

**Village of Cazenovia Planning Board  
Meeting Minutes (In Person and via Zoom)  
March 8, 2021**

5 Present: Rich Huftalen, Chair; Adam Walburger; Steve McEntee; and Don Raleigh.

Absent: Anne McDowell.

Others Present: James Stokes, Village Attorney; Marlene Westcott; Eric Olsen.

10 3 people were in physical attendance and 4 people were in virtual attendance for a total of 7 people.

\* \* \* \* \*

15 R. Huftalen called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

R. Huftalen asked for any changes to the minutes of December 14, 2020. S. McEntee noted a couple of small typos. R. Huftalen made the motion to approve the minutes with the changes A. Walburger seconded. The motion carried with 3 in favor, 0 opposed.

20 \* \* \* \* \*

**Creekside Dental, 4 Chenango Street, New Sign**

25 R. Huftalen: Thanks to Jim (Stokes) who responded to Bill Carr's (Zoning/Code Enforcement Officer) inquiry and corrected my error. I thought Historic Preservation/Architectural Committee (HPC) was the only approval Mr. Olsen would need. Jim pointed out that because it is in the Creekside District, the freestanding sign is subject to site plan review. Eric Olsen, representing 3iographics & Signs, the sign company for Creekside Dental, forwarded visual depictions of where the sign will be located. It is going to be in the same spot as the existing sign. Mr. Olsen is attesting  
30 that it meets the setback requirements in the Code of 10 feet. Are there any comments from Mr. Olsen? Are there any questions from the Board?

Mr. Olsen: I have not personally been to the site. My assumption is that the 10-foot setback from the road was met because the sign had previously been approved for a permit. I was not aware that it  
35 had been grandfathered in to a less restrictive setback. I have a couple of questions for verification: 1) Regardless of where the new sign is, the general vicinity for the sign going into the current location will meet the minimum 10-foot setback. But I did want to ask how the setback would be measured. Property lines, I get. But when we get involved with streets and roads, sometimes it's the inside of the sidewalk, sometimes it's from the center of the road. I want to make sure that we are  
40 measuring from the appropriate landmark.

R. Huftalen: I believe it is the property line, are we right on that, Jim?

Mr. Stokes: It is the property line, which, in this case, is also the street line. Chenango Street,  
45 technically, is a County road I believe. The only way to verify it would be in the field by survey. The sidewalk would not necessarily be an accurate indicator. That tends to be more the case in the older parts of the Village streets. But it would have to be field verified with a survey.

50 Mr. Olsen: I will probably be, within the next couple of weeks, up at the location. If I find that we are at that 10 or greater mark, then I will confirm that with Bill Carr.

R. Huftalen: I'll make a State Environmental Quality Review (SEQR) determination that this falls under a Type II action under 617.5(c), Section 7, construction of an accessory or non-residential structure involving less than 4,000 square feet. I think that would be the appropriate section, Jim.

55 Mr. Stokes: I think so. We also have our own local classification for signs.

R. Huftalen: In any event, I will make a Type II declaration. Since no other agencies are involved, nor will approval have any significant adverse effect on the environment, no further SEQR action is required.

60 R. Huftalen: I make a motion to approve the application conditioned on the verification by the Zoning/Code Enforcement Officer (Bill Carr) that field verifies the setback is adequate.

65 D. Raleigh: I'll second that.

S. McEntee: Jim sent the information and I couldn't find where the 8-foot height was. I saw 5 foot height at one point and I also saw 24 square feet. Can you help me understand that we are okay here?

70 R. Huftalen: I have the text that I can forward to you where Jim compiled the determination because it referred to several sections of the Code at once. I can forward the correspondence between Bill, Jim, and myself.

75 S. McEntee: You don't need to take the time to forward it. I will take your word for it. That's just what I read and I wanted to make sure I wasn't misunderstanding something.

R. Huftalen: To put your mind further at ease, Steve, it is kind of on the HPC to make the determination. We are doing site plan review and setting up the location and the setbacks. I do have that correspondence and will forward it to you.

80 S. McEntee: The only other point I want to make sure we are clear on is the drawing of the non-illuminated sign showed the ground height and then there is another artificial ground height, kind of at the top of the base. For the height off the ground, we are talking from the ground, right?

85 Mr. Olsen: That's correct. There is a 12-inch masonry base. Then from that elevation another 7 feet to the top of the sign for a total of 8 from the ground.

R. Huftalen: Eric, I know it is beyond our purview, but just getting it into the minutes, did the HPC end up approving the gooseneck version or the LED version for the illumination?

90 Mr. Olsen: The hidden LEDs, in agreement with our request. The gooseneck was going to be a little bit of a clash of style. The down lighting in the eaves of the roofline would be cleaner. It is down lighting and doesn't encumber the design by any external fixtures.

95

R. Huftalen: Back to the motion to approve. We have a second from Don Raleigh. Absent any other questions, I will ask for a vote. All in favor?

The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed.

100

R. Huftalen: Eric, you should be all set. I will contact Bill Carr and let him know we made the approval contingent on his field verification of the setbacks.

105

Mr. Olsen: I appreciate everybody's cooperation via email and the comments that were shared back and forth. It makes the preparation for this meeting a whole lot easier when we are getting that feedback in terms of do's and don'ts. I will get ahold of Bill and let him know that we will coordinate a time for him to get out and maybe put some markings out where we want to have the sign placed so that the lead edge complies with the Code, then I think we are in good shape. I appreciate everybody's help in this process. Thank you.

110

R. Huftalen: I make a motion to adjourn the meeting.

A. Walburger: I second.

115

The motion carried with 4 in favor, 0 opposed. The meeting was adjourned at 7:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

120

Marlene A. Westcott  
Recording Secretary