

Woodstock Zoning Board of Appeals

45 Comeau Drive

February 26th, 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, second by Martin Mills. Members present Jude Sillato, Greg Goodbrod, and Martin Mills. Joseph Belluck was absent.

1. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

MINUTES APPROVAL- Move to accept 08/26/2025 meeting minutes by Judith Sillato. Second by Martin Mills and Greg Goodbrod all voted aye.

CHANGES/ADDITIONS TO MEETING AGENDA – no changes were made.

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS SCHEDULED for February 26th, 2026

ZBA Case #26-01 Application of Lisa Nardi, as represented by Stephanie Ullmann, 17 Claires Road, Saugerties NY 12477, for property located at 21 Mill Hill Road, Woodstock NY 12498, a 0.59-acre parcel located within a (HC) Zoning District, for a variance from the Zoning Law of the Town of Woodstock, Article V, Supplementary Regulations, Section 260-31A (7), Sign Regulations, for permission to hang an open flag on a commercial sign.

Representative Mrs. Ullmann was present and stated they were “the new kids in town” and they saw all those flags and they liked them, and to be honest she didn’t think about anything and they hung not the typical blue, white and red flag but a light blue and white one to mimic the Argentinian flag because they sell Argentinian cuisine. They really didn’t think to ask anybody because the whole town was filled with flags, and then one day she came to the restaurant and there was no flag. She started asking what happened and they told her she needed to apply for permit to have it and that is what she did. The reason why she needs the flag is because the restaurant is not at street level, even Sparkle is a little bit into the back. She watched a lot of people walking by and sometimes noticing they were there, that the sign that is up doesn’t belong to Sparkle. People don’t know that behind Sparkle there is another building and the existing walkway is beautiful and romantic but it’s very narrow and sometimes you can barely see the building or if there’s a light on and the flag moves always, so even if you drive by it’s

something that draws attention and it helps them tremendously and she would love to have it back. Chairperson Sillato stated it was to her understanding that everyone was asked to remove their flags and Mrs. Ullman decided to come to the ZBA and ask whether or not she could have the exception, that is why she is here. Chairperson Sillato asked Mrs. Ullman if she had recently spoken to the building department? because it was to her understanding that there were other things on the property that had to be addressed since they were out of compliance. Mrs. Ullman answered yes, she had gotten an email from William Spencer. Chairperson Sillato stated the way they could proceed was Mrs. Ullman could have the opportunity to amend her variance application, since there are other things on her property that are out of compliance, she could add them to her application to ask for those as well. Otherwise, she could bring some of them into compliance without the need of a variance. She understands she is new to town and probably didn't understand that all of these things required building permits and things like that. Mrs. Ullmann asked if it had always been like this? Chairperson Sillato answered yes, the other flags that she saw were not in compliance and that is why they were asked to be removed. Mrs. Ullmann stated she is in the process of filling all the paperwork for the sign that is already there, she wants to do everything right and has no problem following the law. It is just really hard for people to find them, even locals, they just walk by and sometimes they say, "how long have you guys been here?" so it would be beautiful to have the big flag but if she must choose between something, she will and she wants to make it right. Chairperson Sillato stated the best thing to do right now would be for the ZBA to recess the public hearing to give her the opportunity to get everything together, this will give her some time to amend the variance application, she would not have to pay another fee, she would just have to add the asks if need be or if she would like to comply with them without the need of a variance, that all depends on how she would like to proceed. Michele explained to Mrs. Ullmann that she might need to pay some building permit fees but if she were to add anything to the variance application no other fee would be needed to come before the ZBA again. Chairperson Sillato explained what the ZBA was doing was basically putting her on hold until she gets everything straightened out and she can come back with a revised application. Chairperson Sillato stated she should work everything out with the Building Department because they have the authority to decide what has to be done. Chairperson Sillato explained the process to schedule another public hearing. Martin Mills stated if she didn't need a variance she did not have to come back to the ZBA. Mrs. Ullmann stated she would call the Building Department tomorrow and send Michele an email with what she was going to do.

There were no written communications received or contiguous neighbors present.

Michele read the name of the contiguous neighbors: Constantly Awesome/Jennifer Ahearn; Jeffrey Cuiule/Audrey Cosson; Burgher Road LLC; Brandon Hancock and Town of Woodstock.

Chairperson Sillato made a motion to recess the public hearing to the call of the chair of ZBA Case #26-01. Second by Martin Mills. All voted aye.

ZBA CASE # 26-02 Application of Francesca Grassi, as represented by John Stinemire PE of 208 Broadway, Port Ewen NY 12466, for property located at 62 Charlie Spanhake Road, Bearsville NY 12409, a 0.91 acre parcel located in a R5 Zoning District, for variances from the Zoning Law of the Town of Woodstock, Article II Modification of required yards Section 260-26 B (2) (a) for a 6 foot infringement into a 25 foot front yard setback and Article IX, Nonconforming Uses and Noncomplying Buildings, Section 260-94 A (1) in order to construct a 1240 sqft artist studio on an 840 sqft existing structure's footprint.

Representative Mr. Stinemire was present and showed the board some survey maps and explained there was an existing garage, an attached shed. Chairperson Sillato mentioned

photographs were emailed to the board by the applicant and she had also done a drive by. Mr. Stinemire stated it was in pretty rough shape and the owners wanted to make improvements to it. The plan is to demolish both of the structures and then reconstruct a new studio building. The existing shed is 9.17 off the property line and the proposed building is 19.0 off the property line. So the setback is less. Mr. Stinemire showed the board building plans and the survey.

Chairperson Sillato asked about the dimensions and square footage of the studio. Mr. Stinemire stated those were on the floor plans he brought. The partial second floor is a loft area, so 50% of the building has a second floor to it. There are two workspaces and a bathroom in the middle. There are a set of stairs that go up to the loft area. There is a first-floor bathroom with a shower. There is no kitchen. It's not intended to be a dwelling, it's a studio workspace. The dimensions of the building are 25 by 33.5, it's about 1,200 sqft when they add that half. Chairperson Sillato asked what the studio was going to be used for? Mr. Stinemire stated the owners would use it to work at home, he is a cinematographer, so he needs some space and she just needs an office to work out of. Their primary residence is there and they need a workspace. Chairperson Sillato asked what the second story was for? Mr. Stinemire stated the second story is also a work space for him to work, there are no facilities on the second floor. Chairperson Sillato stated that in the zoning law you are only allowed 1000 sqft for a studio. Mr. Stinemire stated they were about 1200 sqft. Chairperson Sillato stated he could revise his plans but his client wasn't available tonight so he would have to reach out to them and see what they wanted to do, either reduce the square footage or amend the application for a 200 sqft variance. Chairperson Sillato asked if the whole building was 2 stories? Mr. Stinemire showed the board on the plans it was a slope roof so only the front area would be full height and the back half of it has a second floor. The overall height is 18 ft 10 in. Floor to floor it is 8ft 10in, so that gives an 8-foot clearance on the first floor and then the highest point is 10 feet. To grade it would be 19-foot 10in slightly under 20 feet. Chairperson Sillato mentioned talking to the owner of the property and seeing what she would like to do. Michele asked if the plans he was showing the board were submitted to the building department. Mr. Stinemire answered yes, they were and he had a conversation with them as well, where they told him to submit a building permit application which he did and it was denied and then he submitted the variance application. Martin Mills asked if it was only for the setbacks? Mr. Stinemire answered yes. Martin Mills also asked if the building department had mentioned anything about the square footage? Mr. Stinemire answered, they did not. Michele requested Mr. Stinemire to send her the plans via email so they could be part of the ZBA case file. Chairperson Sillato mentioned the ZBA did get a site plan, but it didn't have dimensions on it. Mr. Stinemire mentioned he wasn't aware of the 1000 sq foot maximum. He has been through a lot of back and forth with the client to get to this point and he wanted to know what the likelihood of getting a variance for the extra 200 sq ft would be? Had it been done before or was it a hard no? Chairperson Sillato stated not since she has been there, but she doesn't know about before. The setback issue is not an issue. They really must see what the owner wants to do and hopefully there will be more attendance so they can have a full board discussion about it. Martin Mills stated he doesn't recall any recent decisions the ZBA has done like this. They ask if there are any neighbors that have anything to say about this project and he doesn't think they do. He stated the Town has a lot of these because people work from home. He doesn't get the sense that this is going to be a short-term rental or something that is going to be an income driver for them. It is a space for themselves, and they don't have any neighbors. Chairperson Sillato asked if a shower was allowed in a studio, she knows they can have a bathroom facility. Martin Mills stated he is pretty sure they can have a shower just not a kitchen. He asked if there was a reason why they needed to have a shower there? Mr. Stinemire stated it was something the owner requested based on her husbands work. Apparently, he is out in the field a lot so if he comes back late at night or something like that he would go in there instead of going into the house making a lot of noise. Mr. Stinemire stated the DEP had reached out to him, they had some questions about a residential storm water plan which was news to him. Apparently if you are within a certain distance of a stream or wetland, under certain circumstances you need this residential storm or not. They are exempt. Michele asked if he could provide that information as well to include it in the ZBA case folder. Mr. Stinemire said he could forward the email chain. Chairperson Sillato asked if it would connect to their house septic

system? Mr. Stinemire answered there would be a new separate septic. There is another engineer working on that exclusively. Martin Mills asked if the water was coming from the existing well? Mr. Stinemire answered yes. Chairperson Sillato asked what the square footage of the house was? Mr. Stinemire answered he did not have those numbers with him. He could get that to them tomorrow.

Michele read the names of the contiguous neighbors: City of NY DEP and Robin Sylvester.

No neighbors were present and no written communications were received.

Chairperson Sillato made a motion to the call of the chair to recess the public hearing of ZBA Case #26-02. Second by Martin Mills. All voted aye.

3. DECISION & ORDERS AND INTERPRETATIONS OUTSTANDING

None at this time.

4. OTHER

Chairperson Sillato mentioned the March meeting schedule since there were no public hearings for March 12th but there were two for March 26th. She wanted to make sure the members present marked that on their calendars and both said they were available.

Chairperson Sillato made a motion to cancel the ZBA meeting for March 12th, Martin Mills second the motion, all voted aye.

Chairperson Sillato made a motion to adjourn, second by Gregg Goodbrod and Martin Mills, all voted aye.

Submitted by,

Michele Schwerert