

# Cazenovia Zoning Board of Appeals

## Meeting Minutes

March 25, 2024

Members present: Thomas Pratt; David Silverman; Gary Mason; Luke Gianforte; Joseph Juskiewicz, Alternate Member; Michael Palmer, Alternate Member

Members absent: David Vredenburg

Others present: John Langey; Chuck Ladd; Brian Davis, Nadia Kulczycky; Samuel Neivel; Zachary Sharp; Jeffrey Howe; James Howe; Sheila Fallon

---

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

Roll was taken. All were present except David Vredenburg. Michael Palmer was asked to act as a voting member in his stead.

---

Motion by G. Mason seconded by L. Gianforte, to approve the February 26, 2024 meeting minutes was carried unanimously.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Monday, April 22, 2024.

There will be a work session Tuesday, April 16, 2024.

T. Pratt asked everyone in attendance to sign in on the sheet provided.

All requested information must be received prior to the work session.

T. Pratt asked that the rustling of papers, the clicking of pens, and other background noise be limited for the benefit of the recording.

T. Pratt said regarding public speaking, please come forward, provide one's name and address, present to the Board not the Applicant(s), refrain from asking questions but rather make statements, and refrain from repeating items if they have already been stated once during the time for public comment.

---

*Jerabek, Eric - #98-117 – Special Use Permit Renewal – 1639 Delphi Road, Cazenovia*

T. Pratt said this was a special use permit renewal in the RA District for farm animals and the special use permit was initially approved in 1998. He noted Mr. Ladd had completed an inspection on March 18, 2024 and asked if there were any issues or complaints.

C. Ladd responded there were no complaints and “everything's good.”

T. Pratt asked if the inspection went well.

C. Ladd answered it had.

Motion by M. Palmer, seconded by L. Gianforte, to approve the special use permit renewal for another year with the original terms and conditions, was carried unanimously.

---

*Davis, Brian & Melissa - #23-1500 – Special Use Permits – 4580 Fox Lane, Cazenovia  
(Thomas Pratt)*

Brian Davis was present to represent the file.

T. Pratt said the proposal was in the Lake Watershed. He further explained the special use permit would be for a private horse stable for two (2) horses and pastureland with site plan review to follow. He said the General Municipal Recommendation Report (GML) from Madison County Planning Department

was received November 21, 2023. He said Mr. Davis had provided a site plan with the stable and pasture area located.

B. Davis displayed the drawing created by Michael J. McCully Land Surveying, PLLC dated 12-14-23, last revised 02-01-24 entitled *Location Survey on Lot One of the Doust Subdivision Map #2124 Known as No. 4580 Fox Lane, Town of Cazenovia, County of Madison, State of New York*.

T. Pratt said the parcel was 6.71 acres and the (fenced) pasture area would be 3.29 acres, which would comply with the requirement for three (3) acres of pastureland for two (2) horses. He noted the barn would be 34' X 36' or 1224 square feet, which was greater than the 800 square feet required. He also saw there would be two (2) 12' X 12' stalls, and 952 square feet of loft area. He asked if electricity and water would be in the barn.

B. Davis affirmed there would be.

T. Pratt asked about lighting, advising any exterior lighting should be low-level, night-sky compliant, and shielded.

B. Davis responded, "Correct."

T. Pratt said the fencing should be a minimum of four (4) feet high, and eight (8) feet from the property line.

B. Davis consented, saying they proposed the fence to be 10 feet from the property lines.

T. Pratt expressed his approval.

T. Pratt clarified there would be no retail or commercial aspect of the stable; it would be a private stable.

B. Davis responded, "Correct."

T. Pratt noted the pastureland would be over a leach field.

B. Davis explained they plan to fence the leach field area to keep the horses from grazing in that section.

T. Pratt presumed that was the reason the fenced area was 3.29 acres, since three (3) acres must be grazable.

B. Davis replied, "That's right...That's where the buffer comes into play."

T. Pratt believed the barn would be in the pasture area and manure would be stored behind the barn. He said manure should be removed between every 2 – 4 weeks, never longer than four (4) weeks.

B. Davis responded, "So once a month at least – got it."

T. Pratt asked if the pasture would extend up a hill.

B. Davis answered, “A little bit.” Referring to the drawing, he explained the topography lines.

G. Mason asked about a dumpster he saw on the drawing.

B. Davis said the dumpster would be tucked behind the barn.

G. Mason asked if it would be a roll off dumpster.

B. Davis thought that would be the easiest way to transport the manure that would be collected in it.

M. Palmer asked if Mr. Davis intended to put manure in a dumpster.

B. Davis answered, “We need to, right?”

T. Pratt responded the manure needed to be contained.

B. Davis thought it was “the best way to do it,” but wondered if there was a better method.

G. Mason responded usually people would build a concrete pad with some fence around it, so they could access it for removal. He asked if the plan was to have a truck back up to the dumpster and haul it away.

B. Davis thought it would be the best way. He said they had considered laying a pad, but did not know how to remove the accumulation of waste.

M. Palmer responded (it was typically removed) with a tractor and a bucket. He stated Mr. Davis could do whatever he wanted.

B. Davis replied he has “a little compact tractor.”

M. Palmer thought there might be a better way to handle the removal of waste that would not require renting a dumpster “for the rest of your life,” but repeated the choice was Mr. Davis’.

M. Palmer believed someone would “take it and spread it somewhere.”

B. Davis thought that “would be good.”

M. Palmer said part of the management plan included where the manure would be taken.

B. Davis responded, “Yeah.”

G. Mason said a consideration was whether a truck could remove the dumpster when the ground was wet.

B. Davis explained they would have an extension of the driveway to the barn. He said ideally if they could spread it themselves, they would, based on the accumulation of two (2) horses.

M. Palmer repeated the concern for accessing the dumpster with a truck in the springtime.

B. Davis said they would have to figure out how to meet the requirement.

M. Palmer asked if the Board needed to have those details.

T. Pratt answered the Planning Board would address the details when they do their site plan review for the proposal.

B. Davis explained his wife Melissa was the horse-person and felt she had more details about using the dumpster since she knows others who use that method. He said he did like the idea of the pad, so either the plan would include a dumpster or a pad.

D. Silverman suggested Ms. Davis attend the Planning Board meeting.

M. Palmer repeated that questions about manure removal would be part of the review.

J. Juskiewicz spoke about the challenges of weight depending on the size of the dumpster.

M. Palmer thought a pad may be needed for the dumpster.

G. Mason suggested Mr. Davis have his plan formulated for the Planning Board.

B. Davis expressed agreement.

J. Juskiewicz said horses congregate near the barn and said the access was not shown on the plan.

B. Davis responded that they plan to fence in front of the barn for a dry paddock to keep them contained at night.

J. Juskiewicz suggested the pasture be divided in half and the owners rotate the use of the pasture areas to help keep them from being “chopped up.”

B. Davis thought that was good advice.

J. Juskiewicz said his greatest concern had been the horses having access to the leach field where the grass would be greener and the horses rendering the leach field ineffective by grazing.

B. Davis acknowledged they wanted to keep the horses off that section.

M. Palmer recognized the leach field being in the pasture area could be a future problem, so he approved of fencing the horses from it.

D. Silverman spoke about the discharge line to the leach field as being another consideration.

B. Davis believed they would need the highest gauge of plastic.

J. Juskiewicz noted Schedule 40 PVC was proposed by the engineer, and he agreed that would be adequate since it would be buried three (3) feet. He felt there would be enough distribution of the weight at that depth.

G. Mason asked about the driveway location to the barn.

B. Davis elaborated the graveled area would continue to the barn. He showed where the 3-bay garage would be located on the house.

G. Mason asked if there would be a gravel apron in the front of the barn.

B. Davis answered, “Yeah.”

T. Pratt instructed Mr. Davis to include that detail on his drawing for the Planning Board. He informed Mr. Davis the Planning Board would be addressing the details.

G. Mason explained that he was asking about an apron because he was wondering if there would be an area to park a tractor.

Motion by M. Palmer, seconded by D. Silverman, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

Nadia Kulczycky of 4163 Meadow Hill Road said she owned the lot adjacent to Mr. Davis on five (5) acres that abut the property. She said she has two (2) young children, and they own a series of paths near where she believes the pastures are proposed. She asked to look at the site plan for a better understanding. She asked about the area for the proposed barn saying she had a few concerns. She asked where the proposed fencing would be installed. She asked about “a huge trench” that was recently dug.

B. Davis said that was for drainage.

N. Kulczycky believed that had been dug about six months earlier and reported that has caused “water to spill out on” her “entire property.” She stated that drainage has destroyed some of their paths.

B. Davis asked why he had not heard about this before now.

N. Kulczycky answered this was her first time meeting Mr. Davis. She continued by saying her concern was regarding the draining of the runoff from the manure onto her property.

B. Davis responded that was not going to happen; that was why he was before the Board. He said the dumpster or the pad would collect the manure.

N. Kulczycky asked how that would work.

B. Davis answered every 2 – 4 weeks he would have to remove the waste.

N. Kulczycky asked if the manure throughout the site would be collected.

G. Mason explained that the manure would be contained in the dumpster and then it would be removed and not spread on the pastureland.

J. Juskiewicz explained that the horses will, however, relieve themselves in the pasture.

N. Kulczycky stated her main concern was the trench.

B. Davis explained the existing drainage easement has always been part of the property, so they followed that.

N. Kulczycky asked if it had always been dug.

B. Davis indicated it had.

N. Kulczycky recalled seeing an excavator and believed the trench was closer to her property line than the location of the easement on the survey. She said track marks “from the digger” could still be seen.

B. Davis asked her to explain what was happening on her property.

N. Kulczycky repeated “there was a huge trench dug out” on the Davis property, near where the fence was being proposed, causing the stormwater to flow onto her property. She said when it rains hard or when the snow is melting, “it makes a river down” her property, and continues to the neighbor’s property “who lives down the road” from her.

D. Silverman informed Mr. Davis he was not allowed to divert water from his property onto a neighbor’s. He thought if Mr. Davis had excavated, he should not be surprised about the situation. He stated Mr. Davis has an obligation to know if the trench that was dug was diverting water to the neighbors.

B. Davis said he understood that. He questioned why he was just now learning about this issue.

D. Silverman responded it was Mr. Davis’ responsibility as a property owner to know where his stormwater was going.

C. Ladd said he had been contacted about the situation, and he planned to visit the site.

N. Kulczycky believed her neighbor had reached out to Mr. Ladd, and she said this would be a good time to visit with the melting snow.

C. Ladd asked if the lot lines were established between the parcels so he could see whose property was being impacted.

B. Davis believed everything should be marked. He elaborated that the purpose of the drainage was because the neighboring property, the Maiers’ property has a pond that (water) comes through his property so he was endeavoring to divert that. He said clearly that was not working so he would have to adjust that.

C. Ladd thought he and Mr. Davis could look at that and establish the causes and impacts.

B. Davis apologized to Ms. Kulczycky and said they “would figure that out.”

N. Kulczycky said the reason she had not informed Mr. Davis was because the Davises were not yet at the property. She repeated that (drainage) was her biggest concern. She said she was opposed to the proposal because she has young kids, and “because of the danger of horses, the smell, the urine, insects, and all that,” but she doubted the proposal was something that could be denied since owners were allowed to do it.

B. Davis responded that “Cazenovia is an equestrian community.” He said they were in a rural area, and they were allowed to have horses.

M. Palmer stated it was an allowed use with restrictions on the number of horses with the required pasture area. He felt the Town had done a sufficient job of protecting neighbors from impact by limiting the number of horses and restricting the amount of manure storage.

N. Kulczycky expressed understanding saying she “just wanted to make sure it’s done right.” She also asked about lighting, wondering if there would be any along the fence line.

M. Palmer said there would be lighting in the barn.

T. Pratt said anything (on the exterior) would need to dark-sky compliant and shielded.

N. Kulczycky repeated the drainage was her biggest concern, which she said it was done before this proposal was approved, and the impact to her property, as well as the addition of the horses to the property, and manure with the potential of that draining where her children play. She said, “If you could check that out, that would be great.” She encouraged Mr. Davis to feel free to talk to her and to her husband saying they both work from home.

T. Pratt invited any other comments.

Hearing none, motion by G. Mason, seconded by M. Palmer, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

J. Langey led the Board through the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF) for the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) for this Unlisted Action finding all answers to the review to have no or small environmental impacts.

T. Pratt reminded the Board they needed to consider whether the proposal for the private stable would have any physical or environmental impacts upon the neighborhood, and if it would comply with the regulations set forth in the Town Code.

T. Pratt listed the conditions he felt were necessary which were:

1. Comply with Town and New York State Building Code, and shall be in specific accordance with the submitted application and plans;
2. Protect the conservation areas as they are marked;
3. Lights shall be low-level, shielded, and dark-sky compliant, and future electrical work will require inspection per Building Code,
4. Manure shall be removed between 2 – 4 weeks, or sooner if necessary;
5. The leach field shall be protected by a fence;
6. Color and style of the 34’ X 36’ 2-stall barn shall match the color and style of the house,
7. The driveway to the barn shall be noted on the site plan drawing before being reviewed by the Town of Cazenovia Planning Board,
8. The drainage issue involving the Kulczycky property or any other neighboring property must be resolved to the satisfaction of the Town of Cazenovia Planning Board and the satisfaction of the Engineer for the Town of Cazenovia;
9. An as-built survey shall be provided upon completion of the project showing all the property details such as the buildings, fencing, septic area, etc;.
10. No commercial or retail component will be part of the private stable use;
11. The fencing shall be 4-feet high and 10 feet from the property lines, and
12. Two (2) horses will be maintained, with maintenance of additional equine animals requiring additional review and approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals;
13. There shall be a minimum of 3.29 acres fenced for usable pastureland.

Motion by M. Palmer, seconded by G. Mason, to appoint the Zoning Board of Appeals as Lead Agency for the purposes SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration, based upon the Board’s review of the SEAF and to approve the Special Use Permit for a private stable with the proposed barn and pasture area conditioned upon the above-referenced stipulations was carried as follows :

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Michael Palmer	Voted	Yes

Luke Gianforte	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

B. Davis was advised to attend the upcoming Planning Board for site plan review next.



*Hugo, Aaron - #24-1515 – Area Variances – 1050 Tunnel Lane, Cazenovia  
(Thomas Pratt)*

No one was present to represent the file.

T. Pratt explained the application was for a new house in the Lake Watershed requiring area variances and the Applicants have requested the file be tabled while they review some property issues.

T. Pratt said the public hearing was open. He asked if there were any comments in favor of or in opposition to this file.

No comments were made at this time.

There were no comments from the Board at this time.

T. Pratt expected the Applicants to have new information for the next work session.

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



*2607 McKinley Street, LLC - #24-1519 – Area Variance – 2607 McKinley Street, New Woodstock  
(Gary Mason)*

Samuel Neivel and Zachary Sharp were present to represent the file.

T. Pratt noted the application was for area variances for an addition on an existing structure in the New Woodstock Hamlet Overlay and the New Woodstock Central Business Overlay District.

T. Pratt noted the Applicants were seeking two (2) variances, one for front yard relief, and the other for rear yard relief. He said the Board will do site plan review as part of this discussion since this does not require site plan review from the Planning Board. He also noted the GML from Madison County Planning Department was received on March 18, 2024.

G. Mason said the relief needed for the addition was 45 feet (100%) for the front yard and this was a preexisting condition since the addition would be in line with the front of the existing house.

S. Neivel interjected that every house along that stretch of McKinley Street was less than 45 feet from the road.

G. Mason had noted that when he visited the site. He stated the amount of relief being sought from the rear yard sideline was 13 feet for the deck.

Z. Sharp explained that there is an existing deck that is 12 feet from the rear property line that they would be replacing.

T. Pratt noted the geometry of the new deck would differ from the existing deck.

Z. Sharp responded that the original deck, which Mr. Pratt described as a pentagon shape, would be made rectangular, and it would be the length of the back side of the existing house.

G. Mason stated the amount of relief was technically significant, however the existing house was very small and the lot was very small.

S. Neivel agreed the house was small, the lot was small, and he added the house was not in good condition. He explained he wanted to “revive” the house, but he did not plan to live in it himself. He said it was in a great school district and he felt a single mother with kids, or a small family could live in it. He did not expect to make a large profit from the investment, but he would be replacing the roof, residing it, and the addition would add an entryway and a dining area. He said the improvements would not exceed the encroachments that were existing. He offered to adjust the plans to satisfy the Board.

T. Pratt understood the existing house was on the property line and the addition would be also.

S. Neivel currently uses the house for his employees. He explained he owns a plumbing and mechanical company.

M. Palmer asked to see a depiction of the proposed and the existing.

He was directed to the drawing by Daniel Manning entitled *Addition Single Family Residence Neivel's Addition 2607 McKinley Street Cazenovia NY G-1*.

S. Neivel apologized saying his architect was expected to attend but did not. He repeated they were adding an addition to the side of the house and squaring off the deck.

T. Pratt asked about an entry canopy.

Z. Sharp explained there would be no cover over the door. Looking at the drawings created by Daniel Manning A-3 *Elevations*, he explained two (2) columns would support the deck rail, and the stairs would come “straight out.”

M. Palmer asked what would be gained by the addition.

S. Neivel answered it would provide an entryway, a dining room, and there would be storage in the back. He felt it would greatly improve the space in the house.

T. Pratt understood that the whole house would be re-sided and the existing roof would be replaced, so it would be basically a new building.

S. Neivel responded it has a new furnace already and most of the plumbing has been updated. He explained he was a licensed plumber and Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) installer, and that he owns the carpentry company. He repeated this was his personal property.

D. Silverman thought the improvements would be great and would be beneficial to the neighborhood.

G. Mason remarked the options were limited on this small lot. He noticed there was room for a driveway, adding off-road parking was his first concern.

J. Juskiewicz agreed it would be a great improvement to the property.

Motion by M. Palmer, seconded by G. Mason, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

T. Pratt invited comments at this time.

Hearing none, motion by M. Palmer, seconded by D. Silverman to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

J. Langey said this was a Type II Action regarding SEQR.

T. Pratt then led the Board through the criteria for an area variance asking if it would be an undesirable change to the neighborhood. It would be an improvement over the existing condition. He asked if there were alternate solutions. He believed that there may be, but this was a worthwhile endeavor to maintain and improve the existing facility, so this was an acceptable solution. He asked if there would be any physical or environmental impacts from the proposal. He saw none. He asked if the relief would be substantial. He noted the front yard setback relief would be 100%, but it was an existing condition that aligns with the other buildings along the street. The rear yard setback relief would be approximately 29%, so not substantial in his opinion. The final question was whether the hardship was self-created. He answered it was, but he noted the limitations of the site.

J. Langey said the Board could vote on the variances together with one motion.

T. Pratt reviewed conditions. He said:

1. It must comply with Town and New York State Building Code and will be completed in compliance with the submitted plans and application materials;
2. Any exterior lighting on the building must be low-level, dark-sky compliant, and shielded;
3. The color and character of the addition should be consistent with the new exterior of the existing house and sensitive to the community;
4. An as-built survey will be submitted after construction.

Motion by M. Palmer, seconded by G. Mason, to approve the area variances conditioned upon the above-stated requirements was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Michael Palmer	Voted	Yes
Luke Gianforte	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

T. Pratt instructed the Applicants to obtain the necessary permits from Mr. Ladd next.

---

*Howe, Jeffrey & Cara - #24-1520 – Special Use Permit – 5611 East Lake Road, Cazenovia (Joseph Juszkiwicz)*

Jeffrey Howe was present to represent the file.

T. Pratt said this was a special use permit for an additional garage/accessory structure on 4.9 acres in the Lake Watershed District. He noted this project will also have site plan review by the Planning Board.

J. Juszkiwicz said the construction would be a 14' X 28' garage to be used for additional storage. He explained the Owner has a young family and the amount of equipment in the existing garage is inadequate. The Owner would like to store his tractor and other equipment in the proposed garage,

under cover. He said the proposed garage would be pre-built and delivered, and it would be set on a slab. The exterior of the new structure would match the exterior of the house. The front of the garage would align with the front of the house.

T. Pratt asked about electricity and plumbing in the new structure.

J. Juskiewicz answered electricity would be used for exterior lighting of the structure. No plumbing would be provided. He said the pad would be raised, so the Owner will be providing additional landscaping along the front.

T. Pratt asked Mr. Howe what he would plant.

J. Howe answered trees and shrubs.

T. Pratt expressed approval of softening the visual impact with vegetation.

J. Juskiewicz suggested dwarf flowering trees that would not grow over the garage.

T. Pratt noticed the house has horizontal siding and the attached garage has vertical siding. He asked about the matching of the proposed structure.

J. Howe answered the intention was to use vertical board and batten siding to match the attached garage.

T. Pratt expressed his approval of the choice.

T. Pratt informed Mr. Howe his exterior lighting would need to be low-level, night-sky compliant, and shielded.

J. Howe assented.

T. Pratt told Mr. Howe that the Planning Board would discuss the impervious surface percentages, but he did not anticipate an issue with that.

D. Silverman approved of storage space and asked if the existing garage would be kept.

J. Howe explained the existing garage was so full, he couldn't park his vehicles in it, so the intent was to move those items into the new garage so he could store his cars in the attached garage.

D. Silverman asked about other accessory structures on the site.

J. Howe answered there was an existing screen house in the back yard, across the creek.

T. Pratt asked if the new structure would be a 1-car or 2-car garage.

J. Howe replied the proposed would be a 1-car sized structure.

G. Mason asked about the size, wondering if something larger would be more adequate in the future.

J. Howe said the price of a larger structure was restrictive since it would have to be built on-site, whereas the smaller size could be delivered over the road.

G. Mason thought they might be able to haul two (2) halves thinking the smaller size would be filled quickly. He had no issue with the proposal, however.

M. Palmer noted the drawing showed horizontal siding in the depiction.

J. Howe responded the manufacturer did not have a rendering of the vertical siding.

Motion by G. Mason, seconded by M. Palmer, to open the public hearing was carried unanimously.

T. Pratt asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor or was opposed to the proposal.

Hearing no comment, motion by M. Palmer, seconded by G. Mason, to close the public hearing was carried unanimously.

J. Langey said this would be an Unlisted Action and had the Board reflect on the previous considerations of the SEAF. No one believed there would be any significant or large environmental impacts from the request in regard to the SEQR.

T. Pratt repeated the consideration of whether a negative environmental or physical impact on the neighborhood would result.

T. Pratt said conditions for an approval would include:

1. Compliance with Town and New York State Building Code and shall be in accordance with the submitted application and plans – having no commercial business and to be used for private storage only;
2. Lighting shall be dark-sky compliant, low-level, and shielded;
3. The garage will have vertical siding to match the existing garage, will be on a concrete pad, and will align with the front of the existing home;
4. Electricity will be provided for the lighting, but no plumbing will be associated with the structure;
5. Landscaping will be added to the front of the structure to help soften the visual impact from the road;
6. An as-built survey will be done when installation is completed.

Motion by D. Silverman, seconded by M. Palmer, to appoint the Zoning Board of Appeals as Lead Agency for the purposes SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative

Declaration, based upon the Board’s review of the SEAF and to approve the special use permit for a 14’X 28’ garage as a second accessory structure as most recently submitted and with the conditions stated was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Michael Palmer	Voted	Yes
Luke Gianforte	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

Mr. Howe was now instructed to attend the upcoming Planning Board meeting for site plan review.

.

---

M. Palmer asked how the Board knows as-built surveys are submitted once projects are completed.

C. Ladd answered if that is a condition of an approval, he makes sure he has it before he issues a Certificate of Occupancy (CO).

J. Langey said as-built surveys have been requested “for a while now.” He felt it was a reasonable condition in light of some of the problems that have arisen.

M. Palmer was strongly in favor of them; he was just unsure how the Board’s requirement was enforced.

---

Motion by M. Palmer, seconded by G. Mason, to adjourn the meeting at 8:24 p.m. was carried unanimously.

Sue Wightman, Zoning Board of Appeals Secretary – March 26, 2024.