

A regular meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals was held on Thursday, August 13th, 2026 at the Mendon Town Hall, 16 West Main Street, Honeoye Falls, NY 14472 at 7:00 pm.

PRESENT: Chris Mahood - Chair
Jeff Johnston
Vince Dick
David McInnis
Adam Toy

ATTORNEY: David Hou

OTHERS: Jesse Cook – Geotherm Inc.
David & Teresa Ainsworth
Kim Roberts – Town Councilperson
Chris Stanton

Mr. Mahood started the meeting at 7:00 pm.

Minutes were taken by Brooke Buckland, Secretary to Planning and Zoning Board.

APPROVE JULY 23rd, 2026 MEETING MINUTES

The meeting was called to order. The first item on the agenda was the review and approval of the minutes from July 23rd, 2026. The board members confirmed they had reviewed the minutes.

Motion to approve the minutes from the July 23rd, 2026 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting was made by Mr. Johnston and second by Mr. McInnis.

Mr. Mahood – aye; Mr. Johnston – aye; Mr. Dick – ay, Mr. McInnis – aye; Mr. Toy – Aye.

AINSWORTH AREA VARIANCE

David & Teresa Ainsworth, of 1680 West Bloomfield Road, Honeoye Falls, NY, for the installation of ground mounted solar arrays. The applicants are seeking relief from *Chapter 260 – 8(C)(3)* of the Town Code, which limits accessory structure lot coverage to 2%. The proposed solar arrays would result in accessory lot coverage exceeding the maximum permitted amount by approximately 348 sq feet. Zoned RA-5. Tax account no. 230.01-1-29.1.

Mr. Mahood noted that Mr. David Ainsworth and Ms. Teresa Ainsworth had previously appeared before the Board at the July 23rd meeting, and that the public hearing had been left open pending further information. The applicants returned this evening with an amended site plan reflecting a revised panel location on the property.

Jesse Cook, representing the applicants on behalf of Geotherm Inc., presented the updated proposal. He explained that since the last hearing, the applicants had met with the

neighboring property owner to the east and walked the property together. The result was a mutually agreed-upon location for the solar arrays that is not visible from that neighbor's house. Mr. Cook shared a drone photograph taken from the height of the proposed panels, approximately 8 feet, demonstrating that the neighboring residence could not be seen from the installation point.

Teresa Ainsworth clarified that the arrays would be situated behind the neighbor's hedgerow and tree line, with only the neighbor's barn, not the house, visible from that vantage point.

Mr. Mahood observed that the revised location also reduced visibility from the road due to the natural topography, noting the site sits within a depression.

Ms. Ainsworth further offered to provide additional landscaping, such as dwarf spruce plantings, if the neighbor desired further visual screening, and communicated that offer directly to them.

Mr. Dick acknowledged a prior written objection from a resident at 43 Parish Road, who had raised concerns about visual impact.

Mr. Mahood assured that this property is at a considerable distance from the site.

The Board agreed the revised location substantially addressed that concern as well. No further correspondence from the public had been received by the Board.

Mr. Cook also addressed a question regarding panel reflectivity, confirming that the panels are equipped with an anti-reflective coating, meaning they absorb rather than reflect sunlight.

Mr. Mahood asked if there was any public comment.

There was no public comment.

Motion to close the public hearing open was made by Mr. Dick and second by Mr. Toy.

Mr. Mahood – aye; Mr. Johnston – aye; Mr. Dick – aye, Mr. McInnis – aye; Mr. Toy – aye.

Motion to approve the Ainsworth Area Variance was made by Mr. Dick and second by Mr. McInnis.

Mr. Mahood – aye; Mr. Johnston – aye; Mr. Dick – aye, Mr. McInnis – aye; Mr. Toy – aye.

AINSWORTH AREA VARIANCE DETERMINATION

Vince Dick moved, seconded by David McInnis that the area variance requested by Jesse Cook/Geotherm, Inc., on behalf of the owner Teresa Ainsworth (the “Applicant”), for property located at 1680 West Bloomfield Road, Tax ID No. 230.01-1-29.1 (the “Property”), zoned RA-5, to allow the installation of an accessory structure, specifically, a ~655 sq. ft. ground-mounted solar panel array which would cause the total accessory structure lot coverage to exceed 2% by ~389 sq. ft., be GRANTED based on the following:

WHEREAS, Town Code Section 260-8(C)(3) limits the total area of accessory structures to no more than 2% of the total lot area; and

WHEREAS, the Property is 9.96 acres (~433,857.6 sq. ft), and there is an existing pool (~559 sq. ft.), a barn (~994 sq. ft.), and a tennis court (~6851 sq. ft.) on the lot, totaling 8408 sq. ft.; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant proposes to install a 41’ 5” x. 15’ 10” ground-mounted solar array, as depicted in the site design plans submitted by the Applicant dated December 2, 2025, and as subsequently amended as submitted August 11, 2026, and which would increase the total accessory structure coverage of the lot to ~2.08%; and

WHEREAS, the above property owner appeared before the Zoning Board of Appeals at the public hearing on the application on July 23, 2026 and August 13, 2026; and

WHEREAS, this application was sent to the ZBA’s attorney and the Town Code Enforcement Officer for review; and

WHEREAS, this application was sent to the Monroe County Planning Board for review pursuant to General Municipal Law 239-m, and the application was returned as a local matter with comments; and

WHEREAS, the ZBA held a public hearing and the public was given the opportunity to comment on the application; and

WHEREAS, the ZBA has considered the application and any submissions by interested parties as part of the record of these proceedings;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this application constitutes a Type II action under SEQRA and no further environmental review is required;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the ZBA has weighed the effects of the requested variance against the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and community, and hereby GRANTS the requested variance based on the following findings:

1. The requested benefit **CAN** be achieved by other feasible means because there are alternative ways to stay under the 2% limit, such as smaller panels or reducing the size of other accessory structures.

2. The request **IS NOT** substantial because the amount of the overage is minimal.
3. The request **WILL NOT** have an undesirable change in the neighborhood because the Applicant conferred with neighbors and relocated the structure to accommodate any material concerns regarding visual impacts.
4. The request **WILL NOT** have an adverse effect on the physical and/or environmental conditions of the neighborhood or district because related infrastructure is buried and the panels and ground screws will be used for installation.
5. The difficulty **IS** self-created because the Applicant desires to install the solar array which would exceed the lot coverage limit for accessory structures.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this approval is conditioned upon the following conditions, (if any):

The panels shall be no higher than 8' tall, as proposed by Applicant.

Following discussion on this Resolution, the following roll call vote was taken and recorded:

Christian Mahood Aye
Vince Dick Aye
Jeffrey Johnston Aye
David McInnis Aye
Adam Toy Aye

Approved: 5 Ayes, 0 Nays

STANTON AREA VARIANCE

Chris Stanton, of 150 Drumlin View Drive, Mendon, NY, requesting relief from *Chapter 260 – 106* and *Chapter 260-8 (C)(3)* to install a prefabricated wooden storage shed, with a side and rear setback of 12", whereas code requires a 15 – foot side setback and a 20 – foot rear setback. Zoned RS-30. Tax account no. 216.12-1-28.

Motion to open the public hearing open was made by Mr. Mahood and second by Mr. Dick.

Mr. Mahood – aye; Mr. Johnston – aye; Mr. Dick – aye, Mr. McInnis – aye; Mr. Toy – aye.

Mr. Stanton explained that his property is a corner lot, which substantially limits the available locations for any accessory structure. He presented a photograph of the proposed shed, noting

it is identical in appearance to his existing home. He indicated the intended placement is in the innermost corner of the rear yard, where it would not be visible from either of the two adjacent roads. A cluster of mature pine trees on the neighboring property, along with the neighbor's pool fence, provides natural screening from view. Mr. Stanton confirmed that he had spoken with both adjacent neighbors, who did not object to the placement.

Mr. Stanton described the topographical challenges of the lot, noting a significant slope toward the rear of the property that makes alternative locations impractical. He stated that the chosen corner represents the only level area that could accommodate the structure without major grading. He also noted that placing the shed in any other location would likely require a variance regardless, given the corner lot configuration and the code's treatment of road-facing setback lines.

Mr. Stanton explained that he plans to include an opening or gate in a future privacy fence at the location of the pine trees to allow access for trimming and upkeep, without needing to enter neighboring properties. He confirmed he does not intend to bring a mower into the 12-inch space, only a trimmer.

Mr. Vince Dick inquired whether the 12-inch clearance would be sufficient for maintenance without encroaching on neighboring properties.

Mr. Stanton confirmed his intent, adding that one of the neighboring fences in the area is in poor condition and will be taken down cooperatively with that neighbor, after which a new fence solely on Mr. Stanton's property will be constructed and connected to the shed.

The Board raised the question of property line accuracy, given the tight 12-inch tolerance and suggested that the property lines should be formally surveyed before installation to ensure there is no inadvertent encroachment.

Mr. Stanton confirmed he had already been attempting to reach the surveying firm and intended to have the property lines officially marked prior to any construction.

Mr. Mahood asked if there was any public comment.

There was no public comment.

Motion to close the public hearing open was made by Mr. Johnston and second by Mr. Dick.

Mr. Mahood – aye; Mr. Johnston – aye; Mr. Dick – aye, Mr. McInnis – aye; Mr. Toy – aye.

Motion to approve the Stanton Area Variance was made by Mr. Toy and second by Mr. Dick.

Mr. Mahood – aye; Mr. Johnston – aye; Mr. Dick – aye, Mr. McInnis – aye; Mr. Toy – aye.

STANTON AREA VARIANCE DETERMINATION

Adam Toy moved, seconded by Vince Dick, that the area variance requested by Chris Stanton (the “Applicant”), for property located at 105 Drumlin View Drive, Tax ID No. 216.12-1-28 (the “Property”), zoned RS-30, to allow the installation of a prefabricated wooden storage shed with a side and rear setback of 12” where a 15’ side setback and 20’ rear setback is required, be GRANTED based on the following:

WHEREAS, Town Code Section 260-106 requires a side setback of 15’ and a rear setback of 20’ in the RS-30 zoning district; and

WHEREAS, the above property owner appeared before the Zoning Board of Appeals at the public hearing on the application on August 13, 2026; and

WHEREAS, this application was sent to the ZBA’s attorney and the Town Code Enforcement Officer for review; and

WHEREAS, this application was sent to the Monroe County Planning Board for review pursuant to General Municipal Law 239-m, and the application was returned as a local matter with comments; and

WHEREAS, the ZBA held a public hearing and the public was given the opportunity to comment on the application; and

WHEREAS, the ZBA has considered the application and any submissions by interested parties as part of the record of these proceedings;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this application constitutes a Type II action under SEQRA and no further environmental review is required;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the ZBA has weighed the effects of the requested variance against the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and community, and hereby GRANTS the requested variance based on the following findings:

1. The requested benefit **CANNOT** be achieved by other feasible means because topography and site conditions limit other locations for the shed.

2. The request **IS** substantial because the side and rear setbacks are being reduced to only 12”.
3. The request **WILL NOT** have an undesirable change in the neighborhood because the shed is in keeping with the main structure and is located in a low-visibility area, and similar sheds are common in the area.
4. The request **WILL NOT** have an adverse effect on the physical and/or environmental conditions of the neighborhood or district because it is a low visibility location and the shed is prefabricated and will not disturb the soil.
5. The difficulty **IS** self-created because the Applicant desires to install the shed in the proposed location, necessitating the area variance.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this approval is conditioned upon the following conditions, (if any):

The aesthetics of the shed shall match the existing house.

A formal site survey shall be completed and provided to the Code Enforcement Officer as part of the building permit.

Following discussion on this Resolution, the following roll call vote was taken and recorded:

Christian Mahood	Aye
Vince Dick	Aye
Jeffrey Johnston	Aye
David McInnis	Aye
Adam Toy	Aye

Approved: 5 Ayes, 0 Nays

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

None.

UPCOMING MEETING'S

Mr. Dick made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:25 pm, seconded by Mr. McInnis.

Mr. Mahood – aye; Mr. Johnston – aye; Mr. Dick – aye; Mr. McInnis – aye; Mr. Toy – aye.