TOWN OF CLARKSON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING
Held at the Clarkson Town Hall
Wednesday, November 4, 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.

OPEN FORUM:

No Business

PUBLIC HEARING:

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.
C. Ziarniak read the legal notice aloud for the public present
K. Schultz said the original zoning would have allowed them to build on this lot but with the new zoning change has restricted the applicant from building on the lot due to the lot width required.
C. Ziarniak opened the Public Hearing.
No public was present.
C. Ziarniak asked A. Bernier if there was any correspondence regarding this variance.
A. Bernier said no.
C. Ziarniak motioned to close the Public Hearing.
J. Perry seconded.
Unanimously carried.
J. Perry mentioned that this was a side effect of the zoning change.
C. Ziarniak read the questions for determination aloud and applicant answers.
1. What benefit will be derived by the applicant who is seeking this variance?
Applicant stated: "The ability to approve the existing lot for building a new house."
2. What undesirable changes will be produced in the character of the neighborhood by the granting of the area variance?
Applicant stated: "None"
3. What other methods does the applicant have to achieve the benefit other than the area variance?
Applicant stated: "None, he can't purchase adjacent land without causing those properties to fall out of zoning compliance."
4. Is the requested area variance substantial?
Applicant stated: "This lot was zoned RS-20 prior to the 2025 update to the Zoning Map which changed this existing lot to AR- Agricultural/Residential requiring a minimum lot width of 200' instead of 100'. All adjacent lots to the east are zoned RS-20."

5. Will the proposed variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood?
Applicant stated: “No, consistent with adjacent residential development.”
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, created by the change to the zoning district from RS-20 to AR”
C. Ziarniak stated that this was an administrative correction based on the new zoning changes.
C. Ziarniak motioned that SEQR was determined a type II action not subject to further environmental review.
J. Perry seconded
Unanimously carried.
J. Perry motioned to approve the relief from the required lot width to allow the single-family home to be built on this lot.
H. Henick seconded
Unanimously carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

Applicant: Frank Kepler
Property Owner: Frank Kepler
Address: 389 East Ave
Zoning: RS-10
Applicant requesting an area variance to place a shed in the side setback not in accordance with town code 140-23-23.5B(1)(b)
Front yards and side yards. They shall not be located in any required front yard area or side yard area.
C. Ziarniak asked if the siding would be hardy board based on the photo attached to the application.
F. Kepler said that it is T1.11
C. Ziarniak asked if the roof would have shingles.
F. Kepler said yes.
H. Henick asked if F. Kepler had any other accessory structures.
F. Kepler said no, he doesn’t even have a garage. He would like this shed for lawn equipment.
J. Perry asked what the height of the shed is
F. Kepler said that the height to the peak is 11ft.
J. Perry asked why the 22ft from the house amount was chosen.
F. Kepler said that he and his wife marked out where they thought it would look best in the yard.
J. Perry said that there is an open space on that side of the home and the shed being that far could make it look conspicuous.
C. Ziarniak read the questions for determination aloud with the applicants’ answers.
1. What benefit will be derived by the applicant who is seeking this variance?
Applicant stated: “Storage shed in a much more convenient and accessible location nearer to house able to be fenced in and landscaped when possible.”
2. What undesirable changes will be produced in the character of the neighborhood by the granting of the area variance?
Applicant stated: “I know of no desirable effects? * See the map indicating the proposed location of the 10 x 12 storage shed.”
3. What other methods does the applicant have to achieve the benefit other than the area variance?

Applicant stated: “Putting the storage shed in the fenced in area directly behind our home is really not an option, so we would have to place the shed in our open lot to the west of the fence to keep it behind our house.”
4. Is the requested area variance substantial?
Applicant stated: “It doesn’t seem very substantial to me, but I don’t know how you all see it?
5. Will the proposed variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood?
Applicant stated: “I see it as an overall better look and function, rather than placing it in our open lot to the west.”
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: “Not intentionally… with the separation of the garden center and our personal home and lot, we have a need to store the bulky items currently at the garden center on our property… which we have no garage to store things in.”
C. Ziarniak motioned for a Public Hearing on December 2.
H. Henick seconded
Unanimously carried.

REVIEW MINUTES:
C. Ziarniak motioned to approve the minutes from 10/21/2026.
H. Henick seconded.
Unanimously carried.

ADJOURNMENT:
C. Ziarniak motioned to adjourn at 8:05PM.
C. Mattison seconded.
Unanimously carried.

NEXT MEETING:
The next meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals will be Wednesday, November 18, 2026, at 7:00 PM held at the Town Hall.

Respectfully submitted, Andrea Bernier