1	INC	ORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		Willess Hell
4		Village Hall 196 Central Avenue
5		Lawrence, New York
6		July 26, 2017 7:30 p.m.
7		
8	APPLICATION:	Sambrowsky 194 Harborview North Lawrence, New York
9		Lawrence, New Tork
10	PRESENT:	
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
12		MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Member
13		Hember
14 15		MR. DANIEL HILLER Member
16		MR. ELLIOT MOSKOWITZ Member
17		MR. AARON FELDER Member
18		MR. ANDREW K. PRESTON, ESQ.
19		Village Attorney
20		MR. GERALDO CASTRO Building Department
21		J and I among the second secon
22		
23		
24		Many Danai DDD
25		Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter

Sambrowsky - 7/26/17

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Lawrence Board of Zoning Appeals. We'd appreciate it if you have cell phones, please turn them off. If there's a need for a conversation, please take it outside.

Okay. Mr. Castro, do you have proof of posting?

MR. CASTRO: Yes, Chairman, I offer proof of posting and publication.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay, thank you very much.

Let's take care of one piece of business before we start. We have a letter from the Sambrowskys at 194 Harborview North, and it's a letter dated July 20th, and they have a variance that is about to expire and they're asking for an extension. The reason given is they were not financially prepared to proceed, and they're asking for a 24-month extension so that they may complete the project at that point in time. Any discussion on the matter?

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Has any work commenced on the project?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: No. I happen to live across the street.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So there's been no

Sambrowsky - 7/26/17

1	inconvenience to the neighbors to date?
2	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: No. That's the only one
3	on the block that has not inconvenienced me.
4	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: And that's what we care
5	about.
6	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's right.
7	Any other discussion?
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Consensus? Okay, no
10	problem.
11	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
12	7:31 p.m.)
13	*************
14	Certified that the foregoing is a true and
15	accurate transcript of the original stenographic
16	minutes in this case.
17	
18	May Binci
19	MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter
20	Court reporter
21	
22	
23	

1	INCO	RPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		Village Hall
4		196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5		
6		July 26, 2017 7:31 p.m.
7		
8	APPLICATION:	Portnoy 148 Sutton Place South
9		Lawrence, New York
10	PRESENT:	
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
12		
13		MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Member
14		MR. DANIEL HILLER Member
15 16		MR. ELLIOT MOSKOWITZ Member
17		MR. AARON FELDER
18		Member
19	l .	MR. ANDREW K. PRESTON, ESQ. Village Attorney
20		MR. GERALDO CASTRO
21		Building Department
22		
23		
24		Marine Description DDD
25		Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The first matter this evening is Portnoy, 148 Sutton Place South. Would they or their representative please step forward. Please introduce yourself for the stenographer.

MR. SHRIKI: Daniel Shriki, S-H-R-I-K-I, 45 Radcliff Road, Island Park, New York 11558.

Good evening, Board members.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Good evening.

MR. SHRIKI: I'm here on behalf of
John Capobianco, architect, representing
Mr. Portnoy who wishes to build a wood deck in the
back of his house 20 inches above grade. We are
here seeking relief for pervious surface coverage,
side-yard setback, side yard aggregate setback,
and rear-yard setback.

I have spoken with Mr. Portnoy, and he is actually willing to give up a portion of the deck, approximately 102 feet that extends over the side of the house and the deck at the side of the house.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So you will make it flush with the side of the house?

MR. SHRIKI: Making it flush with the exterior of the house, yes.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Do you have a drawing for

the Building Department?

MR. SHRIKI: There are two surveys on that sheet; one of them what we were originally proposing, and the other one shows the modification. In removing this 102 feet, square feet, we will be under pervious surface coverage, eliminating the need for that variance.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. So we only have three more to go.

MR. SHRIKI: Well, it will increase the side-yard setback to 12 feet, as opposed to requested 6 -- 6 and a half feet.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.

MR. SHRIKI: And then we're requesting

3 feet, as opposed to the 8 and a half feet. The aggregate side-yard setback will be increased to

31.4 feet, as opposed to the 25.06 feet.

And for the rear-yard setback, Mr. Portnoy has future plans for the property behind him which he owns and rents out currently, and I'll let him explain that to you right now.

MR. PORTNOY: We don't plan to sell that property, and why we haven't joined it, I don't know why we haven't joined it because we have a house over there, and it seems somewhat

1	convenient, but we'll never sell that house and
2	it's my property as well.
3	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Who is living in the house
4	currently?
5	MR. PORTNOY: Who is living?
6	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: In the house.
7	MR. PORTNOY: A gentleman a woman, a
8	divorced woman.
9	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: A gentle woman.
10	MR. PORTNOY: A woman. No, she's a widow, a
11	widow.
12	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I understand. I have a
13	question. We have the impression that work was
14	done on this deck.
15	MR. PORTNOY: It's there.
16	MR. SHRIKI: Work was started. It's not
17	finished.
18	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: It appeared one day, grew
19	out of the ground?
20	MR. PORTNOY: I was not aware that it was
21	totally my mistake, but I was I was people
22	indicated to me, some friends of mine, that a
23	wooden deck didn't need so much of a permit, so I
- 1	

went ahead and did it and found out that it does

need a permit, and these people were, you know,

24

just advising me wrongly.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I see. Do we know who the contractor is who did the work on the deck, if it was somebody who does work in the Village regularly?

MR. CASTRO: I don't believe so.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The work was completed or not completed?

MR. PORTNOY: I'd say I think it's 90 percent completed, 85 percent completed. It needs the wood on top. The whole foundation is made. It's just ready to close the floor. In fact, we have like a plank so people shouldn't fall in.

MEMBER HILLER: You realize that we're relying on what you said, that you're going to retain the property in the back; otherwise, you're encroaching on that property. If you were to sell it off, if you were to sell it off or not incorporate it into your property, then we'd be giving you a variance really illegally. Not illegally; that's what a variance is. But we'd be giving you a variance on a misunderstanding that you initiated.

MR. PORTNOY: Uh-hm. I could -- if need be, I could write a letter that if I do sell it I'll

take away the deck.

MEMBER HILLER: That would be helpful.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Counsel, are you comfortable with that?

MR. PRESTON: If this Board grants a variance, that variance can't be conditioned on a a future act, and it runs with the land whether he chooses to sell it or not.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: All right.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Good answer. Not the one you wanted, but it's the right answer, but it doesn't solve the problem.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: How long have you owned the house in the back, the other house?

MR. PORTNOY: The other house, since 2000, 2001, and I owned this the same time; I bought both houses.

MEMBER FELDER: Is there any reason you haven't knocked it down yet or incorporated it?

Are you waiting for something?

MEMBER HILLER: Income?

MR. PORTNOY: Could be. No, but we only -we only moved into the house a year ago, a year
and a half ago. We've been building this house.
It took us quite a long time to build the house

that we're living in right now. And eventually we'll put it together, but we haven't done it yet, and it makes sense now not to just throw it down. One of the reasons I didn't throw it down is because when Sandy came I put a lot of money into the house to fix it up, and it just seems wasteful to just throw down a house because I would like a bigger property.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So during Sandy you were in which site?

MR. PORTNOY: I was in the old site, the old site.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The new house is still under construction?

MR. PORTNOY: Yeah, and nothing happened to the new house, but the old house was destroyed.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think we granted you variances on the new house, correct?

MR. PORTNOY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: All right, I think I even had hair then.

MR. PORTNOY: So did I.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Can we take a look at what the new requests are and go over the code relief and see exactly how it's changed starting with the

pervious surface coverage. 1 MR. PORTNOY: Yes. MR. SHRIKI: So the pervious surface coverage 3 we would be removing 5.66 by 18 feet. 4 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So request number one 5 doesn't exist. 6 MR. PORTNOY: Yes. 7 MR. CASTRO: Eliminated. 8 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Let's go to the second one. 9 MR. SHRIKI: The existing side-yard setback 10 is 12 feet, and we would be aligning with that, so 11 the side-yard setback would be 12 feet and we'd be 12 13 short by three feet. 14 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: But you're aligning it with 15 the existing house which was probably given a variance to build that at 12 feet. 16 MR. SHRIKI: The aggregated side-yard setback 17 would be 12 and 19 -- 19.6. So it's 19.4, so 18 31.4. 19 MEMBER HILLER: Is that existing? 20 MR. SHRIKI: Actually, the existing on the 21 other side of the house is 21.89, 21.9, with 12. 22 23 It's over to begin with. With the deck extending down it's becoming 19.4 on that side of the house. 24

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The neighbor impacted by

-	
1	the deck on the side has he been spoken to?
2	MR. SHRIKI: The neighbor right here
3	(indicating)?
4	MR. PORTNOY: Yes. In fact, he might show up
5	to say that. I'm hoping that he walks in now to
6	say that he has no objection.
7	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Who is that neighbor?
8	MR. PORTNOY: His name is Newman.
9	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Right.
10	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Do we have any letters of
11	support?
12	MR. CASTRO: (Indicating.)
13	MR. PORTNOY: I thought he would come in, and
14	he is going to come in.
15	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You're representing that
16	you spoke to him about it?
17	MR. PORTNOY: Yes.
18	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And he was in accord?
19	MR. PORTNOY: He had no problem with it.
20	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chairman, if I could
21	point out that the deck, the part of the deck
22	that's 19.4 feet from the property line, that's on
23	a corner and it doesn't impact any neighbors.
24	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think we'll also take
25	note that there's significant screening at this

point.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Yes, I had to push the bushes apart to ses the deck.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Really?

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: How bold on your part.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: It's unusual.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Anything further?

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: And then the last one is just the rear-yard setback which stays the same, right.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The rear-yard setback is really the concern.

MEMBER FELDER: That's the problem.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: He will never sell the house and that he intends at some point to join the properties. Okay.

MR. PORTNOY: This is the gentleman that owns the house next-door to me. I promised that you would come.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Newman, we would like to have you go on the record. Have you seen -- please step forward, introduce yourself to Mary, our stenographer.

MR. NEWMAN: Dr. William Newman.

1	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And the address that
2	you're at, that you're representing.
3	MR. NEWMAN: Myself.
4	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Well, in this case you're
5	representing the house next-door?
6	MR. NEWMAN: Which is myself, which is owned
7	by myself.
8	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Do you know the number?
9	MR. NEWMAN: 142 Sutton Place South.
10	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Very good.
11	Have you seen the drawing?
12	MR. NEWMAN: No, not yet. That was the only
13	reason I stopped by.
14	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Let's do this
15	expeditiously. Off the record.
16	(Whereupon, a discussion was held off the
17	record.)
18	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Newman, are you okay
19	with that?
20	MR. NEWMAN: I'm fine.
21	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you very much.
22	MR. NEWMAN: You're welcome.
23	MR. PORTNOY: Thank you, Mr. Newman.
24	MR. NEWMAN: You're welcome.
25	MR. PORTNOY: It's hard to find a nice guy

these days.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I know. Hang around tonight and see.

Okay. Anyone in the audience who wants to speak to this matter?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: All right, thankfully not.

I think for the purposes of the Board, just so the record reflects, if a letter can be submitted that there's every intention to never sell the property, and that in fact it's your intention to probably join the properties at some point, I think that to the extent that it would satisfy our interests, we'd appreciate it.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Probably the letter should say if you do sell the property I think you represented that you would remove the deck.

MR. PORTNOY: Remove the deck.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Correct. Thank you, Mr. Moskowitz, appreciate that.

Okay. So taking into consideration the statutory criteria for variances and weighing the benefit to the applicant as opposed to any detriment to any neighbors or the neighborhood and the health, safety and welfare of the

neighborhood, all right, having said that, 1 Mr. Moskowitz. 2 3 MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb. 4 5 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Hiller. 6 7 MEMBER HILLER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Felder. MEMBER FELDER: For. 9 10 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And I vote for as well. 11 MR. PORTNOY: I was wrong. There are nice 12 guys. 13 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And I guess we'll give you a year, but I'm sure it won't require that, right. 14 15 MR. PORTNOY: Thank you very much. (Continued on the following page.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

24

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: No problem. Thank you for coming down. MR. SHRIKI: Thank you. (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 7:43 p.m.) ******** Certified that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the original stenographic minutes in this case. MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter

1	INCOR	PORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2	E	BOARD OF APPEALS
3		Willege Hell
4		Village Hall 196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5		July 26, 2017
6		7:43 p.m.
7	APPLICATION: E	
8	II .	17 Monroe Street Lawrence, New York
9		
10	PRESENT:	
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
12	M	1R. EDWARD GOTTLIEB
13	M	lember
14		IR. DANIEL HILLER Member
15	II .	MR. ELLIOT MOSKOWITZ
16	M	lember
17	10.000	IR. AARON FELDER 1ember
18	M	IR. ANDREW K. PRESTON, ESQ.
19	V	'illage Attorney
20		IR. GERALDO CASTRO Building Department
21		
22		
23		
24		Mary Benci, RPR
25		Court Reporter

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Next is the matter of Eichner, 117 Monroe Street.

MS. EICHNER: Good evening. My name is

Deborah Eichner, and this is my husband

Moshe Eichner, representing 117 Monroe Street,

where we've lived for the past 20 years. We're

here tonight for three variances, but the first

one we already spoke with the Village about, the

pervious/impervious, and agreed to take away some

of the driveway in the front and replace it with

pervious.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: My understanding is that it's no longer a request, right?

MS. EICHNER: Right.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.

MS. EICHNER: My home --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We're down to actually 2/3. You have the side-yard aggregate and you have the height/setback ratio in front and the height/setback ratio in the side yard.

MS. EICHNER: Right. We were damaged in Hurricane Sandy, and we're working with New York Rising to become FEMA compliant. So we're raising our home, and in addition to that we're renovating. In the process we're going to be

Eichner - 7/26/17

losing the basement, so we need to move our mechanicals to the first floor. So we're renovating the house at the same time that we're doing this, and we're asking for a variance because of existing side-yard setback of 11.7 feet. That's the second variance that we're asking for.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: All right, 11.7 and the aggregate.

MS. EICHNER: On the other side I have 15.9.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: But the aggregate is only

27.6, where you require 30.

MS. EICHNER: 30, correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So those are existing nonconforming.

MS. EICHNER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. So far I've got it right. Let's continue. Height/setback ratios.

MS. EICHNER: The third variance that we're asking is the height/setback ratio and the side-yard setback ratio which are unavoidable really due to the violations since the elevation of the home is required to be become FEMA compliant. Since we're losing space in the basement, we thought it best now to take advantage

of the fact that the Village is allowing a third floor, a legal third floor, and we're going up to the maximum of 36 feet from the center of the road.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So on the front the permitted is 0.74. You're going to 0.76, which in most cases we would look upon as being de minimis. And this is your bonus day. The fact of the matter is the numbers that you provided are inaccurate on the existing side yard and in fact they're closer to the proposed. The Village has brought to our attention, the Village Building Department, it's actually 1.9, approximately, and you're asking for 1.97. So once again, it's really de minimis, okay.

MS. EICHNER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Today is your lucky day, okay. The Board can weigh in.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Just so I understand, you're filling in your basement completely?

MS. EICHNER: It's going to be considered a crawlspace. It's not going to be filled in completely.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: And you're raising the first level, the house is going up?

Eichner - 7/26/17

MS. EICHNER: Two feet. 1 2 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Two feet above where it is 3 now? MS. EICHNER: Correct. The house is right 4 5 now at 34 feet in height and it's going to 36. 6 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: What I meant was from the 7 grade level. 8 MS. EICHNER: Raising two feet. 9 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: And they're jacking up the 10 house? 11 MS. EICHNER: Correct. 12 MEMBER HILLER: Do you have pass-throughs on 13 the bottom level, like to allow water to pass 14 through? 15 MS. EICHNER: Yes. One of the requirements for FEMA is to have flood vents in the foundation. 16 17 What they do is they jack up the home, they rip out the existing foundation and put in a new 18 19 foundation to mitigate the water problems. Any 20 water that comes in automatically goes out through 21 the flood vents. 22 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So the crawlspace would not 23 be below grade, it would be at grade? You 24 mentioned there's a crawlspace.

MEMBER FELDER: Below the house.

Eichner - 7/26/17

1	MEMBER HILLER: Above grade.
2	MS. EICHNER: Above grade.
3	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: That's what I meant, okay.
4	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. Do you have letters
5	of support from neighbors?
6	MR. EICHNER: One neighbor right here.
7	MS. EICHNER: My neighbor right next door to
8	me.
9	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Please approach and
10	introduce yourself.
11	MR. ASSARAF: My name is Jacob Assaraf,
12	115 Monroe Street. I'm the neighbor across to
13	their house.
14	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: To the left or the right?
15	MS. EICHNER: Facing the house, to the right.
16	MR. ASSARAF: Yes.
17	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: North of theirs.
18	MS. EICHNER: North side.
19	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So you're familiar with
20	the requests they're making?
21	MR. ASSARAF: Yes, I'm very familiar.
22	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Do you understand how it
23	impacts on your property, if it does?
24	MR. ASSARAF: Yes.
25	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Do you have any issues

1 with it? 2 MR. ASSARAF: No, I don't have any issue, any 3 objections. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Do you have any water 4 5 damage from Sandy? MR. ASSARAF: No, two inches of water. 6 7 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Really? MR. ASSARAF: Yeah. 8 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's remarkable. 9 10 MEMBER FELDER: Only my side of the street 11 got it. 12 MS. EICHNER: I had four and a half feet. 13 MEMBER FELDER: They got hit. 14 MS. EICHNER: Not to the ceiling like most of 15 the others on our block, but I had four and a half 16 feet. 17 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay, thank you very much, 18 appreciate it. 19 Okay. Anyone else want to speak to the 20 matter from the audience? 21 (No response.) 22 MR. CASTRO: The only thing I want to say is 23 I'd ask that the architect revise the drainage 24 plan, the drainage plot plan, the actual

specifications of the dry wells to reflect the

Eichner - 7/26/17

soil boring because there's a little bit of a conflict in the depth of the dry wells and the water table and that was developed on the soil boring.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So our vote will be subject to that, satisfying the Village Building Department in terms of that aspect.

MS. EICHNER: To revise the plot plan.

MR. CASTRO: Correct.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: The drainage plan.

MR. CASTRO: The drainage plan.

MS. EICHNER: The drainage plan.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The drainage plan.

So let's evaluate the benefit to the applicant as opposed to any detriment to the neighborhood, the neighbors, et cetera, et cetera. And taking all that information into consideration, and of course, you will have the revised drainage plan, so we'll start with Mr. Felder.

MEMBER FELDER: I look forward to looking at it every morning in its new state. I am for.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Hiller.

MEMBER HILLER: I look forward to visiting Aaron and looking at it.

Eichner - 7/26/17

MS. EICHNER: You're welcome to park in front 2 of my house. 3 MEMBER HILLER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb. 4 5 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I'll just say for and leave it. 6 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Moskowitz. MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: For, and I wish you the 8 best of luck. 9 10 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And I'm for as well, and 11 two years. 12 MR. CASTRO: Two years and subject to the 13 Board of Building Design approval. 14 MS. EICHNER: Great. 15 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. 16 (Continued on the following page.) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

24

	Eichner - 7/26/17
1	MS. EICHNER: Thank you very much.
2	MR. EICHNER: Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You did a very able job.
4	MR. EICHNER: Thank you.
5	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
6	7:50 p.m.)
7	***************
8	Certified that the foregoing is a true and
9	accurate transcript of the original stenographic
10	minutes in this case.
11	
12	May Benci
13	MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter
14	Court Reporter
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

1	INCO	RPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		
4		Village Hall 196 Central Avenue
5		Lawrence, New York
6		July 26, 2017 7:50 p.m.
7		
8	APPLICATION:	Englander 6 Marbridge Road Lawrence, New York
9		Lawrence, New 1914
10	PRESENT:	
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
12		MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Member
14		MR. DANIEL HILLER Member
15		MR. ELLIOT MOSKOWITZ
16		Member
17		MR. AARON FELDER Member
18		MR. ANDREW K. PRESTON, ESQ.
19		Village Attorney
20		MR. GERALDO CASTRO Building Department
21		
22		
23		
24		Mary Benci, RPR
25		Court Reporter

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The last matter this evening is Englander, 6 Marbridge Road. Would they or their representative please step forward.

MR. CALIENDO: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. My name is Ray Caliendo.

I'm the managing principal of Art of Form

Architecture in Amityville, and I'm representing

Mr. and Mrs. Englander. Mr. and Mrs. Englander are present this evening.

As you are aware, the residence suffered severe damage in Hurricane Sandy. They had anywhere between 3 and a half to 5 feet of water in the home. Thus, necessitating this raising that we are proposing.

Their block, Marbridge Road, has pretty typical difficulties with respect to flooding. So this is a constant issue that was only exacerbated by Sandy and promulgated this entire situation.

Before I begin the nuts and bolts of the presentation, I would like to offer up six letters from neighboring property owners, two of which actually abut the property, and these are all in favor of the application by Mr. and Mrs. Englander. I would offer that into the record, if I may.

....

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Could you describe where those neighbors are located?

MR. CALIENDO: Two of them abut the property. Mr. Englander would know better than me.

MR. ENGLANDER: One is right behind me, currently building a new construction on Meadow Lane, but his backyard and my backyard touch up against each other.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's the neighbor that the construction site is under a stop work right now?

MR. ENGLANDER: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.

MR. ENGLANDER: Regardless, our properties do touch up against each other, as well as
Mr. Michael Weiss who is on Margaret, our backyards do touch each other at points, and they are in favor of what I'm looking to do.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay, thank you.

MR. CALIENDO: Okay. Before I touch on the variances, just conceptually, the idea behind the project is to essentially lift the house in its current configuration. We're not proposing any structural additions to the house, only those involving stairways and the reconstruction of the

rear deck in essentially the same area that it's in right now. So there are no real footprint additions, no living space additions contemplated. It is a straight raise.

The matter that's primarily at issue is the height. The house right now does not have a garage and is in need of one, and in order to do so the intent is to raise the house sufficiently high enough so that we can have a garage at grade level and then just storage space behind it, and then the existing two stories would simply be directly above that.

With respect to the variances specifically at issue --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I'm sorry. You say there's no garage currently?

MR. CALIENDO: There is no garage currently.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Was there a garage?

MR. CALIENDO: There was a garage, yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: What's in the garage currently?

MR. CALIENDO: The garage at some point in time was modified into living space, after Sandy. If you would like me to amplify on that a little bit.

.

-

~

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: That's not permitted to abandon a garage. Was that done with permits?

MR. CALIENDO: No, sir.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Okay.

MR. CALIENDO: With respect to the need for the garage space, the living space, the Englanders have five children, and they have -- their parents are elderly and do occasionally stay with them on weekends. So there is a need for the space for them to occasionally accommodate their parents. So that living space was essential, is essential to them, and certainly we propose to maintain it in this application.

Specific to the variances --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Sorry, maintain the?

MEMBER FELDER: The living space in the garage.

MR. CALIENDO: The conversion of the space into living space from a former garage. So given that, if we were to not raise the house any higher than would be proposed under --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You would not be able to have that.

MR. CALIENDO: We wouldn't be able to have the garage. That's the essence of it.

So we have setback issues on the east and west sides which are necessitated by the fact that it is a nonconforming condition as it exists.

Now, the west-side setback is exacerbated by the fact that we are proposing a small wood staircase out of the kitchen area. That is something that, you know, can be negotiated in terms of its location or positioning. But as of right now, we have a setback issue. We do not meet the minimum or the aggregate for the setback. Again, stressing the fact that this is a straight raise and it was nonconforming as it existed.

The second issue is the sky exposure plane, or setback ratio. I'll just flip to my drawing for that. On the west side we're permitted a 1.46 ratio; we are proposing 1.90. On the east side, again, 1.46, and we are proposing 2.26.

Again, essentially, the house is being raised as is. So there's no new structures that would be impeding or encroaching upon the sky exposure plane.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Could you repeat again about the height/setback ratios, the numbers.

MR. CALIENDO: Okay. On the west side we are permitted a 1.6 ratio, which breaking down the

numbers that would be a height of 22 feet. 1 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I'm sorry, the code relief 2 does not read that. 3 MEMBER HILLER: 25. MR. CALIENDO: The section is -- yeah, I 5 quess you rounded it off to 1.5. In reality it's 6 7 1.46. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: 1.46 is the correct one, 8 and the existing is correct? 9 MR. CALIENDO: Let's see, we are requesting 10 1.9, but the existing is 1.4 to 1.5. The 11 12 difference is really negligible. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Because the code relief 13 reads 1.06 on the -- actually, I don't know which 14 15 one is the --MR. CALIENDO: I'm reading off of the 16 17 June 29th letter of the Village. MR. CASTRO: The denial. 18 MR. CALIENDO: Yeah, the denial letter. 19 20 you want to just take this? MR. CASTRO: I have a copy of it. I'm sorry. 21 What did you say the date on that was? 22 MR. CALIENDO: I have June 29th. I can just 23 give it to you if you want. 24

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Gerry, I have it here.

Here, if you want. There's June 29th (handing). 1 MR. CALIENDO: So according to what I have, 2 the maximum is 1.5. And the way I calculated it 3 was permitted is 1.46. So 1.46 to 1.45 is virtually no difference there. The essence of it is assuming 1.5 on the west side, we're proposing 6 1.90. 7 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Again, what is the existing? The template reads 1.06. MR. CASTRO: 1.06. 10 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: 1.06 is the current. 11 MR. CALIENDO: Actually, I don't have that 12 here. I will take your word for it though. 13 That's fine. And then on the east side --14 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So again, the permitted is 15 1.46, the existing is 1.06, and the proposed is 16 1.9? 17 MR. CALIENDO: 1.9, that would be for the 18 west side. 19 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's for the first 20 floor. 21 MR. CALIENDO: Yes, that's the first floor on 22 the west side. 23 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. Let's go to the

24

25

east side.

MR. CALIENDO: The east side, again, hopefully there's no confusion on the numbers.

There I have permitted of 1.46 and a proposed of 2.26. That seems to jibe with your letter.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We have 1.44. You don't have that?

MR. CALIENDO: I do not have that, I'm sorry. I'll take your word for it.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Oh, thank you. What a relief.

MR. CALIENDO: And lastly, in terms of the variances, this is based on New York Rising standards, this would be considered a three-story house as opposed to a two-and-a-half-story house, which requires relief in relation to the Village Code, as I understand it.

So which brings me to the primary issue I believe, which is the height. And in order to realize the garage underneath the house, the absolute minimum necessary is what we are proposing in terms of the first floor finished elevation.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Well, in reality, your height request, barring the encroachments, is well below what the Village allows today.

MR. CALIENDO: That's correct, yes, sir. 1 What does the Village CHAIRMAN KEILSON: 2 3 allow today? MR. CASTRO: 36. MR. CALIENDO: 36. And this proposal would 5 be 31 and change, yeah, 31.4. 6 MR. CASTRO: I think that height was taken to 7 the 31.4 is to the mean grade. 8 MR. CALIENDO: Yes. 9 MR. CASTRO: So you have to add about a foot, 10 probably about a foot and a half to the crown of 11 the road. 12 MR. CALIENDO: Okay. 13 MR. CASTRO: It creates -- so the 36 is now 14 measured from the crown of the road. 15 MR. CALIENDO: Okay. I wasn't aware of that. 16 I thought it was still from grade. Well, in 17 either case, apparently, we're still going to be 18 significantly under the requirement. 19 MR. CASTRO: Yes. 20 MR. CALIENDO: And I had presented to the 21 Village the analysis of the adjacent homes on the 22 east and west sides in terms of their relative 23 heights in relation to our proposed heights. 24

CHAIRMAN KEILSON:

25

The streetscape, as we

call it.

MR. CALIENDO: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.

MR. CALIENDO: If I can find my streetscape. Here it is, okay. So this should be what you're looking at (indicating).

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Yes.

MR. CALIENDO: Okay. So the top line of homes shows the Englanders' home in the middle in its existing configuration, and then the row of houses below horizontally shows the proposed.

The height of the ridge on Mr. Englander's home, Mr. and Mrs. Englander's home, would be comparable to the ones on either side of his. Plus, his house is actually turned 90 degrees so that the ridge runs north/south as opposed to the primary ridges on the adjacent homes which runs west.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We do have to take into consideration that -- is that the height or really the height should be a foot and a half more.

MR. CASTRO: It should be a foot and a half to 2 feet closer to 34.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: That would be the same for all three houses shown?

.

Englander - 7/26/17 MR. CASTRO: Yes. 1 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So proportionately it would 2 be about the same. 3 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Good. Thank you for 4 pointing that out. 5 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Mr. Caliendo, what is the 6 7 FEMA requirement? MR. CALIENDO: Right now they are required --8 I'll give you the exact numbers. Current floor 9 height is 8.35. Base flood elevation minimum 10 would be 9, but you have to add 2 feet to that so 11 it's 11. So they have to be 2 to 3 feet higher 12 than they are right now minimum. We're proposing 13 14 7. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. And the 7 is, as 15 you've described previously, to accommodate the 16 17 living quarters? 18 MR. CALIENDO: The garage. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And the garage. 19 MR. CALIENDO: It's primarily to be able to 20 get a garage underneath there. 21 MEMBER HILLER: Will this be a real garage or 22 23 a garage that --

MEMBER HILLER: A real garage and maintained

MR. CALIENDO: A real garage.

24

25

1 always as a garage?

MR. ENGLANDER: Always as a garage.

MEMBER HILLER: You have the pass-through water vents in the garage?

MR. CALIENDO: Yes.

MR. ENGLANDER: Yes.

MR. CALIENDO: I believe, and I've been through these Sandy proposals many times in many municipalities, I believe the homeowners will stipulate that the garage will remain a garage and we will make that a condition of the approval if that will satisfy the Board.

 $\label{eq:chain_control} \textbf{CHAIRMAN KEILSON:} \quad \textbf{We certainly appreciate} \\ \text{that.}$

MR. CALIENDO: I think that's pretty much all I can --

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I was listening to your presentation, and one of the comments was that you don't use the garage currently because you're using it for bedrooms. And I don't know if it reduces the variances that we're looking for, but if you were only to raise it 3 feet and not use the garage as you currently do, then you would only need to raise it 3 feet and you would still accomplish the internal functions of the house,

you just don't have a garage. But I don't know that that necessarily reduces the variances that you requested.

MR. CALIENDO: My understanding is that a garage is necessary.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Well, you would be swapping out your variances for a no garage versus the height/setback. That was just because you're not using a garage currently and it was done without permits.

MR. CALIENDO: I understand. Honestly, we hadn't even considered that. I don't know.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I don't know if that's a good alternative, Mr. Chairman. It just came to mind.

MEMBER HILLER: I think it's best if they have a garage. Garages are required.

MR. ENGLANDER: Correct.

MR. CALIENDO: They do want a garage.

MR. ENGLANDER: When we converted the garage, we converted one of the rooms in the back as a bedroom, as a bedroom suite, so that my elderly father who is not so able to walk up steps would have an easier time of everything. We lost space in that room, and we lost the space then created

when we took the -- converted the garage to a den, and we have no space for bikes and, you know, many other things that we were using the garage for.

Not using it for a car necessarily, but we had a lot of storage ability. Now we have no storage ability. So it would create a much easier time of everything.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So we'll consider it the way it was proposed versus reducing it.

MEMBER HILLER: As you yourself suggested, the stairway on the west side of the house, you would remove a big obstacle between yourself and the house next-door to you should that be moved to the rear of the house. I understand in the plans you have a rear exit onto the deck from that same room, from the kitchen I believe.

MR. CALIENDO: That's right.

MEMBER HILLER: So I think as you considered it and you mentioned yourself, I think that should be absolutely part of the design, removing that staircase on the left.

MR. ENGLANDER: Understand that it creates a difficulty a little bit for us in the sense that right now it's an access off of our kitchen. It gives us access to the garbage pails. From the

rear deck we don't have any access to that area at all.

MEMBER HILLER: I understand. But we're trying to minimize the contentiousness of the neighbors' objections, and this would go a long way to do that.

MR. CALIENDO: If I may ask, if I can design a staircase -- I'm sorry. If I could design a staircase that would be located in the rear of the house but would cut into I guess that would be the west side deck, so that he can have access, more or less access, or I can engineer the access from the kitchen to get him around to the side of the house, I would be allowed to put that deck -- excuse me -- that stairwell back there as long as I don't go beyond the plane of the house?

MEMBER HILLER: I think I understood you correctly. I think that would help a lot.

MR. CALIENDO: In other words --

MEMBER HILLER: You would not go beyond the house to the west.

MR. CALIENDO: Right.

MEMBER HILLER: You would not go beyond the plane of the house. You would just have direct access down.

MR. CALIENDO: Correct. I would just modify the deck in the back to have a staircase on the side, but that would not go any closer than the actual plane of the house.

MEMBER FELDER: So if you're looking up the divide between the two neighbors you wouldn't see anything.

MR. CALIENDO: Correct. Again, I'm only speculating here. I can't answer for the Englanders at this point whether or not that's acceptable. I'm just trying to make sure I understand what would be acceptable to the Board.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Tell us about the shadow study and what it shows in terms of the impact of raising the house.

MR. CALIENDO: Okay. I have one that's in color, actually. Bear with me a second, please.

Well, as you can imagine, the long shadows that are going to be created during the solstices are the most problematic. The house does face south, so for the most part the shadows, you know, are going back as opposed to side to side, and would just, you know, change during the course of the day. Based on what we're seeing, the effect of raising that house is negligible beyond what

it's already doing. I don't know what else I can say about that, unless you want to get more specific about it in different times of the year.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Well, let's talk about it in terms of the neighbor to the east.

MR. CALIENDO: To the east.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: During the summer months.

MR. CALIENDO: All right. So we're talking about --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: When people are generally outside.

MR. CALIENDO: The summer solstice at 12 noon, since that's the high point in the sky, and it's basically due south, all the shadows are going to be thrown backwards, or to the north.

And during the summer solstice at 7 p.m., you know, when everything is going to be towards the west, it's going to cast some shadows, but still the way the -- the way we modeled this on the computer, the house to the east isn't going to be affected, despite the fact that it's, you know, going to be a very, you know, intense sun at that point in time. I don't know if I'm really answering.

MEMBER HILLER: Do you know the distance

between your house and the house to the east?

MR. CALIENDO: I can estimate it. I don't

have a survey that depicts those adjacent houses.

But based on the -- based on the elevation study,

I might be able to. This is admittedly a guess.

I'm going to guess in the range of about 35 to

40 feet.

MR. ENGLANDER: More than that.

MR. CALIENDO: More than 40 feet?

MR. CASTRO: To the east, more.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Castro, do you want to weigh in?

MR. CASTRO: We're discussing the primary dwelling to the east, not the garage, because the garage is closer, the detached garage. I'd say more in the lines of -- I'd say more in the lines closer to 60, 60 feet, maybe even beyond that.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Mr. Englander, just a question for you. With regard to communications with your neighbors, and I'm sure the people here will speak for themselves, but can you tell the Board whether you've attempted to speak with the neighbors -- the neighbor on the east, most to your east and most to your west, the two closest

neighbors?

MR. ENGLANDER: I was able to reach -- I was able to reach Mr. Borgen who is on one side. I was able to reach him.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: That's the west side?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: East side.

MR. CALIENDO: I could tell you in a second. 81 Margaret.

MR. ENGLANDER: I reached him on Sunday, and he specifically told me he didn't want to talk to me prior to the meeting. He said that if I wanted to I could talk with him after the meeting, but he wasn't going to talk to me before the meeting.

I attempted to reach Mr. Friedman Friday,
Saturday night and Sunday. I must have called
seven or eight times. I left voice mails and a
few text messages, and nothing was returned. That
was the extent of what I was able to get.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Can we talk about the drainage proposal.

MR. CALIENDO: We haven't gotten that far on the drainage as of yet, but when we had done the drawings we did some preliminary calculations, and I don't foresee any issues with complying with --

1	MR. CASTRO: Again, as in the previous
2	application, I'm going to ask that you revise you:
3	drainage calculations, because what's being
4	proposed will not work in that area. The depth,
5	primarily the depth of the dry wells that are
6	being specified.
7	MR. CALIENDO: Okay. Meaning they're too
8	deep in relation to groundwater?
9	MR. CASTRO: Yeah.
10	MR. CALIENDO: All right, so we'll just have
11	to widen them.
12	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Are we increasing the
13	surface area of the existing surface or building
14	coverage?
15	MR. CALIENDO: Slightly.
16	MEMBER HILLER: For the stairs?
17	MR. CASTRO: Can you quantify that.
18	MR. CALIENDO: Because of the stairs.
19	MEMBER FELDER: That's the only thing that's
20	changing?
21	MR. CALIENDO: Yeah. There's nothing else
22	with respect to the footprint that's changing.
23	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: And there are currently no
24	dry wells there now?

MR. CALIENDO: Not to my knowledge.

25

MEMBER FELDER: And those stairs, are they going to be concrete or patio?

MR. CALIENDO: The stairs on the west side?

MEMBER FELDER: No. If you're moving it to
the rear, just wherever they are going to be.

Let's assume they're in the rear for now.

MR. CALIENDO: Those are intended to be wood.

MEMBER FELDER: Just wood planks?

MR. CALIENDO: Yeah.

MEMBER FELDER: So no major foundation beneath them?

MR. CALIENDO: That's correct, sir. The stair on the right, on the east side, is intended to be a masonry stair simply because of the look that the Englanders favor. I can stipulate, if need be, that if it's an issue of a non-impervious surface at the top landing that could be changed to a would deck so that water can pass through if that's an issue.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I don't think that's an issue. I was just really asking whether you were substantially changing the amount of surface or building coverage because we're talking about drainage.

MR. CALIENDO: No, sir. Just the stairs.

And right now, again, the house is not elevated right now, so stairs of some sort are obviously needed. He does have existing masonry pathways that lead to the house, so that it's already covered in there. So the delta between the existing and proposed in terms of coverage is negligible.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: That's what I was sort of asking.

MR. CASTRO: The only thing I noticed is that the reconstruction of the wood deck in the rear configures slightly differently.

MR. CALIENDO: Yes.

MR. CASTRO: I guess I'm just asking you to verify my accuracy in that the deck is -- the setback of the deck, of the existing deck is going to be less than the current deck, but it's going to be -- it's not going to have angles anymore in the rear.

MR. CALIENDO: Correct. It's going to be a square, essentially a square deck.

MR. CASTRO: So you're swapping surface coverage essentially to maintain the same amount?

MR. CALIENDO: That's right. The configuration of that deck may change slightly

based on the discussion about the staircase moving, if it's decided that that's what's going to take place.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Any further questions from the Board?

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: No.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. Is there anyone in the audience who wants to speak on the matter?

Please step forward and introduce yourself.

MR. BORGEN: Evening, gentlemen. Barry

Borgen, B-O-R-G-E-N, 81 Margaret Avenue. When you face the house, I'm on the right side right by the stairs.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: East.

 $\label{eq:mr.borgen: I'm not good with compasses.}$ That's why I got a phone.

Anyway, first of all, let me just say about three or three and a half years ago Mr. and Mrs. Englander tried to push this through. David didn't even get a letter. I got a letter a day — two days before the meeting. It was a Thursday. We came down here Tuesday, looked at the plans, and this and that. Mike Ryder was at the time in the Village, and we came down to speak to Mike Ryder. Now, that happened three years ago.

This all could have been avoided. He did not meet with us three years ago, not to call us, nothing. He tried to sneak it through. I got a letter two days before the proposed meeting. I got a letter from the architect. So just to go back three, four years about him trying to communicate with us, he didn't even try to communicate with us at that point in time. So there was a lack of communication.

Now, first of all, the house right now is currently illegal the way it's built. Where his door is coming into his house on my side is not 15 feet away from my property line. There's not a chance, not at all.

Now, the most important thing I hear is also the property line with the --

MEMBER FELDER: Has that always been there that way?

MR. BORGEN: Yeah, but the house is illegally built now the house. You can't build that house now.

MEMBER HILLER: There's such a thing as existing nonconforming.

MR. BORGEN: Yeah, but okay, now, so here's the thing. If he's going to go up now -- let me

go one step at a time. That's number one. He's very close to my property line now, number one.

Number two, the plans that he has over here for this new basement extension, he basically wants a basement. There are two doors going out of that to a walk-out basement to the yard. If this is a so-called flood room, why are there two big doors to go out to the backyard as a walk-out basement? Now, he basically wants a basement out of this house. He's not looking to extend the house.

Secondly now, the way the house is situated now as well, he had -- he had like some -- like a fence over there that's coming out over there now. The fence is right also on my property line. I don't care about the stupid fence, it's there. You can see right through the fence; it doesn't bother me. He's going to make a walk-out basement from the back in this new extension that he wants to do.

Now, as for the sun issue, my wife and I seriously do --

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: I'm sorry to interrupt.

Just to be clear, you're suggesting that -- I just want to make sure I understand your point. You're

suggesting that the space that they're characterizing as a garage is not -
MR. BORGEN: No, not the garage, n

MR. BORGEN: No, not the garage, no. This new thing where he's making a new basement, new foundation. He basically wants a basement.

It's not a question of raising the house.

If you want to go up 3 feet, I don't care about

3 feet. It's not going to bother me in the

least 3 feet. That's the minimum Sandy

requirement.

MEMBER FELDER: There were no doors accessing the lower level other than the garage door proposed.

MR. BORGEN: Okay. But he doesn't have a garage now.

MEMBER FELDER: No, after the raise, if he builds the garage under there as proposed and there were no other doorways leading out of that structure, you would be okay with that?

MR. BORGEN: No. Let me finish my -- let me finish my -- my spiel, and then you can ask me whatever you want, no problem.

MEMBER FELDER: It seems like you're bothered by the walk-out part.

MR. BORGEN: No, because he wants to make a

walk-out basement. I'm trying to say the scenario is not to have a Sandy room. It's to have a walk-out basement. That's what the intention is. Once he gets the C of O for this, he will then finish the basement and have a basement. He did that with the garage. Now, I guess, you know, maybe I'll make my garage into a studio or an apartment. I mean, I guess you can do that. You can do the garage, he did it, made a room out of it. So he's going to have it. I don't want to get off the point here.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Good idea.

MR. BORGEN: Next, the sun issue. My wife and I are seriously thinking of doing solar panels. If he's going to raise his house, why put in solar panels to get my electric bill down? It's going to be raised and I'm not going to get sun in September and October if he's going to raise his house. I want to do solar panels. It totally takes that out of the equation for me, for everyone to save money on solar panels.

Now, here's the other thing, a walkway on my side of the house is an eight-foot brick wall that he's taking away grass that would be absorption.

Right now there's grass there with only pavers,

like little pavers, like little like bluestone.

There's grass now to absorb the water. I have some photos. Let me show you. Can I bring these up?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: By all means.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MEMBER HILLER: You can pass them.

MR. BORGEN: This was the last flood on Margaret Avenue, what, about two weeks ago. We've had about four floods in the past month. You can ask Mr. Castro; they used to come clean the sidewalk every time. As you can see, the water now the way it is is very bad. He's going to put up an eight-foot with a staircase of concrete or a brick wall with a staircase. There's nowhere for the water to go. It's all going to come to me, even more than I'm getting now. Look at the photos. They all know. My neighbor, Mr. Konigsberg, lost six cars already in this corner in the past three and a half years. that's documented and they know the situation. don't have to repeat that situation.

MEMBER FELDER: Just to clarify, this situation we all know. We all live here.

MR. BORGEN: I'm not disputing that. My point is he's going to cover up grass with a brick

wall.

MEMBER FELDER: According to the presentation, they're not extending any surface coverage outside. They're just raising up the house.

MR. BORGEN: There's grass there now. He's going to cover it up with concrete.

MEMBER FELDER: Are you talking about just the staircase?

MR. BORGEN: It's an eight-foot high staircase with a concrete wall, and there's going to be concrete steps because he has to get into his house, and a walkway.

MEMBER FELDER: If they concede, as we discussed, to move the staircase to the rear --

MR. BORGEN: I'm on the other side. I'm on the other. I'm on the other side.

MEMBER FELDER: The other staircase.

MR. BORGEN: I'm on the other side. It's an eight-foot high staircase with a brick wall. So he's taking away all that grass and then will put there a concrete wall. I mean, where's the water going to go? It's all going to come to me.

Next -- I made my list over here. During Sandy, I had 5 and a half feet of water in my $\,$

basement, 5 and a half feet of water in the basement. He didn't have as much water in his house as he says he did. He can say what he wants. He had maybe 2 and a half, maybe 2 feet, maybe 2 feet maximum. I had 5 and a half feet of water in my basement. Mr. Friedman had about 6 feet of water in the basement.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: You were in his house during Hurricane Sandy?

MR. BORGEN: We spoke about it after Sandy. We all spoke about our properties.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: I'm just asking if you were in his house.

MR. BORGEN: No. We all spoke about it after Sandy about what each person's situation was and so forth. I remember very clearly what took place, okay. I know what I had. All my neighbors got together and discussed the situation.

Now, next case. As for the letters from the neighbors, all the neighbors signed the letters all nice and dandy, but they're not impacted directly by this project. Certainly, the guy who got a stop work order behind him doesn't live in the house, never lived in the Village, and he's sending a letter to say he's okay with it? The

guy, he did things that he had to stop working. 1 And as for the neighbors on the other side of the street, Levy, Shore and Koningsberg, this does not affect them at all, not at all, because I'm directly next to him. Those guys are on the side of the street; it doesn't affect them at all. It's all nice and dandy, but it doesn't affect them. So why should -- why should these guys mean anything, to be honest with you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, as for the garage, you know, if he made a garage and took it away and he has five children, that's not even my problem. I have five children also. Thank God, I have enough bedrooms. If he doesn't have enough room in the house, so he should get a variance because he needs extra rooms in the house for his kids or someone coming to visit, such as relatives? I never heard a variance being granted because someone needs bedrooms for his kids. I mean, certain things you get a variance for, not because you need more bedrooms because you have more kids.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Mr. Borgen, if there's any reason why we ever grant variances it's because of kids, more than any other reason.

MR. BORGEN: You know, my brother-in-law has

eight kids in West Hempstead. So he cries to my father-in-law, well, I have eight kids, I have expenses. So my answer is, who told you to have eight kids? I'm saying, honestly, if you want to have kids, you have to live with the situation. So if I want to have ten kids, I want to build a townhouse on my property, so I'm going to build a townhouse for ten kids.

MEMBER HILLER: Mr. Borgen, what he's saying is not to build extra bedrooms for the kids. He's raising his house as of a FEMA program. He is not adding to the house, other than your -- well, we're going to find out about it -- your statement that he wants to add some basement room. The house is basically going to be the same house, just raised with a garage underneath, according to what they're saying. So he's not asking for extra bedrooms. That was an incorrect statement.

MR. BORGEN: All right, I want to tell you something. I've seen houses that --

MEMBER HILLER: Just continue.

MR. BORGEN: Okay. I've seen houses that were raised, and I've seen houses that people have done in Long Beach and I've been in people's homes. Once they get that C of O then it's all

bets are off.

MEMBER HILLER: That's not true.

MR. BORGEN: But I've seen it. I've seen it.

All bets are off. All bets are off. But the point that bothers me the most is -- forget about all that other nonsense -- he's going to take away absorption issues that are there right now, going to make a big wall with a staircase on my side of the house. I want to put solar panels up. I'm not going to put solar panels up because he's raising it 7 feet up. If he needs a garage, take away the den you have and take your garage back.

What's the big problem? He wants to go up 2 and a half, 3 feet, I have no problem, but 7 feet to me is a little excessive, you know, because he didn't have that much -- I had more water than he had in his house.

I really don't think the variance should be granted. I'm very, very opposed to it. As a neighbor, I'm living there 22 and a half,
23 years. I didn't come here to have houses -you know, I know the house is grandfathered in. I didn't come here from Brooklyn and Queens that the house is so close to me. The house is there. The house is there.

You see the flooding problem. It's only getting worse on our block. It's not getting better. Mr. Castro has been great about it; he's trying many different things. He's doing his best to alleviate the problem, but the problem, unfortunately, is getting worse.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Was his house already there when you moved into your house?

MR. BORGEN: Yes, it was.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Some of the things that you complain of were already there at the time you moved in.

MR. BORGEN: But he's taking more positives now with the staircase on my side of the house. There's no staircase there now.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Borgen, Mr. Castro already indicated your house is 16 feet away.

MR. BORGEN: My property line is not 16 feet away. My property line, not the house. So if you're telling me --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Castro, how far is the property line from the house?

MR. CASTRO: The survey shows 8.5 feet from the side entrance, approximately 16.7 feet from the main dwelling.

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BORGEN: So you're telling me if I want to go up -- since I can go all the way to his property line, I can build the whole side yard up then?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: When you want to come before us with a proposal, we'll discuss it.

Tonight we're discussing Mr. Englander's house and any impact it might have. You're suggesting that solar panels will be impacted --

MR. BORGEN: And my water issue.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Let me finish. The shadow study seems to indicate otherwise.

Number two, in terms of the impact on the absorption of water, we're talking about a stairway that is, whatever, 50, 60 feet away from your house. It's hard to believe that that's going to be exacerbating the situation.

MR. BORGEN: Why should my yard get flooded numerous times? Why does it get flooded every time it rains and every time there's a storm?

I've had flooding in my yard on numerous occasions as well. Why should my yard get flooded more than it should be now? That's going to happen.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Can I answer that?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Please.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So right now there is no drainage plan. There's no drainage system. are putting in a full drainage system as per code, which does not exist. So while they may be adding 60 or 70 square feet or 100 feet of stairway, they're going to be absorbing a considerable amount of water, of runoff.

MR. BORGEN: What kind of -- what kind of drainage system? Obviously, the architect didn't do -- should have had a drainage plan here, I think; don't you think?

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: The drainage plan will be done as per Gerry's, Mr. Castro's requirements,

MR. BORGEN: But I have no objection going 2 and a half, 3 feet, I have no objection going up, but 7 I'm just vehemently opposed to it.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you very much. Good evening.

MR. FRIEDMAN: My name is Dave Friedman. live at 2 Marbridge Road in Lawrence. I live on the west side of Mr. Englander.

Okay. I'm opposed to this structure that they're building. I am -- his property line is 6 feet from my property line, and on top of that there's a 3-foot easement, a total of 9 feet.

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

3-foot easement was granted to us by prior owners 45 years ago when Mr. Englander's house was built by two previous owners before.

So there's only currently 6 feet of grass.

And we have -- this past summer we've had four or five floods. We had approximately 18 inches to 2 feet of water. There are times that I can't get out of my house, and there are times I can't get back into my house. There were times that I was stranded out up until 2:30 a.m. Mr. Fragin used to keep me company and then he bailed on me.

So the problem we have now by him building up, we have a drainage problem. During Hurricane Sandy my basement was completely flooded. My den had 2 feet of water. We had to swim out of the house. We have approximately four floods a year, four or five floods a year, and they're each up to 2 feet of water. My driveway gets flooded. The water comes into my den at times, and my detached garage gets flooded up to 2 feet of water.

First of all, Mr. Englander, during Hurricane Sandy I approached him to see how we can resolve the issue. After Hurricane Sandy, he had discussed with me about raising the house, and I told him I would let him -- I asked him how much

water did you have on the first floor, because I was there. So he told me he had a foot of water on the first floor. Under the first floor there's a crawlspace of about approximately 3 feet, okay. So I said to him, not a problem. You could raise your house 2 and a half feet, and that's the minimum requirement for New York Rising, okay. So 2 and a half feet. Mr. Englander never, other than Hurricane Sandy, had water on his first floor ever. Never had water coming into his first floor. So I had given an allowance several years ago of 2 and a half feet, the minimum requirement of New York Rising, and he only had at the worst-case scenario, Hurricane Sandy, one foot of water, okay.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: We just asked the same question. Were you inside his house during Hurricane Sandy?

MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes, I was. Not only was I in his house, I helped him out, okay. What I did was -- he was never to be seen after that. He was in Brooklyn for months on straight. So I gave him one of my workers that -- I own property in the City. So I gave him one of my workers to rip up the plywood floors, rip up the sheetrock. I got

23

24

25

him a boiler, \$800 below price. I went to people that I buy plumbing supplies and I told them that my boiler got ruined in Hurricane Sandy, and he said for you, Dave, you're a great customer, I'll give it to you at cost. He got it \$800 cheaper. And each morning when I went out to work the boiler room door was open. I kept calling him. You need to come back and put a lock on your boiler room door. And then came January -- winter recess, January 18th. We were going away to Miami with the family. I called him and I said, you know, this is the coldest part of the year, you need to come here, put a lock on the door. morning I've been opening it, but I'm going away on vacation and no one is going to be locking the door and your boiler is going to, you know, freeze Sure enough, I'm in Miami. Mr. Englander is in Miami with his family. He didn't care about his boiler, and comes back, boiler blew up, okay, or froze all the pipes and the boiler blew up, I did a lot of work for Mr. Englander. helped him out a lot. Did not appreciate anything.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: You can move on. I just

wanted to know, because you made observations about the water level during Hurricane Sandy, I just wanted to know if that was from your own personal observations.

MR. FRIEDMAN: It was one foot of water and that's exactly what Mr. Englander had told me.

And I offered three, four years ago that we didn't have to come to this meeting, two and a half feet to go up. What he did was he converted his garage illegally to a den. And now he wants to build a garage, lift the house and build -- I don't understand how we do something illegal and then we're going to grant him a garage because the poor guy doesn't have a garage. He had a garage. How did the Village sign off a den from a garage? He had a garage.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I don't believe the Village signed off.

MR. CASTRO: There's no permits.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: There's no permits.

MR. FRIEDMAN: No permits, okay. So now he's asking for a garage when he had a garage?

And I have water coming into my den. He has no consideration for me. He has -- he never had water in any of these floods other than Hurricane

problem. I live on the court.

Sandy.

0 -

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Well, Hurricane Sandy -- MR. FRIEDMAN: I get the brunt of the

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Hurricane Sandy is the reason that we're here. That's why there's FEMA and that's why there's New York Rising, to preclude it from happening again. So it's affording the resident the opportunity in a flood zone to raise his house --

MR. FRIEDMAN: I offered him 2 and a half feet.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Let me finish. It's not a matter of what you're offering. He's here tonight to raise the house to 7 feet. What we'd like to hear from you -- and we're sympathetic to all of the problems you've had with the water. I'm familiar with the situation. I know people on the block. We want to understand how that impacts on you. I understand that there's some personal aspects to this, but it really doesn't fall within our purview to deal with that.

MR. FRIEDMAN: First of all, my driveway, when I did my extension I did everything legal, and they told me the second floor I have to push

back 16 inches. I did exactly what the Village had told me. Now, he only has 6 feet of grass to absorb the water, and 3-feet easement which belongs to me indefinite. And he's building a stairway. And my view, now you're telling him he can build a stairway in the back? How is he going to get to the garbage? The back does not have a grass patch of 6 feet.

MEMBER HILLER: That's his problem.

MR. FRIEDMAN: What?

MEMBER HILLER: That's his problem.

MR. FRIEDMAN: No, it was suggested by the Board over here that he could take it from the back from his deck. Where is he going to get to the grass?

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: He's willing to address one of the problems I think that you've identified which is the staircase that's on the west side of the house. And it's being removed from that location on the plan and it's being moved to the back. So to the extent that that staircase was facing your house and was an area of concern, it's being removed.

MR. FRIEDMAN: How is he going to get -where is the -- how is he going to get out

of the staircase? It's on my property.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: The staircase is on your property?

MR. FRIEDMAN: No. If you look at the plan where the 6 feet of grass is on the length of the house, when you get towards the back, the backyard, Englanders' backyard, there is no longer 6 feet of grass over there. It's the driveway.

MR. CASTRO: I think what Mr. Friedman is saying is that his driveway, the cobblestone curb pushes further into the Englanders' property, so the distance between the cobblestone curb and the house is narrow, and you can see that on the survey.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So if it's not 6 feet, is it 4 feet?

MR. FRIEDMAN: No, there's nothing there.

MR. CASTRO: Less. It's approximately 3 feet.

MEMBER FELDER: Is that driveway in its entirety yours or just the 3 feet of the easement?

MR. FRIEDMAN: No, entirely. There was a partial easement there that was granted 40, 45 years ago when they built the Englanders' house, two owners prior to me, two owners prior to

Englander, and that's for my use, and the garage is for my use.

MEMBER FELDER: He's technically --

MR. FRIEDMAN: And I have to maintain it. I had to put down cobblestone -- I mean pavers and cobblestone, and that was my job to do.

MEMBER FELDER: But he's not allowed to step on that driveway at all, that belongs to you?

MR. FRIEDMAN: He has his grass. That's where he puts his garbage. He has a walkway and the grass.

MEMBER HILLER: I believe you're incorrect. What happens with your driveway is you have an easement.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Correct.

MEMBER HILLER: Technically, the easement is on half the driveway going up three -- you share equally with him. You have half the land of the width of the driveway, and he has half the land. When the driveway comes near your garage, it's almost totally his land that you are using to go in.

Also, you are misinterpreting the easement.

After doing research we have found that the easement does allow you to use that to pass

through to get into your garage. Do you park cars 1 2 in your driveway? 3 MR. FRIEDMAN: Yes. MEMBER HILLER: Technically, you're not 4 5 allowed to park cars on your driveway because you have only an easement to get to your garage. 6 7 we have never heard a word about this, so 8 apparently it's all right with him. So you are mistaken. The land at the end of 9 your driveway when right in front --10 MR. FRIEDMAN: It turns. 11 MEMBER HILLER: -- it turns and it's his 12 13 land, but you have an easement so you can continue 14 using it. 15 MR. FRIEDMAN: Correct. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Ingress and egress. 16 17 MEMBER HILLER: Yes, only for ingress and You are not allowed to park cars there. 18 egress. MR. FRIEDMAN: Right. And what about for 19 20 Englander? MEMBER HILLER: For Englander, he technically 21 owns that land, but he can't do anything on it --22 MR. FRIEDMAN: Correct. 23 24 MEMBER HILLER: -- because we have the

25

easement.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And I have to maintain it, 1 2 which I do. 3 MEMBER HILLER: Yes, but you get an easement. MR. BORGEN: The reason for that was, was his 4 5 house was illegal to be built, so they had to give him more land. 6 7 MEMBER HILLER: That's not the reason. MR. FRIEDMAN: What was the reason? 8 MEMBER HILLER: It's an existing 9 nonconforming. Don't worry about that. 10 The other thing, by removing the staircase on 11 your side and putting it wherever it is in the 12 rear it will be on his property, one of your major 13 concerns was addressed. You will not have any 14 extension of his house towards your house at all. 15 MEMBER FELDER: Your view looking straight up 16 that driveway will be identical. 17 MEMBER HILLER: You will have the same -- the 18 19 same view you had. MR. FRIEDMAN: There will be no steps, 20 nothing there? 21 MEMBER FELDER: No. 22 MEMBER HILLER: Correct, nothing there. It 23 will be in the rear. So that's good for you. 24

The other thing is we -- for you, this is

your first encounter with FEMA regulations. We see them at every Zoning Board meeting. People, regardless of how much water they had, are entitled to apply for New York Rising. Once they apply for that, the Board is naturally very sympathetic to people who had flooding. That would include you if you wanted to raise your house; we would be very sympathetic to you. And we've even allowed people to go over the height limits at times. They are not going over the height limits.

My main concern in what you said and what Barry said is the fact that I want to be assured that the bottom level, the basement -- the garage level is not used as a finished basement. So that's my main concern.

MR. FRIEDMAN: So how could we be assured when someone turns a garage into a den and that's not credible?

MEMBER HILLER: That's going to be our problem, and I'm sure you'll be watching if any construction workers come around. But that is our problem and we will address it.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Let me ask you this. How are we going to address the water issue?

MEMBER HILLER: All right. The water issue was partially answered by Elliot. Right now you are in a condition where there's no drainage -- drainage isn't being addressed. They had a lesser drainage solution, but Mr. Castro is going to be on top of it to make sure that a proper new plan for drainage is introduced which is actually going to help both of you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Could Mr. Castro elaborate on that while we're here?

MEMBER HILLER: I can't speak for him.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Castro, would you like to elaborate on your thoughts on the drainage plan?

MR. CASTRO: Yes. What the applicant had submitted, actually the architect, were dry wells to encompass the roof runoff, as well as some of the driveway which you use to get in. The dry wells specified to encompass that water were 10 feet wide by 10 feet deep. The water table is extremely high in that area. So what's going to have to be done is, it's just a suggestion, a different type of dry well, a very shallow dry well be used in his applications where the water

Englander - 7/26/17 table is close to 3 feet below the grade. 1 2 Unfortunately, the area that they're going to have 3 to encompass is going to be much greater because 4 of the shallow depth. So it's very possible that, 5 you know, 50 percent of the rear yard might have 6 to be shallow dry wells. 7 MR. FRIEDMAN: What about the driveway? MR. CASTRO: Next-door? 8 9 MR. FRIEDMAN: My driveway, our driveway. MR. CASTRO: Since it's on his land, he's 10 11 proposing a drain to encompass the water that 12

proposing a drain to encompass the water that actually pitches backwards towards the garage.

That would be connected to the dry wells, and then the driveway would have to be restored back to its original state, exactly as it is.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FRIEDMAN: Wait. Who is going to restore that? I have 6,000 PSI concrete under and are we going to get matching bricks?

MR. CASTRO: Everything would have to be restored in kind, exactly the way it is.

MR. FRIEDMAN: The full driveway? The driveway is about five years old.

MR. CASTRO: Whatever the materials used, that would have to go -- or have to be fixed.

MR. FRIEDMAN: How many wells are they going

to be putting in the driveway?

MR. CASTRO: The architect is proposing one to capture the water that's running backwards towards the property because I believe the pitch differs from front to back. Some of it pitches towards the street, some of it pitches backwards, and since it's located on his property, unfortunately, he's obligated to take that water in also.

MR. BORGEN: Is he bringing dry wells on my side between him and my house as well?

MR. CASTRO: The dry wells are probably going to go front and rear yard, but the pipes and leaders that capture the water off of the roof that come down the sides will be piped into the --

MR. BORGEN: So he has to dig up the side of the house?

MR. CASTRO: It's possible.

MR. BORGEN: So he has to restore my grass and my swingset. Whatever's there, he has to restore everything exactly the way it is with the trees and everything?

MR. CASTRO: Yes.

MR. FRIEDMAN: So on my end of the driveway, how many shallow wells are we putting in?

MR. CASTRO: Well, the driveway itself wouldn't hold the dry well. It would only have the catch basin to capture the water, which would direct it to the dry wells in his backyard which would be under the grass. Again, I don't know what the type is. Most likely they're going to have to use shallow dome dry wells.

MR. FRIEDMAN: On the driveway.

MR. CASTRO: No, not under the driveway. In the backyard. The driveway will only have a catch basin.

MR. FRIEDMAN: How much of an opening are they going to be making in the driveway?

MR. CASTRO: The catch basin is typically 24 by 24. They could be 24 inches round. It could be a strip drain. There's many types of drains that are used.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And who is going to do this construction to my specs?

MR. CASTRO: The applicant, whatever subcontractor the applicant uses, they would have to suffice the Building Department's requests.

MR. FRIEDMAN: And how many -- and how many flat --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I have a suggestion.

We're straying, okay. We would normally stipulate that whatever is going to be done for drainage will be approved by the Village Building

Department. You can have adequate input, but you're asking him to respond off the cuff, and I'm not sure that we want to stipulate on the record exactly how many dry wells and exactly the configuration because we've been satisfied in the past, and I haven't had an issue that anybody came back to the Board to complain that when it's stipulated that the Building Department will oversee and approve, that that has seemed to suffice.

MEMBER HILLER: Gentlemen, you will be better off than you are now. The roof is the same roof line. It's higher, true, but --

MR. FRIEDMAN: But I offered two --

MEMBER HILLER: Just let me finish. I know you're concerned, but you have input, and you have responsiveness from Mr. Castro. You are going to be better off than you are now because there's going to be more places for water absorption.

Let's not turn this into a --

MR. FRIEDMAN: My issue is the height, because I'm going to be driving into a dark

driveway.

itom

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You're introducing a new item now.

MEMBER HILLER: Let's move on. We've really heard your concerns and I think they've been addressed.

MR. BORGEN: Can I ask you one question.

This house is now illegally built. It's grandfathered in. Let's say during construction --

MEMBER FELDER: It's not grandfathered.

MEMBER HILLER: It's not.

MR. BORGEN: Whatever the case might be, whatever the case might be. Let's say during construction the house is raised and then something happens and the house is destroyed. Is he going to be allowed to rebuild the same house on the same spot?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We don't deal in hypotheticals. Gentlemen, please sit down.

MR. FRIEDMAN: There was a house in back

Lawrence that collapsed. This house, Englander's

house, when you build a house you build the

two-by-fours on the foundation. After the

termites were -- this house was not built on the

foundation. The two-by-fours were built on the studs, on the beams, okay, because when we took down the plywood we were shocked to see that. And my concern is that the house is going to collapse and fall on my house. What guarantees do I have?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Castro, would you like

MR. CASTRO: It's subject to the subcontractor's insurance.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay.

to address such a hypothetical?

MEMBER HILLER: I think you guys come out all right. Can we continue. Thank you very much.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay.

MS. SHORE: May I approach?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Please introduce yourself.

MS. SHORE: Tracie Shore, 315 Marbridge Road.

I'm sorry I'm late. I came from work. I don't know what has transpired here.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Nothing. We're just having a nice, casual conversation.

MS. SHORE: But I just want you to know we live on a block of six families. We live in Lawrence. We live in a town that we pay taxes, like all of you pay taxes, but we are the orphan child.

When we get a rainstorm, our street floods constantly. We live in fear of the rain. This family lives in fear. They go to bed. No mother, no father should go to sleep with any amount of children in fear of the rain. When we hear that a rainstorm is coming, my husband gets up and goes, oh, we have to move the cars, in the fear that we are going to lose a car.

Now, I was on the -- when we had the whole Sandy thing and they had the people come down and they showed all the maps, how they're going to go ahead and change the water route, and Mayor Oliner was the one who was going to -- he was presiding at the time. \$8 million to fix the rain. Do you know how many phone calls I get when I'm at work? Don't come home tonight. How many times I'm at a simcha, you can't come home on your block tonight because we're flooded. It's enough. It can't go on anymore.

All I know is that when it happened in the Isle of Wight, they're done. They're clean. They never have a water problem. Every time it rains we are in fear.

This family got from New York Rising that they could go ahead and raise their house so they

won't be in fear of the rain anymore. It's ridiculous that that's what they're in fear of. We are the orphan child.

You go across the street to Dogwood Lane -- have you ever been down Dogwood Lane?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Absolutely.

MS. SHORE: Two years after Sandy you paved the whole street. You got a guy who bought up two houses. It's mansion road.

You come to us -- you've been there, Danny, recently. What does our block look like? When's the last time you paved Marbridge Road? Living there 27 years, my kids used to play roller hockey. You've never paved our street. You know how they paved our street? Little patches of blacktop, that's how they paved our street. We pay thousands of taxes. It's ridiculous. We are the orphan child. Now this family wants to live in no fear. You need to help them.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So you're a proponent of the application, right? I just want to make sure I got this right.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: You support the application?

MS. SHORE: Uh-hm.

MR. BORGEN: Can I make a response to that? 1 2 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: No. 3 MEMBER HILLER: We're not having cross-talk. MR. BORGEN: No, no, the reason why --4 5 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Borgen, we're finished. Mr. Borgen, please. 6 7 MS. SHORE: All I know is when there's a 8 rainstorm, I have a basement, I have multiple sump 9 pumps. At night music to my ear are my sump pumps 10 going off. Nobody could live in Lawrence or on 11 Marbridge Road without sum pumps. 12 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I have a suggestion. Fortunately, the Village Administrator happens to 13 be sitting in on our meeting. He heard everything 14 15 that you've shared with us. 16 MS. SHORE: Who is it? 17 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Goldman and the Mayor. 18 MS. SHORE: Oh, Mr. Goldman. You're the 19 Mayor? You're not the Mayor. 20 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The Mayor is here as well. 21 It's not falling on deaf ears. If it were up to 22 us, we would do everything that you want to 23 rectify this. It's not up to us. Those two

gentlemen have the quarterback. I believe it

would be worthwhile when this meeting is over,

24

Mr. Castro I know had outlined in my presence to Mr. Friedman certain things that are being contemplated for Marbridge Road. Perhaps he will share at that point, okay.

MR. CASTRO: Absolutely.

MS. SHORE: I mean, in all due respect, if I

MS. SHORE: I mean, in all due respect, if I hear one more time that you're going to go ahead and open up the valves so the water could go through, whatever --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's not for tonight.

MS. SHORE: -- it's ridiculous already, but it needs to be part of this discussion because part of the --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you very much.

MS. SHORE: Part of the reason that we're here today is because of our flooding situation, and it's got to stop. It's enough already.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We understand. Thank you. Anyone who hasn't spoken yet?

MEMBER HILLER: I want to speak to $\mbox{Mr. Englander.}$

MR. BORGEN: Could I say one more thing? CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Borgen, go ahead.

MR. BORGEN: It's so nice and dandy what my neighbor says, but by having a garage, if it rains

the water is still going to come there. It is irrelevant that they want to raise the house for a hurricane, not for the rain. So it's irrelevant. They want to sleep at night because the rain won't come to their house. The garage is still going to be ground level. It's a new garage that they won't convert into a den.

MS. SHORE: How many sump pumps do you have?

MR. BORGEN: That's not the point.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: No, no, no, please. You can take it outside, have all the fights you want.

Okay. Back to the Englanders.

MEMBER HILLER: Mr. Englander, I have a very serious question based on what your neighbors said and the history of your garage up to this point.

So your neighbors and somewhat the Board want to have full confidence that when you say you're building a lower level which contains a garage, that that's all it contains. That there will not be a conversion into a basement room or a playroom or a bedroom. We need to have confidence that that's what's going to happen.

MR. ENGLANDER: It's only going to contain a garage, that's it.

MEMBER HILLER: And the room behind it?

MR. ENGLANDER: Empty, maybe storage, that would be it. There's no need. I have my den now from the converted garage. I have the space that I need upstairs. I need a garage for my storage, and whatever else might be downstairs is not going to be living space. According to FEMA regulations, I am not allowed to have any living space down there.

MR. CALIENDO: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. Mr. Architect, back to your suggestion of the stairway in the back, exactly how are they going to find ingress and not walk on the wild side?

MR. CALIENDO: I understand, sir.

I've reviewed the survey while we were talking. There's no exact dimension from the corner of the house, that would be the northwest corner of the house, and the stone fence. But just interpolating, it looks to me like there's about 3 and a half to 4 feet there. I don't know if Mr. Castro would agree with that. Plenty of room to be able to walk through that area. There is an air-conditioning condenser that's pad mounted right now; that could be very easily located. In plain English, it's not a big deal.

MR. CASTRO: The staircase, by relocating it to the back, did you say you're incorporating it into the deck?

MR. CALIENDO: Yeah.

MR. CASTRO: Or is it going to be in addition to the deck?

MR. CALIENDO: No, I think we're going to have to incorporate it into the deck, which means our lot coverage is actually going to decrease.

Unless the Board -- unless the Board would permit us to increase the depth or the dimension of the deck on the east side to offset where the stairs go so that the numbers would equate, you know, the lot coverage.

MR. CASTRO: I think myself and the Board would prefer that the number goes down.

MR. CALIENDO: Okay. Again, I can't speak for Mr. Englander, but I know they want this approved. But the bottom line is I know there was some confusion about this which is why I tried to chime in before. That stairway that's on the side that's so objectionable will be gone on the west side.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: West side.

MR. CALIENDO: That joins Mr. Friedman, his

property.

MR. BORGEN: What about the one on my side?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Please, Mr. Borgen.

MR. ENGLANDER: Should we get rid of that?

MR. BORGEN: You're taking away the grass.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Borgen.

MR. CALIENDO: The stair on the west, if that is removed, now you have basically a clear path all the way down. Nothing there. So essentially, you're not talking about any obstructions or additions on that side of the property. I mean, there were so many things brought up, I don't know which you want me to address first, and certainly if I miss any, tell me.

MEMBER FELDER: Any other option to the staircase on that side?

MR. CALIENDO: The staircase, the infamous staircase on the east side, the Englanders' aesthetic preference was to have that stair built out -- at least the facade of the stair built out of stone. As far as the underside of the stair, it will be open. Basically, there's going to be open area underneath there. Now, whether that's grass or whether that's the existing brick walkway that's still there right now, it doesn't

matter. Essentially, you're talking the same amount of surface area that's being covered right now. So there's not going to be any change.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So there's no net change in terms of surface coverage?

MR. CALIENDO: No net change. And also, again, you know, these are schematic design plans you're looking at here. They're not fully engineered drawings as of yet. So that stone wall in all likelihood would have some cross-vents through it to allow water to go in, you know, across in an east/west direction if need be. So that stone wall was just an aesthetic addition, and the stair is open underneath so the water would be allowed to pass through without any issue. So there really is no effect to the drainage on-site.

MR. BORGEN: It's 8 feet high. It's like a whole floor.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Borgen.

MR. BORGEN: Because he's talking.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Borgen.

MR. CALIENDO: Isaac's already stipulated with respect to the lower level, so to speak, is intended to be pure storage. I'll just amplify on

that by saying, and he touched on this, you probably know this, and I know Mr. Castro is well aware of this, the area below the base flood elevation is noninsurable. That means if he finishes or anybody finishes space down there it's basically laying wait to be destroyed. And we all know the problems that you have here. So it would basically be foolish to do anything down there other than to allow it to remain as a storage area. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: How about the concern

about the solar panels, the impact on that?

MR. CALIENDO: Here's the issue with that. I

can't really speak to his solar designer's

calculation specifically, but I design solar

panels as well. Maximum solar gain is from the

south side, not from the west side. He may be

putting panels on the west roof, I don't know.

But that is going to be the secondary location of

the panels if need be. Again, I'm speculating

here because I don't know exactly what his solar

designer is planning. The gain on the west side

is going to be minimal. And as Mr. -- I'm sorry,

I'm very bad with names.

MR. CASTRO: Castro.

MR. CALIENDO: Mr. Castro stipulated we have approximately 60 feet of depth between the houses. The western sunlight would easily pass over his house even in an elevated configuration to reach those solar panels. So again, I don't want to -- I don't want to -- I don't want to disagree, you know, but I guess I'll have to respectfully disagree with that until someone can prove to me otherwise mathematically that that would be an issue.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Any further questions from the Board?

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: No.

MR. FRIEDMAN: I'd like to speak.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Friedman, I'll give you the courtesy of one last.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay. My suggestion would be that they go up no more than 2 and a half feet. They can have the garage. Put back where the garage was with the higher depth ceiling of 2 and a half feet. There is no need to go up 7 feet and cause darkness in my driveway. And on the east side of the house we're talking about an 8-foot wall. That's a full structure. And if you look at his plans, you would see that he has steps,

walkway, steps, walkway. The full length of the east side is all bricked up and all covered up. The full grass is covered up with steps and walkways, and it's not like that now at all. Right now there is coverage of grass. And with this plan it shows full coverage of the complete east side.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think we just had a presentation from the architect which is contrary to what you just described.

MR. FRIEDMAN: The plans are there.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay, thank you.

MR. FRIEDMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. So gentlemen, all right, the Board has a responsibility of weighing the benefit to the applicant as opposed to any detriment that will be caused regarding the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood, and we have five criteria. So we're going to evaluate this matter based on the criteria.

Number one, will an undesirable change be produced in the character of the neighborhood or the nearby properties? Personally, I don't think that the presentation tonight indicates that's the case. I think there's an express need, and I

don't think raising it 7 feet instead of 2 and a half feet has any undesirable change to be produced. In fact, I think with the improved irrigation and drainage systems, the circumstances might improve for the neighbors.

Number two, can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved by some method other than a variance? Under the New York Rising, that would be impossible. It's only through the raising of the house.

Three, is the requested area variance substantial? I think overall, it's not, in the context of what's being requested.

Number four, will the proposed variance have an adverse effect on the physical or environmental conditions of the neighborhood? I think not. And again, I think that based on the proposed drainage systems that will be approved by the Village, I think things will be improved.

Lastly, is the alleged difficulty for the applicant self-created? I think the presentation suggests not. I think everybody on the block has suffered through Sandy, and I think this is just an opportunity for a family to be able to improve their living conditions and not live in fear, as

-

the presentation has indicated.

I think we would make it subject to the approval of the Building Department in terms of the drainage system. Obviously, we'll invite the neighbors to consult so that they have their input. And obviously, all of the concerns about restoring the property, whatever work is done, will have to be adhered to, and the Village will give scrupulous oversight to that.

So I, personally, based on my analysis of the criteria, would vote in the affirmative for the variance.

And I will ask the other members to weigh in. Mr. Moskowitz.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: I'm for.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Listening to your explanation, which was very detailed, due to the fact that there was some, whether it's personal or other, opposition to this particular application, there's been a lot of facts or opinions that were brought out, but I think that when you went through the criteria you answered it very carefully and succinctly, weighing in everything, and I agree with you fully, and I vote for.

1

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Hiller.

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MEMBER HILLER: I think the applicant and the neighbors walk away with a win tonight. All of

them will benefit from the plans as stipulated by our Chairman. I'm for.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And Mr. Felder.

MEMBER FELDER: I concur. I'm for, based on the stipulations put forth.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So we approve and we'll give them two years.

MR. CASTRO: Two years.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Two years. Board of Building Design?

MR. CASTRO: I'd like it subject to the Board of Building Design because the lower level, the face of it can be seen from the street and is substantial. So I'd like it to be reviewed by them.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Needless to say, you will incorporate, Mr. Architect, all the changes that we've discussed tonight. You know, the fact in terms of the location of the stairway. And again, wherever we can consult with the neighbor, hopefully, he will give time to that. We don't need his approval, but certainly we would like his

consultation on it, okay.

Thank you very much and good evening.

(Whereupon, six letters of support were received and marked as Applicant's Exhibit 1.

(Three pictures of street flooding were received and marked as Objectant's Exhibit A.)

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 9:04 p.m.)

Certified that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the original stenographic minutes in this case.

MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter