



*"The Heart of the Park...Where the Eagle Soars"*

[www.shandaken.us](http://www.shandaken.us)

Supervisor: (845) 688-7165

Police: (845) 688-9902

Town Clerk: (845) 688-5004

Justice Court: (845) 688-5005

Assessor: (845) 688-5003

Assessor Fax: (845) 688-5708

**ZBA/ZEO/Planning: (845) 688-5008**

Highway: (845) 688-9901

Fax: (845) 688-2041

P.O. Box 134, 7209 Rte. 28, Shandaken, NY 12480

**Town of Shandaken Zoning Board of Appeals  
Minutes for Public Hearings  
July 16, 2025**

**Public Hearing for Justin Keeseey – 14.5-3-29 – Area Variance**

Public Hearing was opened at 6:45;

Roll call as follows:

Mark Loete, Chair	Absent
Gary Guglielmetti	Present
Allen Vella	Present
Christian Lynch	Absent
Henry Williams	Present

**Roll Call Summary:** 3 Present, 2 Absent

Legal Notice regarding the application was read. Clifton Rabuffo, representing the applicant, gave a brief overview of the requested variance. With no one present to speak, and no correspondence received regarding this Public Hearing a motion was made by Board Member Vella to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Board Member Guglielmetti; all in favor.

The Public Hearing was closed at 6:47.



*"The Heart of the Park...Where the Eagle Soars"*

[www.shandaken.us](http://www.shandaken.us)

Supervisor: (845) 688-7165

Police: (845) 688-9902

Town Clerk: (845) 688-5004

Justice Court: (845) 688-5005

Assessor: (845) 688-5003

Assessor Fax: (845) 688-5708

**ZBA/ZEO/Planning: (845) 688-5008**

Highway: (845) 688-9901

Fax: (845) 688-2041

P.O. Box 134, 7209 Rte. 28, Shandaken, NY 12480

**Town of Shandaken Zoning Board of Appeals  
Minutes for Public Hearings  
July 16, 2025**

**Public Hearing for Charles Papia – 4.-3-2 – Area Variance**

Public Hearing was opened at 7:00;

Roll call as follows:

Mark Loete, Chair	Absent
Gary Guglielmetti	Present
Allen Vella	Present
Christian Lynch	Absent
Henry Williams	Present

**Roll Call Summary:** 3 Present, 2 Absent

Legal Notice regarding the Public Hearing was read. Charles Papia gives a brief overview of the requested variance. Those present are invited to speak, those comments as follows:

Billie Ann Carlsen of 115 St Kathrin Drive is present to speak against the project, she has the following concerns: damage to the property has already been done, quality of life for residents would be negatively impacted, negative impacts to the land, environmental concerns, this project would negatively impact the quiet neighborhood. She would like the Board members to visit the property before they make a decision about the variance. She provided a letter she wrote that has been made a part of these minutes.

Hedi White of 110 St Katherin Drive is present to speak against the project, she has been a resident of St Kathrin Drive since 2003 and has the following concerns: there are 8 homes, all single family, on St Kathrin Drive and a two-family home would change the character of the neighborhood, she does not want to see overdevelopment. She would not be opposed to the construction of a single-family home on this lot. She provided a letter that she wrote that has been made a part of these minutes.

Not in attendance were Robert Carlsen of 115 St Kathrin Drive and Craig and Judi Comperatore of 87 St Kathrin Drive, both sent in letters against the project which have been made a part of these minutes.

Mr. Papia addresses these concerns with the Board as follows: He will take the necessary precautions and will not be bringing in outside fill, but using the materials on the property to grade. The septic for the proposed two-family home has been approved. He feels it is a buildable lot. When the land was originally subdivided there were many approved "buildable" lots, so there could have been many houses on St Kathrin but a lot of those lots were sold to the DEC and became "forever wild" land. He feels the proposed home would add to his neighbor's property values, not detract value. He informs the Board that the proposed house was designed with the steep grade of the property in mind.

Board Member Williams asks if both the units would be serviced by the same electric meter and heat source, Mr. Papia says they will be. Board member Vella asks if the units will be rented or owner occupied. Mr. Papia states that they would be owner occupied.

Billie Ann Carlsen informs the Board that she sold a vacant property on St Kathrin to new owners who constructed a single-family home and there were never any objections to that project.

With no other comments from those in attendance, or the Board a motion was made by Board Member Vella to close the Public Hearing, seconded by Board Member Guglielmetti; all in favor.

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:26.

①

July 16 2025

Dear Board Members,

As a long term resident of 115  
St. Kathrine Drive of 35 years - ...

I am vehemently opposed to granting  
this application to build a two family  
house next to my house.

1) This builder has already demonstrated  
his total lack of regard for proper  
procedures by demolishing the property  
and leaving a scar ~~on~~ the landscape

2) I resent the further destruction of the  
quality of life and our enjoyment of  
our privacy for the Urbanization and  
commercialization of said property

3) Please consider the impact on the  
land for the necessary waste disposal  
and environmental concerns ...



5)

4) This plot is on a very steep incline and in order to build a two family home . . . . how many truck loads of perhaps toxic landfill would be necessary to create a proper building site

4) The builder does not want to become a member of our small community but rather as a spot builder he wants to extract as much profit as possible only to leave us residents a forever changed urbanized and commercialized neighborhood

5) We long term residents have all followed the rules so as not impact our neighbors ~~and~~ long enjoyed the peace and quiet and appreciation of  
6) living in natural beauty.

c) We do not now want to allow this to be forever destroyed...

b) Please visit this site to see what is the reality of this property

Bills Ann Carlson

Cell #914-672-0038

Email - bacumom@gmail.com

**THOMAS H WHITE**  
**HEDI H WHITE**  
**110 SAINT KATHRIN DRIVE, BIG INDIAN N.Y. 12410**

July 16, 2025

TO: ZBA Town of Shandaken

RE: Variance Application of Charles Papia

We have been residents of 110 Saint Kathrine Drive since 2003 and activists and supporters of this Ulster/Delaware community for many years.

We wish to endorse and add our names to the comments of our neighbor, Mr. Craig Comperatore and oppose the approval of this variance application.

Saint Kathrin Drive is made up of eight homes, all of which are in compliance with the existing zoning.

The applicant must have been aware of the zoning together with its challenges and limitations before he purchased the property. If to meet his need he requires a variance which should be for hardship only, he should not have made the purchase.

If he can accomplish his need for his family by finishing his basement, and if in doing so he does not create noncompliance by building a *defacto* two family home, we would not object. However, to reclassify the property as a two-family or multiple dwelling is not acceptable, and it establishes a precedent on Rose Mountain and indeed in all 5-acre zones in the area.

A primary purpose of our Zoning is to protect and control the balance between conservation and development. This is especially true of our location in the Catskill Park and the NYC/Catskill Watershed of which we are ALL stewards.

We urge you to disapprove this application.

Thomas H. White

Hedi H. White



July 8, 2025

Olivia Gnantia  
Secretary to Zoning Board of Appeals.

RE: Application of Charles Pappia  
97 St. Kathrin Drive

Dear Ms. Gnantia,

My name is Robert Carlson, owner of adjacent lot 115 St. Kathrin Drive. I write this letter on behalf of my self and those other owners in the subdivision who will be affected by the Area Variance application of Charles Pappia to be heard at the July 16 meeting. Please read this letter into the record.

All affected neighbors in this one family zoned subdivision unanimously oppose the application to build a two family house on a legal one family lot. These opposing neighbors include myself to the West, Craig Comeratore to the East, Tom White to the North, and all other owners along St. Kathrin Drive who are not abutting to the applicant but whose use and enjoyment as one family owners would be affected.

Here are the reasons for our specific objections to the variance application:

(over)



Page 2

1. Every objecting owner has been living upon his property with his family and personally occupies his home. We are here for over 30 years and most other neighbors have long term ownership.
2. We all purchased our properties for personal use, quiet and natural beauty. The peaceful environment and enjoyment as family members was paramount. A one family character of the area was perfect. This proposed two family house would be opposed to what we purchased for our own use.
3. The applicant is not to be trusted or believed. His track record shows that as follows:
  - (a) Within the past several years he destroyed his lot by cutting down all mature hardwoods without permission or notice to the Town or government.
  - (b) The resulting appearance of St. Kathren Drive has been forever changed for the worse - without any consent. Please personally inspect what I mean. Seeing is believing.
  - (c) After cutting down the trees he began to burn them in an open fire, a danger to all our properties.
  - (d) He advertised the property for sale to the public as a one family home site. There were

(over)



no buyers and the Town made him remove his signage from the public road. Unsanctioned by any measure. Now he wants a two family variance for his selfish pursuits against the character of the entire road.

(e) As invested residents who use the property we own for families, a two family structure would lend itself to renters and those with no commitment to the owner occupied vicinity.

The above demonstrate that the applicant does not abide by the legal regulations. Why should he now be believed in any feature of his application?

In conclusion, please listen to the unanimous objection of the affected neighbors. We have paid our taxes, observed the law and use for our families the one family homes we own.

Robert A. Carlson  
115 St. Katharine Drive  
(914) 325-8133  
rcc.carlsen39@gmail.com

**Re: Public hearing July 16<sup>th</sup> 7:00pm – Charles Papia 97 St Kathrin Dr**

I request this be read into public record during the hearing on July 16<sup>th</sup>. I would also like to offer my sincere apologies for not being able to attend in person as I'm currently dealing with post-surgical medical issues.

What our neighborhood/townships needs is responsible development that respects the sensitive environment we live in and share. It should respect neighborhood and family values as well as follow the carefully created township zoning plans. When exceptions are considered in well-established single family home zoning, it opens up the path for more exceptions and that will forever hurt, devalue, and change the face of the quiet family living our existing owners cherish.

Rose Mountain is a sensitive section of land where development/expansion of St Kathrin Drive was stopped and the land was converted to forest forever to protect our water and land. Why would we consider the opposite now introducing a high impactful build?

The mess that has already been created at 97 St Kathrin is the exact opposite of what our long-established neighborhood is and what the township needs. Not only should the 2-family exception be denied, but an environmental study should be done to see what the impact of what has already been done and if it's even feasible to build a single-family house on this lot. I consulted with two contractors who both told me the lot would be extremely difficult and expensive to develop due to the grade and width. Careful and expensive planning would need to happen prior to any purchase consideration or work. The opposite of what has happened.

What we have witnessed so far..

A downstate investor purchased the last "buildable" lot on St Kathrin Drive. The last because it's steep, narrow and has no permitted street access, septic, well and so on... and then...

- Clear cuts the lot without surveyed property lines – who wants a house with no trees?
- Burned not only the brush but tree trunks larger than 6 inches and longer than 8 feet
- Cuts a "driveway" with no road department permit.
- Brings in outside fill in hope of creating a level pad to build a >1M house
- Places investment/house for sale signs on public property hoping to find someone crazy enough who wants a 1M+ house on a clear-cut cliff

I can only imagine what's next in a highly unprofessional, unplanned development.



When all of this horribly fails, he would now like all of the established property owners to allow him to build a 2-family house on a 5+ acre single family zoning, causing our property values and quiet quality of life in our single-family neighborhood to crash?

If this outrageous request is approved it will have an impact on this steeply graded sensitive land, devalue the existing single-family homes, decrease quality of life on the road, and ultimately will change the landscape of Rose Mountain forever. It also opens the door for additional conversions. Reduced property values will quickly translate to assessment values of existing houses being challenged, and this will result in lost tax revenue to the township.

We would also like you to consider/compare this mess at 97 St Kathrin Drive to the home that was recently completed at 141 St Kathrin Drive. The owners carefully planned, permitted, and built a single-family home that fits the neighborhood. This home is also environmentally friendly from both a resource and land perspective. This type of development is exactly what Big Indian needs, not a get rich quick scheme that will do nothing but ruin the environment and impact quality of life.

Also, an important note -- all of the wells up here are deep, expensive and have low GPM -- hardly enough to support a single-family home. How does that work for a 2 family? Has a study been done to see if the additional draw on the aquifer will affect others on the road?

Sincerely,

Craig and Judi Comperatore

87 St Kathrin Dr

862-226-1057



Supervisor: (845) 688-7165  
Police: (845) 688-9902  
Town Clerk: (845) 688-5004  
Justice Court: (845) 688-5005  
Assessor: (845) 688-5003  
Assessor Fax: (845) 688-5708  
**ZBA/ZEO/Planning: (845) 688-5008**  
Highway: (845) 688-9901  
Fax: (845) 688-2041

*"The Heart of the Park... Where the Eagle Soars"*  
[www.shandaken.us](http://www.shandaken.us)

P.O. Box 134, 7209 Rte. 28, Shandaken, NY 12480

**Town of Shandaken Zoning Board of Appeals  
Minutes for the Regular Monthly Meeting  
July 16, 2025**

The regular monthly meeting was called to order by Acting Chair Williams with the pledge of allegiance.

Roll call recorded as follows:

Mark Loete, Chair	Absent
Gary Guglielmetti	Present
Allen Vella	Present
Christian Lynch	Absent
Henry Williams	Present

**Roll Call Summary:** 3 Present, 2 Absent

**Minutes:** The Board would like to review the provided minutes and vote on them during the August meeting.

**Old Business:**

Justin Keeseey – 14.5-3-29 – Area Variance

With no questions or comments from the Board, Board Member Vella makes a motion to approve the variance as requested, seconded by Board Member Guglielmetti; roll call vote:

Mark Loete, Chair	Absent
Gary Guglielmetti	Yes
Allen Vella	Yes
Christian Lynch	Absent
Henry Williams	Yes

Roll Call summary: 2 Absent, 3 Yes

Motion approved.



#### Charles Papia – 4.-3-2 – Area Variance

Following a conversation amongst the Board Members, they decide they would like to visit the property before voting on the variance. They will do so prior to the next meeting. This application will be added to the August agenda for further review.

#### **Old Business:**

#### Wellington Blueberry LLC – 4.46-1-32.110 – Area and Use Variances

Following last months approvals of the requested variances, Mike Mariello attorney for Wellington Blueberry, provided the Board with a draft resolution for their ratification.

Following a conversation regarding the draft, Board Member Guglielmetti made a motion to approve the draft resolution, seconded by Board Member Vella; roll call vote:

Mark Loete, Chair	Absent
Gary Guglielmetti	Yes
Allen Vella	Yes
Christian Lynch	Absent
Henry Williams	Yes

Roll Call summary: 2 Absent, 3 Yes

Motion approved.

#### **Other Business:**

Board Member Williams has prepared a letter ratifying the resolution denying Verizon Wireless's request for two variances from June's meeting. He asked that the letter be read, and a motion be made accepting its contents. The letter was read, and has been made a part of these minutes. No motion was made to accept this letter ratifying the Boards resolution denying the requested variances.

Board Member Vella states that the abutting property owner who spoke against the cell tower during the June meeting made a very compelling argument. Following that meeting many have reached out to him expressing their support for the tower, and he feels that reopening the application in order to hear from those who feel the tower is important would be a good idea. Board Member Vella made a motion to reopen the application submitted by Verizon Wireless for two area variances.

Board Member Williams feels that the ZBA read and carefully reviewed all of the submitted documents, and that the Public Hearing held during the June meeting gave anyone who wanted to speak for or against the application the opportunity to do so, and feels that the application should not be reopened for further review. He also states that since Board Member Lynch, who voted to deny the application, is not in attendance it would not be legal to vote on reopening the application without him present.

Sam Umhey, abutting property owner, is in attendance and speaks against reopening the application for further review.

Town Board Member Kneissl expresses concerns about public comment being allowed if the application has not been reopened.

Board Member Vella states that this would not be a vote to approve the variances, but rather a vote to do more review on the application before voting again.

Board Member Williams feels that some Town Board members have been trying to pressure ZBA members into reopening this application, and states that that is inappropriate.

A second to Board Member Vellas motion is not made.

**Adjournment:**

There being no further business Board Member Vella makes a motion to close the regular monthly meeting, seconded by Board Member Guglielmetti; all in favor.