

The Village of Woodridge  
Zoning Board Meeting  
March 25, 2026

Salute to the Flag

In attendance: Chair Board, Stephen Miller, Board member, Charles Davis, Louis Saperstein, Yehuda Weisz, Sue Kasofsky (on Zoom)

Also Present: Village Attorney, Jeffrey Kaplan

**A Motion was presented by Louis Saperstein, seconded by Charles Davis to open the Zoning Board meeting at 6:05pm. Unanimous.**

**A Motion was presented by Charles Davis, seconded by Yehuda Weisz to accept the minutes of January 7, 2026. Unanimous.**

**There were no public comments**

Jeffrey Kaplan States: Before we begin, I would like to mention that we have four Zoning Board members present. We have another Zoning Board member that is on Zoom, Sue you can not make a motion but you can comment.

Stephen Miller States: We are here in regards to 95 Highland Ave SBL 102-2-13. They are here for a proposed reduction of required side and rear yard setbacks. To use an existing garage as a residential dwelling.

Moshe Attie States: Good evening I am here on the behalf of the 95 Highland Avenue LLC.

Charles Davis States: Who are you?

Moshe Attie States: My name is Moshe Attie from MA Expediting this is approximately a 17,000, square foot property The client has unfortunately done this without building permits. He has converted a garage into a residential structure. This is for somebody with an elderly mother and the daughter will be living on the property to take care of the mother. This is a 25 x 25 shed and 625 square feet. It has been converted already to a single-family house.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: How many square feet is this?

Moshe Attie States: 625 square feet 25X25 Originally, we were under the impression that we were going to need four variances. One Use variance and three area variances. I received some correspondence from the planner, because we are only going to require one variance for the actual area. There is only 17,000 square feet on the property as opposed to 20,000 square feet, that would have been required.

We asked that the Board to please consider granting the variances to the reduction for the 3,000 square feet and to putting the second residence on the property.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: I just have a couple questions. I wanted to explain to the board one of the items here, and that is that there is no authority under the current zoning law for, accessory, residential, or dwellings. There is a growing trend in the state as a result of the housing shortage to allow what is called accessory dwelling units, but has not been passed yet in Woodridge. The Village board did take this up at its last meeting, and, in fact, it is on the agenda tonight for the Planning board to make a recommendation to the Village board of allowing or adding this to our zoning code to allow accessory dwelling units. It is not allowed yet now, which would, in effect, require a use variance since it is not allowed here, in order to get around that. Use variance, as opposed to an area variance, is a very challenging thing, I assume you gentlemen have found the distinction between the two the reasoning is this. When you are going for something and asking for something that is not allowed under the code, that the legislature, which is the Village board, has not authorized. It is a higher standard than taking something that is authorized by the Village board and in the zoning code, that needs some exceptions. That is where the area variance comes in. For example, an easy one is you have to have in some zones a 25-foot frontage between the street and the house. Because of the lot because of the way they want to build a house, they need it to be 22 feet or a 3-foot variance. That is the kind of variance, which is allowed, the use is not allowed. Now you are just asking for the area to be changed. The criteria we will go over. It is much simpler for an area variance than a use variance. However, for a Use variance, there are some criteria that are almost impossible, and very few exceptions, for the use variance that you need to find that the alleged hardship has not been self-created. Here you have an applicant that is coming in and saying, I want to make a garage into a residence. It is self-created, and there is no exceptions to that in a use variance. There is for an area variance. Another provision that he would have to meet is that he or she cannot realize a reasonable return provided lack of returns is substantial as demonstrated by competent financial evidence. There is no way putting a house on a single-family lot, and then an accessory dwelling unit, you are going to be able to show that you can not define that you can not make a financial return of your investment in the house. What I would suggest tonight, and again, I am just giving you a legal opinion here. You guys are the boss.

Charles Davis States: We appreciate that.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: What I would suggest tonight is you review with the applicant, his proposal for the area variance, with the understanding that if and when the Village board passes a ADU that would be allowed in that zone, that he would be set to go because you have already considered what variance he needs. The only questions that I have is this. I believe that once the new law comes in, he will not need 20,000 square feet to begin with. They will only need 10,000 square feet. You do not need to have 20,000 square feet under the zoning law that is being proposed. What he would need, and what you should be looking at tonight, is the fact that, he does not meet your side lot requirements on this property. For example, he is only five feet from the property line, and at one point, it was 4.1 feet, 7.1 and 18.2. You started by saying you were told you did not have to meet those variances?

Moshe Attie States: That was in the letter that was forwarded to me from the Village planner. That letter from my understanding of that letter, is that we're going for Variances for the 17,000, it is supposed to be for 20,000.

Yehuda Weisz States: If that is the case, what is the minimum setback for that?

Jeffrey Kaplan States: The minimum side lot would be the side yard, is 12 and a half feet in that district, and he is requesting a 4-foot 6-inch, variance. The rear lot is 25 feet, and his is requesting 12.7. That is the average. You do not have to worry about Lot area, even though that is what this letter says, because if they passed the new law, then that would allow the 10,000 square feet. You do not have to go for that because there is because there is only one principal dwelling, and this is going to be an accessory dwelling,

Stephen Miller States: This is if they pass it. and if they do not pass it?

Jeffrey Kaplan States: You can just take the position here that if an accessory dwelling is not allowed, and you need a use variance, we are not going to give it to you, and that's the end of the discussion. My thought is that rather than him then come back, for an area variance at some point, at which time you are first going to review and discuss this, that you should discuss it tonight. To avoid an additional trip back, that would be up to you. The whole thing is up to you.

Yehuda Weisz States: You are saying if we give a denial, he can still come back under the new area variance.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: It depends what your denial is based on. If you say to him that we are denying this because we do not think that an accessory dwelling should be as close to the adjoining property as this garage is, then that is one thing. I mean, we can take into account, of course, that the building is already there. It is not like he is building a building within five feet of his neighbor. The building was there. If you denied him the use of an accessory dwelling, he would still be able to have his garage there. That is not going change anything. That sort of limits

your concerns on that when you have a dwelling. I am sure the dwelling predates zoning and it is a nonconforming use. When he does get a change, you can look at what he is doing and how he is proposing to do it. There are a few differences obviously you know his access to his residence it is not like he is driving his car up. It looks like he is parking somewhere up here, and then walking through his house, or the residence. Is that correct?

Moshe Attie States: I believe that they have done this. I do not want to miss represent this. From my understanding, there will be a walkway.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: How far is that distance from the walkway to that back?

Moshe Attie States: Just going off of the scale it looks something like,40 feet or something like that. This is just going off of the scale.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: Some of the issues, and I believe they may come before the planning board would be lighting the sidewalk. I mean, you have a 40-foot sidewalk. You come home at 10 o'clock at night you may not make it back to your house. Clearly, you are going to want lighting between that, probably some sort of movement lighting, and as you're moving, the light is going to go on. It would have to be dark sky protected, so you do not have lights glaring all over to the neighboring property.

Moshe Attie States: We actually are not planning on presenting this to planning board tonight because where we stand, there is a lot of the site plan to be updated substantially further.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: I am saying I do not think it is their issue, as much as the planning board issue for the lighting. You are really looking at this from point A in what I am calling a use variance, because it is not allowed. Then, B, the fact that you have a property that is, on one side, 5 foot to the neighbor, and the other is 7 feet at one of the shortest points and 18.2 at the other. I do not believe there is anything else that you are really looking at other than those two area variances. As I said, under the proposed zoning law, because it is an accessory dwelling, and not a principal dwelling, you are only looking at the required square footage in that district, not double. For example, if you put a two-family house in the R1 or R2 district 10,000 per dwelling, you need 20,000 square feet. He would need that if it was a two-family house. He would need 20,000 square feet. But under the proposed accessory dwelling unit law, it does not change the 10,000. The reason for that is that the second resident is, by law, significantly smaller than the primary resident.

Louis Saperstein States: Jeff, could we ask him, more or less, when this garage was created way back when, It obviously had what two doors or one door in the front, right? When did you start to do the construction on the garage and did you get permission to do that?

Moshe Attie States: Unfortunately, they did it without any building permits. This was without any permission, unfortunately.

Louis Sapestein States: You need a building permit Correct? You never got one?

Moshe Attie States: They never received a building permit.

Stephen Miller States: They never applied for a building permit.

Moshe Attie States: They will have to apply for a building permit. Once there is an approval, the building will apply for a building permit, and the building permit will review the transfer, and we'll probably have to have an architecture, engineer sign off on the actual construction of it, to make sure that's all done, per code.

Louis Saperstein States: How so, how far has it gone now? Is it just the outside? Are you looking at it is yellow? And there is nothing inside, or is the inside finished, also?

Moshe Attie States: The inside is finished as well.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: He can not occupy it? He can not occupy it as a residence until he goes through the proper steps. The fact that he started building it is not on him. He is just the agent that really is the reason they are here to begin with. They are here because they were told afterwards, hey, you can not do that. You have to go first to the planning board, the planning board then sent them over to you, but again, one of the issues is, an accessory dwelling unit is not specifically allowed in the code, and the way a zoning code works. If it is not specifically allowed, then it is not allowed. It is not that if it does not say, it is not allowed, you can do it. It is the other way around.

Louis Saperstein States: Can he walk out of here today with no permits and go to the planning board?

Jeffrey Kaplan States: No, here is what he needs from you. He would need from you a blessing, so to speak, that the, notwithstanding the fact that he does not meet the current area variances and that you are alright with that. It is not really that big of an issue, because again, the building is there, whether or not you approve the variances or not. Then he would have to wait until the board, the Village board, acts on the ADU proposal, which is going to be discussed tonight by the planning board. The way a change in the zoning law works is the Village board would refer it to the planning board, the planning board would then make a recommendation and send it back to the Village board.

Louis Saperstein States: What I hear you saying is, we can not really make a decision tonight.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: You can, if you feel it is appropriate you can say well, we are going to give them a use variance, and let them have an accessory dwelling unit. Again, my comment to you is, I do not see how he meets that criteria without a change of the law.

What you can do is save him a trip back here pending and subject to the authority to have an accessory unit on your property. We are alright with the variance to that structure, that you can do tonight. The other items are all going to be before the planning board.

Stephen Miller States: They should move the building closer to the other building. It would cost just as much. What do you think?

Sue Kasofsky States: Jeff I would like to ask a question.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: Sure, Sue Go ahead.

Sue Kasofsky States: I am not sure that I heard the whole explanation, but what you are saying is that we could approve the idea that it can be closer on the side door and closer in the rear yard, that the zoning calls for now? We can approve that if we want.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: You can approve it subject to the amendment and the zoning code that would allow for accessory dwelling units in the R2 district. Without that, he could not do it. You could, again, vote and say, well, I heard what Kaplan had to say, but I am going to give the use variance anyway. That would be difficult, you know, you have to meet certain criteria, and I do not believe he meets that criteria but you can. It is just avoiding him having to come back here, since he is here already, and you are hot on the topic, then you are going say to him.

Alright, we looked at this it is alright. We will give you the area variances you need, but it has to be subject to the Village board passing a ADU law.

Yehuda Weisz States: Our approval is not a guarantee for him to be able to do this.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: Absolutely not. You are absolutely correct.

Sue Kasofsky States: What you are saying is that if we do not approve it, and the planning board says that there can be an accessory unit, then what he is doing would be allowed? Is that what you are saying?

Jeffrey Kaplan States: If you would have to come back. If you said that we are not giving him the area variance to have a residential unit as close to the adjoining property, then, no matter what anyone else does, he would fail because he does not meet the side or the rear lot areas. If you said, that it is acceptable to us, as long as ADUs are allowed, in the R2 district, then he does not have to come back here. Then he can present this to the planning board that that building can be used where it is located as an accessory dwelling unit. As long as that the other criteria that you make is met. You meaning the planning board.

Sue Kasofsky States: What you are saying is if it becomes an accessory unit and we have approved this. He does not have to do anything.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: He does not have to come back here. He still has to go to the planning board.

Sue Kasofsky States: He Can be very close on the side and the rear?

Yehuda Weisz States: Yes, but again, it still does not change the fact that the dwelling is there. We have to have that discussion.

Charles Davis States: It was not done correctly, though? I think the building department would need to look into it.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: The building department looked into it, and put a stop work order on it, and that is why they would still have to go for that process.

Charles Davis States: Infrastructure, was that considered?

Moshe Attie States: The planning board will be taking a closer look. We are going to be showing this to the planning board but we do have to put a lot of work in on this.

Charles Davis States: How many residents are you planning on having up there? How many people are we talking about?

Moshe Attie States: There will be one residence there will be two bedrooms there. There is going to be a family there.

Charles Davis States: Is this going to be a rental property? Is it seasonal or year-round?

Moshe Attie States: This is for a mother and a daughter who is living there. It is not being rented out to others. It will be all year; I do not know if they will actually live in it all year

Louis Saperstein States: They have both water and sewer?

Jeffrey Kaplan States: Yes. They can not use anything right now, but there is.

Louis Saperstein States: In the garage, did they put in water and sewer?

Moshe Attie States: No, they ran a line, and they are going to have to show the planning board exactly what they did. Most likely there will have to be changes made to bring this up to code. When we are in front of the planning board and when we are in front of the building department, there will have to be structural and super upgrades made to bring this up to code.

Louis Saperstein States: Jeff, we do not allow this unless a person can put in water and sewer. Unless they hook up to the village water and sewer, I do not even know if they are allowed.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: They are going to have to. Since both properties are on the same lot, they will probably let them use the same water and sewer lines and just extend it.

Louis Saperstein States: What, you are saying is that you have to have water and sewer from the village?

Jeffrey Kaplan States: You always need water and sewer. You can not have a residential dwelling without water and sewer. That is their problem.

Louis Saperstein States: That is the problem with the planning board, having to say, you better have water and Sewer or we are not allowing it. That is up to them to do that is not up to us.

Yehuda Weisz States: That house that is existing right now, is someone living their full time?

Moshe Attie States: I do not believe it is full-time whether they come up only in the summertime,

Yehuda Weisz States: This dwelling that is on there is for the mother and daughter staying in there or the mother lives in the bigger house and the daughter who takes care of her lives in the dwelling.

Moshe Attie States: The mother lives in the bigger house. This is a daughter that is taking care of the mother she lives in this small house. I do also want to point out that they have been served to go to court in the Village of Woodridge for the fines for this. That is something that the court is handling because the fines do have to be paid. If they do occupy without a CO, I believe it is \$1500 a day. It is not going to be occupied until this is fully brought up to code and the building department has fully signed off on it.

Stephen Miller States: Are there any other discussions? I guess the proposal is to wait to see if the planning board approves or the Village board would approve the accessory dwelling unit before he can move on.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: He is going to have to do that anyway. The question is are you really looking at this as whether you want to require him to come back here after the ADU. If and when the ADU law has been passed by the village board, or are you comfortable in just saying we will grant you those variances that you need as long as the ADU law has been passed into those.

Louis Saperstein States: Sounds like he has to come back anyway.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: He does not have to come back here unless you are going to say we are taking no action today, because we will not give them a use variance because the new law is not in affect yet for the ADU.

Louis Saperstein States: What is your issue with time? What are you looking for now?

Moshe Attie States: They would love to be in there for the summer, and we would really appreciate if we could get a conditional approval subject to the Village board changing the laws of the ADU. We would really appreciate that. If the board is not comfortable with that, I have no problem coming back here. We would appreciate, though, if we could receive an approval subject to the law change tonight.

Yehuda Weisz States: The law is not being changed tonight. It is just being talked about.

Stephen Miller States: They are going to discuss it and then something that is going to be dragging on for a little bit. The planning board is going to discuss it and then have it placed in front of the village board and the village board will have to vote.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: At the April meeting, the board will probably discuss what happened at the planning board meeting tonight. At that meeting, they would probably most likely, as a first step, have to send it to the county. For the county to consider this under the 239 County Review for the proposal to allow ADUs in the village. Then they would come back I would say that if everything went as expeditiously as the applicant hoped it would, the board, the Village board could vote on it in May. Depending on when the May planning board meeting is, they could either be back in front of the planning board in May or June. I would say this to you, for all practical purposes. It really is just a question of your convenience. Whether you want to come back again after the law has been passed. At the end of the day, he is not going to get held up anymore. What they will do is, you will talk to him at six, and if he gets his approval, he will go before the planning board at seven. It is really just a question of saying, hey, look, why are we coming back? We took a look at this. The building was there, and we will give him his rear and side lot, and then let him go over the planning board and the Village board. If you say to yourself, Yeah, well, we will wait until after they pass it, then you guys have to come back.

Louis Saperstein States: How does that set a precedent for the next person that comes along?

Sue Kasofsky States: What I am concerned about is that if we approve this tonight, it could set a precedent. I really feel. The side yard, and the rear, as he has it, is much too close, and then if we approved it then Someone else comes along.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: Sue, I understand your concerns, because once you give someone an area variance, the next person is going to look at it, but, you know, the reason why there are exceptions to the rule is that there are different facts in each case. In this case, in particular, he is not building the building is there. If he was building, then you would say, you got enough land? Move your building into the middle, and then you do not even have to come to us. But the building is there already, so it is a very limited exception that you would make. And again, I am not advocating for the applicant. I hear your argument, but the bottom line is, as I said before, that building is going to be there, whether you would allow or don't allow those variances. It's not like, there won't be a building within five feet of the next property. It is going to be there anyways. You may have some concerns and say if it is different if it is a new garage or a new residence. That might be an argument. In terms of saying you are setting a precedent, the precedent is very limited because you would have to find other garages that are detached

Sue Kasofsky States: What I am concerned about is that this was done five years ago without approval. Someone else could do something without approval.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: No Sue the building was not built then the building has been there for a long time. They started renovating it five years ago that is an old building. That building was not

built in violation of the law. The building was there. It was converted in violation of the law, not built.

Moshe Attie States: If I may point out the alternative over here would be if we do not, if we were, for some reason, not to receive a variance, and the alternative would be, once the ADU laws are passed would be to build a separate ADU unit over here. This would be putting 3 structures on the property instead of the existing shed. If the ADU law is passed that would be the alternative somewhere that would comply with the setbacks. It is something that is going to be a big financial burden on them, but it is something that would be the only alternative situation.

Stephen Miller States: I would actually wait

Yehuda Weisz States: In my opinion whether or not we give him an approval right now, he still has to go through all the other jumps to get there, right? Because there is the ADU, there is the building department, and the planning board. We are just the first people to give them the okay, but he still has to go through a bunch of hoops before he gets anything done. I do not think it is setting the precedence for anything, because, like we're saying, the structure is already there.

This was built yes; they did it without permits. 100% and that is wrong. They have consequences for that. They are paying fines. You know, if people learn from that then, you know, they want to follow in suit and pay fines as well. That is why we have a criminal justice and a justice department for it. I believe that the fact that the dwelling is there, and he still has to go through all the hurdles, maybe we cut a little bit of slack on our end. Even if we do give him an approval, that is not even a guarantee. If he goes through the loops and gets everything else anyways.

Stephen Miller States: The biggest part is if they approve the new law. And that's the thing. So, of course, if you have to present it to the planning board, present it to the Village board, and they have to go into the County planning division. It is going to take at least to June, as government works, to do this. I mean, the only thing Jeff is saying is that, if we give him the okay, says, we will give you the variance depending on if the law is passed.

Yehuda Weisz States: That is what we are saying if it is passed, if it is not passed, he does not get it, then it does not set a precedent for anybody else to do anything.

Charles Davis States: When someone else comes here when they want to renovate, but they bypass the committee. Are they going to do that? If we do not hold true to the policy, then everyone can do what they want to do. With any kind of consequences. That is why you have this board. And if you can bypass the board, then, you know, you're not doing the right thing.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: There are plenty of people that try to bypass the board by not getting building permits when they required it. And the bottom line is, that is up to the building department to determine that somebody did a construction renovation or addition, without a building permit. In which case, a couple of things would happen. Number one, they could say, you have to take down what you did. Number two, they could take them into court and give them violations. Number three, if they started to work and did not complete it, then they give them a stop work order. They will not give them a certificate of compliance or completion that would allow them to occupy. That is what is happening here. They have the triple whammy of number one there, now in court, because they did this. They can not occupy it so and they are coming before the planning board and the ZBA. They have gotten their knuckles wrapped, so to speak.

Yehuda Weisz States: Correct. Had this been a structure that would have been added, Okay. I would have, completely said not to go for it, but structure is there. Whether we approve it or not approve it, it is still going to be there, and it is still going to be something that they can use, just not as a dwelling.

Louis Saperstein States: Jeff, can I make a crazy remark here? What would happen if they took whatever monies they have or whatever they want to do, and they decided, because there is no water and sewer hooked up there, yet, probably, you know, electric there and it works or whatever. What happens if they jack the building up and move it over 20 feet? Does it take away these problems?

Jeffrey Kaplan States: They can do that if they want to. I mean, it is an old garage. I do not know.

Louis Saperstein States: I do not know what it costs to move a building, but it is an option that you may have. Then there is no argument. It will solve all the problems.

Stephen Miller States: That is if it could stand the jacking up and then moving.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: What you have got to focus on is this. Your job in this case is either to say, I will allow you to reduce the side and the rear variances, or areas, or I won't. If you say No, the building is going to stay there, but it will only be able to be used as a garage. If you say yes, then he has to go through all those other steps before he is going to use it as a residence. If you want to say, well, we are going to wait until after the law is passed, then we will just come back and we will be in the same condition we are in now. But you can do that.

Louis Saperstein States: Does that include the driveway, which is 4 feet away from the line?

Jeffrey Kaplan States: That will be discussed with the Village board, but I have a feeling that it is not a structure for purposes of side lot, putting in a driveway there. You can have a driveway closer to property in a single-family residence or a dwelling.

Stephen Miller States: The thing is, do we want to hold off until a law is passed, or should we word it that when the law is passed, he would have the variances necessary? That is the only basic two things we are aiming for?

Jeffrey Kaplan States: Yeah, you are doing two things. First of all, you have to do a SEQR so you are going to neg dec the project. It might be a type two, I have to look at that, and you would not have to do anything, but for our purposes, you would do a SEQR. You say that it has, no impact, no significant impact on the environment by doing what he is doing. And then your 2nd would be to consider the 2 area variances that would allow the building to be used as a dwelling unit provided that the laws passed that would authorize that.

Then he gets the proper approvals from the planning board and the building department.

Louis Saperstein States: Somewhere in here, I read something about the fact that there is water running through that property. I do not know if it is down deep or on top, but it does say this.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: If that is the case, that would be reviewed by the planning board. It does not really impact what it is.

Moshe Attie States: The advantage of us receiving a zoning board variance tonight, although we will not be able to build any sooner, I will not get them, you will not be able to be in there any sooner. The advantage of it would be, really, that we can more confidently begin working on the actual site plan of it. Doing whatever has to be done. Looking at the water and the sewer, the lighting as Mr. Kaplan pointed out earlier, things like that. That way we will feel more confident to spend the money looking at now as opposed to now. We do not really feel so confident spending that money.

Louis Saperstein States: We want to help the guy, but then again, the flow is coming up. I would not know how to answer this one.

Jeffrey Kaplan States: Let's start by doing SEQR Let's get the easy part out of it. Can we have a motion, for purposes of a SEQR, to find that there is no significant environmental impact? We need a motion to on that

**A motion was presented by Louis Saperstein, seconded by Charles Davis to determine that under the SEQR the board has found that there is no significant environmental impact.**

**Role Call**

**Stephen Miller,     Aye**  
**Louis Saperstein,  Aye**  
**Charles Davis,     Aye**  
**Yehuda Weisz,**

Okay, so now, in terms of the variances, why don't you just put a motion on the floor, and then vote, and either you are going to vote yes or no.

**A motion was presented by Stephen Miller, seconded by Louis Saperstein to grant the variances requested for side yard 4'6',rear yard 12'7', and lot area of 17,031 To allow, a variance for the building that now exists, to be used as a single or a residential dwelling unit, or an accessory dwelling unit, subject to the Village board approval and Planning board approval the building department.**

**Unanimous.**

#### **Role Call**

<b>Stephen Miller,</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Louis Saperstein,</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Charles Davis,</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Yuda Weisz,</b>	<b>Aye</b>

You have to be here to vote, sorry I am sorry Sue. You can listen on Zoom?

Sue Kasofsky States: Does that count for Village board meeting too?

Jeffrey Kaplan States: In an absent an emergency situation, and also there's some criteria that has to be met in the notice that the person who is on the village board that is voting has to be in a place open to the public so that people can come and watch the person at the meeting. So there's a lot of steps, and so we start off by where you are now is not an emergency, so you wouldn't qualify to begin with. But when you come back, we're happy to have you.

**A motion was presented by Louis Saperstein, seconded by Charles Davis to end the Zoning Board meeting at 6:58pm. Unanimous.**

