

**MINUTES**  
**MUNICIPAL BUILDING**  
**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

February 24, 2026

5:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Kevin Foltz, Chairman, Meghan Lutz, Dennis Stachera, Nancy Babis, Kevin McDonough, Andrew Rosenberg, Damon DeCastro, Deputy Corporation Counsel, Jason Dool, Chief Building Inspector

EXCUSED: Sam Marotta

The Chairman explained to those present the procedure followed in these Hearings, First the explanation by the Appellant as to what he/she is appealing for, second, any questions those present wishes to ask to clarify the appeal, and third, the Board will hear any opinions for or against the granting of this variance. The chairman stressed the point that anyone wishing to speak must first state their name and address.

Roll call was taken by Chairman Kevin Foltz and all the members present stated that they have seen the properties.

The first case to be called was Case No. 2363. Appeal of Coulton Baker-Durst to utilize the property for agricultural operation with a retail stand located at 59 Nicholls Street situated in a Medium Density Residential Zone.

Mr. Baker-Durst stated that before speaking of his case he wants to attest for the record that he is submitting a formal written motion along with supporting correspondence and documents. He said that he is requesting it to be formally placed in the minutes after the meeting.

Mr. Baker-Durst submitted his documentation to the Board.

Mr. Baker-Durst stated that he is submitting a copy of his written speech as well as supporting documents that back up the speech.

Mr. Baker-Durst proceeded to read aloud a prepared speech.

Mr. Baker-Durst stated that he is formally moving that this matter be tabled and adjourned through the conclusion of the growing season. He said that he operates a seasonal farm. He said that planting cannot be delayed or recovered once missed. He said that any restrictions now or during the season causes permanent, irreparable harm rendering any later decisions meaningless.

Mr. Baker-Durst said that due process requires adequate notice so that he has an opportunity to prepare. He said that he only received a verbal request to cease operations.

He said that he complied immediately. He said that he filed an appeal which triggered his due process rights.

Mr. Baker-Durst said that this triggers procedural protections before any citation was ever issued. He said no written citation was provided for months.

Mr. Baker-Durst said that when a written citation was provided, it was only five days prior to this hearing. He said that this did not allow him sufficient time to prepare a defense.

Mr. Baker-Durst said that he has not received any documentation or evidence that supports the allegations. He said that this is necessary for a fair trial. He said that this violates his due process rights.

Mr. Baker-Durst said that the delivery of the citation triggers statutory deadlines.

Mr. Baker-Durst read aloud Section 190-42.2 (A) of the City of Lockport Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Baker-Durst read aloud Section 81- a (5) (b) of General City Law.

Mr. Baker-Durst stated that the new deadlines fall in the start of the season which begins this month. He said that pausing operations or attempting to manage this case mid-season would cause him permanent loss of planting opportunity and the opportunity to fully exercise his legal rights. He said that the loss of time combine with the statutory deadlines will cause him irreparable harm of the proceeding before the end of growing season.

Mr. Baker-Durst said that because of the timing of the delivery of the written citation and the procedural burden, his ability to adequately prepare and focus on planting has been affected. He said that if a hearing proceeds prior to the conclusion of the season it can cause irreparable harm.

Mr. Baker-Durst said that according to the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment of the United States Constitution he cannot be deprived of property or livelihood without due process of law.

Mr. Baker-Durst read aloud Section 81-A (6) of New York General City Law.

Mr. Baker-Durst stated that this section of law cross referenced to the City of Lockport Zoning Ordinance Section 190-42.2 (A).

Mr. Baker-Durst read aloud Sections 190-46.2 (D) and 190-46.2 (E) of the City of Lockport Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Baker-Durst said that he requests the Board exercises its authority to amend and adjourn applications under Lockport Code and New York State municipal law to ensure

procedural fairness. He said that he requests that his original variance application be amended to include a formal request for interpretation of the applicable zoning code in its proper legal context.

Mr. Baker-Durst said that tonight, he is requesting procedural relief only, not a ruling on the merits of the alleged violations.

Mr. Baker-Durst said that he reserves all rights to present evidence and arguments once the matter is properly noticed and scheduled. He said that he cannot answer any further questions at this time. He said that he request the matter be addressed only at a properly noticed hearing.

Deputy Corporation Counsel DeCastro said to clarify, Mr. Baker-Durst is requesting an adjournment. He asked how long he would like the hearing adjourned for.

Mr. Baker-Durst said that from February to probably October or November.

Deputy Corporation Counsel DeCastro asked if he is also asking to amend his application to include an interpretation.

Mr. Baker-Durst said that he wants to keep his variance application, but also wants a chance to interpret and understand the law.

Deputy Corporation Counsel DeCastro explains that someone would have to make a motion for an adjournment. He said that he would ask the board now to do so if they wish.

Mr. Foltz said that he will need a motion to adjourn the case from February to October.

Mr. Foltz said that the intent is to be able to begin the growing season now and plan on coming back to present the case in October or November.

Mr. Baker-Durst said yes. He said that moving forward with this case will case him irreparable damage.

Mr. Foltz asked that if this motion to approve the adjournment passes, would he be agreeable to not have a sign out front and not to sell on the property. He said that in the past, it was stated that you sell out of a farmer's market.

Mr. Baker-Durst said that he is not trying to be combative but on the merits of this case, he cannot discuss that matter.

There being nothing further Meghan Lutz made a motion to table this case until November 1, 2026. Motion Seconded by Kevin McDonough.

In the middle of the vote Mr. Stachera said that he didn't understand the motion.

Deputy Corporation Counsel DeCastro explained that a motion has been made and seconded. He said that he needs to vote to adjourn the case.

Mr. Stachera asked what is going to happen in between.

Megan Brewer explained the motion is already on the floor, it needs to be voted on.

Meghan Lutz-Yes  
Nancy Babis-Yes  
Kevin McDonough-Yes  
Dennis Stachera-Yes  
Andrew Rosenberg-Yes  
Kevin Foltz-Yes

### **TABLED**

The next case to be called was Case No. 2364. Appeal of Mal Kurtyko to install an 8'x 20' parking area on the north side of the front porch and an 8'x 20' parking area on the south side of the front porch located at 211 Lock Street, Lockport, New York situated in a Mixed Residential Zone.

Ms. Kurtyko said that she purchased 211 Lock Street in 2018. She said that there are six one bedroom apartments. She said that when she first purchased the house her tenants did not have cars so there wasn't a problem. She said that because of the way the lot is, there is a limited parking area. She said that that they added gravel and concrete blocks to stabilize the drop off in the back of the property and have removed a large tree. She said that you can fit two cars in the back because of the drop off.

Mr. Kurtyko said that all of her tenants now have cars. She said that it is in their lease that one off-street parking space will be provided to them. She said that in the winter people cannot park on the street. She said that her tenants are getting tickets. She said that there is nowhere in that area that you can do paid parking. She said that she is looking to get a variance to put the two spots on either side of the front porch. She said that it will not block the sidewalk, there is enough room for the cars to be parked safely. She said that she needs the variance to accommodate all of the tenants. She said that all of her tenants have jobs and need their cars. She said that the house is over 150 years old, it used to be a single family. She said that it was converted many years ago to apartments.

Mr. Foltz asked if she knew what she was buying. He asked if she saw the situation with the apartments and limited parking.

Ms. Kurtyko said that this is the second property that she has purchased in the City of Lockport. She said that in the City of Buffalo there is on street parking during the winter. She said that she didn't know that the City of Lockport does not allow that.

Mr. Foltz asked if she only has room for two cars currently.

Ms. Kurtyko said yes in the back because they have to have somewhere to plow the snow.

Ms. Kurtyko said that because of the property's fence in the back and the one story drop off and the fact that they had to put concrete blocks in that reduced the parking to keep people safe.

Ms. Lutz asked if any of the tenants applied for an on street parking permit.

Ms. Kurtyko said yes, one tenant received one. She said that she told her tenants that she was coming before the board for a variance because she does have a driveway and it does look like she can accommodate parking. She said that she just can't because of the way the back is.

Ms. Lutz asked if there is a reason the other tenants were not granted an on street parking permit.

Ms. Kurtyko said that if they apply for it right now they are going to be told they have a driveway and must use it.

Mr. McDonough said that he thinks the rest of the tenants should go and apply. He said that they can make them aware that you have been before us.

Ms. Kurtyko said that she has advised them of that before she came here. She said that it is an issue with the tenants say why can they park here and I can't. She said that she is trying to avoid it looking like she is discriminating against anyone. She said that she paid for the tenants parking permit already. She said that she offered to pay for all the tenants parking permits.

Mr. Foltz said that she can do a lottery system.

Ms. Kurtyko said that the tenants change, new people come and go.

Mr. Foltz said that it is tough.

The meeting was opened to the public.

Mr. Anthony Stashak, 275 Locust Street, stated that he has owned 205 Lock Street for 40 years. He said that when he first purchased it the people from 211 Lock Street came over and told him that he is a good landlord. He said at the time he was talking to someone and asked them how many units are in 211. He said he was told six and his building only has two in a building the same size. He said that he has owned property here for a long time. He said that he taught at North Park for years. He said that over time he has found out

while he was getting permits, people were not getting them for apartments and he was told they are grandfathered. He said that he had to build a wall at the back of his property that cost \$20,000. He said that he has long term tenants.

Mr. Stashak said that he received some information regarding the parking lot in the back. He said that there has been room for more than two cars in the past. He said that the 8' x 20' in the front is more than enough for two cars plus three more in the back.

Mr. Stashak said that all the snow that is there gets pushed onto his property to his front porch and into his front lawn. He said that his tenant Rita who has a special needs child applied for a permit because all the tenants at 211 are parking in front of his place. He said that 211 can fit two or three cars in the back. He said that people can park in the driveway as well. He said you can park two to 4 in the back then three or four in the driveway. He said that 7 to 10 spaces. He said now you are going to put four more spaces in front, which is 11 or 12 spaces for six units.

Ms. Sharon Stashak read aloud a letter drafted by her husband.

Ms. Kurtyko stated that the driveway is single lane. She said that she has tenants that work at 5 am, the driveway can't get blocked. She said that they can fit 2 or 3 cars in back if there is no snow. She said that the cars have to be able to maneuver, the driveway is single lane.

Mr. Stashak said that he knows the lot, they can fit more than two cars in the back. He asked why the tenants at 211 are asking the neighbors if they can park in their driveways. He said that if this is granted there will be no green space it will be all parking. He said that the house is big. He said that this should have been addressed in the lease. He said that he has properties in Buffalo. He said that his tenant go a permit for her special needs child. He said that they do not need the 8' x 20' parking in front of the house.

Ms. Kurtyko said that there are six apartments and they need one space per tenant. She said that now they have to park on the street. She said that it is in her lease that the tenants get one off street space. She said that if they have two cars they have to park the second on the street. She said that she is more than willing to submit documentation so that they can see how much room is in the back.

Mr. Foltz said that one of the problems that he has is that she bought the property knowing there were that many apartments. He asked if she knew parking was going to be problem.

Ms. Kurtyko said that no had cars at that time.

Mr. Foltz said that she needs to find people to rent the apartments that don't have cars or have an alternative way to park.

Ms. Kurtyko said that some of the tenants have asked the neighbors if they can park on their property because this is an issue. She said that she didn't convert the house to be six units, she bought it like this and unfortunately the parking is an issue now. She said that 60 or 70 years ago not everyone had vehicles. She said that public transportation here is not great. She said that she will advise her tenants to apply for on street parking and she will pay for them. She said that this is an alternative.

Mr. Stashak asked where they plan on putting the snow, there will be no green space. He said that he pays to have his driveways plowed and they clear the snow into the grass. He said that they push the snow into his yard and in front of his porch.

Mr. Stashak said that there is Uber. He said that you can put things in a lease, plan ahead. He said that this is not fair to good landlords. He said that now there is not going to be any green space, nowhere to put the snow.

Mr. Baker-Durst asked if he could submitted another document for his case.

Mr. Foltz said that the public hearing is for this project right now, it doesn't pertain to anything else.

The meeting was closed to the public.

Mr. Foltz said that the people that owned the house before you had tenants.

Ms. Kurtyko said no, it was vacant. She said that it was on the market for many years, the sewer was leaking. She said that they kind of saved this apartment. She said that they replaced the roof and rebuilt the porches. She said that they wants their tenants to stay a long time. She said that they do, they refer other people to her. She said that she has working tenants that pay their bills. She said that is crucial so that they don't have eviction. She said that they want to help grow Lockport.

There being nothing further Meghan Lutz made a motion to deny the request for a variance for front yard parking as follows:

WHEREAS, the request is substantial,

WHEREAS, paving the front portion of the house will change the character of the neighborhood,

WHEREAS, the request is self-created as the property was purchased as a six unit building,

WHEREAS, the benefit can be reach by obtaining on street parking permits from the City of Lockport.

Seconded by Dennis0 Stachera.

Meghan Lutz-Yes  
Nancy Babis-Yes  
Kevin McDonough-Yes  
Dennis Stachera-Yes  
Andrew Rosenberg-Yes  
Kevin Foltz-Yes

**DENIED**

Nancy Babis made a motion to deny the variance request to increase the lot coverage to 81.48% as follows:

WHEREAS, the request is substantial,

WHEREAS, paving the front portion of the house will change the character of the neighborhood,

WHEREAS, the request is self-created as the property was purchased as a six unit building,

WHEREAS, the benefit can be reach by obtaining on street parking permits from the City of Lockport.

Seconded by Meghan Lutz.

Meghan Lutz-Yes  
Nancy Babis-Yes  
Kevin McDonough-Yes  
Dennis Stachera-Yes  
Andrew Rosenberg-Yes  
Kevin Foltz-Yes

**DENIED**

The next case to be called was Case No. 2366. Appeal of Angelo Vilardo to convert the existing four-unit dwelling into a five-unit dwelling located at 135 Ontario Street, Lockport, New York situated in a Mixed Use Neighborhood Zone.

Mr. Vilardo stated that he is before the board to use an existing interior space to be utilized as an efficiency unit. He said that the building has been legally classified as a four-unit building since 1986. He said that he is not disputing that classification, however it was originally constructed as a larger multi-unit building. He said that the building contains the space that is still an integral part of the structure.

Mr. Vilardo said that under the current zoning, the space cannot be lawfully occupied even though it is heated and kept code compliant. He said that this creates inefficiency that limits the reasonable and economically viable use of the space. He said that the requested variance represents the minimum relief necessary to allow existing space to be used safely. He said that there will be no exterior change to the building, no change in the character of the neighborhood and no traffic change.

Mr. Foltz asked if there is room for enough parking.

Mr. Vilardo said yes in the back.

Mr. Foltz asked how many spaces are in the back.

Mr. Vilardo said six or seven spaces in the back and he can expand it if he needs to.

Mr. Foltz asked if he would blacktop or stone an area if need be.

Mr. Vilardo said stone.

Mr. Rosenberg asked where in the building the space is located.

Mr. Vilardo said that in 1986 Larry Simmons purchased the building. He said that prior to that an Edward Lecher owned the building. He said that when Edward owned the building it was a five-unit. He said that for finance reason they did a certificate of compliance to reduce the amount of units to four. He said that the space has always existed, it just hasn't been used since 1986. He said the space is finished, the drywall is up, and there is a bathroom and flooring. He said it just needs minor alterations.

Ms. Lutz asked where inside the building is the space located.

Mr. Vilardo said that when you look at the house there is a green front porch. He said that when you enter there are three apartments through that entrance. He said that on the 1<sup>st</sup> floor right on the right hand side by the staircase that is where the apartment is. He said that it sits below another efficiency unit that is above it. He said that trying to think of ideas, like adding a staircase above it to make the unit bigger the structural modifications that would need to be made wouldn't make it economically viable.

Ms. Lutz explained that one of the criteria that has to be met is financial evidence. She asked if Mr. Vilardo had any estimates as to the cost to make changes.

Mr. Vilardo said that he do not at the moment. He said that he could imagine having to replace joist and going through the second floor. He said that he would have to reconfigure the kitchen above. He said that he would imagine it would be costly.

Mr. Foltz asked if the building was four-units when he purchased it.

Mr. Vilardo said yes.

Mr. Foltz asked if thought it would be profitable enough, it was a good business investment then but now are asking for a 5<sup>th</sup> unit.

Mr. Vilardo said that the building can function as a four-unit but is still maintained at the scale and configuration of a larger building. He said that the hardship is maintaining unused residential space that is not productively used.

Mr. Foltz asked how much of a hardship it is.

Mr. Vilardo said that there are utilities and water that have to be maintained.

Mr. Foltz asked if he knew that when he bought the building.

Mr. Vilardo said yes.

The meeting was opened to the public.

Mr. Anthony Stashak, 275 Locust Street, asked what the legal size of an apartment is. He said that he remembers when it was 425 sf.

Megan Brewer explained what the current and prior Zoning Ordinance requirements are.

Mr. Stashak said that the unit is just too small to live in.

The meeting was closed to the public.

Ms. Babis asked when the last time the building was rented as a five-unit.

Mr. Vilardo said that he just purchased the building a year ago. He said that Larry never rented it as a five-unit because of the Zoning regulations. He said that it would have had to be before 1986. He said that the space has doors, a bathroom, drywall a ceiling.

Ms. Babis asked if he plans on making this a market rate unit.

Mr. Vilardo said that he would imagine so. He said that it would be affordable.

Mr. McDonough said that he mentioned another efficiency unit above this space. He asked if it is also close to 315 square feet.

Mr. Vilardo said that it is slightly larger, maybe 400.

Mr. McDonough said that these essentially were rooms converted into apartments. He said clearly this building was a sort of mansion back in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. He said that 315 square feet is a small efficiency unit. He said that since you purchased this as a

four-unit, you could have one very spectacular market rate unit if you combine the spaces.

Mr. Vilardo said that he doesn't know how viable that is economically. He said that you have to open floor joist. He said that the appraisal that he got seems to show the building being built as a five-unit.

Mr. McDonough said that he did not take the time to research the property history but from knowledge, that time period of house would have been built in the 1830's or 1840's as a large single family home.

Mr. Vilardo said that he knows that prior to this, efficiency units have been granted around 350 square feet.

Mr. Foltz said he bought the building knowing that the space was there. He said that if the building has four apartments and the 5<sup>th</sup> apartment proposed would be regulation size it wouldn't be a problem. He asked what the hardship is.

Mr. Vilardo said that the hardship is that the house was designed as a five-unit prior to 1986. He said that the zoning now prevents the historic layout from being used. He said that he is requesting a variance to restore that.

Mr. Vilardo said that it sounds like you bought a hardship. He said that it is more self-created, you bought the property as a four-unit.

Mr. Vilardo said that he thinks the property presents the hardship with itself.

Mr. Rosenberg asked if he currently paying separate utilizes for the space.

Mr. Vilardo said yes, for the gas and electric.

Mr. Vilardo said that under NYS law the Board has to apply a balancing test when considering a use variance including whether a reasonable return can be made a property.

Mr. Vilardo read aloud the criteria for a use variance.

Mr. Vilardo stated that the limitation of four units limits the use of interior space. He said that there are no other feasible methods that are economically viable as combining it with another unit would require substantial reconstruction.

Mr. Vilardo said that granting the use variance would allow the building to function with its historical configuration while maintaining the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Foltz read the four criteria for a use variance aloud.

Mr. Foltz that you cannot realize a reasonable return.

Mr. Vilardo said that as far as the interior space, not being able to use the space he cannot expect a return because of the current zoning.

Mr. Foltz said that he bought it like that.

Mr. Foltz read aloud the remaining criteria.

Mr. Vilardo asked the board to elaborate on criteria one and two.

Mr. Foltz said that you bought the building knowing there are four apartments and you were happy with getting whatever it is, a reasonable return on four units which is fine but now you want five. He said that the Board is not in the business of making money for people, they are here to solve problems.

Mr. Vilardo said that he cannot use that space. He said that it is not viable economically.

Ms. Lutz stated that they are not seeing any financial evidence in the application. She said that you are talking about it but the Board has to see it.

Mr. Vilardo asked what would satisfy that.

Ms. Lutz said that they need to see the cost for the property, what it would cost to potentially renovate it. She said that he needs to show what he paying now for the space and why he can't make a reasonable return.

Mr. Vilardo asked if he can provide something pro forma, maybe some estimates.

Ms. Lutz said that she can't tell him what he can and cannot provide.

Mr. Vilardo asked if the Board is asking him to provide financial evidence as in documentation.

Ms. Lutz said that she is saying that she cannot vote either way on the use variance because one of the criteria is financial evidence and she doesn't have it in order to accurately determine that criteria. She explained that all four criteria need to be met.

Mr. Vilardo asked again if he has to give the board financial evidence. He asked if he can do that pro forma in estimates on what it would cost to renovate and how much he pays.

Deputy Corporation Counsel DeCastro said that would have been submitted with the application.

Mr. Vilardo asked if he can add something, the gentleman earlier was able to add something.

Deputy Corporation Counsel DeCastro said that they can table the decision.

Mr. Vilardo said that he has a pro forma that he can provide the board and they can maybe give him an answer another day.

Deputy Corporation Counsel DeCastro said that he can either provide it now or table the decision and come back next month.

Mr. Vilardo said that he will table it.

Megan Brewer explained that because the public hearing was opened, Mr. Vilardo needs to waive the 45 decision requirement.

Mr. Vilardo waived the 45 decision requirement.

There being nothing further, Andrew Rosenberg made a motion to table the decision. Seconded by Kevin McDonough.

Meghan Lutz-Yes  
Nancy Babis-Yes  
Kevin McDonough-Yes  
Dennis Stachera-Yes  
Andrew Rosenberg-Yes  
Kevin Foltz-Yes

### **TABLED**

The next case to be called was Case No. 2367. Appeal of Elizabeth Qasem to erect an addition on the west side of the house located at 120 Willow Street, Lockport, New York situated in a Medium Density Residential Zone.

Ziyad Qasem, father of the owner was present.

Mr. Qasem stated that the house was built in 1964. He said that he purchased it three years ago. He said that the house is vacant, we had to evict the people there. He said that they decided to improve and extend the house. He said that on the right side of the lot is Fairfax Street but it is unimproved.

Mr. Qasem said that they hired an architect and went over what they want to do. He said that they have the plans. He said that after looking at them the addition is close to the unimproved street. He said that he isn't sure how it works, they just told him that he needs a variance.

Mr. Qasem it is not a street. He said that they can turn the addition to go along the street as an option. He said that if they do that, there will not be access to the street because

Fairfax is unimproved. He said that they want the addition the way it is so that they have access to Willow Street.

Mr. McDonough said that he really appreciates the detailed plans provided.

Mr. Foltz asked what the setback is going to be from the unimproved street.

Mr. McDonough said 15', 25' is required.

Mr. Foltz said that it is a corner lot, historically they are special problems. He asked if the expansion is going to match the house, look similar. He said that the drawings say it is going to look identical to the house. He said it looks like it is going to have vinyl siding.

Mr. Rosenberg clarified that they are asking if it is going to look different, it isn't going to be purple and green.

Mr. Qasem said that it is going to improve the house. He said that they have had many issues since they purchased the property. He said that they have issues with rain water coming down the street and onto his property.

Mr. Qasem said that it is up to you gentleman on what we can do. He said that we are building under the house. He said that it is an extension of the existing house. He said that because the street is unimproved, they cannot access it.

The meeting was opened to the public.

Mr. Qasem said that he talked to the neighbors and they were ok.

Kitty Fogle, 4<sup>th</sup> Ward Alderwomen, said that she knows where his house is, it is the house that floods. She asked if he has spoken to Bev and Scott, they live one house away. She said they have the concrete driveway on Weld Street. She asked if the addition that is being built is to mitigate the water issue.

Mr. Qasem said no, he is building the extension because he has a son and his girlfriend.

Alderwomen Fogle asked what they are going to do about the flooding.

Mr. Qasem said that he is going to follow the plan.

The meeting was closed to the public.

There being nothing further Dennis Stachera made a motion to approve to variance request to erect an addition on the west side of the property as follows:

AND IT APPEARING, benefit cannot be achieved by other means feasible to the applicant, and

WHEREAS, there will be no change to the character of the neighborhood, and

WHEREAS, request is not substantial, and

WHEREAS, there will be no adverse physical or environmental effect, and

WHEREAS, alleged difficulty is not self-created, and

WHEREAS, premises shall be kept in a neat, clean, and orderly condition

Seconded by Andrew Rosenberg.

Kevin Foltz-yes  
Meghan Lutz-yes  
Dennis Stachera-yes  
Nancy Babis-yes  
Andy Rosenberg-yes  
Kevin McDonough-yes

**AREA VARIANCE GRANTED**

Andrew Rosenberg made a motion to approve the minutes from the November 25, 2025 meeting. Seconded by Kevin McDonough. Ayes-6 Noes-0

Andrew Rosenberg made a motion to adjourn; Motion seconded by Nancy Babis. Ayes-6 Noes-0

**MEETING ADJOURNED**

**The next regularly scheduled meeting will be Tuesday, March 24, 2026 at 5:00 p.m.**