



TOWN HALL
(716) 941-6113
Fax (716) 941-6116



TOWN OF BOSTON

Zoning Board of Appeals

Zoning Board of Appeals

AGENDA

Thursday, August 6, 2026

7:00 PM

1. Work Session – Planning Board Room
2. Call Meeting to Order
3. Pledge of Allegiance
4. ZBA Responsibility Reading
5. NY Boston II, LLC Resolution
6. Minutes
7. Public Hearing(s)
8. New Business
9. Old Business
10. Motion To Adjourn

The ZBA will meet at the Town of Boston Town Hall on Thursday August 6, 2026 at 7:00 PM for a work session in the Planning Board room, followed by the Public Hearing(s) in the Court Room to hear the following petitions:

Petition #658 – Nick and Amber Chuba, 7300 Boston State Rd requests a use variance per Town of Boston Code 123-25 B 3 (a) for a detached in law apartment in violation of C-1 zoning and an area variance per Town of Boston Code 123-136 B (4) for a detached accessory building in violation of maximum square footage and height allowed per lot size

Petition #661 – Todd Gallagher, Foxhole Farm Winery, 8325 Cole rd, Colden requests a use variance per Town of Boston Code 123-78 A 5 to allow a use as a tavern eating and drinking establishment as in a C-2 zoning, and an area variance per Town of Boston Code 123-136 B (4) for size and height for a (2) detached accessory buildings in violation of maximum square footage and height allowed per lot size

Petition #662 – Daniel Sheehan, 28 Euclid, Hamburg requests (2) area variances from Town of Boston Code 123-26, minimum lot size, and 123-28 required rear yard to erect a single family dwelling at 7756 Deanna Drive, Boston.

Petition # 663 – Kenneth Zidell, 142 Central Ave, Lancaster requests an area variance for SBL 258.00-1-54 on Brown Hill Rd, Boston to build a

8500 Boston State Road Boston, New York 14025-9848

The Town of Boston is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

If you wish to file a Civil Rights program complaint of discrimination, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, found online at http://www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html, or at any USDA office, or call 1-866-632-9992 to request the form. You may also write a letter containing all the information requested in the form. Send your completed complaint form or letter to us by mail at U.S. Department of Agriculture, Director, Office of Adjudication, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or fax 202-690-7442 or e-mail at program.intake@usda.gov.

Public Notice
Town of Boston
Zoning Board of Appeals

The ZBA will meet at the Town of Boston Town Hall, 8500 Boston State Road, Boston on **Thursday, August 6, 2026 at 7:00 PM** for the work session in the Planning Board Room, followed by the Public Hearing in the Court Room to hear the following petitions:

Petition #656 – Paul Ziokowski, 8605 Back Creek Rd, Boston requests a use variance per Town of Boston Code 123-48 to erect an accessory structure at SBL 241.00-2-14.14 vacant lot in violation of requirement to have a primary residence on the parcel first

Petition #658 – Nick and Amber Chuba, 7300 Boston State Rd requests a use variance per Town of Boston Code 123-25 B 3 (a) for a detached in law apartment in violation of C-1 zoning and an area variance per Town of Boston Code 123-136 B (4) for a detached accessory building in violation of maximum square footage and height allowed per lot size

Petition #661 – Todd Gallagher, Foxhole Farm Winery, 8325 Cole rd, Colden requests a use variance per Town of Boston Code 123-78 A 5 to allow a use as a tavern eating and drinking establishment as in a C-2 zoning, and an area variance per Town of Boston Code 123-136 B (4) for size and height for a (2) detached accessory buildings in violation of maximum square footage allowed per lot size

Petition #662 – Daniel Sheehan, 28 Euclid, Hamburg requests (2) area variances from Town of Boston Codes 123-26, minimum lot size, and 123-28 required rear yard to erect a single family dwelling at 7756 Deanna Drive, Boston.

Petition # 663 – Kenneth Zidell, 142 Central Ave, Lancaster requests an area variance for SBL 258.00-1-54 on Brown Hill Rd, Boston to erect a single family dwelling in violation of Town of Boston Code 123-50, maximum height of dwelling, and number of stories

Zoning Board of Appeals
August 6, 2026
Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Chairman Ms. Lisa Rood, Ms. Bethany Pryor, Mr. David May, Mr. Robert Ballard, Ms. Pamela Zylinski, Attorney Laurie Baker, Code Enforcement Officer Mr. Shawn Vanderdoes, Code Enforcement Officer Mr. Robert Reed, Councilman Mr. Robert Penders/Town Board Liaison.

Chairman Ms. Rood called the Board of Zoning of Appeals meeting to order at 7:31 PM.

Ms. Pryor read the ZBA responsibility statement, explaining the difference between use variances and area variances and what the Board must consider when reviewing each type of request.

Roll call was taken as follows:

Ms. Zylinski: Present	Mr. May: Present	Chairman Ms. Rood: Present
Ms. Pryor: Present	Mr. Ballard: Present	

Chairman Ms. Rood: I would like Ms. Zylinski to be an alternate. I would like her to be a full voting member this evening.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chairman Ms. Rood read Resolution No. 2026-001

TOWN OF BOSTON ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS - RESOLUTION NO. 2026-001

**APPLICATION OF NY BOSTON II, LLC
(BUFFALO SOLAR PROJECT) FOR AREA VARIANCES**

WHEREAS, the Town of Boston has received applications for zoning variances, a special use permit, and site plan review from NY Boston II, LLC, an entity associated with Delaware River Solar, related to the development of a proposed 3.6-megawatt community solar energy facility (the "Project") at 7832 Feddick Road (the "Project Site"); and

WHEREAS, the Town Board classified the Project as a Type I Action pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA"), declared itself Lead Agency, and, following environmental review, adopted a Negative Declaration on November 6, 2024; and

WHEREAS, the Town's regulations governing Large Scale Solar Energy Systems, codified as Local Law No. 5 of 2019 (the "Solar Law"), provide that the purpose of the Solar

Law is to balance the potential impacts upon neighboring properties, protect environmental and agricultural resources, preserve the rural character of the Town, while recognizing the importance of solar energy systems in generating electricity, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and supporting the development of renewable energy resources; and

WHEREAS, in adopting the Solar Law, the Town Board expressly recognized that large-scale solar energy systems may have aesthetic impacts upon neighboring properties and, therefore, established dimensional requirements, including setbacks, lot area limitations, screening, and other development standards intended to minimize those impacts while accommodating appropriate solar development; and

WHEREAS, the Project Site is located within the Town's Residential-Agricultural ("RA") Zoning District, in which Large Scale Solar Energy Systems are permitted by special use permit, subject to compliance with the dimensional requirements of the Solar Law or the granting of appropriate variances by the Zoning Board of Appeals; and

WHEREAS, the Solar Law requires, among other things, a minimum setback of five hundred (500) feet from all property lines adjoining residentially zoned property and limits Large Scale Solar Energy Systems to a maximum lot area of fifty (50) acres; and

WHEREAS, on or about December 16, 2024, the Applicant applied to the Zoning Board of Appeals ("ZBA") for (i) area variances reducing the required 500-foot property line setbacks to approximately 125 feet along portions of the southern, eastern, and western property lines and approximately 225 feet along a portion of the northern property line, and (ii) an area variance permitting a project encompassing approximately 73.8 acres, exceeding the maximum permitted lot area by approximately 23.8 acres (collectively, the "Variance Application"); and

WHEREAS, the ZBA conducted duly noticed public hearings on the Variance Application on March 6, 2025, and May 1, 2025, during which it received testimony from the Applicant, consultants, neighboring property owners, interested agencies, and members of the public, together with written submissions and other documentary evidence; and

WHEREAS, following the March 6, 2025 public hearing, the Applicant supplemented the record with additional information, including responses to public comments, revised line-of-sight analyses, and noise information relating to the Project; and

WHEREAS, following the close of the public hearing, the ZBA adopted Resolution No. 2025-001 on June 5, 2025, denying the requested Lot Area Variance and Property Line Setback Variances; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant thereafter commenced a proceeding pursuant to Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules in the Supreme Court, Erie County, entitled *NY Boston IL LLC*

v. Zoning Board of Appeals of the Town of Boston, Index No. 811463/2025, seeking to annul the ZBA's determination; and

WHEREAS, by Decision dated October 17, 2025, and Order and Judgment entered November 7, 2025, the Honorable Catherine Nugent Panepinto granted the Petition in part, annulled the ZBA's prior determination, and remanded the Variance Application to the ZBA for reconsideration solely under the three-prong public utility variance standard set forth in *Matter of Consolidated Edison Co. of New York v. Hoffman*, 43 N.Y.2d 598 (1978), and *Matter of Freepoint Solar LLC v. Town of Athens Zoning Board of Appeals*, 234 A.D.3d 127 (3d Dep't 2024), without reference to the traditional balancing factors contained in Town Law § 267-b(3)(b). The Court further directed that, should the ZBA determine that the intrusion and impacts associated with the requested variances are not minimal, the ZBA specifically identify those impacts not referenced or considered in the Town Board's SEQRA Negative Declaration.

WHEREAS, following remand, the ZBA reviewed the Supreme Court's Decision and Order, the certified record previously filed with the Court, the applicable provisions of the Town Code, the relevant case law, and the entire record developed before the Board, and has reconsidered the Variance Application in accordance with the legal standard established by the Supreme Court; and

WHEREAS, the findings supporting the ZBA's determination upon remand are set forth in the attached Statement of Findings, which is incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that upon reconsideration of the Variance Application in accordance with the Decision and Order of the Supreme Court, Erie County, and the public utility variance standard established in *Matter of Consolidated Edison Co. of New York v. Hoffman*, 43 N.Y.2d 598 (1978), and *Matter of Freepoint Solar LLC v. Town of Athens Zoning Board of Appeals*, 234 A.D.3d 127 (3d Dep't 2024), the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the Applicant has satisfied the first prong of the public utility variance standard by demonstrating that the proposed Project constitutes a public necessity; however, the Applicant has failed to satisfy the second and third prongs of the public utility variance standard for the reasons set forth in the attached Statement of Findings, which is incorporated herein by reference; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate compelling reasons, economic or otherwise, that make the requested Lot Area Variance more feasible than reasonable alternatives, and further finds that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the intrusion and burden upon the local community resulting from the requested Lot Area Variance are minimal or can be adequately mitigated. Accordingly, the Applicant's request for the Lot Area Variance is **DENIED**; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Zoning Board of Appeals finds that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate compelling reasons, economic or otherwise, making the requested Property Line Setback Variances more feasible than reasonable alternatives, and further finds that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the intrusion and burden upon the local community resulting from the requested Property Line Setback Variances are minimal or capable of adequate mitigation. Accordingly, the Applicant's request for the Property Line Setback Variances is **DENIED**.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Statement of Findings attached hereto is hereby adopted as the findings of fact and conclusions of the Zoning Board of Appeals and is incorporated into this Resolution as though fully set forth herein; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Resolution constitutes the final determination of the Zoning Board of Appeals upon remand from the Supreme Court, Erie County, pursuant to the Decision and Order entered November 7, 2025.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Clerk of the Zoning Board of Appeals is directed to file a copy of this Resolution and the attached Statement of Findings in the Office of the Town Clerk within five (5) business days of its adoption and to promptly provide a copy to the Applicant and all parties entitled to notice under applicable law.

On *August 6*, 2026, the question of the adoption of the foregoing Resolution was duly put to a vote on roll call, which resulted as follows:

	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Chairperson Rood	[X]	[]	[]	[]
Board Member Pryor	[X]	[]	[]	[]
Board Member Ballard	[X]	[]	[]	[]
Board Member May	[X]	[]	[]	[]
Board Member Zylinski	[X]	[]	[]	[]



ZBA Clerk

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

I. LEGAL STANDARD

The Supreme Court has directed the Zoning Board of Appeals ("ZBA") to evaluate the requested variances solely under the public utility variance standard established by *Matter of Consolidated Edison Co. of New York v. Hoffman*, 43 N.Y.2d 598 (1978), as applied in *Matter of Freepoint Solar LLC v. Town of Athens Zoning Board of Appeals*, 234 A.D.3d 127 (3d Dept. 2024).

Accordingly, the ZBA has considered only the following three questions:

1. Whether the Project constitutes a public necessity;
2. Whether compelling reasons, economic or otherwise, make it more feasible to seek the requested variance than reasonable alternatives; and
3. Whether the intrusion and burden upon the community resulting from the requested variance are minimal or can be adequately mitigated.

In reconsidering the Application, the ZBA has independently evaluated the evidence contained in the administrative record and has made its own findings under the *Hoffman* standard consistent with the Supreme Court's remand order.

II. MAXIMUM LOT AREA VARIANCE (23.8 ACRES)

A. Public Necessity

Finding: YES

The ZBA finds that the Applicant has satisfied the first prong of the public utility variance standard. Consistent with *Freepoint Solar* and *Delaware River Solar, LLC v. Town of Aurora Zoning Board of Appeals*, community solar facilities such as the proposed Project constitute a public necessity for purposes of applying the public utility variance standard.

B. Compelling reasons, economic or otherwise, that make it more feasible to seek the requested variance than reasonable alternatives.

Finding: NO

The ZBA finds that the Applicant failed to satisfy its burden of demonstrating compelling reasons, economic or otherwise, making the requested variances more feasible than reasonable alternatives.

The Applicant selected a parcel containing significant physical constraints, including wetlands, streams, a utility easement, and topographical limitations that substantially reduce the available buildable area. Those conditions were neither hidden nor unforeseen, but were known to the Applicant before the Project was designed. Rather than designing a project capable of complying with the Town's dimensional requirements, the Applicant seeks substantial variances to accommodate its preferred site plan.

The Applicant represented that it had considered alternative locations and further represented that an Applicant's Site Selection Analysis was attached as Exhibit B to its December 16, 2024 submission. However, Exhibit B did not contain a site selection analysis. Instead, it consisted primarily of legal authorities discussing the applicable variance standard and did not include any comparative evaluation of alternative parcels, interconnection studies, hosting-capacity analyses, engineering reports, or economic analysis demonstrating why the requested variances were necessary.

During the public hearings, the ZBA questioned the Applicant regarding the basis for selecting the subject property, the availability of alternative project configurations, and the feasibility of reducing the requested variances. In response, Molly Messenger, Development Manager for Delaware River Solar, testified that the Project would interconnect through NYSEG's South Park Substation in the Lancaster Division and that the Applicant anticipated paying approximately \$560,000 for the necessary system upgrades. She further testified that she was unable to identify the precise location of the substation and would need to provide that information at a later time.

While the Applicant asserted that alternative locations had been considered, it did not present a comparative site-selection analysis, engineering studies, hosting-capacity evaluations, interconnection analyses, or other objective evidence demonstrating why the requested variances at the subject property were more feasible than reasonable alternative locations or project configurations. Likewise, when asked whether the Project could be redesigned by eliminating approximately 850 solar panels from the first section of the array, Ms. Messenger acknowledged that such a modification could be discussed with the owners but was unable to state whether the Applicant would pursue that alternative. The ZBA therefore finds that the Applicant failed to produce competent evidence establishing compelling reasons, economic or otherwise, demonstrating that the requested variances were more feasible than reasonable alternatives, as required under the second prong of the public utility variance standard.

The Applicant's subsequent written submissions likewise asserted that alternative locations, including the Bethlehem Steel brownfield and the Rice Road area, were not feasible because of transmission distance or substation capacity. However, those assertions were unsupported by engineering studies, hosting-capacity data, interconnection analyses, or other objective evidence that would permit the ZBA to independently evaluate those conclusions.

As the Applicant failed to identify reasonable alternative locations or provide competent evidence demonstrating why the requested variances were more feasible than reasonable alternatives, the ZBA finds that the Applicant failed to satisfy the second prong of the public utility variance standard. This finding independently supports denial of the requested Lot Area Variance.

C. Minimal intrusion, or capable of adequate mitigation.

Finding: NO

The ZBA further finds that the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the intrusion and burden upon the community associated with the requested Lot Area Variance are minimal or capable of adequate mitigation.

The Supreme Court directed the ZBA to consider the Town Board's SEQRA determination in evaluating the third prong of the public utility variance standard. The ZBA recognizes that the Town Board issued a SEQRA Negative Declaration on November 6, 2024. However, the record before the ZBA does not identify the specific impacts associated with the requested variances that were evaluated by the Town Board in issuing that determination. Accordingly, while the Board has considered the existence of the Negative Declaration, it has independently evaluated the evidence before it in determining whether the requested variances satisfy the third prong of the *Hoffman* standard.

The Board further finds that increasing the Project footprint from the 50 acre maximum permitted by the Solar Law to approximately 73.8 acres substantially enlarges the physical extent of the proposed utility-scale solar facility beyond that contemplated by the Town's dimensional regulations. The additional acreage increases the visual presence of the Project within the surrounding rural landscape, expands the area occupied by utility infrastructure, and increases the cumulative impact upon neighboring residential and agricultural properties.

The Applicant acknowledged during the public hearing that effective screening of the Project could not be accomplished by landscaping or vegetative plantings located upon the Project Site itself. Instead, the Applicant suggested that adequate screening would require landscaping to be installed upon neighboring properties outside the Project Site. The ZBA finds that such off-site screening is beyond the Applicant's ownership or control, cannot be required or guaranteed as a condition of approval, and therefore does not constitute a reliable or adequate mitigation measure for the impacts associated with the requested Lot Area Variance. Indeed, the Applicant's own acknowledgment demonstrates that the visual impacts associated with the expanded Project footprint cannot be adequately mitigated on the Project Site.

Based upon the evidence presented, including the Applicant's acknowledgment regarding the inability to provide effective on-site screening, the ZBA finds that the Applicant failed to establish that the intrusion and burden associated with the requested Lot Area Variance would be minimal or capable of adequate mitigation. Accordingly, the ZBA finds that the Applicant has failed to satisfy the third prong of the public utility variance standard.

III. PROPERTY LINE SETBACK VARIANCES

A. Public Necessity

Finding: YES

For the reasons set forth above with respect to the Lot Area Variance, the ZBA finds that the proposed Project constitutes a public necessity under the public utility variance standard.

B. Compelling reasons, economic or otherwise, that make it more feasible to seek the requested variance than reasonable alternatives.

Finding: NO

The ZBA adopts and incorporates by reference its findings set forth above with respect to the second prong of the public utility variance standard. For the reasons previously stated, including the Applicant's failure to identify or meaningfully evaluate alternative locations, the absence of any competent site selection analysis, the failure to produce engineering or hosting-capacity studies supporting its preferred site selection, and the Applicant's failure to demonstrate why alternative project layouts or configurations would not reduce or eliminate the need for the requested relief, the ZBA finds that the Applicant has failed to establish compelling reasons, economic or otherwise, demonstrating that the requested Property Line Setback Variances are more feasible than reasonable alternatives.

Accordingly, the Applicant has failed to satisfy the second prong of the public utility variance standard with respect to the requested Property Line Setback Variances. This finding independently supports denial of the requested Property Line Setback Variances.

C. Minimal intrusion, or capable of adequate mitigation.

Finding: NO

The ZBA finds that the Applicant failed to satisfy its burden of demonstrating that the requested Property Line Setback Variances would result in only minimal intrusion or burden upon the surrounding community or that such intrusion is capable of adequate mitigation.

The Town's Solar Law requires a minimum setback of five hundred (500) feet between large-scale solar energy systems and adjoining residentially zoned property. The Applicant seeks reductions of that requirement to as little as approximately one hundred twenty-five (125) feet, representing a reduction of approximately seventy-five percent (75%) of the required setback. The requested variances would therefore place the solar arrays, fencing, inverters, access roads, and associated utility infrastructure substantially closer to neighboring residential properties than contemplated by the Town's Solar Law.

The Supreme Court directed the ZBA to consider the Town Board's SEQRA determination in evaluating the third prong of the public utility variance standard. The ZBA recognizes that the Town Board issued a SEQRA Negative Declaration. However, the Applicant did not identify the specific impacts evaluated by the Town Board, and did not demonstrate how the Town Board addressed the impacts associated with the requested Property Line Setback Variances. Accordingly, the Applicant failed to establish that the concerns raised before this ZBA had been specifically evaluated or resolved through the SEQRA review process.

The evidence presented during the public hearing affirmatively demonstrated that the requested setback reductions cannot be adequately mitigated.

Specifically, the ZBA finds:

1. The Applicant acknowledged that effective visual screening could not be accomplished through landscaping or vegetative plantings located upon the Project Site because of the existing topography and viewsheds.
2. Rather than proposing effective on-site mitigation, the Applicant suggested that landscaping would need to be installed upon neighboring properties. The ZBA finds that vegetation located on property not owned or controlled by the Applicant cannot be required, maintained, or guaranteed as a condition of approval and therefore does not constitute an adequate mitigation measure.
3. The existing topography permits direct views of the proposed solar arrays from numerous neighboring residences notwithstanding the proposed landscaping.
4. Reducing the setbacks from 500 feet to as little as 125 feet substantially diminishes the buffer intentionally established by the Town Board when it adopted the Solar Law to protect neighboring residential properties from the impacts of utility-scale solar facilities.
5. The reduced setbacks materially increase the visibility and prominence of the Project from adjoining residential properties and public roadways and place construction activities, including grading, pile driving, and heavy equipment operation, substantially closer to neighboring residences than would occur under a project complying with the Solar Law.
6. The Erie County Agricultural and Farmland Protection Board likewise expressed concerns regarding the fragmentation of agricultural lands, interference with agricultural operations, cumulative farmland conversion, and the loss of productive agricultural soils associated with the proposed development.

Based upon the entire record, including the Applicant's own acknowledgment that effective on-site screening could not be accomplished, the ZBA finds that the Applicant failed to demonstrate that the intrusion resulting from the requested Property Line Setback Variances is minimal or capable of adequate mitigation.

Accordingly, the ZBA finds that the Applicant has failed to satisfy the third prong of the public utility variance

standard.

Chairman Ms. Rood read the Public Hearing:

The ZBA will meet at the Town of Boston Town Hall, 8500 Boston State Road, Boston, NY on Thursday, July 2, 2026, at 7:39 PM for the work session in the Planning Board Room, followed by the Public Hearing in the Court Room to hear the following petitions:

Chairman Ms. Rood: Let's start our meeting with Petition #658 – Nick and Amber Chuba, 7300 Boston State Rd requests a use variance per Town of Boston Code 123-25 B 3 (a) for a detached in-law apartment in violation of C-1 zoning and an area variance per Town of Boston Code 123-136 B (4) for a detached accessory building in violation of maximum square footage and height allowed per lot size.

Chairman Ms. Rood made a motion to close the Public Hearing for the Use Variance. Mr. Ballard seconded the motion.

Vote Taken:

Ms. Zylinski	Yes ☒	No ☐	Mr. May	Yes ☒	No ☐	Mr. Ballard	Yes ☒	No ☐
Ms. Pryor	Yes ☒	No ☐	Chairman Ms. Rood	Yes ☒	No ☐			

Chairman Ms. Rood: There is new information that we received seconds ago. Time to review unfortunately.

Ms Pryor: Well, same thing we've had.

Chairman Ms. Rood: It is a whole, Well.

Ms. Pryor: There was always an area variance on it. It is just the use variance is gone. So, from my understanding, the side of the set back is still, to keep it in line with the rest of your house. Correct?

Mr. Chuba: Yes, the structure is at two, and we are requesting there to be five ft., opposed to 10 ft. We are eliminating the use variance because we are adding an addition to the house. We are eliminating the kitchen. Which eliminated the independent living style. It is just going to be an addition and a private living space for my mother. It will no longer be an independent apartment. So, from my understanding we are only requesting a setback for the property line.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Okay, of ten feet of the side yard.

Ms. Pryor: We did get some information from Matthew C. Sakora. This was in our folder.

Chairman Ms. Rood: I got it. I will read this into the minutes. A neighbor's letter of support dated 6/29/2026 to the Zoning Board of Appeals. My name is Mathew C. Sakura. I am the owner of the property located at 7302 Boston State Road, Hamburg, New York, 14075. It is adjacent to the property owned by Nicholas Chuba. I am writing in support of the proposed construction of a new detached garage with an in-law apartment above it. I understand that the proposed structure will generally occupy the same location as the existing garage. This would allow the side setback to remain as close to the current structure with a maximum encroachment of approximately 2 feet from the existing property line setback. I have no objection to the setback and fully

support allowing the new structure to remain in substantially in the same location as the existing garage. In my opinion this minor setback does not negatively affect my property enjoyment of it. Based on my experience as a neighboring property owner, I do not believe the proposed project will have adverse impact on any neighborhood view, surrounding property values, drainage, or storm water runoff. The existing garage has never created any concerns in these areas, and I do not expect the replacement structure to do so. I am confident that the owners will complete the project responsibly following all applicable building codes, permit requirements, engineering recommendations, and drainage standards to ensure it will be well maintained, and neighboring properties are not adversely affected. For these reasons, I fully support the requested variance, including the continuation of the existing setback of up to two feet from the property line and respectfully ask the board to approve the application.

Ms. Pryor: you requested five feet, that is, and the allowance is a total of 10 feet.

Mr. Ballard: What is the building right now?

Mr. Chuba: It is 20 x 20 feet.

Mr. Ballard: How far off the line is it right now? So, it is going to be farther away than it is now.

Mr. Chuba: It is farther way.

Chairman Ms. Rood: But still not to code. Right?

Mr. Chuba: Yes, if I bring it forward to 10 feet It brings to into the driveway, which obstructs the view of the backyard for one of my kids. Because I am on Boston State Road, I do not want them to go into the road.

Ms. Pryor: Fair enough.

Chairman Ms. Rood: All Right.

Ms. Pryor: I'd like to make a motion to approve Petition # #658 setback petition and Mr. Ballard seconded the motion.

Conditions as follows:

(1) Does it create an undesirable change to the character of the neighborhood?

Yes []

No [X]

(2) Can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved if the variance is not granted?

Yes []

No [X]

(3) Is the request variance substantial?

Yes []

No [X]

(4) Will the variance have an adverse effect on the physical impact or environmental conditions of the neighborhood?

Yes []

No [X]

(5) Is the alleged difficulty self-created?

Yes [X]

No []

Six months to get a permit and then the applicant is good to go.

Mr. Chuba: Thank you very much.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Petition #661 – Todd Gallagher, Foxhole Farm Winery, 8325 Cole Rd, Colden requests a use variance per Town of Boston Code 123-78 A 5 to allow a use as a tavern eating and drinking establishment as in a C-2 zoning, and an area variance per Town of Boston Code 123-136 B (4) for size and height for a (2) detached accessory buildings in violation of maximum square footage and height allowed per lot size.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Hello, Mr. Gallagher, we have not received any new information from you.

Mr. Gallagher: I do not have any new information, just what I provided to the board. I do not think the use variance obviously is the way to achieve what the SLA and AG Markets is telling me that I can. I can do it on that property and at that building currently. You know changing and I mean it is specific that I do not have to change it according to AG Markets and the SLA from Agricultural to Commercial. This is all the information I have.

Ms. Zylinski: Do you have someone here from SLA?

Mr. Gallagher: I have the dockets from SLA Law that can be reviewed.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Well, we haven't received anything to review. We have nothing new to look at all. So, you are withdrawing your use variance. Is that what you are saying?

Mr. Gallagher: Well, I am not going to get it. There is no sense proceeding forward with it. I do not meet any of the four requirements.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Okay.

Mr. Gallagher: I felt I was given guidance to do it. It is not just the way that I have to go down it. According to the SLA via conversations, they gave me the same information that I provided here last month. AG Markets will do a 305A investigation, but that takes 12 to 18 months. This brings New York State into the Town of Boston to do a site investigation.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Okay.

Mr. Gallagher: Multiple letters to you.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Okay.

Mr. Gallagher: Planning, Code, Supervisor. I do not think we need to go down that route. I believe so.

Chairman Ms. Rood: All of that does not affect us.

Ms. Pryor: Base on the information we were given to us. We have differing opinions. So, it does sound like that is your best bet. Okay great. We are good. Right.

Chairman Ms. Rood: I would move to close the public hearing, and Ms. Pryor seconded the motion.

Vote Taken:

Ms. Zylinski Yes ☒ No ☐ Mr. May Yes ☒ No ☐ Mr. Ballard Yes ☒ No ☐
Ms. Pryor Yes ☒ No ☐ Chairman Ms. Rood Yes ☒ No ☐

Chairman Rood: So, you are going to proceed in a different direction.

Mr. Gallagher: I understand. Okay.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Okay thanks for letting us know. Appreciate that, okay.

Chairman Rood: Petition #662 – Daniel Sheehan, 28 Euclid, Hamburg requests (2) area variances from Town of Boston Code 123-26, minimum lot size, and 123-28 required rear yard to erect a single-family dwelling at 7756 Deanna Drive, Boston.

Ms. Pryor: We did not get a SEQR for this?

Chairman Ms. Rood: No.

Ms. Pryor: Okay.

Chairman Rood: Motion to open this public hearing and it was seconded by Mr. May.

Vote Taken:

Ms. Zylinski Yes ☒ No ☐ Mr. May Yes ☒ No ☐ Mr. Ballard Yes ☒ No ☐
Ms. Pryor Yes ☒ No ☐ Chairman Ms. Rood Yes ☒ No ☐

Chairman Ms. Rood: A letter from Daniel Sheehan, please find attached an amended letter to request an area variance for a new home to construction on Deanna Drive. Also, attached are an updated sketch not to scale showing the proposed structure on the lot indicating the setback distances and a preliminary set of plans showing actual dimension of the building. We have updated the variance requested to include the rear yard depth. Code requires 30 ft. yard depth, and we are requesting a variance to 21 ft. In addition, we are requesting a variance to the yard requirement. Code requires 175 ft. and we are requesting a variance to 125 ft. Please let me know if I must make any adjustments to the documentation that has been provided. Also, from Daniel and Christy Sheehan, Dear members of the Zoning Board of appeals, we respectfully request an area variance to the Town of Boston Code for construction of a new home on vacant land on Deanna Drive, SBL 226.02-4-13.12. Specifically, we request variance approval for the following: A minimum lot depth 123-261. Code requires 175 ft., we are requesting 125ft. This is consistent with our neighbors at 6405 and 6417 Deanna Drive. As their loss both have depths of 125 ft. Also, the minimum rear yard 123-28C code requests 30 ft. We are requesting 21 ft. If we were to shift the front of the building to Boston State Road, the setback requirement would be reduced to 10 ft. to the northern lot line. 21 ft would be less intrusive to our neighbor at 7740 Boston State Road than 10 ft. We plan to work closely with our contractor, Sales Associates of Western New York LLC and their subcontractors to ensure the storm water discharged from the structure is channeled to the drainage ditch to the north of the property or available storm sewer along Deanna Drive using conductor pipes. We have worked very hard with our contractor to design a single-story floor plan for our lifestyle. We are not far from retirement age, and the ranch layout will be ideal for us as we get older. Additionally, we have designed our house with a third bedroom extending to the North to create a barrier to our back porch from the noise and activity on Boston State

Road. Please see the attached documents for the location for the structure on the property, including setback distances.

Chairman Ms. Rood: So, do we have a letter from the Code enforcement Officer.

Ms. Pryor: This one.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Thanks. A letter from Robert Reed, Code Enforcement Officer, regarding area variances for new single-family residents, respectable Chairman Rood and conscientious board members, petitioner wishes to obtain two variances for a new single-family residence at SBL 226.00-4-13.12 on Boston State Road, on Deanna Drive, Boston, New York from local zoning requirements. The variances sought are as follows: Per Article VIII R-2 Single Family residence District 126-26 minimum lot size; D: minimum lot size one residence 175 ft. and Article VIII R-2 Single Family Residence District 123-28 required yards. Required Yards No rear yard shall have a depth less than 30 ft. or a distance equal to the height of the principal building, which is greater. Due to lot depth decrease, required depth, the required front yard and depth of house as required requested decrease of the depth of the rear yard from 30 ft. to 21 ft. is requested. Area variance #1 requires 175 ft.; requested is 125 ft. The variance would be 50 ft. Area variance #2 required is 30ft. requested, is 21 ft. requested; and the variance is 9 ft. Respectfully Robert Reed.

Chairman Rood: We do not have anything from our planning consultant unfortunately. Who always gives us her recommendations as well. I don't know why we didn't revive anything, but we have nothing in our packets. What would you like to add?

Mr. Sheehan: I think you have read all the points that I would have mentioned. The main argument would be if we didn't orient the house towards Boston State Road suddenly, it is 10 ft. instead of the 20 ft. instead of 30 ft. So, to maintain a similar square footage we would have to go two stories. So that becomes a much more imposing structure to the neighborhood. We are getting older.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Aren't we all. I know in our work session too we were talking about finding the stakes? We could not find them.

Mr. Sheehan: I know the email that Mike Holder sent sort of indicated we did do a box. It is a little bit overgrown right now. But there are four stakes that do bore the extent of what the house would be. But the house is a little narrower. It's just that one bedroom that kicks out.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Yeah.

Mr. Sheehan: just to 21 ft. level. So, that is all I would say. Then this way if we keep the house oriented towards Deanna Drive. We will be consistent with our neighbors down the road.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Right.

Mr. Sheehan: I think they are just a little bit closer than 50 ft to the setback. It is consistent that way.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Yeah.

Mr. Sheehan: Then we can keep one story.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Well, I know I would like to see exactly where it would be oriented to be honest. I could only find two of the stakes. Would it be possible to clear it a little to find the stakes for us?

Mr. Sheehan: Sure, we could. The way that they are set up, there are two orange stakes close to the road.

Chairman Ms. Rood: The wooden ones, right?

Mr. Sheehan: Yes, there should be two orange plow stakes.

Mr. Ballard: The fiber glass ones.

Mr. Sheehan: If you stand and you look at those stakes and look back along towards the north side of the lot, there are two stakes indicating sort of the outside of that box. Then if you go up Boston State Road, there is an orange steak. There is one 50 ft in and there is one that would be 21 ft. back.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Okay.

Mr. Sheehan: There are stakes there. It is overgrown.

Chairman Ms. Rood: I was crawling around there 20 minutes. The weeds were over my head. I could only find two. I went back twice. Because I was there a couple of weeks ago when we first got the information. I was trying to get everything done because I have got a lot of other things going on right now. I tried to get it, you know all figured out. I talked to the Code Enforcement Officer who said the stakes are in now. So, I went back and found two but not four. So, I mean even just something just to clear out where that is somehow and maybe put a flag on the top of the stake. Because they all blend in. They are as big as my finger and it all blends together. Unless you are right on top of it with spray paint, they are hard to find.

Mr. Sheehan: If you need to be out there again, I'd be happy to meet you and show you.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Okay that would be great.

Ms. Pryor: Have you spoken to any of your neighbors or potential neighbors?

Mr. Sheehan: To the north. They had concerns about a tree close to a power line.

Ms. Pryor: Okay.

Mr. Sheehan: I did mention that this was coming and to contact me if you have any issues.

Ms. Pryor: It sounds like we might be kind of leaving this public hearing open till next month so we can get out there and look around bit more. It always helps when you speak with your neighbors and maybe get some letter of support. It is always very helpful to preserve the character and nature of the neighborhood.

Mr. Sheehan: That makes sense.

Chairman Ms. Rood: We need to get something from our planning consultant as well. So, we must leave it open. It will be open and we will be back in September, First Thursday.

Mr. Sheehan: Fair enough.

Mr. Ballard: Maybe if you can have it then it will be more visible too. Maybe you can clear a little bit. Even if you can just get some of the weeds down or something. Because that helps for an outline to get a better visual to see who is impacted.

Chairman Ms. Rood: If you could weed wacker from stake to stake, just in that square. This we would be able to find easily. Then you wouldn't have to come down because we can't come as a group.

Mr. Sheehan: It is going to be a little more industrial version of a weed whacker to get the stuff down. We tried it with a gas powered one and it wasn't making a difference.

Chairman Ms. Rood: I got one of those ones that have a blade at the end and I just swing it. Honestly, they work like a charm.

Ms. Zylinski: Like stakes with a little flag at the top. Something for seeing it visually. It is easy for you to see because you have been to the property many times. We are going with fresh eyes. It is like where is Waldo.

Chairman Ms. Rood: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Sheehan: All right. We will see you in a month.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Petition # 663 – Kenneth Zidell, 142 Central Ave, Lancaster requests an area variance for SBL 258.00-1-54 on Brown Hill Rd, Boston to build a single-family dwelling in violation of Town of Boston Code 123-50, maximum height of dwelling, and number of stories.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Made a motion to open the public hearing and Ms. Pryor seconded the motion.

Vote Taken:

Ms. Zylinski	Yes [X]	No []	Mr. May	Yes [X]	No []	Mr. Ballard	Yes [X]	No []
Ms. Pryor	Yes [X]	No []	Chairman Ms. Rood	Yes [X]	No []			

Chairman Ms. Rood: Letter from Mr. Zidell, To whom it may concern, I'd like to make a formal request regarding the zone variance for the house I plan to build. Permit application is in progress due to a planned walkout basement. This A-frame house will be 35 ft. and 3 inches above grade on one side. Therefore, in conflict with town ordinance of the 35 ft. foot limit, as well as three stories exceeding, it should be a two-story limit. The property in question is SBL 258.00-1-54 located on Brown Hill Road. Please let us know what the next steps are as we look forward to building and moving to the Town of Boston from Lancaster.

Chairman Ms. Rood read a letter from the Code Enforcement Officer, Robert Reed here in Boston. Mr. Zidell, your building part for a new single-family residence at SBL 258.00-1-54 on Brown Hill Road, Boston, New York, is denied for the following items not in compliance with local zoning. Per Article 11A, RA, Residential Agricultural District 123-50, maximum height of buildings, a dwelling, two and half stories not to exceed 35 ft. Due to the design as an A-frame with a walkout basement, the number of stories will be three and the height will be 35 ft and 3 inches. As such, the building will also be fully sprinklered as required by the 2025 New York State Residential Code. You may apply for a variance for the area and eight of the building. Please ensure all required paperwork is in and completed by July 8th at our office.

DRAFT

Then we have a letter from his neighbor, future neighbor, Craig Bowmen. Dear members of the Zoning Board of Appeals, my name is Craig Bowmen. I reside at 6947 Brown Hill Road, Boston, New York, 14025. I am writing in support of Mr. Kenneth Zidell's request for variance in the construction of a single occupancy home SBL 258.00-1-54, the dimensions 290 ft. 26x0. I am a neighboring property owner, and my property shares a border with Mr. Zidell's property. Because of this I have a direct interest in the proposed construction and its potential impact on the surrounding area. My understanding is that Mr. Zidell is requesting a very minor height variance from the permitted 35 ft. and 3 inches. This is only a 3-inch difference, which appears to be minimal and reasonable for the proposed residential construction. I do not believe this minor variance will create undesirable changes to the character of the neighborhood, negatively impact nearby properties, or create any meaningful adverse effect on the surrounding area. A single occupancy home is consistent with residential, and the requested height difference is so small that it should not substantially alter the appearance or use of the property. For these reasons, I respectfully support Mr. Kenneth Zidell's request for the height variance and ask the Zoning Board of appeals to approve the application.

Chairman Ms. Rood: So, we were in the safari looking for the snakes.

Mr. Zidell: There was one in there, but it got squashed by a tree that came down. We are clearing the area though. I do not know if you went out there this week, but we took down probably 20 trees in preparation.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Okay. I did. I went there on Tuesday. We do not have anything from our planning consultant. So, I know that we really didn't get a chance to look at the site because we did know. The only way that we could figure out where it possibly sort of could be this letter from your neighbor, because there was an actual address on it. So, I guess it would be good to have something at the end of the street with a number. Do you have a number yet? You do not. Last name is just something to identify the property.

Mr. Zidell: Okay. There is a driveway there, but it is overgrown.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Is there a posted sign?

Mr. Zidell: There used to be an orange sign, but I took it down.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Okay I saw that, but I didn't pull in because there was a cable across the driveway. I took that down.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Okay. All Right. If we can figure out where it is, then we will look at the site. Then we will have the Planning Consultant suggestions also by the next meeting. I am sorry to have to leave it open until September. Are you in a hurry?

Mr. Zidell: Not anymore.

Ms. Pryor: Can we get like an agree on that you are going to put out a sign. Something that will tell us that it is your property.

Mr. Zidell: Whatever you need.

Ms. Pryor: I mean, it could just be something we all agree upon.

Ms. Zylinski: It could be a big cone.

Mr. Zidell: Sure. Where will the house be.

Ms. Zylinski: So, we know that we are on the right property.

Ms. Pryor: Yeah. We also would like the location of the house to be staked out if that is possible?

Mr. Zidell: The proposed site.

Ms. Pryor: Yes, that would be great. Just so we get an idea of what we're looking at

Mr. Zidell: Okay.

Mr. Ballard: That helps us to see who and what neighbor is affected. Okay if it is there, is it. Then that was we know if that person doesn't have a problem with it. Their weight is pulled heavier than somebody that is no where's near it.

Mr. Zidell: Sure.

Chairman Ms. Rood: I am sorry to delay it.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Petition #664 – Boston Free Library, 9475 Boston State Rd, Boston requests an area variance from Town of Boston Code 123-136 B (4) maximum area of accessory structures.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Made a motion to open the public hearing and Ms. Zylinski second the motion.

Vote Taken:

Ms. Zylinski	Yes ☒	No ☐	Mr. May	Yes ☒	No ☐	Mr. Ballard	Yes ☒	No ☐
Ms. Pryor	Yes ☒	No ☐	Chairman Ms. Rood	Yes ☒	No ☐			

Chairman Ms. Rood: We have a couple of letters here.

Ms. Herron: Hi!

Chairman Ms. Rood: I am a good reader aren't I! Do you want me to come to Story Hour?

Ms. Herron: I do not know how long you will have the kid's attention.

Chairman Ms. Rood: I know, right? I try to put inflexion in and out.

Ms. Pryor: you did a great job.

Mr. Ballard: you did a great job, it was great.

Mr. Ballard: That was a lot.

Chairman Ms. Rood: We have a couple of letters here. Dear Zoning Board of Appeals, the Boston Library recently received a grant from the Ralph C. Wilson Jr. Foundation for a project entitled connecting the Community to nature, a native plant, garden, and outdoor educational space at the Boston Free Library. The

project involves the installation of a small greenhouse as integral parts of the library's educational garden design. The garden will provide interactive and hands-on experiences for the community, emphasizing the importance of native plants, pollinator friendly gardening techniques, and responsible environmental stewardship. A Community greenhouse will provide space to start and raise seedlings. This space will allow community members of all ages to gain hands-on experience planning and tending the garden, learning new skills and creating a greater awareness of the ecological impact of landscaping. The greenhouse will require a variance due to the restrictions on square footage allowance granted auxiliary buildings. The auxiliary building currently on the property of the Boston Free Library includes the 20 x 42 ft. Pavilion used for community programs, an 8 x 10 shed that stores the library lawn mower and maintenance equipment, and an 8x8 shed that stores the outdoor program furniture. The Boston Free Library operates within a very limited square footage building and needs additional space in auxiliary buildings to facilitate programming, building maintenance, and community outreach services. On behalf of the Boston Free Library Association, I wish to request your consideration for granting the variance for the installation of the Greenhouse for community use. It is our sincere hope that the variance will be granted given the community nature of this building. We wish to make this project a true asset to the town and inspire our community to integrate responsible environmental stewardship in their own backyards. Thank you for your consideration and for your continued support

Sincerely, Lydia Herron, Director.

So, from Mr. Reed, Ms. Herren, your building permit for a greenhouse structure at 9475 Boston State Road, Boston, NY is denied for the following reasons: item not in compliance with local Zoning per Article VIII R-2 single family residence district 123-136 B (4) limitations on obstruction and required open space Due to size of the lot being less than one acre. Total allowed area is limited to 728 square feet. There are two pre-existing sheds of 80 and 64 square feet, and a pavilion added two years ago that exceeded allowed. Now a greenhouse is planned to be added to 96 sq ft which will bring the total to 1080 square ft. You may apply for a variance for the area and height for the building. Please ensure all required paperwork is completed, and the petitioner wishes to obtain an area variance for a cumulative size of accessory structures at 9475 Boston State Road, Boston, New York from local zoning requirements. The variances sought are as follows. per Article VIII R-2 Single Family Residence district 123-36136 B (4) limitations on obstruction and required open space due to the lot size being less than an acre. The total is limited to 728 sq. ft. This variance will bring the accessory structure totally into compliance. Area variance allowed 728 sq. ft. is requested is 1080 sq. ft. the variance would be 352 sq. ft.

Robert Reed.

Chairman Ms. Rood: This is very exciting.

Ms. Herron: We think so.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Right. Yes.

Mr. Ballard: They were all in kind of a pile, I think, when I got there but luckily that he was mowing the lawn. I didn't realize it because he tries to do it on Wednesday. I swung in there and he pointed everything out. He was very helpful,

Ms. Herron: Okay. Good. Yeah, that was a good job.

Chairman Ms. Rood: No safari needed. We have everything necessary from you. We don't have anything from our Planning Consultant. Which frustrates me to no end.

Ms. Herron: Our only concern is that because it is a grant funded project. We have a deadline for which to use the funds.

Chairman Ms. Rood: What is the deadline?

Ms. Herron: It must be used by the end of the year.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Okay.

Ms. Herron: And of course we will have to deal with the weather.

Chairman Ms. Rood: If we left this open till the first Thursday in September, would this screw things up?

Ms. Herron: It will make it more difficult for us for sure. I do not know what the lead time is on ordering the greenhouse to get it delivered. So, I am a little concerned about that.

Chairman Ms. Rood: I do not foresee any issues, but you know what I am going to do? I will call Sarah. I hate holding people up.

Ms Pryor: This one of those prefab ones, correct. It is all made and everything.

Chairman Ms. Rood: The other two applicants who we didn't have anything for have to stake their properties. So, they would have been delayed anyway. I do not want to look like I am giving you special preferential treatment in any such way. But I do not know even if she is around. Maybe she left it here and it is lost in space or something. Hey Sarah How are you? Good. I am at a public hearing at the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting. We did not get any recommendations from you on any of the petitions. The library wants to put up a little greenhouse. I do not know if it would need anything? Sarah said it is a type two SEQR. The other two petitions needed to stake their property, so you know. I am not showing preferential treatment. They would have had to come back next month anyway. But they are on a time frame with this grant. So, it be type two. So, requires nothing else. Nothing is needed from us or you under SEQR.

Ms. Herron: Okay.

Chairman Ms. Rood: So, with that in mind, I want to make a motion to close the public hearing, and Ms. Pryor seconded the motion to close the public hearing.

Vote Taken:

Ms. Zylinski	Yes [X]	No []	Mr. May	Yes [X]	No []	Mr. Ballard	Yes [X]	No []
Ms. Pryor	Yes [X]	No []	Chairman Ms. Rood	Yes [X]	No []			

Ms Pryor: I would like to make a motion to approve petition #664.

Conditions as follows:

(1) Does it create an undesirable change to the character of the neighborhood?

Yes []

No [X]

(2) Can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved if the variance is not granted?

Yes []

No [X]

(6) Is the request variance substantial?

Yes []

No [X]

(7) Will the variance have an adverse effect on the physical impact or environmental conditions of the neighborhood?

Yes []

No [X]

(8) Is the alleged difficulty self-created?

Yes [X]

No []

Vote Taken:

Ms. Zylinski Yes [X] No [] Mr. May Yes [X] No [] Mr. Ballard Yes [X] No []

Ms. Pryor Yes [X] No [] Chairman Ms. Rood Yes [X] No []

Chairman Ms. Rood: Anything else bring before the Board? I am reminding everyone to make sure they get their training in. We are approaching September. Mandatory training, Get them in.

Board Clerk: Are the minutes from last month good? Were they okay?

Chairman Ms. Rood: We do not vote on the minutes.

Board Clerk: Okay. Just checking.

Chairman Ms. Rood: It really doesn't need to be on your agenda.

Chairman Ms. Rood: Made a motion to close the meeting and Ms. Pryor seconded the motion to close the meeting.

Vote Taken:

Ms. Zylinski Yes [X] No [] Mr. May Yes [X] No [] Mr. Ballard Yes [X] No []

Ms. Pryor Yes [X] No [] Chairman Ms. Rood Yes [X] No []

Respectfully submitted



Margaret Derk
Board Clerk

Petition #664 – Boston Free Library, 9475 Boston State Rd, Boston requests an area variance from Town of Boston Code 123-136 B (4) maximum area of accessory structures for a pavilion and greenhouse

Robert Reed
Code Enforcement Officer
Town of Boston

Dated July 17, 2026

Published:

An Equal Opportunity Provider & Employer