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

Board Members	**Support Staff**	
Conrad Ziarniak, Chairperson	Keith O'Toole, Town Attorney*	Excused *
Joseph Perry	Stephen Frosini, Code Enforcement*	
Howard Henick	Andrea Bernier, Building Department Clerk	
Peter Connell	Scott Mattison, Town Engineer*	
Colleen Mattison		

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.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Applicant: John Toal
Property Owner: John Toal
Address: 2665 Clarkson Parma TL Rd
Applicant is requesting a detached garage within the front setback not in accordance with Clarkson Town Code 140-23-23.5A (3) Front Yards. They shall not be located in any required front yard area.
C. Ziarniak read the legal notice aloud for the public present
J. Toal said that he was proposing to build a 24 ft by 38ft garage and provided renderings from the log company.
C. Ziarniak asked if the roof would be metal.
J. Toal said yes.
C. Ziarniak asked if there would be utilities.
J. Toal said that he would only have electricity to the garage.
C. Mattison asked if the rendering provided accurately depicts where the windows would be placed
J. Toal said yes.
C. Ziarniak asked if there was any public comment
A. Bernier said yes, a neighbor stopped in to ask where the garage would be placed. With the location shown he was in agreeance.

C. Ziarniak motioned to close the public hearing.
J. Perry seconded.
Unanimously carried.

J. Perry stated that there is a large drop off toward the back of the property, so the location is the best option in this scenario. The appearance is also out of the way to make it match the home.
H. Henick asked what the use of the garage would be for.
J. Toal said that he would use it for larger tools, and his small tractor.
C. Ziarniak said that they would consider the use would be for items incidental to the home.
C. Ziarniak read the questions for determination aloud.
1. What benefit will be derived by the applicant who is seeking this variance?
Applicant stated: "Extra storage space."

C. Ziarniak said that he agrees with the applicant's answer, that the reason for the variance request was adequately described.
2. What undesirable changes will be produced in the character of the neighborhood by the granting of the area variance?
Applicant stated: "None."
C. Ziarniak mentioned that J. Perry had stated that the location of the garage was the best option for the layout of the property; and how the applicant went out of his way to match the garage to the architecture of the home.
C. Ziarniak said that there is a significant amount of buffering of trees surrounding the property.
3. What other methods does the applicant have to achieve the benefit other than the area variance?
Applicant stated: "Build in s location farther from the house and closer to the neighbor."
C. Ziarniak asked if J. Toal could further explain the extent of his thought process to determine whether other locations on the property were not ideal.
J. Toal said that he had not truly explored other options because the back portion of the property was lower than the rest and is wet.
C. Ziarniak said that where he located the garage would have less impact to the neighbors.
4. Is the requested area variance substantial?
Applicant stated: "No."
C. Ziarniak said that he agrees with the applicant's statement.
5. Will the proposed variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood?
Applicant stated: "No."
C. Ziarniak said that he agrees with the applicants' answer because there is no smoke, dust, or fumes produced.
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 stated: "No."
C. Ziarniak said the difficulty was not self-created; the lot has a natural slope to it.
C. Ziarniak motioned that SEQR was determined a type II action not subject to further environmental review.
H. Henick seconded
Unanimously carried.
J. Perry motioned to approve the application with the following conditions:
1. No commercial use of the garage.
2. Down lighting shall be used for illumination outside of the garage
3. The garage shall remain in like new condition
H. Henick seconded.
Unanimously carried.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Applicant: Emilio Sebastian
Property Owner: Jubilee Christian Church
Address: 3565 Lake Rd
Zoning: MU-R

Applicant requesting an area variance for a secondary accessory structure for a storage shed for Jubilee Christian Church not in accordance with Clarkson Town Code 140-23-23.5B (1) One accessory building shall be permitted on any residential lot in the Town of Clarkson
C. Ziarniak read the legal notice aloud for the public present.
E. Sebastian said that he provided the requested materials, the barn would be 20ft by 30ft and would be strictly used for storage.
H. Henick asked if the barn would have electricity.
E. Sebastian said yes.
H. Henick asked if there would be security cameras.
E. Sebastian said not at this point in time but there would be motion lighting.
C. Ziarniak asked if there was public comment .
A. Bernier said no.
C. Ziarniak motioned to close the public hearing.
H. Henick seconded.
Unanimously carried.
P. Connell asked if the other storage on the property was used for hygiene products.
E. Sebastian said yes, and they are requesting a second barn for storage because they can't mix hygiene products and lawn equipment or other items of similar use for the church together.
C. Ziarniak read the questions for determination aloud.
1. What benefit will be derived by the applicant who is seeking this variance?
Applicant stated: "Acquisition of space necessary for better utilization of existing space, enhance operation and function of benefits."
C. Ziarniak said that he agrees with the applicants answer.
2. What undesirable changes will be produced in the character of the neighborhood by the granting of the area variance?
Applicant stated: "None that I am aware of."
C. Ziarniak said that he feels like the barn matches the church.
3. What other methods does the applicant have to achieve the benefit other than the area variance?
Applicant stated: "We have exhausted every bit of space available within our existing building. And know of another solution to our storage problem."
C. Ziarniak said that it seems fair and is behind the front setback avoiding any other need for a variance.
4. Is the requested area variance substantial?
Applicant stated: "No."
C. Ziarniak said that he agrees with the applicants answer.
5. Will the proposed variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood?
Applicant stated: "No."
C. Ziarniak said that the barn doesn't produce smoke, glare or dust so it is not an impact on the environment.
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 stated: "No. As the church grows, items like additional tables, chairs, music and microphone stands and other such objects have no home."
C. Ziarniak said he agrees with the applicant's statement.

C. Ziarniak motioned that SEQR was determined a type II action not subject to further environmental review.
H. Henick seconded
Unanimously carried.
P. Connel motioned to approve the application with the following conditions:
1. Use of the barn shall be in relation to church activities
2. Down lighting shall be used for illumination outside of the barn
3. The barn shall remain in like new condition
H. Henick seconded.
Unanimously carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

Applicant: Joesph Mancini
Property Owner: Joesph Mancini
Address: Lot 5: 053.01-1-2.004 Ridge Rd
Zoning: Lot 5 AR
Applicant requesting relief from the required setback requirement for an AR zoned property.

K. Schultz said that the applicant has been requested to apply to the Zoning Board of Appeals from the original Planning Board application to request a 100ft of relief from the setback required for the proposed home.
C. Ziarniak asked what the reasoning for the relief would provide for the applicant.
K. Schultz said that it would allow the proposed home to be built on the lot, as the zoning has changed from the original zoning that would have allowed it.

C. Mattison motioned for a Public Hearing on November 4.
C. Ziarniak seconded.
Unanimously carried.

REVIEW MINUTES:

C. Mattison motioned to approve the minutes from 9/16/2026.
P. Connell seconded.
Unanimously carried.

ADJOURNMENT:

C. Ziarniak motioned to adjourn at 8:06PM.
J. Perry seconded.
Unanimously carried.

NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals will be Wednesday, October 21, 2026, at 7:00 PM held at the Town Hall.

Respectfully submitted, Andrea Bernier