TOWN OF MINA

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES

October 14, 2026

ZBA Members Present: Bryan Allison (Chairman), Travis Anderson, Charles Armstrong

ZBA Members Absent: Chuck Carter, Joe DeBoe

Others Present: Mark Laramie, Sherri Schenk, Gene Blakeslee, Gunnar Bergqvist, Amy Bergqvist, Rebecca Brumagin (Town of Mina Supervisor/ Acting Code Secretary)

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 7:01 pm by Bryan Allison, Chairman.

AI Recording: Charles Armstrong reported that he is recording the proceedings using an artificial intelligence app. This is the first meeting where this is being used and, if the recording is successful, he will share the recording with the acting secretary to assist with the preparation of the minutes.

Public Notice of the meeting was acknowledged*: Post-Journal* 10/3/26, Town of Mina Website (10/13/26) and Town of Mina Official Bulletin Board (10/2/26).

Approval of Minutes: Motion was made by Travis Anderson, with a second by Charles Armstrong, to approve the September 16, 2026 minutes as presented. Motion carried, unanimous.

Approved: Ayes (unanimous) – Allison, Anderson, Armstrong

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS HEARING REQUEST

1. **Applicant – CAROL GILLIGAN – Tabled from the September 16, 2026 meeting.**

Type of Request: **SPECIAL USE PERMIT** to plant five (5) arborvitae trees/bushes along the garage side of the fence across from 2671 Shadyside Road, Findley Lake NY on the empty lot known on the tax map as 359.10-1-6, owned by Carol Gilligan.

Carol Gilligan did not attend the meeting and there was no representative present at the meeting to respond to questions from ZBA members. ZBA Board must approve or deny at this meeting to meet the requirement of a timely decision.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Although he was not representing Ms. Gilligan, Gene Blakeslee shared that he has spoken with her and she told him that after a large tree was removed from the property

DRAFT

that her view of the lake greatly improved and that she no longer plans to plant the arborvitae trees/bushes as she requested in her Special Use Permit application.

Amy Bergqvist, a neighbor, was in attendance and inquired as to how far down the property that the trees would go.

No other written or verbal comments were received from the public.

Motion: *Charles Armstrong moved, and Bryan Allison seconded, a motion to deny the Special Use Permit.*

Motion carried, unanimous.

Denied: Nays (unanimous) – Allison, Anderson, Armstrong

2. **Applicants – MARK and TINA LARAMIE – Revised and Resubmitted Application**
Chairman Allison noted that the Special Use Permit and Area Variance applications were resubmitted after the original Special Use Permit and Area Variance applications were denied. ZBA considered the resubmitted application as there was a miscommunication regarding the need for Mark and/or Tina Laramie or their representative to attend the ZBA meeting held on September 16, 2026 at which time the Special Use Permit was denied and the Area Variance request was automatically rejected.

   Type of Request: **SPECIAL USE PERMIT** was originally requested to construct a 570 square foot accessory building as an attached garage that would be part of an addition to an existing house. Town of Mina Zoning Law limits a garage (attached or detached) to a maximum of 500 square feet in overall size. In the revised application, the structure has been reduced to 500 square feet and fits the definition of a garage, therefore, a special use permit is not required for the garage. However, a new 10' x 16' shed (accessory building) is proposed to be constructed. The Zoning Law requires a Special Use Permit in R2 (Lakeside Residential) for an accessory structure.

   Type of Request: **AREA VARIANCE** to fully renovate an existing 950 +/- square foot house and add 2nd floor, construct a 1,350 +/- sq. ft. two story addition, construct a 500 sq. ft. attached single story garage and construct a new shed (accessory building) 10 ft x 16 ft. Total height of (2) two story addition above existing grade will be +/- 35 feet. The location is 2252 Shadyside Road, Clymer (Findley Lake), NY on the lot known on the tax map as 376.07-1-33, owned by Mark Laramie and Tina Laramie.

   The area variances requested are as follows:

DRAFT

- Height variance of 6 feet (30' maximum allowable, requesting 36')
- Lakeside set back variance of 40 feet (50' minimum allowable, requesting 10')
- Lot width variance of 75 feet (120' minimum allowable, requesting 45')
- Side yard variance of 16 feet (20' minimum allowable, requesting 4')
- North side variance of 8 feet (20' minimum allowable, requesting 12')

No variances were required for maximum lot coverage, minimum road side set back, maximum number of stories and storage space.

For the September 16, 2026 ZBA meeting, Mark & Tina Laramie responded to all of the questions posed by the ZBA on August 19, 2026 with the exception of a question regarding the highest point of the proposed project as it compares to the height of the house located south of the property. Mark Laramie brought a photo of the two houses taken from the lake which showed that the house to the south is higher than the proposed height of the addition to the Laramie house.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Other than comments at the August 19, 2026 ZBA meeting for the prior application, no written or verbal comments were received from the public on this revised application.

DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS FROM THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGARDING THE SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR AN ACCESSORY BUILDING (SHED):

Section 202 page 4 – Definition of Accessory Building/Use – the proposed shed meets the legal definition of an accessory building
R2 Lakeside Residential page 45 – Accessory Building – Uses by Special Use Permit (Hearing Required)
Section 611: Lakeshore Regulations page 79 – Accessory Building considerations:

1. Visibility from adjacent parcels - Limited
2. Structure is sufficiently anchored to prevent movement due to wind, high waters, etc. – Not an issue
3. Structure does not extend beyond the natural high-water shoreline – It does not extend to the shoreline
4. Other reasonable conditions deemed necessary – None identified

Section 601 General Development Conditions: B page 70 – Areas of Concern:

1. Traffic – No concern
2. Safety – Dwellings are close together; 30 feet structure to structure
3. Health – None identified
4. Character of Neighborhood – None identified
5. Public Costs – None identified
6. Environmental Protection – None identified
7. Nuisance – Don't know if this would be a problem

DRAFT

8. Land Use Preservation – None identified
9. Aesthetics – None identified – Siding will be the same as the house, shed is for storage only, any electricity installed will be for lights inside the shed, there will be no windows in the shed

THE ZONING BOARD CONSIDERED THE FOLLOWING FOR THE SPECIAL USE PERMIT:

1. The location and size of the use, the nature and intensity of the operations involved, the size of the site in relation to it, and the location of the site with respect to the existing or future streets giving access to it, shall be such that it will be in harmony with the orderly development of the district and the location, nature and height of buildings, walls and fences will **not** discourage the appropriate development and use of adjacent land and buildings or impair the value thereof.
   All ZBA members agreed – Yes.
2. The operations in connection with any special use shall not be more objectionable to nearby properties by reason of noise, fumes, vibrations, or lights than would be the operations of any permitted use.
   All ZBA members agreed – Yes.
3. Conditions:
   a. The Permitting Board has referred to General Conditions in the Zoning Law.
      All ZBA members agreed – Yes.
   b. A plan for the proposed development of a site for designated special use was submitted with the application and shows the location of all buildings, lots, parking areas, traffic access and circulation drives, open spaces, landscaping and any other pertinent information that the Permitting Board deems necessary.
      Revised exhibit provided - All ZBA members agreed – Yes.
   c. There are no existing violations of the Zoning Law on the property where the Special Use Permit is being requested.
      All ZBA members agreed – Yes.

Motion: *Charles Armstrong moved, and Travis Anderson seconded, a motion to approve the Special Use Permit.*

Motion carried, unanimous.

Approved: Ayes (unanimous) – Allison, Anderson, Armstrong

DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS FROM THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGARDING THE AREA VARIANCE APPLICATION:

Considerable discussion was held on each of the four area variances requested. Various questions were posed to Mark Laramie and he responded to ZBA members.

DRAFT

THE ZONING BOARD CONSIDERED THE FOLLOWING FOR THE AREA VARIANCES:

1. Would an undesirable change be produced in the character of the neighborhood, or would a detriment to nearby properties be created by the granting of the area variance?
   All ZBA members agreed – No, it would not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. There is no house behind them.

2. Can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved by some method feasible for the applicant to pursue other than an area variance?
   All ZBA members agreed – No, it could not be achieved by some other method.

3. Is the requested area variance substantial?
   All ZBA members agreed – Yes, there are a large number of area variances requested and some of them are substantial.

4. Would the proposed variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district?
   All ZBA members agreed – No, it would not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.

5. Would the alleged difficulty be self-created, which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance?
   All ZBA members agreed – Yes, the alleged difficulty is self-created as the applicant knew the size of the lot at the time of purchase.

   Motion: *Travis Anderson moved, and Bryan Allison seconded, a motion to approve the Area Variances as follows:*

   - *Height variance of 6 feet (30' maximum allowable, requesting 36')*
   - *Lakeside set back variance of 40 feet (50' minimum allowable, requesting 10')*
   - *Lot width variance of 75 feet (120' minimum allowable, requesting 45')*
   - *Side yard variance of 16 feet (20' minimum allowable, requesting 4')*

   Motion carried, unanimous.

   Approved: Ayes (unanimous) – Allison, Anderson, Armstrong

DRAFT

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS HEARING REQUEST

3. **Applicants – ERIC AND KATHRYN NORTON**

Type of Request: **AREA VARIANCE** to construct a 9' x 16' addition onto an existing residence in R2 Lakeside Residential to use as a utility room, laundry, and bathroom at 2210 Shadyside Road on the lot known on the tax map as 376.07-1-46, owned by Eric V. Norton and Kathryn E. Norton.

Contractor Gene Blakeslee represented Eric and Kathryn Norton. He reviewed the planned addition to the residence that included a revamped entrance with a utility room, laundry and bathroom. The addition is 9' x 16', is 30' from the road and 35' from the lake high water. The owners are drilling a new well. The house is on a concrete slab and the proposed addition is the best way to add onto the existing house. The addition will be at ground level.

The area variances requested are as follows:

- Lot size variance of 4,000 feet (20,000 minimum allowable, requesting 16,190)
- Lakeside set back variance of 15 feet (50' minimum allowable, requesting 35')
- Roadside set back variance of 10 feet (40' minimum allowable, requesting 30')

DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS FROM THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGARDING THE AREA VARIANCE:

Section 403 page 45 – Lakeside Residential (R2) Dwelling Unit is a Use by Right
Section 601 General Development Conditions: B page 70 – Areas of Concern:

1. Traffic – None identified
2. Safety – None identified
3. Health – None identified
4. Character of Neighborhood – None identified
5. Public Costs – None identified
6. Environmental Protection – None identified
7. Nuisance – None identified
8. Land Use Preservation – None identified
9. Aesthetics – None identified

PUBLIC COMMENT:

No written or verbal comments were received from the public. There were no comments from the floor.

THE ZONING BOARD CONSIDERED THE FOLLOWING FOR THE AREA VARIANCES:

1. Would an undesirable change be produced in the character of the neighborhood, or would a detriment to nearby properties be created by the granting of the area variance?

DRAFT

All ZBA members agreed – No, it would not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties.

2. Can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved by some method feasible for the applicant to pursue other than an area variance?
   All ZBA members agreed – No, it could not be achieved by some other method.

3. Is the requested area variance substantial?
   ZBA members responded: Allison – Yes, Anderson – No, Armstrong – No.

4. Would the proposed variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district?
   All ZBA members agreed – No, it would not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.

5. Would the alleged difficulty be self-created, which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance?
   ZBA members responded: Allison – Yes, Anderson – No, Armstrong – No.

   Motion: *Charles Armstrong moved, and Travis Anderson seconded, a motion to approve the Area Variances as follows:*

   - *Lot size variance of 4,000 feet (20,000 minimum allowable, requesting 16,190)*
   - *Lakeside set back variance of 15 feet (50' minimum allowable, requesting 35')*
   - *Roadside set back variance of 10 feet (40' minimum allowable, requesting 30')*

   Motion carried, unanimous.

   Approved: Ayes (unanimous) – Allison, Anderson, Armstrong

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS HEARING REQUEST

4. Applicant – PATRICK McDERMOTT

Type of Request: **AREA VARIANCE** as part of the plan to construct a new residence to replace an existing residence that will be demolished at 2287 Shadyside Road in R1 Residential on the lot known on the on the tax map as 376.07-1-54, owned by Patrick McDermott. The applicant also intends on removing the existing shed behind the house.

DRAFT

Contractor Gene Blakeslee represented Patrick McDermott. He described the condition of the existing house and the necessity to have it demolished as opposed to remodeled. It has significant structural issues and the intent is to build a new residence that has a similar rustic style. The new residence will be a two story 36' x 32' barn home with a gambrel roof with large front dormer. The detailed plans of the first and second floors along with an image of the proposed new structure were included in the application packet.

The area variances requested are as follows:

- East side yard setback variance of 10 feet (20' minimum allowable, requesting 10') – the existing house is currently 5' from the east side property line
- Rear yard setback variance of 3 feet (40' minimum allowable, requesting 37')

No variances were required for lot width, lot size, maximum lot coverage, or minimum road side set back.

DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS FROM THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS REGARDING THE AREA VARIANCE:

Section 401 page 36 – Residential (R1) District – Project fits the purpose of the R1 District
Section 401 page 38 – Residential (R1) District – Area standards were reviewed

PUBLIC COMMENT:
No written or verbal comments were received from the public. There were no comments from the floor.

THE ZONING BOARD CONSIDERED THE FOLLOWING FOR THE AREA VARIANCES:

1. Would an undesirable change be produced in the character of the neighborhood, or would a detriment to nearby properties be created by the granting of the area variance?
   All ZBA members agreed – No, it would not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties.

2. Can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved by some method feasible for the applicant to pursue other than an area variance?
   All ZBA members agreed – No, it could not be achieved by some other method.

3. Is the requested area variance substantial?
   ZBA members responded: Allison – Yes (side yard), Anderson – No, Armstrong – No.

DRAFT

4. Would the proposed variance have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district?
   All ZBA members agreed – No, it would not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.

5. Would the alleged difficulty be self-created, which consideration shall be relevant to the decision of the Board of Appeals but shall not necessarily preclude the granting of the area variance?
   All ZBA members agreed – Yes, the alleged difficulty is self-created.

   Motion: *Charles Armstrong moved, and Bryan Allison seconded, a motion to approve the Area Variances as follows:*

   - *East side yard setback variance of 10 feet (20' minimum allowable, requesting 10') – the existing house is currently 5' from the east side property line*
   - *Rear yard setback variance of 3 feet (40' minimum allowable, requesting 37').*

   Motion carried, unanimous.

   Approved: Ayes (unanimous) – Allison, Anderson, Armstrong

Other Business:

Acting Code Secretary: Town Supervisor Rebecca Brumagin reported that she met with Autumn Boardman who is currently the Supervisor's Bookkeeper and the Code Enforcement Assistant. Ms. Boardman is willing to serve as the Code Secretary if ZBA members are able to move ZBA meetings to a night other than Wednesdays as she has a standing obligation on Wednesday evenings. The ZBA members in attendance expressed a willingness to change the meetings to Thursdays.

Next Scheduled Hearing Date: The next ZBA meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 19, 2026 with the cut-off date to accept applications of Monday, November 2, 2026.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 8:23 pm upon motion by Bryan Allison and second by Travis Anderson.

Recorded by: Rebecca Brumagin, Town Supervisor/Acting Code Secretary

DRAFT