

TOWN OF CLARKSON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING
Held at the Clarkson Town Hall
Wednesday, May 6, 2026, at 7:00 PM

Board Members

Conrad Ziarniak, Chairperson
Joseph Perry
Howard Henick
Peter Connell*
Colleen Mattison

Support Staff

Keith O'Toole, Town Attorney*
Stephen Frosini, Code Enforcement
Andrea Rookey, Building Department Clerk

Excused *

CALL TO ORDER:

C. Ziarniak called the Zoning Board meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led all those present in the Pledge of Allegiance with a moment of silence for veterans and first responders.

OPEN FORUM:

Millhouse Family Restaurant would like to update their signage

C. Ziarniak said that he would like to give the Board a chance to review this application to determine if it is an 'apples to apples' situation and would need to determine this at the next meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Applicant: Andria & Nick White

Property Owner: Andria & Nick White

Address: 7137 Ridge Rd

Applicant is requesting an area variance to allow a fence in a front yard setback on a corner lot, where the side yard is classified as a front yard under zoning code not in accordance with Clarkson Town codes 140-24-24.2D, Corner lots. Both sides abutting a street, road or highway shall be considered front yards and shall be subject to the front setback requirement and 140-24-24.6P wire fences including chain link fences, shall be prohibited between the front setback line and the highway right-of-way.

C. Ziarniak read the Legal Notice aloud

A. White stated that they would need this fence to help keep the dogs safe but cannot place the fence in the rear yard due to the driveway placement

*No public present

*No correspondence has been received

C. Ziarniak asked if the three sides of the fence, 47Sqft, 38Sqft, 40Sqft are enclosed

A. White said yes

C. Ziarniak asked what the type of fence is proposed and the height of the fence is proposed

A. White said that it is a 4ft black vinyl coated chain-link fence

C. Ziarniak asked if there would be gates

N. White said that there would be roughly 8ft of gate

C. Ziarniak motioned to close the Public Hearing

J. Perry seconded

Unanimously carried

H. Henick read the questions for determination aloud

1. What benefit will be derived by the applicant who is seeking this variance?

Applicant answered: "Fenced area with a doggie door so that the dogs can run free safely and when need to go out."

C. Ziarniak said that a benefit would be to keep the two dogs safe.

2. What undesirable changes will be produced in the character of the neighborhood by the granting of the area variance? Applicant answered: "None. The neighbor West of us, also on the corner, has a fence close to the road. Ours would not be close to the road."

H. Henick said that the other neighbors have fences even closer to the road.

3. What other methods does the applicant have to achieve the benefit other than the area variance? Applicant answered: "None."

H. Henick said that the only other method for the fence does not need a variance would be for the fence to be placed in the rear yard, but it cannot be placed in the rear yard due to the driveway located behind the house.

C. Ziarniak stated that he did some research on electric fences and there is only a 70% effective rate.

N. white said that he is not willing to take the 30% risk due to past experiences with dogs getting out of the electric fence and getting hit on Ridge rd.

4. Is the requested area variance substantial? Applicant answered: "Yes."

H. Henick stated that this is a substantial variance but with breed and size of dogs that they own it would be enough for the dogs to have enough space to run.

J. Perry said that regarding the portion of code where chain-link fences shall be prohibited does not feel like it fits this case.

C. Ziarniak said that if the fence were not chain-link in this area it would stand out more.

5. Will the proposed variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood? Applicant answered: "No."

H. Henick said that there are no wetlands to where the placement of the fence would create an adverse effect.

6. Was the alleged difficulty self-created? Note: If the difficulty was self-created, it is relevant to the decision of the ZBA but does not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance.

Applicant answered: "No."

H. Henick said that the issue of the corner lot was not self-created.

J. Perry mentioned a condition for approval would be to keep the fence in "like new condition"

H. Henick mentioned another condition for approval would be that the gates are secured.

C. Ziarniak motioned SEQR a type II action with no further environmental review

H. Henick seconded

Unanimously carried

J. Perry motioned to approve the 4ft black vinyl coated chain-link fence with the conditions that the fence shall remain in "like new condition" and gates shall be secured.

C. Mattison seconded

Unanimously carried

PUBLIC HEARING:

Applicant: James & Linda Koenig

Property Owner: James & Linda Koenig

Address: 2659 Sweden Walker Rd

Zoning: RS20

Applicant requesting an area variance for a garage less than 10ft from the property line not in accordance with Clarkson Town code 14022D(1)(c)[2] Side: 10 feet

The applicant did not attend the Public Hearing therefore the application is void. Should the applicant wish to proceed in the future, a new fee and application must be submitted at that time.

NEW BUSINESS:

Applicant: Cody Armes

Property Owner: Cody Armes

Address: 1640 Lawrence Rd

Acres: 1.04

Applicant requesting an area variance for a 32'x48' pole barn on his property, not in accordance with Town Code 140-23-23.5B(1)(d) No such building shall be larger than 25% of the square footage of the main building or habitable floor area of the residence upon such lot, or 2% of the lot size, whichever is larger. In no case shall the accessory building exceeded 2,500 square feet in size. Agricultural buildings on working farms are exempt.

C. Armes stated that he has applied for a second driveway to Monroe County and has received approval

H. Henick said that in reference to the code that C. Armes is requesting a variance from that the 2% of the lot is the larger amount and would limit him to 900SqFt

C. Ziarniak said that the goal is to grant the least amount of variance possible, would C. Armes be willing to downsize the barn

C. Armes stated that he has recreational vehicles that would be stored in the proposed barn and lots of incidental house items that would be stored in the barn as well that are currently being stored at his parents' house.

J. Perry asked if there would be utilities running to the barn

C. Armes said that he is planning to run a second utility service and was thinking that he would have water going to the barn via frost proof spicket.

J. Perry mentioned a possible condition for down lighting on the barn to not disturb neighbors

C. Ziarniak asked what the height of the doors are

C. Armes said that the door height is

C. Ziarniak asked if C. Armes could provide a rendering of the barn with dimensions

C. Armes said that he would provide a rendering

C. Ziarniak motioned for a Public Hearing on June 3 at 7:00PM

H. Henick seconded

Unanimously carried

REVIEW MINUTES:

H. Henick motioned to approve the minutes from 4/1/2026 with a correction

C. Mattison seconded

Unanimously carried

H. Henick motioned to approve the minutes from 4/15/2026 with a correction

J. Perry seconded

Unanimously carried

ADJOURNMENT:

C. Ziarniak motioned to adjourn at 8:24PM

J. Perry seconded
Unanimously carried

NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals will be Wednesday, May 20, 2026, at 7:00 PM held at the Town Hall.

Respectfully submitted,
Andrea Rookey