

Cazenovia Zoning Board of Appeals

Meeting Minutes

June 22, 2020

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

Members absent:

Others present: Roger Cook; John Langey; Stephen Halton; Janine English; Nicole Catgenova Schmidt; Thomas Revelle; Jennifer Wardell; Kristi Andersen; Kyle Reger; Kate Hill

T. Pratt called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. He stated, “Welcome to the June 22, 2020 Meeting of the Town of Cazenovia Zoning Board of Appeals, which has been legally noticed in the Cazenovia Republican, on the Town Website and outside the Town Offices. This meeting is a virtual meeting as authorized by New York Executive Order 202.1. This meeting is being recorded, and will be made available on the Town’s website. Please note: The output of transcribing from an audio/video recording from Zoom, will be fairly accurate, although in some cases will be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting. If you should need clarification for something said, please contact the Zoning Board of Appeals Secretary. Attendance will be taken and votes will be conducted by roll call. When possible, the Board members and applicants are asked to state their name each time they speak for audio recording purposes. The public may be participating. When public speaking is allowed, speakers are asked to please state their name and address for the audio recording every time they speak. Please provide statements, please do not ask questions, and please address the Board, not the applicant. Please do not repeat the same ideas if they have been stated once. In an attempt to maintain orderly discussion, participants may be muted until it is their turn to speak and they will need to use the raised hand symbol to be recognized. Other than times allowing for public comment, the public is asked to remain silent during the proceedings.”

Roll call vote was then taken.

Motion by J. Anderson, seconded by J. Wigge, to approve the May 18, 2020 meeting transcript as submitted was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Monday, July 27, 2020.

*Trush, Glen – # 19-1214 – Special Use Permit – 1876 Route 20, Cazenovia
(Thomas Pratt)*

No one was present to represent the file.

T. Pratt said nothing new has been added to the file and to his knowledge, Mr. Trush is working on additional items. He felt the file should be removed from subsequent agendas until Mr. Trush is ready to proceed, unless the Board felt otherwise. No one objected.

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

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.



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

No one was present to represent the file.

T. Pratt said the Applicants are seeking solar panels, and they will be ready to present at the July meeting.

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

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.



*CNY Hemp Processing, Inc - #19-1265 – Special Use Permit – 2069 Elm Street,
(Gary Mason) New Woodstock*

Stephen Halton was present to represent the file.

T. Pratt said Mr. Halton has recently submitted a letter amending his application at this time to request approval only for the retail store portion of his proposal. The light manufacturing component will be addressed at another time with a separate application.

S. Halton affirmed that he wanted to pursue the storefront use at this time. He stated he would not be processing in the facility at present. He said he will submit a new special use permit application when he is ready to seek approval for the processing component. He said there are more tests and more

information he needs to obtain for the processing application, so currently he just wants to move forward with the opening of the storefront.

T. Pratt asked how Mr. Halton intends to use the back portion of the building, wondering if it would be empty space.

S. Halton answered part of the space would be used for storage.

T. Pratt asked if it would be storage for the store inventory.

S. Halton said it would be storage for the CNY Hemp Processing equipment.

T. Pratt assumed the space would be merely for storage of the equipment, not for operation of any equipment.

S. Halton said that was correct.

T. Pratt said the hours of operation (outlined in the business plan) were 10:00 A.M – 5:00 P.M. Thursday – Friday, and 10:00 A.M. – 4:00 P.M. Saturdays.

S. Halton said that was correct.

T. Pratt asked if the hours are definite, cautioning Mr. Halton if he wanted to extend them, he would need to seek approval for them in the future.

S. Halton believed those hours were sufficient. He did not anticipate needing to extend them and understood he would need a future approval if that were to change.

T. Pratt then asked about the bathroom at the facility.

S. Halton said the bathroom was not operational at this time.

T. Pratt asked Mr. Cook about the need to make the bathroom operational as part of a retail operation.

R. Cook said the minimum requirement would be to make it operational for the employees; Mr. Halton would not have to provide a bathroom for the general public.

T. Pratt asked the number of employees.

S. Halton said he would be the sole person running the storefront. He said he would have the bathroom operational.

T. Pratt asked about painting the visible portions of the store and asked if Mr. Halton objected.

S. Halton responded that he intends to start painting the storefront next week.

T. Pratt asked about outside lighting. He said he visited the site and noted there were lights under the canopy as well as mounted on the side of the building. He said the only concern regarding lighting was that the lights be converted to dark-sky compliant lighting, whether that would involve modifying what is already there or replacing what is there. He asked Mr. Halton if he had an issue with that.

S. Halton said he will not be using the motion lights on the side of the building and he intends to disconnect the light that lit the New Woodstock Lumber sign on the front of the building, so the only lights he would be using would be the ones under the overhang. He intends to replace those with LED bulbs, but he did not think there would be any issue with light pollution since they shine downward.

T. Pratt asked about parking. He noted the business plan letter mentioned Mr. Halton would like to hold educational seminars, and he wanted to be sure there was adequate parking for such events. He thought the requirement for parking space was one space per 150 SF of retail store. He asked how many spaces would be available. He thought the storefront was about 3000 SF.

S. Halton said the storefront had 3000 SF and there was also parking along the side of the building (to the west) near the trail. He mentioned that alternate parking area would be plowed in the wintertime.

T. Pratt was comfortable with Mr. Halton's working out the parking details with Mr. Cook, believing handicap-accessible parking would need to be included as well. He then asked about signage. He presumed Mr. Halton would be replacing the current signage for the lumber company, and instructed Mr. Halton that the requirement would be no larger than 24 SF. He asked if Mr. Halton was planning on installing a new sign.

S. Halton affirmed he would be, saying the sign would be smaller than 24 SF. He said there is currently an additional square sign on the building which he thinks is a trusted hardware sign. He will be removing that sign and putting his new sign in its place. He will also be eliminating the New Woodstock Lumber sign.

T. Pratt asked if Mr. Halton would be storing hemp on the premises.

S. Halton said at this time, hemp would not be stored on the premises.

T. Pratt asked Mr. Halton's plan for refuse and garbage.

S. Halton said he already contacted H&R Refuse about having a dumpster on site and collection.

T. Pratt assumed the dumpster would be enclosed/sufficiently shielded so as to be concealed.

S. Halton responded that he would locate it behind the building so that it would not be seen from the road.

T. Pratt asked Mr. Cook if he any issue with that.

R. Cook said the law requires that the dumpster be enclosed. He said it was fine locating it behind the building, but it still needed to be enclosed.

S. Halton said he would do that.

T. Pratt asked about the piece of equipment mentioned in Mr. Halton's letter dated June 11, 2020, wondering if that would be displayed inside or outside the building.

S. Halton expressed confusion about which piece of equipment, not having the business plan letter with him.

V. Koch clarified that it was Bobcat equipment.

S. Halton said those would be floor models; he would not be operating any machines.

T. Pratt said he was concerned about equipment being exhibited or displayed outside the building.

S. Halton said he would have the equipment inside the building.

T. Pratt asked how often Mr. Halton anticipates hosting seminars/events and about the attendance he anticipates having.

S. Halton replied he would like to have one seminar per month, and he did not expect to have more than ten (10) people in attendance at any one time. He said he was willing to limit attendance according to what the Board considers suitable for the parking and the space.

T. Pratt asked if Mr. Halton anticipates the need for amplified sound or would be producing any objectionable noises at the events.

S. Halton answered, "Not at this time." He explained there would be a bale of hemp used for educational purposes, so people could see and touch it, but he would generally be using a projector. He would have guest speakers once a month as well. He added the seminars would be held inside the building.

T. Pratt asked Mr. Mason his thoughts.

G. Mason said Mr. Pratt had hit upon a number of the things he was going to ask. He said the letter actually states the business hours would be 10:00 A.M. – 6:00 P.M. rather than 5:00 P.M. He said he had wondered about the size of the events in regard to attendance and frequency since the letter stated it would be once/month or bimonthly. He wondered which it would be. He also wanted to know with certainty that equipment would not be displayed outside, wanting to be sure the neighbors would not have an issue in the future.

S. Halton said he did not want to have equipment outside either. He said if anything were to change, he had no issue speaking with the Board and the neighbors again.

T. Pratt asked the other Board members if they had any additional concerns or questions.

J. Anderson, V. Koch, and J. Wigge all expressed that their concerns had been addressed.

D. Silverman said he too had visited the site and was able to speak to Mr. Halton who showed him the facility at the time. He said the building had been around for quite some time, and it has been vacant for quite a while, so he thought this was a good first step to utilize the space, generate revenue, and to acquaint the neighborhood with Mr. Halton’s business plans and operation. He was strongly in favor of “the step approach” - advancing the business one step at a time.

T. Pratt invited the public comment regarding the operation of the business strictly for the retail storefront.

Hearing no comment from the audience, T. Pratt said his final comment was that Mr. Halton understand that an approval for the storefront was not a guarantee that there would be an approval for the manufacturing in the future. If and when the manufacturing proposal was submitted, it would be evaluated independently and individually, on its own merits, and separate from the retail, storefront use.

S. Halton said he understood.

T. Pratt asked about the storage building at the back of the property, assuming nothing would be stored there at this point.

S. Halton affirmed nothing would be stored there at this time.

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

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

In reviewing the Short Environmental Assessment Form (SEAF), J. Langey said the State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) was now amended for the retail only portion of the proposal. In reviewing Part 2 of the SEAF, impacts were found to be “no impact” for all items.

J. Langey then listed the conditions of the approval. At this time, there would be no processing pursued at this facility and the Applicant understood should he like to go forward with that pursuit in the future,

he will return to the Zoning Board of Appeals for an independent consideration that would be based upon its own merits. The hours and days of operation would be 10:00 A.M – 6:00 P.M. Thursdays and Fridays; 10:00 A.M – 4:00 P.M Saturdays. He will be utilizing certain existing lighting limited to the lighting under the overhang, which will be replaced with LED lighting and will be dark-sky compliant prior to usage.

T. Pratt interjected that in addition it should be noted that the lighting on the back portion of the building will not be used.

J. Langey made that notation and he continued by saying prior to commencement of operation, the bathroom will be made operational. That will be confirmed by the Town. At this time, the Applicant represents that he will be the only employee. At this time the Applicant represents that there will be a painting of a portion of the building. Seminars will be conducted on site and associated parking for the seminars will be sufficient to accommodate the attendees. Currently 20 parking spaces will be provided for and Mr. Cook will confirm adequate parking exists, including handicap parking required by Code. Signage will be equal to or less than 24 square feet.

T. Pratt added that signage should be reviewed by Mr. Cook also.

J. Langey made that notation and continued by saying the unused space in the rear of the building will be for the storage of equipment, but not hemp. Refuse and garbage will be collected in a dumpster and picked up weekly.

S. Halton said when he called to arrange for a dumpster, he asked for the smallest commercial size, and was told he would probably need pick up every other week since he will be the sole employee. He said he did not want garbage accumulating, so if the Board requires weekly pick-up he was agreeable.

J. Langey said he would word the condition to read that garbage pick-up would be no less than every other week.

T. Pratt asked that language be added so that if garbage accumulates quicker, it would be collected out of schedule.

J. Langey said he would add that language as well. He went on to say the dumpster area is to be enclosed and concealed behind the building. There will be no outside storage or display of equipment. Educational seminars are anticipated to be one time per month and the number of attendees cannot exceed the available parking. There will be no amplified sound at this time. Educational seminars will be conducted inside the building.

T. Pratt asked if the storefront area was designated by a concrete block wall inside the building.

S. Halton said that was correct.

T. Pratt asked if the 3000 SF was an approximate or a measured area.

S. Halton said it was an approximation.

T. Pratt said a usual condition was compliance with the Town and the New York State Building Code.

J. Langey agreed.

T. Pratt asked if Mr. Langey captured that there would be no storage of hemp on site.

J. Langey said he had written no storage of hemp inside the building, and that there was no storage of any kind to be outside the building, but he offered to include more specific language to clarify that point. He stated Mr. Halton is free to return for additional approvals in the future.

V. Koch noted Mr. Halton indicated he would have a bale of hemp inside the building for demonstration and wanted to be sure that would be allowed under the proposed conditions.

J. Langey said that would be allowed.

Motion by G. Mason, seconded by J. Anderson to appoint the Zoning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration, based upon the Board’s review of the SEAF, and to approve the special use permit for storefront retail operation with the conditions previously stated by Mr. Langey and confirmed by Chairman Pratt was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.



*Revelle, Thomas & Wardell, Jennifer - #20-1276 – Area Variance – 3573 West Lake Road,
(David Silverman) Cazenovia*

Thomas Revelle and Jennifer Wardell were present to represent the file.

T. Pratt displayed drawings entitled *Addition for Revelle SD1.0, SD1.1, SD1.2 & SD 1.3* by Harmony Architectural Associates as well as a photograph from the vantage point of looking North on West Lake

Road. He said the existing house is 55 feet from the center of the road, not the required 85 feet. He said the proposed connector between the house and the proposed garage would be 64 feet from the center of the road, the proposed garage addition would be 72 feet from the center of the road (and the proposed covered storage area would be 73 feet from the center of the road). He noted that Mr. Revelle cited a power easement and a leach field as issues that forced the designed location of the development and asked Mr. Revelle to explain his proposal.

T. Revelle said they purchased the house about a year ago and moved into the house in March. He said the house was built in the 1850's, fell into disrepair, and was recently lovingly restored as a farmhouse by Brian Coughlin. He said the downside was that there was no garage and the house was relatively small. The connector would provide a proper entrance to the house, a mudroom, and a pantry off the kitchen. The garage would provide storage for the vehicles as well as other items that are currently stored in the yard.

T. Pratt reminded the Board about the subdivision of the property Mr. Coughlin had done recently. He asked if the setback rendering was current and coincided with the subdivision.

T. Revelle said it was.

T. Pratt asked if the side yard property line shown was the current property line, to ensure the side yard setback measurements were accurate.

After some examination, Mr. Revelle affirmed it was.

T. Pratt then reiterated the amount of relief for the three areas proposed.

T. Revelle explained the third area would be covered storage.

D. Silverman said his thought was how the project could be done without seeking relief. After examination of the proposal, he noted the utility easement, which he assumed was for National Grid and perhaps the cable companies, he thought there might be the prospect in the future of perhaps water and sewer connection, and he noted leach fields at the back of the property. He wondered if the project could be located any further from the road.

T. Revelle said the leach field was behind where the proposed garage would be located.

D. Silverman asked if there was any possibility of bringing the project into greater conformity.

T. Revelle said a challenge of that was topography since the house is on a hill. He said the grades drop significantly and fill will be required to locate the addition as proposed. He said another issue is the location of the septic system which he estimated to be about 15 feet behind the proposed location of the garage.

D. Silverman noted the addition will be in greater conformity than the existing structure.

T. Revelle mentioned their proposal would be more conforming than what had existed before Mr. Coughlin renovated.

D. Silveman presumed the project would be architecturally more pleasing.

G. Mason commented that the amount of relief was less than what he first thought. He said when he drove by the site, he noticed the drop-off behind the house. He thought perhaps the connector could be set back further from the road, but otherwise he said he was good with the proposal.

J. Wigge asked for clarification of the variance requested, wondering if it was 21 feet or 12 feet.

T. Pratt believed the variance would be for 21 feet since that was the greatest relief needed for the three varying areas.

J. Langey explained there would be three (3) specified amounts of relief for the three (3) sections within the addition. The mudroom would require 21 feet; the garage would require 13 feet; and the storage area would require 12 feet.

R. Cook agreed.

J. Wigge felt the variance was significant. He agreed that aesthetically the proposal would be a nice addition, but a request for 25% relief concerned for him.

T. Revelle explained the original structure had a covered space where they propose to locate the connector which had been only 55 feet from the road, so this proposal would improve upon what had existed before Mr. Coughlin remodeled.

J. Wigge responded he was considering what exists now and the amount of relief requested for the proposed addition.

T. Pratt felt the issue to consider was the factors driving the location of the project. He felt the hill as well as the location dictate where the addition can be constructed. He did not see an alternative short of moving the septic system.

J. Wigge agreed the location was limited. He said that raised the question of whether the proposal could be done if no variance was given, saying he did not feel there was “any other place you could put this.”

T. Revelle agreed stating they had given a lot of consideration to the location.

T. Pratt asked if it could go on the other side of the house.

T. Revelle said the current entrance to the house is located where the connector was proposed. The living room was on the other side of the house. The cellar entrance was also there. He felt the floor plan of the house was not conducive to an addition on that side.

J. Wigge asked about the safety issue of having the addition closer to the road.

V. Koch pointed out the largest section of the addition, the garage, would only require a 13-foot variance. He said the mudroom requiring 21 feet of relief was a small section of the project. The garage would require 15% relief.

J. Wigge commented that a smaller variance was easier for him to approve.

V. Koch wondered if the covered storage area could be pushed back and brought into compliance.

T. Revelle said pushing that section of construction back would encroach into the utility easement.

T. Pratt thought it might be pushed back a little more without encroaching into the easement.

T. Revelle responded any shift in location would make the grade more challenging.

T. Pratt referred to the photograph to visualize the drop-off.

V. Koch said it was just a suggestion.

D. Silverman said he would not split hairs asking the Applicant to move the storage area back two (2) feet. He said he was pleased with the improvement of the property that had been marginal. He thought the plan was pleasing architecturally. He did not see the storage area an issue. He said once the Board reaches a consensus, he would be happy to move the project forward.

J. Anderson said he was inclined to agree with Mr. Silverman. He said the property was “difficult to work with to begin with,” and felt the plan was good.

T. Pratt noticed it appears there would be horizontal siding on the connector, matching the horizontal siding on the house but vertical siding on the garage. He asked the reasoning for that.

T. Revelle said he wanted to distinguish between the house and garage by making the garage appear more like an attached barn. He is planning on using vertical shiplap barn board which they will stain in a complementary color. The house will be its own entity visually with cedar clapboard siding, and the garage will be a separate but connected entity visually. The garage will have the same roof as the house.

T. Pratt asked about the color, not wanting it to appear vastly contrasting from the green house.

T. Revelle thought they might paint it white or off-white to match the trim of the house. He said it would be a complementary treatment.

T. Pratt asked that it be “something sensitive.” His second item was concerning the garage doors. He wondered if they could be carriage-style doors since they will be facing the street.

T. Revelle said that was what they were planning.

T. Pratt said carriage doors often have an arch making the shape less sharp and angular.

T. Revelle said the garage they had previously built had those doors, matching the architecture of that house. He felt, because this house is angular, they would want to opt not to use arched doors. He said if it was a requirement to have arched doors, they would abide by that, but they had considered the option from an architectural standpoint and decided otherwise for this project. He said their choice was nice, carriage-style doors with hardware and the windows.

T. Pratt understood, but thought perhaps the arched-style would add to the garage looking like a separate entity.

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

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

T. Pratt asked if there were any public comments for or against this project.

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

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

T. Pratt reviewed the five criteria for the granting of area variances. In response to the question ‘is it an undesirable change to the neighborhood,’ he thought they were on an isolated section of West Lake

Road and therefore it was not a significant change to the neighborhood. Addressing other options, they noted there was a septic system and a hill that prevented the location from being placed farther back on the property. He added the build line was behind the line of the existing house which was a plus. The percentage of relief requested was between 15% - 24%. Regarding physical and environmental conditions, he did not think it presented any such issues. He asked Mr. Revelle about the drainage in that area.

T. Revelle said there will be some regrading, so they will be careful to ensure drainage will be away from the house.

T. Pratt said there would be a little bit of an affect regarding drainage then.

T. Revelle said it would not be changing any drainage patterns that already exist.

R. Cook agreed.

T. Pratt said it was certainly recognized as being a self-created hardship. He said two (2) of the five (5) items have a negative impact with three (3) having none.

It was repeated that 21 feet, 13 feet, and 12 feet of relief are being sought.

J. Langey said for the purposes of SEQR this will be considered an Unlisted Action and he reviewed Part 2 of the SEAF finding all answers to the questions being “no or small impact,” according to Chairman Pratt. He said Chairman Pratt has already asked the questions for the Board to determine if the benefit to the Applicant outweighs any perceived detriment to the community or neighborhood.

Motion by D. Silverman, seconded by J. Anderson, to appoint the Zoning Board as Lead Agency for the purposes of the SEQR, to affirm the matter an Unlisted Action and make a Negative Declaration, based upon the Board’s review of the SEAF, and to approve the area variance for the structures to be located as depicted in the submitted plans with the stated setbacks thereto was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

T. Pratt said a letter and resolution would be sent to outline the approval granted.

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

T. Pratt said the Board will only be seeking to assume Lead Agency for the Type I Action so that the accompanying letter can be issued to the New York State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and any other Interested and Involved Agencies.

J. Langey said his list of potential Involved and Interested Agencies based upon other projects by this business in the past included SHPO, New York State Department of Transportation (DOT), Madison County Planning Board, the Town Planning Board, and the Village of Cazenovia.

It was determined that the application will not be coming before the Town Planning Board so that board will be deleted from the list.

J. Langey asked Mr. Cook if he felt the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) should be included.

R. Cook said there was no wetland or waterway involved in the area where the proposal is taking place.

J. Langey said he would remove the DEC from his list as well. He has already composed the letter to be sent, informing the Board this is a Type I Action due to the proximity of the project to The Maples which is historic. The sending of the notices was built into the motion.

Motion by J. Wigge, seconded by J. Anderson, to designate the Town of Cazenovia Zoning Board of Appeals as Lead Agency, and to identify:

- 1) New York State Historic Preservation Office;
- 2) New York State Department of Transportation;
- 3) Madison County Planning Department; and
- 4) The Village of Cazenovia

as Involved Agencies, or Interested Agencies for this Type I Action was carried as follows:

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes

Town of Cazenovia Zoning Board of Appeals - Meeting Minutes – June 22, 2020

Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.



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

David Silverman	Voted	Yes
Gary Mason	Voted	Yes
Joe Anderson	Voted	Yes
Jim Wigge	Voted	Yes
Thomas Pratt	Voted	Yes.

Sue Wightman, Zoning Board of Appeals Secretary – June 23, 2020