

**VILLAGE OF HASTINGS-ON-HUDSON, NEW YORK**  
**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**JANUARY 22, 2015**

A Regular Meeting was held by the Zoning Board of Appeals on Thursday, January 22, 2015 at 8:00 p.m. in the Meeting Room, Municipal Building, 7 Maple Avenue.

**PRESENT:** Chairman Matthew Collins, Boardmember Ray Dovell, Boardmember David Forbes-Watkins, Boardmember Sean Hayes (8:02 p.m.), Boardmember Adam Anuskiewicz (8:02 p.m.), Village Attorney Linda Whitehead, and Deputy Building Inspector Charles Minozzi, Jr.

**Chairman Collins:** All right, ladies and gentlemen, we're gonna get underway as soon as I can confirm there are cameras on. All right, good, there's the nod.

Thanks, everybody, for joining the January 22 meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals. We typically have five Boardmembers and, by every indication, all five were gonna be here tonight. You have three, and I'll just explain a little bit about a procedural wrinkle that you'll want to think about.

In order for any zoning variance request to be approved you have to have a majority of the Board, which means you need to have three out of five. That means when there are only three we can hear cases, but it means that the vote must be unanimous in order for the variance to be approved. So what we've told people in the past is you're absolutely welcome to present the case. And if you feel like you would like for us to go to a vote we're happy to do that. If you are uneasy, based on the feedback that you're getting in the conversation and your presentation, you also have the choice to defer your case until the next meeting. If you have any questions along the way, just ask them. It's perfectly OK.

Before we begin, Buddy, how are the mailings?

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** I've been informed by my staff that the mailings are all in order.

**Chairman Collins:** OK, thank you very much. So we have two cases tonight, and we'll take them in the order in which they're presented in the notice. So why don't we begin with Case 01-15, which is Aaron and Jennifer Tubbs for 108 Mt. Hope Boulevard for the construction of a deck which has front- and side yard variance impact.

**Case No. 01-15  
Aaron & Jennifer Tubbs  
108 Mt. Hope Boulevard**

**Relief from the strict application of the Village code sections 295-68F.1.a and 295-68F.1.c, for construction of a new nonconforming side deck at their home at 108 Mt. Hope Blvd. Said property is in R-10 Zoning District and is also known as SBL: 4.80-74-13 on the Village Tax Maps.**

**Non-conformity details of the proposed deck are as follows:**

- 1. Front Yard: Existing and Proposed – Existing - 12.8 feet & 10.4 feet; Proposed - 13.5 feet; Required Minimum - 30 feet {295-68F.1.a.}**
- 2. Side Yard: Existing and Proposed – Existing - 6.3 feet; Proposed - 7.0 feet; Required Minimum - 12 feet {295-68F.1.c.}**

**Chairman Collins:** So who's gonna present on behalf of the applicant? And as always, just introduce yourself into the microphone. And anyone speaking, please do speak into the microphone because we've got all of that being recorded.

**Julius Twine, architect:** I'm the architect representing Mr. Tubbs.

**Aaron Tubbs, applicant:** I'm the property owner.

**Chairman Collins:** All right, thank you.

**Mr. Twine:** OK. Mr. Tubbs has decided to go with the three members we've got here.

**Chairman Collins:** And you also have the choice to ... you don't have to, you can change your mind later. You can present your case, and if you're not liking the way things are going ...

**Mr. Twine:** That's quite all right. Basically, the project is

**Chairman Collins:** And here we are. You've got your five now.

**Mr. Twine:** Maybe we can start out with the site. This is a portion of the site which shows the important areas. This is the residence, and the total site is a sort of flagpole and the residence has been built in the pole part of the flagpole site and really has very little clearances on any of its sides. The flag portion of the site is away from the house, and Mr. Tubbs wants to extend somewhat into that area.

On the west side of the property it is 6 foot 3 from the property line, and on the east side he has another street. Although it's one-way, Mt. Hope Boulevard, he has Jefferson on the east side which gives him another front yard situation of 30 feet. So he's kind of restricted in that area. The larger portion of his site is on the southern part of his property, and if he could get to it he could probably put a deck in that area. But there is no reasonable way for him to get to it so he is rather restricted to what he can do. I've got to say that I've been looking at this property for some 30 years. Since I live in the area, I keep going by. I've got to say that Mr. Tubbs has done one heck of a job of taking that house that is there and working on the exterior of it, and made it a showplace for what he's done

The thing he does need is some outside space where he can have some sort of activity, and at the moment there's just no easy way for him to get to the exterior, even to the lower part of his property. He has to go downstairs and have all kinds of difficulties to actually get to it. That's the basic problem he faces. Looking at the actual buildable area, given the restrictions of our code for this area, this is really what he could have built given the fact that he wanted to start from scratch and build here because of the setbacks on the front, which extend to three sides of his property. Then from the side yards, he's got very restricted areas. So if he would have started from scratch he would have a very restricted kind of area to build in.

The deck he's talking about building is a simple 29 by 15 foot deck which projects out from the south part of his house, which is the living area. It gives him this much space to be able to get out of his house onto an open space. That's the basic problem he's got to deal with. There is not another good solution, as I said, that I thought I could recommend for him to do, and I think it's about the most reasonable one we have. These are just the elevations of what the south portion of his property would look like, the deck being along the living area.

The rest of the property is a floor – a large floor area – a large distance below his living area. This is the living area. From the west of the property, you can see it sticks out that way. From the road, from Jefferson Avenue – which is the road going along – the deck is not very prominent. It is a very low kind of deck I think would work fairly well for him. And his neighbors, I don't believe, will be impacted in any significant way since they can see around the deck toward the river area.

Basically, that's about it. I don't know that Mr. Tubbs wants to add anything.

**Mr. Tubbs:** You covered it.

**Chairman Collins:** OK, I thank you for the presentation. One thing I wanted to clarify, and it's more of a technicality in the variance request itself, is that when we talk about the

proposed front yard setback of 13-1/2 feet and the proposed side yard of 7 feet, we are talking about the relationship between the deck and the property lines.

**Mr. Twine:** The property lines, right.

**Chairman Collins:** The home itself, in every way – the existing condition because this is an existing nonconformity – that existing condition does not change.

**Mr. Twine:** No.

**Chairman Collins:** So we are talking purely about a variance that applies in these dimensions only to the deck.

Having visited the site I sympathize, Mr. Tubbs, with your desire to have an outdoor space you can access. Because there are very steep slopes there, having a way to go from the first floor out to some usable space makes an awful lot of sense. And of all the yards you have to work with, that is the one that is the most generous and available to you.

I only spent 10 minutes on the property yesterday and I can't recall if the deck, once built, will come all the way forward to what I'll call the driveway. Or the brick patio is probably the better way of describing it; it is not a driveway at all. But the brick patio you have there, does the deck extend to that patio, or no?

**Mr. Tubbs:** It'll be just to ... so in other words, the bricks kind of start at the face of the house. And it'll be maybe a foot short of that and wrap around the corner, if you will. So it won't extend past ... I don't know if you remember, there's a downspout that comes down the side of the house about a foot from what I would call the front face if you're standing on Jefferson.

**Chairman Collins:** OK.

**Mr. Tubbs:** The deck would be about a foot behind that.

**Chairman Collins:** So the only entrance, then, to this deck will be from the inside of the house there on the first floor, correct?

**Mr. Tubbs:** Right.

**Chairman Collins:** OK. All right, I think I wanted to clarify the technicalities of it. I think that is a very straightforward request, I think it's a very reasonable request. I think it'll

improve the usability of the home, especially given the steep slope conditions. But at this point, I'd like other Boardmembers to weigh in and ask any questions.

**Boardmember Forbes-Watkins:** How high is that deck gonna be? You step out ... you have a doorway on that wall and you'd step out. How far down would you go from that doorway to the ground level?

**Mr. Tubbs:** At the back of the house it's about 12 feet.

**Boardmember Forbes-Watkins:** Twelve?

**Mr. Tubbs:** And then it slopes up, you know, a couple feet there. So you're probably 8, 9 feet. Once you get towards the bottom of the steps ... there's a set of concrete steps that go down from the driveway level. So it'll be, you know, somewhere in the neighborhood of 10 to 12 feet tall once you come down below there.

**Boardmember Forbes-Watkins:** It's not a place where you would step out to take a breath of air without breaking your leg.

**Mr. Tubbs:** Right, right. No. As they say, it's not the fall that hurts you, it's the landing, right?

**Chairman Collins:** And what's the total square footage of the deck itself, when completed?

**Mr. Tubbs:** Rough number would be 15 by 30.

**Chairman Collins:** Fifteen by thirty.

**Mr. Tubbs:** So 450 square foot; 435, I think, something like that, right ?

**Boardmember Dovell:** Well, it's a large variance, but I don't think you have a ... there's no solution given the topography and given the weird condition of the site, the weird configuration of the site.

**Mr. Tubbs:** Yes.

**Boardmember Dovell:** There's just not another solution.

**Mr. Tubbs:** Right.

**Boardmember Dovell:** And it's so steep you kind of fall off your own site if you didn't have something out there level.

**Mr. Tubbs:** Yeah.

**Boardmember Dovell:** I think it's quite a reasonable solution, despite what a large variance it is in terms of area and setback. I don't have a problem with it, Matt.

**Chairman Collins:** All right, thanks Ray. Sean, anything?

**Boardmember Hayes:** Well, I would just say that it sounds like there aren't other alternatives.

**Mr. Twine:** It's about 450.

**Chairman Collins:** OK. Thanks, Mr. Twine.

**Boardmember Hayes:** It sounds like it's reasonable, doesn't sound like there are other alternatives. I'd be curious if there was anybody, any neighbors, who have an objection. That's usually my first concern.

**Chairman Collins:** Yeah.

**Boardmember Hayes:** But in the absence of that, I don't see an issue.

**Chairman Collins:** OK. Adam, any feedback?

**Boardmember Anuskiewicz:** I don't have a problem with this either. I think it's a reasonable solution.

**Chairman Collins:** OK. Well, why don't we take the opportunity to see if anyone in the audience wishes to be heard on the case. If you could just come forward and speak into the standing microphone. Just introduce yourself, please.

**Bill Borowitz, 49 Jefferson Avenue:** This is my wife, Annette. We live in the house which would probably be most impacted by this deck. We live within the adjoining property on Jefferson Avenue, which is due south of that deck, approximately 50, 75 feet from it. We have absolutely no problems with it. We feel it would have very little visual impact because of the type of construction: it's not a building, there's no foundation. Mr. Tubbs has been very forthcoming, has called us over, informed us what he was doing, asked us if we had any

suggestions or things that we didn't care about it and that he would try to accommodate us. We didn't.

So we completely support his idea. Living in the same property, the same conditions, we built a side deck because we couldn't really get to our property. It's just you're down like almost two to three stories. So it is a very difficult area to use your yards in. So, again, I would suggest that you approve his application.

**Chairman Collins:** All right. Thank you, Mr. Borowitz.

Yes, please?

**Annette Borowitz, 49 Jefferson Avenue:** Neighbor of Mr. Tubbs and his lovely family, we've lived in the house, our house, for 47 years. And we've looked at Mr. Tubbs' house for 20 years that was an eyesore. We're so happy that he has done such a beautiful job. It's just a welcome to the neighborhood. So I think everyone on the street has commented, too. I wish him luck, and I hope you approve it.

**Chairman Collins:** Thank you, Mrs. Borowitz. Does anyone else wish to be heard on the case?

Then if there's nothing further from the audience or from the Board, can I get a motion, please? And here, we're talking the proposed really is in reference just to the deck, not to the dwelling.

On MOTION of Boardmember Forbes-Watkins, SECONDED by Boardmember Hayes with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the application of Aaron and Jennifer Tubbs for the construction of a new non-conforming side deck at 108 Mt. Hope Boulevard. Non-conformity details of the proposed deck are as follows: 1) front yard: existing 12.8 feet and 10.4 feet; proposed 13.5 feet; required minimum 30 feet. 2) side yard: existing 6.3 feet and proposed 7 feet; required minimum 12 feet.

**Chairman Collins:** The vote's unanimous. Congratulations. Thank you very much.

**Case No. 02-15  
Paul Gates  
95 Circle Drive**

**Relief from the strict application of the Village Code sections 295-68F.2.a (1) and 295-68F.1.c, for construction of a new side entrance and a new, larger rear deck at their house at 95 Circle Drive. Said property is in the R-10 Zoning District and is also known as SBL: 4.40-42-14 on the Village Tax Maps.**

**Variance is sought for the extension of an Existing Nonconformity:  
Nonconformity details of the proposed Entrance & Deck are as follows:**

- 1. Building Coverage: Existing - 24.84%; Proposed - 27.5%; Required Maximum - 25% {295-68F.2.a(1)}.**
- 2. Side Yards: One Side - Existing - 12.2 feet; Proposed - 8.2 feet; Required Minimum - 12 feet {295-68F.1.c}.  
Two sides - Existing - 29.54 feet; Proposed - 25.54 feet; Required Minimum - 30 feet {295-68F.1.c}**

**Chairman Collins:** Our second case this evening is Case 02-15, Paul Gates, for 95 Circle Drive, also for the creation of a deck. This one has both building coverage variance and side yard variance needs. As usual, anyone speaking speak into a microphone and make sure you introduce yourself the first time you speak.

**John Adams, architect:** I'm representing Paul Gates and Kerry Sparks, who are here. They're the homeowners. Basically what we're proposing is, we're doing a renovation of the house. We're doing sort of a major fix-up of the house. The house itself is existing nonconforming in quite a few respects. The lot area is significantly less than 10,000 square feet.

I don't know how well you can see it, but the dash line here represents the actual setbacks. So the house itself, there was an original house which we call the "core house." Then there was an addition done at some point in the back. The actual core house sits in the entire front yard as the zoning rules are written right now.

The principal thing we're really trying to accomplish here is, when you look at the house the way it exists right now – so this being the front of the house and another view of the front of the house, there are no front steps – it's very hard ...

**Chairman Collins:** Never seen a house like that before.

**Mr. Adams:** No.

**Chairman Collins:** I mean, not just with the entrance, but just the whole facing of it looks, at first glance, like it's been placed backwards on the lot.

**Mr. Adams:** Right, it's very weird. As you say, I've looked all over that neighborhood trying to find another example and I haven't been able to find one. And I'm not really sure if that's how the house was originally designed. Because one of the things were doing is, we're turning this into an open porch and rebuilding what was an addition on top. And forensically, we've found that the actual exterior stucco falls on the face of the house, moving back, so we think it was an open porch originally. As we've designed it now, we feel like we're returning it closer to what it was.

Anyway, our solution to this problem was to place the steps in the side yard. We think that makes the most sense. I'll just give you the proposed.

**Chairman Collins:** One thing, Mr. Adams, as you're taking us through your proposal speak to the need that the applicants are hoping to address and why these changes. I mean, you've got an entrance that you'd like to make more logical in keeping with the way houses are done, but there are other things you have in mind. So as you're taking us through the changes, just keep those things in mind.

**Mr. Adams:** Yeah, let me just move this. I mean, right now the entrance to the house actually is at the back. So you have to travel to the back. We just think that's a hardship, basically. I mean, eventually when they have children and people come to drop their kids off it's like nobody knows how to get into your house. So it is strange. We also think adding these steps on the side yard will add a lot to the neighborhood. And I think it will improve the look of the house, as well.

I would also note that there's an existing pathway here which is going to remain. Our intention is to place these steps between the inside edge of this pathway and the house itself. As far as the impact of the steps, I think it's very minimal. In other words, we're not extending into where the path already is; it's not a new path that we're forging. That's the one variance that we're looking for.

The second variance is ... again, it's something even more minor, I think. We've decided to create ... in our addition, what we've done in our treatment of the house, we've opened up the back of the house with a series of three doors – three big sliding doors. Our intention is that we would like to have the deck. There is a deck there now, but it's broken up on different levels. It's in about three different levels. So what we want to do is create a deck that's just one level that's 10 feet deep, which is about the minimum, we think, for entertaining. And we want it to stretch all the way from the one corner of the house to the

other corner of the house. In doing so, we exceed, in a minor way, what's called the "building coverage" which, in Hastings, for some reason, includes a deck. We would argue that it's a very minor nonconformance.

At the same time, we have continued to conform with the developable area. In fact, we've reduced the developable area. Because what we've done when we removed the paving associated with the entrance at the back of the house, we've actually returned more of the land to the natural landscape. So there's a net impact, or a net effect, of reducing the development coverage in this case. We think that's a reasonable tradeoff. And also the fact that the deck itself is not really building coverage in the sense that it's a mass. It's not a zoning regulation in the sense that it's controlling the actual mass of the build in this case. That would be our argument for the deck.

**Chairman Collins:** I think it's a great design. I really, really love it. I think it's very attractive. I visited the property yesterday, and seeing it in person you appreciate just how constrained the lot is. You don't have a lot of room to maneuver. One question I had is, right now there's a fence. The fence in what I'll describe as the backyard and the fences in the deck area, does that fence remain in this project?

**Mr. Adams:** We haven't actually addressed that fence yet, to be honest with you.

**Chairman Collins:** If you're gonna speak just grab a mic. Thank you. And introduce yourself, please.

**Paul Gates, applicant:** I think just to echo the comments, we're trying to, obviously, bring back some of the character of the house. As you all kindly noted, it's a very strange-looking house. And I think our neighbors feel the same. So we would hope that, similar to Mr. Tubbs, what he's done, in the future a neighbor will look upon our house a little more kindly.

But to answer your question, the fence at the back can remain and we would like it to remain. But potentially, at some point in time, we might wish to maneuver one of those back panels at a right angle just to give us a bit more yard space at the back. Does that make sense? If we're looking at the pictures here, potentially this panel here where we go in we might just want to bring that back. But that's not ...

**Mr. Adams:** [off-mic].

**Mr. Gates:** Exactly, yeah. At the moment, there's no need or intention to do that. It's just something we might possibly like to consider in the future.

**Chairman Collins:** OK. That's not a part of the project scope in this.

**Mr. Gates:** Yeah.

**Chairman Collins:** I'd mention it because it seems like there's quite a distance between the rear-facing part of your house and the neighbors to the rear. The fence there, I think, provides a bit of a barrier so if you are entertaining on your deck you can enjoy some privacy and your neighbors can enjoy their privacy, too. So it wasn't clear from the drawings whether or not the intention was to do one thing or the other. I just wanted to clarify it.

**Mr. Adams:** Yeah, from my side I didn't see any reason to take the fence down or spend the money.

**Chairman Collins:** And right now the deck does not extend the full backside of the house.

**Mr. Adams:** No, it doesn't.

**Boardmember Forbes-Watkins:** The deck is one of the strangest things I've ever seen.

**Mr. Adams:** Yeah, the deck is very odd.

**Chairman Collins:** Yeah.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Stranger than the front?

**Mr. Adams:** There was a time in the '70s when everybody liked different levels.

**Chairman Collins:** Ahh, OK.

**Boardmember Forbes-Watkins:** But part of it is not big enough to do anything.

**Mr. Adams:** Exactly. That's exactly right.

**Chairman Collins:** So now give us a rundown of the dimensions of the deck, the one you propose.

**Mr. Adams:** Well, it's 10 feet deep from front to back. And it's about 30 feet ... am I reading this right? No, I'm sorry, 36 foot 8 wide. So it's the width of that piece in the back. It's about 386 square feet.

**Chairman Collins:** It's a nice usable space.

**Mr. Adams:** Yeah.

**Chairman Collins:** And no railings planned?

**Mr. Adams:** Well, we do have to have a railing because it's 3 feet from the ground. So by code, we have to have a railing.

**Chairman Collins:** OK, so there will be.

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** Mr. Chairman, I just want to bring a little bit more clarity. That the developmental coverage on this project is actually going down even though the building coverage is going up because they're removing so much impervious surface during the course of this project. It's just something to keep in mind.

**Chairman Collins:** Yeah, that's another benefit to add to that column. I don't see any downside of this in terms of the character of the neighborhood, in terms of trying to find another solution here to give a proper front-of-house entrance. Hard to imagine a better solution than the one you've proposed here. And the deck seems to me to be a substantial enhancement to the dwelling's value and utility. So in my mind, keeping the fence there is the right thing to do. I think it goes from being a striking design in one sense to being a striking design in a much better sense.

Any questions from the Board, comments?

**Boardmember Anuszkiewicz:** I also think it's very well done. And you guys are really improving the property. I don't think you're doing it in a way that has a negative impact on anyone. I mean, I can see another way you could have done that stair, but you don't have to do it that way I don't think. But you could've potentially put that stair in the front yard; not that it would have been any less of a variance you'd be asking for. But if there is another way that you could've called attention to the front of the house by putting that stair in the right side of the garage, going up ...

**Mr. Adams:** We did look at that. That was one of the alternatives. But I sort of felt ...

**Boardmember Anuszkiewicz:** I wouldn't say you have to do that. I think it's lovely the way you have it. I was just curious.

**Mr. Adams:** We sort of felt that circulation-wise it was better the way it is on the side.

**Boardmember Anuszkiewicz:** Yeah, because you come right up and straight into ...

**Mr. Adams:** The porch.

**Boardmember Anuszkiewicz:** ... the porch.

**Boardmember Dovell:** I think you made the right decision with the stair the way it is, to disagree with my colleague. Because the house looks like it's just been turned 90 degrees from the way it should have been turned.

**Mr. Adams:** Right.

**Boardmember Dovell:** I think it's minimal, it's really nicely done. And now you can get into your house instead of going through the garage door or something. But it's very nice.

**Mr. Adams:** I agree.

**Chairman Collins:** David, Sean? Anything?

**Boardmember Hayes:** Nothing from me.

**Chairman Collins:** Anyone in the audience wish to be heard? I have to ask. All right.

Well, I'll close and just ask if I can get a motion, please.

On MOTION of Boardmember Hayes, SECONDED by Boardmember Forbes-Watkins with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the application of Paul Gates for the construction of a new side entrance and a new, larger rear deck at 95 Circle Drive. Non-conformity details of the proposed entrance and deck are as follows: 1) building coverage: existing 24.84%; proposed 27.5%; required maximum 25% and 2) side yards: one side – existing 12.2 feet; proposed 8.2 feet; required minimum 12 feet; two sides – existing 29.54 feet; proposed 25.54 feet; required minimum 30 feet.

**Chairman Collins:** The vote's unanimous. Congratulations, good luck.

**Mr. Adams:** Thank you very much.

## **Approval of Minutes**

### **Regular Meeting of December 11, 2014**

**Chairman Collins:** Buddy, I sent you comments on the minutes. They were ...

**Deputy Building Inspector Minozzi:** I forward them to the secretary.

**Chairman Collins:** OK, great. They seemed very clean. The only part of the minutes, David, that came to you – and I just don't remember you saying anything quite like this – is that you were asking a question about the case we last had that was abutting the Aqueduct. The minutes reflect that you asked whether or not the applicant had consulted with the Department of History. And that didn't ... I know that you were asking about whether or not the right people were consulted, but I couldn't imagine that you would ask about the Department of History.

**Boardmember Hayes:** Where is that department, just out of curiosity?

**Chairman Collins:** NYU ... I don't know.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** It had to do with the Aqueduct.

**Boardmember Hayes:** Maybe the Historical Society?

**Boardmember Forbes-Watkins:** No, no. I said the state Department of History or whoever.

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Just put Historic Preservation.

**Boardmember Forbes-Watkins:** Historic Preservation, OK.

**Boardmember Hayes:** So Historic Preservation?

**Boardmember Forbes-Watkins:** On the same page, Mr. Koch at some point, the paragraph starting "*Currently they occupy ...*" and down one, two, three, the fourth line there's a word "*they're on 'sweep.'*" I can't begin to conceive of why.

**Boardmember Hayes:** It's "on suites." That's what it's supposed to say. "On suite."

**Boardmember Forbes-Watkins:** “On suite.”

**Boardmember Hayes:** Yeah, “on suite bathrooms.”

**Chairman Collins:** Ahh, mystery solved. OK. All right, good catch. I found a couple of those, too, later in the minutes. Where just maybe an intonation there and it changes everything. Anything else?

**Boardmember Forbes-Watkins:** No.

**Chairman Collins:** Any other comments on the minutes?

**Boardmember Dovell:** No.

**Chairman Collins:** OK, can I get a motion to approve the minutes, as amended?

On MOTION of Boardmember Forbes-Watkins, SECONDED Boardmember Hayes by with a voice vote of all in favor, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of December 11, 2014 were approved as amended.

**Chairman Collins:** So then I guess for the purposes of voting on chairmanship, is that something we can do after we adjourn? Or do we do that ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Do it as part of ...

**Chairman Collins:** OK. What’s the procedure?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** I don’t know because I didn’t realize you were doing this tonight.

**Chairman Collins:** I didn’t ...

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** It’s informal. It’s just the Board elects its chair so you can just nominate ...

**Boardmember Forbes-Watkins:** May I make a motion?

**Village Attorney Whitehead:** Just make a motion, yes.

**Chairman Collins:** Yes, you may make a motion.

On MOTION of Boardmember Forbes-Watkins, SECONDED by Boardmember Anuskiewicz with a voice vote of all in favor, the Board resolved to approve the re-election of Matt Collins as Chairman of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

**Boardmember Hayes:** I didn't even hear what you said.

**Boardmember Forbes-Watkins:** I moved that he be re-elected.

**Boardmember Hayes:** Oh, yeah.

**Chairman Collins:** All right, thank you.

**Boardmember Hayes:** You get 25 cents a week.

**Adjournment**