TOWN OF WOODSTOCK, NY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

45 Comeau Drive, Woodstock NY 12498 Tel: (845) 679-2113, Ext. 14 • Fax: (845) 679-8743

Colony of the Arts E-mail: zba@woodstockny.org
Website: woodstockny.org

Woodstock Zoning Board of Appeals

45 Comeau Drive

August 27th, 2026

7:00 PM Town Offices, 45 Comeau Drive

ZOOM only for listening purposes

MEETING MINUTES

Chairperson Sillato called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm. Members present Judith Sillato, Howard Harris, Joseph Belluck and Olivia Twine. Martin Mills and Gregg Goodbrod were absent.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

MINUTES APPROVAL- Chairperson Sillato made a motion to approve meeting minutes 05/14/2026,05/28/2026,06/11/2026 & 7/23/2026, Olivia Twine abstained from voting on 5/14, 5/28 and 6/11 meeting minutes as she was not a member at the time, second Joseph Belluck, all voted aye.

CHANGES/ADDITIONS TO MEETING AGENDA – Chairperson Sillato made a motion to change and add some items to the meeting agenda, second Joseph Belluck, all voted aye. There was a resolution she was going to read for ZBA Case # 25-01 of Ian Vinci. She wanted to give the members an update on ZBA Case # 26-01 of Lisa Nardi and to discuss ZBA Case # 26-05 of Aaron Yassin.

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED for August 27th, 2026

ZBA Case #26-10 Application of Devra Golberg, as represented by Juliet Walker of Evolved Design, 86 Mill Hill Road, Woodstock NY 12498, for property located at 71-73 Ohayo Mountain Road, a 5.41 acre parcel located within a R5 Zoning District with Scenic Overlay, for variances from the Zoning Law of the Town of Woodstock, Article V, Accessory apartment in detached structure, Section 260-60 (E) (F) , in order to allow an existing 1076 sqft guest house to be increased in size by 914 sq feet to create an accessory apartment that does not meet the applicable requirements. Chairperson Sillato made a motion to open ZBA Case # 26-10, second Joseph Belluck, all voted aye.

Representative Juliet Walker and applicant Devra Goldberg were present. Mrs. Walker handed the members the correct measurements of the project (Primary Residence sq. footage: 2,876; Current guest house sq. footage: ~1076 and Proposed guest house

addition sq. footage: ~940). Mrs. Walker stated what they intended to do was extend the length of the ranch cottage. They want to add a bathroom and divide the additional space in the front into two sections, one would become the bedroom, the other would become an office and the front part would become a living room. She showed the members a site plan with this information. Joseph Belluck asked what the purpose of doing this was? Mrs. Walker answered it was to enable the family to be able to accommodate the entire family on the property. Her mother passed and the property was left to Ms. Goldberg and by adding this additional space it would allow her brother and father to be with her all in the same space all at once in addition to the other members of the family. She proceeded to show the members what the 1,076 sq. ft. area was on a drawing, where the L shape addition was going to be and where the existing porch was located. Chairperson Sillato asked about the age of the cottage, Mrs. Goldberg answered 1986, she believes most of the construction on the property took place in the late 80's. Chairperson Sillato mentioned there was an SUP granted in the 90's for the guest house to become an accessory dwelling. Ms. Goldberg stated she wasn't the owner back then so she wasn't sure about that, she would have to rely on what they were telling her. Joseph Belluck asked if she was living in New Jersey full-time? Ms. Goldberg answered no she actually lives at the house most of the time, she spends from 1-3 nights in the city, she works in New Jersey. Joseph Belluck asked where her father and brother lived? Ms. Goldberg explained that her father, his partner, her stepsister, stepbrother in law and step-niece all live in New Jersey. Other family members live in Colorado and her brother and brother-in-law live in California. Since they are able to work remotely for significant portions of the year. She would like to accommodate those three groups of people and also be able to host the rest of her family in the same space. Chairperson Sillato asked her if when she wrote up the application for the expansion, did Butch explain to her what the current law was since 1989? Mrs. Walker answered he did when he denied the permit but not before. Chairperson Sillato asked if she understood what the limitation of an accessory dwelling unit or accessory is? Mrs. Walker answered no, not exactly. Chairperson Sillato took the section of the law and it's a maximum of 800 sq. ft. she is already exceeding that by 200 sq. ft and/or 35% of the total available space of the principal residence. So, what they are asking for is basically for a second house on her property. If an accessory apartment is limited to 800 sq. ft and they are asking for almost a 2000 sq ft building, that's a lot to ask for and essentially, she is asking the ZBA to change the zoning law and allow her to have two houses on one property. This is her opinion and she had to mention it right off the bat, so they aren't misled. She was surprised when she saw the application because it is so extreme. Joseph Belluck stated it seemed unlikely and a little bit of a stretch to assume that they are going to be the main occupants of this property. He doesn't know what her intent to use it for is. Ms. Godberg assured the board there was no intent on any part of her ownership of this property to rent it out at any time. She has no interest in that whatsoever. Joseph Belluck stated that was his concern because it's not like they live here or are moving here to occupy it since they live in Colorado and California. It is a big project to undertake to have people who live across the country spend time with her family. He understands it but it just seems like a lot. Mrs. Walker stated all of this was brought on because of COVID and the current fires in California. There is a real possibility that they may move here. Ms. Goldberg spoke and stated the ultimate goal of this project is for her bother and brother and law to live here with her for significant parts of the year, months, weeks at a time. Her father his partner and the rest of the family are also interested in being able to be here with them on a fairly regular basis as their schedule will accommodate. Most importantly

there is no intention at any point in time of using this as a vacation home. She is on her property for 3-6 days a week. Howard Harris asked how many bedrooms were in the main residence at this time? Ms. Goldberg answered, two bedrooms. Chairperson Sillato stated the main residence was almost 3,000 sq. ft. Howard Harris asked how many people lived in the main residence? Ms. Goldberg answered she does currently and when her sister and brother-in-law come to stay with her they live with her in the house. Howard Harris asked what the purpose of the extended living area being enlarged was? Ms. Golberg answered the purpose of the living extension as stated on the application was simply to create a space where the people who were living in the accessory unit would be able to congregate comfortably. As the space is currently laid out, there is not a common area. Howard Harris asked about the dimensions of the rooms. Mrs. Walker showed the members the site plan but stated she didn't know what the dimensions were. She stated she believed the long wall along the side of the house was 28 feet. The bathroom width was 73 inches across because of the bathtub she knows those dimensions, and she believes it is 8 feet long. Howard Harris asked what the office space was for? Ms. Goldberg answered her brother and brother-in-law both worked in tech and when they stay with her they need to work remotely and they work for competing companies so they can't work in the same room together. In the house currently there is no space to do that, her brother does keep his computer in her office at the house, so the purpose of the second office would be to enable her brother-in-law. Mrs. Walker stated the elevation of the addition is exactly the same as the existing elevation, it will be clad an exactly the same way, it will not look out of place, it will not stand out, it will have the same siding, the same windows so it would look like a single structure that has always existed.

Michele read the names of the contiguous neighbors: Lonergan Trust; Barbara & Walter Kortrey; Howard and Karen Cohen; Patricia Bresca-Cantine & Robert Cantine; Woodstock Mill LLC and Sophie Jean Winston.

No communications were received.

Mr. & Mrs. Lonergan spoke and stated they own two properties; they have two cottages that are pre-existing non-conforming on a 3-acre parcel and then they have their main residence on the other property. Mrs. Lonergan proceeded to state she has a really good relationship with Ms. Goldberg she is a good neighbor but she is concerned with this project because there was a neighbor right next door to them on the other side of their cottages, he requested their house be doubled in size, at that point she spoke out and said it was unacceptable. They said they were going to build a garage and they built an apartment, whatever they got to get through the process to say they were going to build a garage didn't happen. Unfortunately, this happens a lot in Woodstock. She knows things start as one thing and turn into something else. She has been in real estate for a very long time and she has always promoted that the town does the right thing in terms of really keeping to the zoning and the pristine look of what you see is what you are going to see when you buy something. She is not saying this project visually would be a terrible impact and she knows Ms. Golberg doesn't rent to other people. But when they made an investment for their family to be here, they made an investment that followed through with the zoning law. She strongly believes the zoning law should be upheld. If Ms. Goldberg wanted to build another 1000 sq ft onto her house then go ahead, she is sympathetic to her situation, but the next owner might not use it for the same reasons. Now all of a sudden, they have 2 houses on a 5-acre

zoning and there is not one property that surrounds them that she knows of where there are two houses that could withstand two and a half acres each. They haven't asked for their cottages to be subdivided because they are on 3 acres. Joseph Belluck stated visually she doesn't have any objection to the proposal and she is/ has been a good neighbor but her position is the law has to be followed regardless of how she views the project. Mrs. Lonergan answered yes she feels this proposal is huge, if it were 300 sq ft that is a different thing than 900 sq ft. So, coming up the driveway visually it would look fine, but it would still be two houses that are very visual and it impacts their neighborhood. She is opposed to this proposal and the law doesn't allow it. Mrs. Walker is wondering if there is a way to bridge a gap. Joseph Belluck stated it wasn't a negotiation. Mrs. Walker asked again if there was any possible way to try to keep it within the same footprint with a tiny addition. She showed them where the porch was and stated she really didn't understand the rules. She is trying to understand everything and give her client what she wants, if they were to enclose the porch area which is part of the existing footprint, and they were able to put a little more space like another 300 sq feet onto the existing porch would that be something that could work? Joseph Belluck stated they could withdraw the application. Chairperson Sillato stated they could modify their application. Howard Harris explained that the porch wasn't considered living area, so that was negligible. He asked how far the house was from the cottage? The contractor Tim answered 60-70 yards. Mrs. Cohen a contiguous neighbor asked about the porch not being considered a part of the house even if there was a foundation. Chairperson Sillato answered saying it was not considered a living area. Mr. Cohen stated they had come to confirm what Ms. Goldberg was doing on her property. They live on the other side of the main house so they wouldn't be able to see the new structure. They just came to understand the process since they got the letter. They have no objections as it doesn't impact them directly, but he is very respectful of what he has heard about maintaining the integrity of the town.

Chairperson Sillato stated extremely emphatically she believes in the Towns zoning and she believes if the ZBA allows Ms. Golberg to have two houses on her property the floodgates are going to open. Someone who is living on 15 acres is not allowed to have two houses on their property, that's just the way the law is and an accessory apartment is supposed to be accessory to the main house and this is far more than that. People live in houses that are 1,000 sq ft. and she is asking for a 2,000 sq ft house in addition to an almost 3,000 sq ft house. They are welcome to pursue this, they are welcome to modify it. She would encourage them to consider putting an addition on the main house which she is completely able to do under the law. To have two separate houses, the law is pretty strong on not allowing it. She is thinking it is because it is preexisting, she would like to see the SUP, she doesn't believe there was a variance, but because the building was there the planning board gave the allowance to convert it into an accessory apartment. She doesn't believe it had a kitchen before, and it is already exceeding what is allowed under the law by 200 sq ft. She already has 35% of the main structure and the maximum is 800 sq ft. Joseph Belluck made a point to explain this variance was unlikely to get approved. The ZBA can go through the process, do the site visit, write up the decision which would take a period of time, what she might consider doing is withdrawing the application and resubmitting a different proposal. Chairperson Sillato stated if they wanted to put an addition onto the main house that would be a whole other process, going through the building department, making sure the septic is adequate, if they meet their setbacks etc. With the current application she is looking for an exception to the zoning law, and it's a really big variance to ask for. Joseph Belluck mentioned the

variance goes with the property not with the owner. Whatever assurances Ms. Goldberg stated about the use of the property, if she were to sell it the next owner would not have to follow through and could rent it. Chairperson Sillato stated it was also setting a very big precedent, which means anyone could come to the ZBA and say " Hey I want a 2,000 sq foot accessory apartment which is another house on the property". Mrs. Walker stated she was new to all of this and was still learning so she asked if they were to put an addition on the house, were there limitations to the size of the addition? Chairperson Sillato answered she didn't believe so, they would just have to meet the setbacks and probably deal with the Ulster County Health Department as well. Mrs. Walker asked if they could add a 4,000-foot addition to the existing home as long as she adheres to the setbacks and did all the septic things. The answer was yes. An architect would be able to let them know what could be added to the existing structure. Mrs. Walker stated the ZBA had been pretty clear this proposal was a non-starter so she will talk to her client and they will probably pivot and find a way to do something else.

Chairperson Sillato made a motion to close the public hearing, second by Joseph Beluck all voted aye. Chairperson Sillato made a motion to recess ZBA Case # 26-10, second by Joseph Belluck, all voted aye.

3. DECISION & ORDERS AND INTERPRETATIONS OUTSTANDING

Chairperson Sillato made a motion to open ZBA Case # 25-01 of Ian Vinci, second by Joseph Belluck, all voted aye. Chairperson Sillato read the following resolution:

RESOLUTION DISMISSING WOODSTOCK ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS CASE WITHOUT PREJUDICE:
IAN VINCI ZBA 25-01

WHEREAS, Mr. Ian Vinci made an application to the Zoning Board of Appeals on February 21, 2025 for property located at 234 Tinker Street, Woodstock NY 12498, a 5.15 acre parcel located within a SLI Zoning District, for variances from the Zoning Law of the Town of Woodstock, Article IV, Area & Bulk Regulations, Section 260-16 Attachment 2, for an 87-foot infringement into a 125-foot side-yard setback (West side) and Section 260-16 Attachment 2, for a 94-foot infringement into a 125-foot side-yard setback (East side) in order to construct a 50 foot by 100 foot metal storage building; and
WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals held a duly advertised public hearing on this Application at Town Hall on March 21, 2025. Several members of the public provided comments and concerns, including, but not limited to, the size of the structure, encroachment into the setbacks, proposed location, impact to quality of life, impact to nearby stream corridor, and potential noise. The public hearing was continued to a later date; and
WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals referred the application to the Ulster County Planning Board, pursuant to New York State Law General Municipal Law §239-m; and
WHEREAS, on May 07, 2025, the Ulster County Planning Board reviewed the application at its public meeting. Several members of the public and neighbors were also in attendance at the Ulster County Planning Board and provided additional comments to the Ulster County Planning Board; and
WHEREAS, the Ulster County Planning Board requested additional information in its comments back to the Zoning Board of Appeals. According to the Ulster County Planning Board, "This

request is for critical details necessary for the ZBA to conduct the area variance balancing test, particularly regarding community character and the degree of the requested variance, which exceeds 50% of the statute's requirement." The Ulster County Planning Board stated "contextual details must be provided so the ZBA can understand how the proposal fits into the surrounding neighborhood. Photo simulations are recommended for this purpose." The Ulster County Planning Board also noted that the applicant requests two area variances, greater than the 50% of the requirement of the zoning statute, and noted the requirement that "the minimum variance necessary and adequate to satisfy the hardship must be balanced against the other aspects of the variance test." The Ulster County Planning Board recommended an exploration of alternative layouts, designs, and locations for the proposed storage building. The Ulster County Planning Board further recommended a coordinated review with the Town of Woodstock Planning Board under the New York State Environmental Quality Review act to identify potential environmental impacts with constructing a "5,000-square-foot-building, particularly the requested side yard variances."; and

WHEREAS, the Ulster County Planning Board recommended the above-referenced materials and analysis be provided to the Zoning Board of Appeals and then referred again to the Ulster County Planning Board with the updated materials; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals continued the public hearing on June 12, 2025; and

WHEREAS, additional comments and concerns were received from the public during the public hearing. The Zoning Board of Appeals also discussed comments and requested information received from the Ulster County Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals recessed the public hearing with instructions for Mr. Vinci to return with alternate plans, photos, as well as detailed site plans as recommended by the Ulster County Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, on February 9, 2026, having not received any further submissions, the Chair of the Zoning Board of Appeals emailed Mr. Vinci requesting an update on the status of the Application on whether he planned to continue his application, and further included a request that Mr. Vinci respond by February 23, 2026, with a date certain that he will return to the Zoning Board of Appeals with the materials requested by the Board; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Vinci replied via email on February 10, 2026 to the Zoning Board of Appeals that he would like to keep the Application open, but did not provide any of the requested materials, nor did he provide a date by which such materials would be provided; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals has now waited an additional 6 months and has not received any further communications from Mr. Vinci; and

WHEREAS, no further submission or requested materials have been received from Mr. Vinci in over a year; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Board of Appeals has determined that the lack of communication and progress for many months warrants the dismissal of the Application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED based on all of the facts described above and upon the reasoning described above, as follows:

Section 1. Due to the inactivity and lack of requested materials from the Applicant, Mr. Ian Vinci, the Zoning Board closes the public hearing on ZBA Case: Mr. Ian Vinci #25-01.

Section 2. Due to the inactivity and lack of requested materials from the Applicant, the Zoning Board of Appeals dismisses ZBA Case: Mr. Ian Vinci #25-01 as incomplete, without prejudice.

Section 3. This dismissal shall be without prejudice, and the Applicant shall be permitted to submit an amended area variance application, with the submission of the materials previously

requested by the Zoning Board of Appeals and the requested materials and information previously requested from the Ulster County Planning Board.

Section 4. We direct the Zoning Board of Appeals Clerk to obtain the final invoices from the Board's consultants and to pay those invoices from the escrow deposit posted by the Applicant. The Town of Woodstock shall return any remaining escrow funds to Mr. Vinci once all accounting is completed.

Section 5. Any submission of an amended area variance application shall be contingent upon the Applicant paying all applicable fees and required escrow deposits.

Motion to approve resolution by: ___Judith Sillato_____
Seconded by: ____Joseph Belluck_____

The vote was announced as follows:

Judith Sillato:(aye), Joseph Belluck: (aye), Martin Mills: (absent), Gregg Goodbrod: (absent), Olivia Twine: (aye), Howard Harris: (alternate) (no vote).

THE RESOLUTION WAS (ADOPTED) by a vote of (3) in favor, (0) opposed, (2) absent, and (0) abstaining.

Chairperson Sillato made motion to close ZBA Case # 25-01, second by Joseph Belluck, all voted aye.

*****

Chairperson Sillato made a motion to open ZBA Case # 26-01 of Lisa Nardi, second by Joseph Belluck, all voted aye. Chairperson Sillato gave a brief update stating she had spoken to the new Building Inspector, and she said she would be calling Mrs. Nardi on several different things. Chairperson Sillato believes this case will progress as well because of this. Chairperson Sillato made a motion to recess ZBA Case # 26-01, second by Joseph Belluck, all voted aye.

*****

Chairperson Sillato made a motion to open ZBA Case # 26-05 of Aaron Yassin/Glasco Ridge LLC, second by Joseph Belluck, all voted aye. Chairperson Sillato stated they had had three public hearings on this case. Although two only really produced any testimony. It is time to have a public discussion on this case and move it along. Chairperson Sillato created a guideline because whatever they do discuss should appear in their decision. She based this guideline on the 5 criteria, she read as follows:

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

Chairperson Sillato asked the members if they had any comments on community character if they were to grant this variance. Howard Harris stated he doesn't think it is a detriment to the nearby properties because there are a lot of small undersized lots in the area. Joseph Belluck stated he thought based on the feedback from the neighbors, not that that is determinative, but he thought they made a good case that the quality of character of the neighborhood would be impacted. He would be inclined to vote there would be an impact. Olivia Twine agreed by saying she thinks that adding a house where the law doesn't provide for it would have a negative impact. Chairperson Sillato showed the members a local tax map and colored all the properties that are larger than 3 acres in green. So, she doesn't think they would really necessarily be wrong to say that there are a few small properties that are less than 3-acres. She wanted to show the board a visual of what was going on. The white parcels are undersized lots, all of the other ones are larger, some are 23 acres, some are 28 acres and moving on.

Contiguous neighbors:

Either pre-existing non-conforming 1964, 1960 or

Larger than 3 acres: 3.92, 26.2, 3.17, 10.74

Neighbors spoke at public hearing: Andrew Scherer stated all present (Margot Molnar, Adina Scherer, Jerald Jacobik, Danielle Modzelewski, Joseph and Avis Toochin, Daniel and Leah Rubenstein) are all unanimously opposed to this plan: Density, sensitive environment, water resources, safety (see minutes) and neighbor emails in file. Mr. Yassin has established with the DEC that there are no wetlands on his property but there are some nearby.

"Acreage Comparison Map (Drawing T-002.00)" – properties pre-exist 1989 and many cases predate 1965 law. Any lot with a whole single digit lot number was created in 1971-73.

Chairperson Sillato looked at what they gave the ZBA and their reasoning for why they should get this. They presented an acreage comparison map of properties that were less than 1 acre.*** She did some research and spoke to the Ulster County Real Property Department and every single one of the undersized lots were created prior to the 1989 zoning law, some of the houses were built in the 1840's. Chairperson Sillato proceeded to show all members on the tax map a development that was built in 1973. She also showed them a subdivision that was probably done prior to that.

Argument that there are other small lots does not address the goals of the Town

Zoning law enacted in 1989 – 37 years ago.

The maps were created in 1973 so a lot of those properties existed through deed or subdivision. Pre- existing zoning was in 1965. If they look at the single-digit lot numbers in the S.B.L numbers of each property they will see most of the houses were built prior to that period of 1971-1973. *** The zoning law has been in existence for 37 years; these are going back even further.

Development pressures were the driving force to increase lot sizes in order to preserve open space and environmental resources.

The reason the Town created the districts with larger lot sizes was because there was a lot of pressure to develop and a lot of these areas really couldn't withstand environmentally that kind of density. She looked at the residential R3 district and it says it's a low-density residential district. Land withing the R3 district is generally at a slope of 10% to 15% and includes those areas identified as ecologically sensitive areas by the town's home spaces plan. These are lanes that they consider ecologically sensitive and that is why they have expanded the lot sizes.

They did mention a section from the zoning law Section 260 Article 4 Area and Bulk Regulations 260-10 permitted modification of minimum lot area. And what this means basically is if they have a 10-acre parcel and they are in a 5-acre zoning district, they could make a 2-acre lot and an 8-acre lot. They are allowed to make a smaller one as long as it doesn't change the density. What the law says, which she felt was fairly emphatic, under no circumstances shall more lots be created than would otherwise be created if the parcel were subdivided in compliance with the maximum lot area requirement for the district. She looked at a statement like that and it says "under no circumstances" this made her think what circumstances would warrant a change of that? She doesn't necessarily see that this subdivision really warrants that.

Small lots are not only pre-existing, but houses are located right on a road so they had access, without long driveways. This construction would be "behind an existing mature woodland"

Density not design – ZBA cannot mandate any particular size, style or design. The applicants were very enthusiastic about their notion about what they want to put on this property but the ZBA can't control who is going to own the property and what their choices are going to be and they can't say if they buy this property you have to put this kind of house on it or even to these owners, they can't say that. It is not something the ZBA can regulate.

Whether the benefit sought by the Applicant could be achieved by some feasible method other than an area variance.

Howard Harris stated in the testimony on their application they said they were in the process of negotiating the purchase of additional land, so there is an alternative. Joseph Belluck stated they indicated if they weren't given the variance that they had alternatives that might be less welcomed by the neighbors. So, they did acknowledge they had alternatives to this. Chairperson Sillato stated what the law says is basically you can't tell someone they can't use their property, they don't have to have the highest use of their property in zoning, but you can't say you can't use it. They could have a house, nobody is saying they can't build a house there. The alternatives she sees are as follows:

- Build one house

- Sell the property and purchase a property that is eligible for subdivision
- Pursue purchase of contiguous property (mentioned in applicants' submission)

Whether the requested area variance is substantial.

Joseph Belluck stated he thought it was substantial, he isn't even sure that is even a dispute. Chairperson Sillato stated they calculated it and said it was 27% (which they quoted saying it wasn't trivial) -it's almost one acre reduction. It's not a minor variance talking about a few feet.

- Permitted modification of minimum lot area (§260-20 A) is emphatic, ***"Under no circumstances*** shall more lots be created than would otherwise be created if the parcel were subdivided in compliance with the minimum lot area requirement for the district as listed in §260-16, the Schedule of Area and Bulk Regulations."
- Impact of two house sites, two septic systems, two wells, utilities and potential accessory buildings

- Precedents: Baker Road and Mink Hollow Road were both denied for subdivisions.

Whether the proposed area variance would have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district.

The R3 District is defined in the Zoning Law: §260-7 C: "Land within the R3 District is generally at a slope of 10% to 15% and includes those areas identified as "ecologically sensitive areas" by the Town's Open Spaces Plan.

The site-visit report from the representatives of the Woodstock Environmental Commission (WEC) identified significant environmental concerns: steep slopes, the Fontyne Kill stream/gorge, a small vernal pond, nearby wetlands and exposed bedrock The WEC report identifies this property in the R3 district as ecologically sensitive.

Safety; UCPB "this section of Glasco Turnpike has limited sight distances, features steep slopes on the north side of the road, and a road geometry that has a history of accidents due to high-speed driving" (report attached). Chairperson Sillato drove by the site and there is a 20-foot cliff on the road. It's not like it is on a big flat piece of property, there's going to have to be some serious work done for visibility. It is not the ZBA's purview, but the ZBA has to look at it and say, adding more cars, another residence to a situation where the county has identified that section of the road as being particularly dangerous would be a significant environmental impact.

The addition of a second residence at this location would impact driver safety at this location of Glasco Turnpike

Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created.

Chairperson Sillato stated that it clearly was self-created and this property was purchased in January 2026. Joseph Belluck stated anecdotally a lot of neighbors commented on traffic conditions and issues with the roadway. Chairperson Sillato stated she has seen this issue on Glasco where people had two driveways in a circular or U-shape and the County has closed one of those access points.

Joseph Belluck mentioned he wasn't inclined to approve this application. Olivia Twine stated she wasn't either.

Chairperson Sillato made a motion to recess ZBA Case # 26-05 of Aaron Yassin, Glasco Ridge LLC, second by Olivia Twine, all voted aye.

Chairperson Sillato made a motion to adjourn, second by Joseph Belluck, all voted aye.

Submitted by,

Michele Sehwerert

*** Hello ZBA,

At the ZBA meeting on Thursday, 8/27 when discussing 26-05 Yassin/Glasco Ridge LLC, I misspoke twice and I would like to officially correct the record.

1.When referring to maps that identified undersize lots, I said lots less than one acre. I meant to say undersize lots less than 3 acres.

2. When referring to lot numbers on tax maps that indicate the lots were created prior to 1971-73, I said that lot numbers that had single digits were created prior to when Ulster County developed the tax maps. I meant to say that lot numbers on tax maps with "whole numbers" indicate that the lots were developed prior to 1971-73.

The documents, maps and written decision reflect the correct information.

My apologies.

Jude Sillato

Standard disclaimer applies ***