for the units on the roof.

G. Rasmussen asked if they would be doing some testing to ensure the air conditioners will not be vibrating since they will be mounted on the roof.

S. Waltz answered they had not been contracted for that work at this time, but they could do that, or the outside consultant may do that as part of his evaluation.

A. Feguson asked if there was a reason the air conditioners needed to be mounted to the roof.

P. Muserlian explained that they would be in the way of the patio and sidewalk designed for the east side of the building.

R. Seeley showed where he said the intent was to bring people out of the building with an 8-foot walk which would go where the units are now.

G. Rasmussen repeated his question asking if once the units are installed, will they check the sound to ensure there will not unacceptable noise from the roof to the neighborhood.

R. Seeley said they would design the vibration railing, and the units were ones that would be used for any home.

T. Clarke asked the number of units to be installed.

R. Seeley answered, "Two."

S. Waltz elaborated that if they were not added on a common rail there would not be any dual action spring behavior. After further discussion, he commented that the location was good. He still recommended vibrations insulators. He did not think they would exceed 45 dBA at the source, so at a distance he thought they would be “virtually inaudible.” He said his concern regarding vibration was not impacting the neighbors, but impacting the attendees inside the building.

J. Langey noted there had been a lot of discussion about various sound attenuations practices and wondered if, with the next set of drawings, a definitive list of those measures could be provided so a good understanding could be reached.

R. Seeley responded they could provide a summary. He said all the changes Mr. Waltz mentioned were already included in the plans that were submitted.

A. Ferguson said the list would particularly be helpful since there will be a review, and if two lists were created it would be easier to compare the evaluations.

S. Waltz said he could generate that for the Board.

M. Koppers remarked she will visit the site to hear the air conditioners as they are now.

D. Bowers understood that this app could also store data to the Cloud.

S. Waltz explained the app has multiple modules. He said if both modules were to be run simultaneously, two iPads would be needed. He added they would not have to be current iPad, iPad 3's would work. If one iPad was logging and recording, the other would be doing the Stoplight. The other app would record the entire event as an audio file and it would show all the frequency balance throughout the event. One would be able to see where a peak occurred and then one could review it to see if it was the crowd or the sound system making the noise. He said they have never had an end user using both apps because the Stoplight has been successful, but both are available. He said when you buy the software, you own them both.

D. Bowers explained he was thinking how the data could be available for the Town and how well the Town could see the responsiveness of the Applicant.

A. Ferguson asked if Mr. Ladd were to receive a complaint, could he retrieve the statistics from the Cloud.

D. Bowers was hoping there would be no future complaints, but he was interested in seeing what takes place when the app registers red.

S. Waltz said the Stoplight does not report to the Cloud; the other app he described does. He described how one would set up the Cloud access, but he thought the Stoplight was critical for the DJ or band to have something visible.

J. Langey asked the parameters for doing the measurements. He wondered about the placement of the iPads.

S. Waltz answered he would determine where the iPad would be located. He said the iPad would be on a stand with a calibrated microphone. He said when it is calibrated it is placed “right next to the sound system speakers.” Whoever sets up, the iPad would be three (3) feet “off to the side of the main speakers.” It is placed to hear the system “direct.” He said they do not want the people dancing to trigger it, they want what can be controlled to trigger it. He said one would not hear the crowd inside the building from outside the building. He said the crowd is nothing in comparison to the DJ. He said that was how they have installed the system on all the jobs where they have had success. He repeated live bands were less than enthusiastic about it, but they tolerated it to keep working.

J. Langey asked how the iPad was oriented, wondering which way it faced.

S. Waltz said it would face the DJ.

J. Langey asked if the crowd would see the display, wondering if they would try to trigger it.

S. Waltz answered the crowd would not see the display.

D. Bowers believed the new building would help prevent having people in the front, but he wondered what the plan was for handling people outside. He said that could be an issue over the course of the whole wedding event. He understood how that was an issue with the existing tent structure and expected the issue to lessen with the new building, but he wanted to hear how that would be handled nonetheless.

A. Ferguson asked if Mr. Bowers was asking for that issue to be addressed as part of their operating protocol.

D. Bowers answered that was right. He said he would like to see Staff at the entrance deterring people from going that way.

A. Ferguson thought a condition for any approval would be that the operating procedures be updated to reflect responsibility for operating the app, for keeping the records for at least one season so that there would be an historical record of performance and compliance. It should include the doorway management, the

parking lot management, and naming who/ what position, would be accountable for those areas.

J. Langey asked if Ms. Ferguson was asking the Applicant to propose protocols that would be attached to each event “that the Board could take a look at.”

A. Ferguson said she was, explaining that these would be additional protocols added to what was now in place for their operating plan and as part of the overall submission.

R. Ridler added that it would pertain to guest management.

S. Waltz said they had asked about Cloud-based storage for the Stoplight, but he explained that “It shoots out an email.” He said that email could go to Ower Management and to the Town. He said it was interesting that in Skaneateles emails would be received, but because the sound was just barely over, they received no complaints. He said that was a way the Town could receive reporting with just the Stoplight app.

D. Bowers felt that would preclude the need to have it recorded in the Cloud.

A. Ferguson asked for confirmation that there have been no changes to the landscaping plan since at least four (4) months have passed since it was last discussed.

R. Seeley said there have been no changes to that and summarized they were still proposing some evergreen planting in three (3) areas to screen headlight directions, as well as a 4-foot fence on the edge of the parking lot to block those headlights. Dark-sky compliant lighting was also still proposed as part of the project.

M. Koppers asked where the weddings were currently taking place. She was wondering where outside ceremonies happened.

P. Muserlian answered there were some that have taken place outside.

M. Koppers believed complaints had been received about the volume of the ceremonies themselves and hearing them within the neighboring house(s).

There was some confusion among the members as to whether the complaint was about the vows or whether it was during toasts.

R. Ridler pointed to an area on the site drawing where the gazebo is located toward the middle of the property where vows were exchanged.

M. Koppers wondered how that issue of the noise that was happening at the gazebo could be addressed.

The Board asked if there was a better location for the gazebo.

M. Koppers asked if it could be moved or shielded or mitigated in some way.

P. Muserlian responded the number of ceremonies there was “very minimal.”

R. Ridler said that would be happening at the beginning (of events) followed by the celebration.

D. Bowers asked the time period those ceremonies would typically take place.

P. Muserlian answered, “It’s usually around 4:30, 5 o’clock.”

D. Bowers wondered how loud it could be and if it could be considered “a bad time.” He felt if it were later at night, it might be a greater hardship.

J. Langey asked if the participants used microphones.

P. Muserlian answered the priest or justice does use a speaker.

J. Langey asked that any new submissions the Board were to receive would be submitted well in advance of the next work session so that the Board could be well-informed at the work session.

It was repeated that the next work session will be held on September 28, 2023.

A. Ferguson asked when the Sound Engineer for the Town was expected to respond with his evaluation.

R. Ridler felt his response should not be a problem in terms of timing.

G. Rasmussen asked if his review would be done by the next work session.

R. Ridler said he could not guarantee that it would, but he expected it to be.

R. Ridler asked if the Board was ready to have a public hearing at the October 5, 2023 meeting.

There was some discussion, but it was decided that a public hearing could be opened at the next meeting, and the public hearing could be continued if the Board felt they needed more input.

J. Langey said the Board had flexibility.

Town of Cazenovia – Planning Board – Meeting Minutes – September 7, 2023

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by G. Rasmussen to move the file to a public hearing at the next meeting was carried by majority.

Public hearing instructions were given to Peter Muserlian at this time.

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

Motion by D. Bowers, seconded by G. Rasmussen, to adjourn the meeting at 8:33 P.M. was carried unanimously.

Sue Wightman, Planning Board Secretary – September 8, 2023