1	INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2	BOARD OF APPEALS
3	Village Hall
4	196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5	7
6	August 17, 2016 7:35 p.m.
7	TO TO THE OWN THE TOTAL THE TOTAL PARTIES.
8	APPLICATIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT:
9	Majeski Alpert 9 Rolling Hill Lane 455 Mistletoe Way Lawrence, New York Lawrence, New York
10	
11	Luck Crossing LLC
12	PRESENT:
13	MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
14	MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Member
15	MR. DANIEL HILLER
16	Member
17	MR. ELLIOT MOSKOWITZ Member
18	
19	MR. AARON FELDER Member
20	MR. KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ. Village Attorney
21	MR. GERALDO CASTRO
22	Building Department
23	MR. DANNY VACCHIO Building Department
24	Mary Benci, RPR
25	Court Reporter

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Good evening, ladies and 1 Welcome to the Lawrence Board of 2 gentlemen. Zoning Appeals. Please turn off any phones, and 3 please, no cross-conversations. If you have to 4 converse with someone about one of the items, 5 please step out into the vestibule. 6 7 Okay. Proof of posting, Mr. Castro. MR. CASTRO: Mr. Chairman, I offer proof of 8 posting and publication. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay, thank you very much. 10

I think we'll skip the preamble.

MR. GRAY: Whatever you like.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We have several requests for extensions. Let's see if we can address them. The first is the Majeski residence, 9 Rolling Hill Lane. The letter is requesting that they adjourn the variance application to August 17th.

MR. GRAY: Today is August 17th.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Sorry, you're right.

September -- what's the next date?

MR. CASTRO: 14th.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: September 14th. Okay

from the Board?

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Yes.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Yes.

MEMBER FELDER: Yes. 1 MEMBER HILLER: Yes. 2 3 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Very good. Then we have a letter from Warren Meister, 4 architect, in reference to the Alpert residence, 5 where he apologizes for missing the last meeting, 6 and he's asking for an adjournment till the 7 September 14th date. 8 Again, any issue from the Board? 9 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Okay with me. 10 MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: No. 11 MEMBER HILLER: Fine. 12 MEMBER FELDER: Fine. 13 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Very good. 14 Finally, we have a letter from Luck Crossing 15 LLC, Tobi Nachman Lokshin, and this is a 16 longstanding project. 17 How long ago did this begin? 18 MR. CASTRO: Approximately 2000 -- I think it 19 was in about 2008. 20 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: 2008. And how far along 21 are they in their construction? 22 MR. CASTRO: Currently, the dwelling is fully 23 constructed, but the outside has to be finished 24 and they're working on finishing inside and the 25

utilities.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So the lengthy explanation is the windows didn't come from Europe, okay. And let's see what they're asking for. They're asking for a further extension of 18 months.

I think at this point let's just give them two years so we don't have to deal with this again, if that's acceptable to the Board.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I'm okay with the two years, but I'd like you to ask them to work expeditiously with respect to their neighbors who have been facing this construction for the past many years.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Many years.

So Mr. Castro, you can express the sentiments from the Board. I think everybody is in accord with that, that it's far too long this project has been going on. We've been very compassionate about it, but at this point I think they have to do everything possible to expedite the completion because it's very disruptive to the neighbors as we know.

MR. CASTRO: I will share it with them.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Please do. And I think we'll go for the two years. Is that acceptable to

1	the Board?
2	MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Yes.
3	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Yes.
4	MEMBER HILLER: Yes.
5	MEMBER FELDER: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.
7	MR. GRAY: Was that final?
8	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think it's almost
9	pointless at this point to suggest that.
10	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
11	7:38 p.m.)
12	**************
13	Certified that the foregoing is a true and
14	accurate transcript of the original stenographic
15	minutes in this case.
16	
17	MayBinci
18	MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter
19	Court Reporter
20	
21	
22	

1	INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2	BOARD OF APPEALS
3	
4	Village Hall 196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5	August 17, 2016
6	7:35 p.m.
7	APPLICATIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT:
8	
9	Majeski Alpert 9 Rolling Hill Lane 455 Mistletoe Way Lawrence, New York Lawrence, New York
10	
11	Luck Crossing LLC PRESENT:
12	
13	MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
14	MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Member
15 16	MR. DANIEL HILLER Member
17	MR. ELLIOT MOSKOWITZ Member
18	MR. AARON FELDER
19	Member
20	MR. KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ. Village Attorney
21	MR. GERALDO CASTRO
22	Building Department
23	MR. DANNY VACCHIO Building Department
24	Mary Benci, RPR
25	Court Reporter

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Good evening, ladies and 1 gentlemen. Welcome to the Lawrence Board of 2 Zoning Appeals. Please turn off any phones, and 3 please, no cross-conversations. If you have to 4 converse with someone about one of the items, 5 6 please step out into the vestibule. 7 Okay. Proof of posting, Mr. Castro. 8 MR. CASTRO: Mr. Chairman, I offer proof of posting and publication. 9 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay, thank you very much. 10 11 I think we'll skip the preamble. MR. GRAY: Whatever you like. 12 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We have several requests 13 for extensions. Let's see if we can address them. 14 The first is the Majeski residence, 9 Rolling Hill 15 Lane. The letter is requesting that they adjourn 16 the variance application to August 17th. 17 MR. GRAY: Today is August 17th. 18 19 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Sorry, you're right.

September -- what's the next date?

MR. CASTRO: 14th.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: September 14th. Okay

from the Board?

20

21

22

23

24

25

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Yes.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Yes.

MEMBER FELDER: Yes. 1 MEMBER HILLER: Yes. 2 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Very good. 3 Then we have a letter from Warren Meister, 4 architect, in reference to the Alpert residence, 5 where he apologizes for missing the last meeting, 6 and he's asking for an adjournment till the 7 September 14th date. 8 Again, any issue from the Board? 9 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Okay with me. 10 MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: No. 11 MEMBER HILLER: Fine. 12 MEMBER FELDER: Fine. 13 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Very good. 14 Finally, we have a letter from Luck Crossing 15 LLC, Tobi Nachman Lokshin, and this is a 16 17 longstanding project. How long ago did this begin? 18 MR. CASTRO: Approximately 2000 -- I think it 19 was in about 2008. 20 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: 2008. And how far along 21 are they in their construction? 22 MR. CASTRO: Currently, the dwelling is fully 23 constructed, but the outside has to be finished 24

and they're working on finishing inside and the

utilities.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So the lengthy explanation is the windows didn't come from Europe, okay. And let's see what they're asking for. They're asking for a further extension of 18 months.

I think at this point let's just give them two years so we don't have to deal with this again, if that's acceptable to the Board.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I'm okay with the two years, but I'd like you to ask them to work expeditiously with respect to their neighbors who have been facing this construction for the past many years.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Many years.

So Mr. Castro, you can express the sentiments from the Board. I think everybody is in accord with that, that it's far too long this project has been going on. We've been very compassionate about it, but at this point I think they have to do everything possible to expedite the completion because it's very disruptive to the neighbors as we know.

MR. CASTRO: I will share it with them.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Please do. And I think we'll go for the two years. Is that acceptable to

1	the Board?
2	MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Yes.
3	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Yes.
4	MEMBER HILLER: Yes.
5	MEMBER FELDER: Yes.
6	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.
7	MR. GRAY: Was that final?
8	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think it's almost
9	pointless at this point to suggest that.
10	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
11	7:38 p.m.)
12	***************
13	Certified that the foregoing is a true and
14	accurate transcript of the original stenographic
15	minutes in this case.
16	
17	MayBinci
18	MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter
19	Coult Reporter
20	
21	
22	
23	

1	INC	CORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		
4		Village Hall 196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5		August 17, 2016
6		7:38 p.m.
7	A DDI TOA III TOM	Hanahari ta
8	APPLICATION:	80 Barrett Road Lawrence, New York
9		Lawrence, New Tork
10	PRESENT:	
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
12		MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB
13		Member
14		MR. DANIEL HILLER Member
15		MR. ELLIOT MOSKOWITZ
16		Member
17		MR. AARON FELDER Member
18	,	
19		MR. KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ. Village Attorney
20		MR. GERALDO CASTRO Building Department
21		MR. DANNY VACCHIO
22		Building Department
23		
24		
25		Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: There's nothing here to

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The matter of Herskowitz, 80 Barrett Road. Will they or their representative please step forward.

MR. YOON: Good evening. Young Yoon, with PAU Architects. I'm here representing the Herskowitzes. We're here requesting a relief from surface area coverage of 2,006 -- 2,006 square feet, which is 25 percent overage which is currently existing and we're not changing.

We're also requesting a rear-yard setback of 15 -- 15 feet 9 inches, also currently existing that we're not changing.

We're also requesting a rear-yard height/ setback variance of 0.26 overage, and we're requesting a height variance of ten inches over the 30-foot allowed.

The reason why we're here requesting the relief is because the property is very irregular in size and shape, and in speaking with the client, we wanted to minimize how much work was going to be done in the house. When we looked at doing the addition towards the front, they're still going for a height/setback ratio, and doing an addition towards --

4 5

explain to us why it's needed. The premise for a variance is that there's a need, okay. The papers are very lean and leaves a lot to the imagination. And we spend time. I think the least you could do is flush out your papers so that when we come here we know how many years the applicant has lived in the house, how many children they have, other than just giving us boilerplate.

In fact, it's offensive for us to read this application and the other one that you submitted where it's identical language.

MR. YOON: I apologize.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We don't want apologies. We have had this before. No apologies.

MR. YOON: The reason for the request is the Herskowitzes need additional bedrooms. They need additional rooms. They recently purchased this home. They have been in it for about a year now, a year and a half and --

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Seven months she said?

MR. YOON: Seven months, yes. And they love the area, they love the area, they want to stay in this area, and when they found this house they fell in love with the house, but they needed more space.

1	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: How many children are
2	there?
3	MR. YOON: There are currently three
4	children.
5	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: How many bedrooms will you
6	have with this addition?
7	MR. YOON: With the addition they would have
8	four on the first level, and then they would have
9	two on the I'm sorry three on the second
10	level, and the master bedroom would be up on the
11	second level.
12	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Seven bedrooms, plus a
13	master bedroom, three children?
14	MR. YOON: Yes.
15	MS. HERSKOWITZ: Not seven bedrooms.
16	MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Maybe, Mr. Chairman, we
17	have the applicant here herself, she may be able
18	to answer those questions better than the
19	architect.
20	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Moskowitz, there's a
21	procedure, okay.
22	MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Okay.
23	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: First of all, identify
24	yourself for the record.
25	MS. HERSKOWITZ: I'm Esty Herskowitz, owner

1 of the house. 2 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: All right. So the 3 question was proffered to the architect, who responded, and you're correcting the architect. 4 5 MS. HERSKOWITZ: Right. It's not going to be 6 seven; it's going to be six. 7 MR. YOON: There's six bedrooms. The one towards the back of the kitchen is currently used 8 as an office space. There's six. 9 10 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Six bedrooms and a master 11 bedroom? 12 MS. HERSKOWITZ: One of them will be a 13 master. 14 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Of the six? 15 MS. HERSKOWITZ: Yes. 16 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So it's not seven, it's 17 not six plus one; it's six. 18 MR. YOON: Yes, six. 19 MS. HERSKOWITZ: Yes. 20 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Six bedrooms, okay. For 21 three children, plus the couple. 22 MS. HERSKOWITZ: Right. 23 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. 24 MS. HERSKOWITZ: Two of them are tiny, if you 25 look you can see them.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You're moving into a 1 house, and generally speaking, variances that are 2 3 being granted support a need. It's quite clear there is not the need, so we have to evaluate the 4 5 nature of the variances in terms of, you know, what's being requested. 6 MR. YOON: They do have a lot of guests that 7 do stay over the house and, you know, I mean --8 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you. 9 MEMBER HILLER: Could you clarify for me 10 again which bedroom is the den -- is the office? 11 MR. YOON: The one towards the back behind 12 the kitchen is actually an office. 13 MEMBER HILLER: To the left of the kitchen as 14 15 I'm looking at the plan? 16 MR. YOON: Yes. MEMBER GOTTLIEB: There's no basement in this 17 house? 18 MS. HERSKOWITZ: It's a playroom. Is that 19 even called a basement? 20 MR. YOON: It's a basement. It's a basement. 21 The ceiling height is about 7-6 and it is a 22 23 playroom. 24 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: You're saying, just so I

understand, on the main level, the furthest most

from the front bedroom close to the kitchen, that's an office?

MR. YOON: That's an office.

MEMBER HILLER: What is it currently being used as?

MR. YOON: It's currently being used as an office.

MS. HERSKOWITZ: An office.

MEMBER HILLER: So this, again, is something on the plans which is not clear and misdirects the intentions of the owner and confuses the Board.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Continuing on with this, so there is a shed that is on the plan, but there's no application for maintaining a shed that looks like it is too close to the neighbor's property line.

MR. YOON: Correct. There is a shed towards the back of the house that was existing. We didn't know that it needed to get maintained.

Gerry, does it need to get maintained?

MR. CASTRO: I have to check. I'd have to check for any prior permits for a shed, but regardless, in that location the shed would have also have needed a variance if it was approved as a permit.

1	MR. GRAY: For the setback purposes?
2	MR. CASTRO: For the setback purposes.
3	MEMBER FELDER: At that size how many feet
4	does it need to be off the property line?
5	MR. CASTRO: Just looking right now, this is
6	a BB zone, it's eight feet.
7	MEMBER FELDER: Eight feet?
8	MR. CASTRO: Eight feet.
9	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Eight feet off the
10	property line?
11	MR. CASTRO: Yeah.
12	MEMBER FELDER: Do you need that shed?
13	MS. HERSKOWITZ: I don't need it, no.
14	MEMBER FELDER: Would you be willing to move
15	it if you had to?
16	MS. HERSKOWITZ: Yes. I didn't put it in.
17	MEMBER HILLER: May I ask, what is in the
18	cabana?
19	MS. HERSKOWITZ: A bathroom
20	MEMBER HILLER: I'm sorry?
21	MS. HERSKOWITZ: A bathroom, a changing room
22	and a sink.
23	MEMBER HILLER: Okay.
24	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: There's an issue in terms
25	of the surface coverage.

MR. CASTRO: Yes. As exists, there's excess surface coverage and it seems to be primarily in the pool area where what exists currently is not what -- it doesn't conform to what was approved when the pool was originally put in sometime 15, 16 years ago. So sometime between then and now the paving was changed. That's why the applicant needs to -- they're applying to maintain the overage in surface coverage even though there's no proposed changes at this time.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So it is captured within the numbers that we have.

MR. CASTRO: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So that's really a technicality that we want to validate.

MR. CASTRO: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. We don't penalize because of poor preparation of plans or application. We're going to look at it on its face and evaluate it. In terms of, again, my perspective only, the surface area coverage is not being changed, so there's nothing that's being affected by the proposed construction. The rear-yard setback is not being changed by the proposed construction. The height is ten inches

over the permitted. The likelihood is that the new zoning regulations that will come about in the next period of time will probably permit even higher homes. So again, I don't think from my perspective that it's an issue. The rear yard height/setback ratio, which is of concern normally, I don't think in this case there's a problem because there's really nothing back there or no neighbors to the rear.

And again, have you discussed the construction with the neighbors?

MS. HERSKOWITZ: Yes.

MR. YOON: We have (handing).

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: How many letters of support, Mr. Chairman, for the record?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: One, two, three letters of support. Who is the neighbor directly behind you?

MS. HERSKOWITZ: Ziff.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So he's here.

MS. HERSKOWITZ: Ziff and Rosenberg would be the two that would be able to see the work.

They're the only one's facing.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Any questions?

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Did we say what we're doing with the shed, moving the shed or removing the

shed?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Are you shedding the shed?

MR. GRAY: The options are just to move it eight feet off the property line or to take it down; is that correct, Gerry?

MR. CASTRO: Correct.

MR. GRAY: Unless you wanted to amend the application and go for a variance and then we'd have to renotice the hearing and come back another time. Those are your three options.

MS. HERSKOWITZ: I've never actually been in the shed.

MR. YOON: So we'll remove the shed.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: That takes a little bit off the surface coverage. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Yes, it's actually a reduction. So you have to amend that.

MR. GRAY: Do you know what the dimensions of the shed are?

MR. CASTRO: Twelve by ten.

MR. VACCHIO: A little more than 120 square feet.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Does anybody in the audience want to speak to the matter? Anyone else on the Board want to ask any further questions?

1	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Are you living in the house
2	now?
3	MS. HERSKOWITZ: Yes. We actually don't have
4	a master bedroom in the house. That's why.
5	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Well, based on the plan
6	you are going to have a sizeable master bedroom.
7	We wish you well with it. Assuming that we vote
8	positively.
9	MS. HERSKOWITZ: Right.
10	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Anyway, in determining and
11	assessing the decision, we evaluate the benefit of
12	the applicant as opposed to any detriment in terms
13	of the neighborhood, the neighbors, et cetera, and
14	we're going to vote at this point.
15	Starting with Mr. Felder.
16	MEMBER FELDER: I'm for.
17	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Hiller.
18	MEMBER HILLER: For.
19	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb.
20	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: For.
21	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Moskowitz.
22	MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: For.
23	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And I too will vote for,
24	and you have two years, and Board of Building
25	Design.

1	MR. CASTRO: Two years. And the addition is
2	on the rear of the home. Are you changing the
3	exterior of the facade or are you matching
4	existing with it?
5	MR. YOON: We're matching existing. They
6	currently have stucco.
7	MR. CASTRO: Since it's on the rear, I'm not
8	going to send it to the Board of Building Design,
9	okay.
10	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
11	7:52 p.m.)
12	**************
13	Certified that the foregoing is a true and
14	accurate transcript of the original stenographic
15	minutes in this case.
16	
17	May Bene
18	MARY BENCI, RPR
19	Court Reporter
20	
21	

1	INCO	DRPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		
4		Village Hall 196 Central Avenue
5		Lawrence, New York
6		August 17, 2016 7:52 p.m.
7		
8	APPLICATION:	Frishman 129 Hards Lane
9		Lawrence, New York
10	PRESENT:	
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
12		
13		MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Member
14		MR. DANIEL HILLER Member
15		MR. ELLIOT MOSKOWITZ
		Member
17		MR. AARON FELDER Member
18		MR. KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ.
19		Village Attorney
20		MR. GERALDO CASTRO Building Department
21		MR. DANNY VACCHIO
22		Building Department
23		
24		
25		Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter

1 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Frishman, 129 Hards Lane. 2 MR. YOON: Young Yoon, PAU Architects, 3 representing the Frishman residence. So we're here requesting a variance to again 4 5 add additional space to the house. The current family -- the family has four children. 6 7 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: How long are they living there? 8 9 MR. FRISHMAN: Ten years. MR. YOON: 10 Ten years. 11 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Ten years, four children, 12 okay. MR. YOON: And it's -- and they need more 13 14 With that, we're requesting a front-yard 15 setback where the permitted is 30 feet. We're 16 requesting a -- proposing 22.5 feet from the 17 front, seven -- which is 7.5 feet overage, and 18 that is currently --19 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: It is existing, right? 20 MR. YOON: That is currently existing, yes, and then we're also requesting a 15-feet side yard 21 22 setback. I mean, required is 15 feet side. 23 requesting 10-foot side on one side and 5.2 feet

on the other side. And that's a 5-foot overage on

the 10-foot side and it's an 8.8-feet overage on

24

the 5.2-feet side.

We're also requesting a --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: This is actually a positive, right? You're going from 9.5 to 10?

MR. YOON: I apologize. To clarify, what they're going to -- the existing house is currently 9.5, but the addition that we're putting on is at the 10-foot side-yard setback line.

MEMBER FELDER: So it's moving back?

MR. YOON: Right, so it's --

MEMBER FELDER: Half a foot.

MR. YOON: The addition sets in at the property setback line.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You're increasing the setback.

MR. GRAY: Only on the new portion of the building.

MR. YOON: Only on the new portion, correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Yes. Can I just clarify something else. Your papers read that you're putting the addition on the east side of the house. I'm not an architect, but I don't think it's on the east side of the house.

MR. YOON: No, it would be on the --

25 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Chances are it's on the

west side.

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. YOON: It would be on the north side. My apologies.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa.

MR. YOON: Well, following the north arrow, right -- I'm sorry, sorry.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Let's not play Jeopardy. The answer is the west side.

MR. YOON: West side, yes.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Not the east side.

MR. YOON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.

MR. YOON: And then we're requesting a side-yard setback aggregate of 15.2 feet and the overage is 14.8 feet and that as well as no change.

We're requesting a front yard height/setback ratio of 0.84 where the required is 0.74, an overage of 0.1, and that is existing nonconforming as well, and a side yard height/setback ratio of 2.1 on the one side and 2.8 on the other side, an overage of 0.6 and 1.3 respectfully, and that as well as no change.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. Let's synopsize

1	what you're doing here as far as the numbers,
2	because it's hard to understand. On the left side
3	of the house you're removing the existing
4	driveway, correct?
5	MR. YOON: Correct.
6	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The driveway that goes
7	from the street all the way to the garage in the
8	back, right?
9	MR. YOON: Correct.
10	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So you're removing that?
11	MR. YOON: Yes, and also removing the
12	detached garage.
13	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's a positive, right?
14	MR. YOON: Yes.
15	MR. GRAY: You're also removing what, you
16	said?
17	MR. YOON: The detached garage.
18	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The detached garage is
19	being removed as well.
20	MR. YOON: Correct.
21	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's also a positive,
22	correct?
23	MR. YOON: Correct.
24	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Now we are moving to the
25	right side. You're putting in a driveway?

1 MR. YOON: Correct. 2 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And the one-story 3 addition? MR. YOON: Correct. 4 5 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: In the rear of the house you're putting on a two-story addition? 6 7 MR. YOON: Correct. 8 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And even though the 9 drawing depicts a pool, there is no pool? 10 MR. YOON: There is currently no pool, but we 11 are proposing to put a pool in, and the size of 12 the pool is 16 by 32. 13 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Is that part of this 14 application? 15 MR. YOON: We submitted it, but I just spoke 16 with Gerry, and he was telling me that he didn't 17 realize that the pool was part of this 18 application. 19 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I think he might have said 20 that because it says pool on separate application. 21 That might have given him that reason and us as 22 well. 23 MR. YOON: But the pool is within the 24 setbacks and it does not increase -- it does not

exceed their surface coverage allowed.

MEMBER FELDER: The numbers that you put on here for surface coverage included the pool already?

MR. YOON: Correct, correct. But there was no reason for a variance for the pool. The code requires them to have a one car.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The pool is on the south side of the house, right?

MR. YOON: Yes. The code requires a one-car garage, which is why we're requesting that side-yard setback to extend that addition towards the back to take that current sunroom and convert it into a garage.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Can you just tell us what you're doing in terms of the interior of the house. You're adding bedrooms? What are you doing?

MR. YOON: In terms of the interior, we are adding -- in terms of the interior, we're reconfiguring the first-floor layout to provide an office, a bigger dining room and living room combination, with a den, and a bigger kitchen.

And in terms of the second floor, they currently have I believe four bedrooms, and they're looking to add a nice, big, master bedroom

1	for themselves to, you know, accommodate their
2	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Themselves.
3	MR. YOON: Themselves and their children,
4	correct.
5	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So is it safe to say that
6	the addition on the second floor is all the master
7	bedroom?
8	MR. YOON: Yes.
9	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: And the four bedrooms in
10	the front are staying as they are?
11	MR. YOON: With modification because we're
12	adding another bathroom as well. We're so the
13	bedrooms and the closets shifted and reconfigured
14	to provide a bathroom.
15	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So previously, was there
16	only one bathroom on the second floor?
17	MR. FRISHMAN: There were two.
18	MR. YOON: There were two.
L9	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So you're adding one in the
20	master bedroom.
21	MR. YOON: One in the master we're
22	proposing three on the second floor now; one
2.3	towards the back of the house in the master
2.4	bedroom suite.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Right. But there are

currently two?

MR. YOON: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. Further questions from the Board?

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So as you're building the house 17 or 18 feet further to the back, how does that line up with the neighbors' house east and west? How much further back is this house going to be from the neighbors east and west? What I'm getting at is if they currently have a deck and they are looking out, are they now going to be facing a brick wall ten feet off their property line?

MR. FRISHMAN: I know the calculation as far as --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: State your name for the record.

MR. FRISHMAN: Yehuda Frishman.

I know the calculation as far as the distance, but I understand that it would be conforming to side setbacks.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Actually, it's not conforming.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: No, you're not conforming.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: You're conforming to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

existing conditions.

MR. FRISHMAN: The new addition is being set in, I understand. That's what was mentioned before.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: By six inches.

MR. FRISHMAN: I mean, right now my neighbor to the east has a dilapidated garage that they stare out at. I think they'd rather not stare at it. I think they probably would rather not see that, and that's going to come down and probably be fenced in there, so they'll see a nice open backyard.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: That's my question. they going to see a nice, open backyard or are they going to open their rear doors and look at a 17-foot wall?

MR. FRISHMAN: Well, I don't believe they will. I believe the extension ends behind where -- it would be behind where the east neighbor has their patio set, and right now, like I said, that patio set is staring more at a dilapidated garage than an extension of a house.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Where is that dilapidated garage on the drawing right now?

MR. YOON: It's actually very faintly dashed

in.

MEMBER HILLER: Have you consulted your neighbors about your plans?

MR. FRISHMAN: I consulted both my neighbors before we began construction. I consulted the east neighbor, who is actually here. The concern is that we would be moving the driveway to their side, and I was concerned that might infringe on their quality. At that time before we even proceeded, they said that things seemed to be an issue. They can comment on that themselves, they're here. The west side neighbors we consulted and they didn't seem to have an issue with it.

MR. YOON: We are also -- we are also proposing to provide screening and tall trees around the perimeter of the property.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Do you have any letters of support from your neighbors?

MR. FRISHMAN: No, but my neighbors are here so you can discuss it with them.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Terrific.

MR. CASTRO: Do you know what size the screening in the back is going to be, how tall?

MR. YOON: Leyland cypress, most likely, and

1	tall trees that grow from the very bottom upwards
2	of 15 feet.
3	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think we can stipulate
4	that for the record when we vote.
5	MR. CASTRO: I think we should.
6	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think definitely we
7	should.
8	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So do you want to speak
9	with the neighbors?
10	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Let's hear from the
11	neighbor. Please step forward, identify yourself
12	for the record.
13	MR. STATMAN: I'm Dr. Meyer Statman,
14	127 Hards Lane, right next-door.
15	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You're on the east side?
16	MR. STATMAN: We're on the west.
17	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You're on the west side.
18	MR. STATMAN: We're closer to the sun when it
19	sets.
20	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: For clarity, you're the
21	neighbor closest to where the new garage is going
22	to be?
23	MR. STATMAN: No.
24	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Yes.
25	MR. STATMAN: Let me just say, if I can, I'd

like to make some preface to this whole thing.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Please.

MR. STATMAN: This is the second time I'm here. The first time was when our neighbors to our west unfortunately had a fire; the house pretty much burned down. They decided to rebuild and they came here so that they can build a much bigger house, and I recall they said that it's the smallest house on the block and they wanted a bigger house. And my argument was it was the smallest when you bought it, and there's no -- you know, and it was the smallest when they built it. So that's what you got and why do you want to build a bigger house? And I said that this house -- you know, the houses are relatively close compared to other sections, and I claimed --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I'm sorry, who is the neighbor to the right?

MR. STATMAN: Mindell. Other than bringing in the issue, I really didn't want to bring in the thing but that's okay.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: No problem.

MR. STATMAN: They're good folks.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.

MR. STATMAN: And their variance request was

approved. I claimed that because of the situation that the houses are that close that their building if it would go higher would have a major negative impact on us, including sunlight. We have a garden on the side and in the back, and in fact they did build the house, and it's a very unfortunate thing for us and we did nothing wrong and we should not have to pay any price for other people's desires to expand.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Do you recall how long ago that was?

MR. STATMAN: I'm going to guess, ten years.

Ten years. It's way over five and under 15, I

think.

And our quality of life is impacted in a way that we're not happy and we feel unjustly so because it's okay to do what you want, you know. They say you can -- you can punch your fist as far as you can, but not till you hit my nose, and that's what happened, my nose got hit by this situation.

So I'm bringing in the same thing here. Here we are again. We were asked about this some time ago by Mr. Frishman. My wife, she could tell you the details of it. We spoke to -- we have never

been involved in giving any approval or anything like that. So we were asked to sign a paper saying that we approve, and in speaking to a member of the administration which there's no need to mention who said it, just get the blueprints. When we requested blueprints we were told --

MS. STATMAN: It wasn't on paper.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You have to identify yourself for the record. I'm sorry.

MR. STATMAN: Hearsay. She can vouch for it.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You can identify yourself

for the record and augment the testimony.

MS. STATMAN: I'm Miriam Statman. We were told that we have a right to see the plans -- CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Of course.

MS. STATMAN: -- before signing the letter that we saw the plans, and we asked to see the plans and we were told it's not available on paper to look at, it's just on the phone, and you know --

MR. STATMAN: And just a minimal amount of the plans would be -- you know, somebody is going to show me a little thing for five minutes, and have a nice day.

MS. STATMAN: The part that would affect us.

1	MR. STATMAN: And we were told also that
2	there would be some private things that they
3	didn't want to share.
4	MS. STATMAN: They were uncomfortable showing
5	all the plans.
6	MR. STATMAN: But they wanted us to approve
7	all this.
8	MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Who was this conversation
9	with? Was this a member of the administration?
10	MS. STATMAN: No, no, I had the conversation
11	with Mrs. Frishman.
12	MEMBER FELDER: But the plans were available
13	here at the Village.
14	MR. STATMAN: We were not aware of that.
15	MS. STATMAN: We weren't told that, that it
16	was available here.
17	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: All right, continue.
18	MS. STATMAN: So then we were told, you know
19	what, if you want to see the plans, we don't
20	really feel comfortable showing you all the plans.
21	Never mind about the letter, please just come to
22	the hearing and you'll see the full plans. And
23	that's why we're here.
24	MR. STATMAN: In other words, tough luck, and

it sounds like, you know, if we can get away

25

without showing you the plans we'll try to.

That's the way it came across to me. But

nevertheless, I still have no idea what exactly

the picture is. I just want to say that I very

much object to any impact on my quality of life

and our enjoyment of our investment, if you will,

and our daily, you know, you get out, you see

grass, and I'm going to have a driveway to look

at. I can look out of my back porch and I can see

east past, you know, to see some neighbors a few

houses down. Now, if they expand back there I

don't know that I'll see anybody else. I'll just

have a garage between myself and the eastern sun,

the rising sun, and I'm not happy about that.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You're going to see -MR. STATMAN: I know. I haven't seen the
plans due to no lack of effort on my part.

MR. CASTRO: Mr. Statman, did you receive a copy of the notice? Because in the last paragraph in the legal notice it tells you that all the applications, the exhibits are on file and you can inspect them at the Village office between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m.

MR. STATMAN: I didn't see that, but we were told by the Frishmans that they're not available

to us.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay, thank you very, very much.

MR. STATMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Any other neighbors? I guess not.

So Mr. Frishman, you've heard your neighbor.
MR. FRISHMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And we've heard your neighbor, and obviously, we have to give some recognition to their concerns, and I don't think that we're in a position tonight to be able to, you know, evaluate. I'm not sure that we can ask the neighbors at this point in time to sit here and evaluate.

Any other comments from the Board?

MR. FRISHMAN: Can I just offer a response to

what they said?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Of course.

MR. FRISHMAN: Thank you.

That the claim that we're trying to pull the wool over their eyes is really unfounded. We called them and we said we have the plans on our iPad, we'd be more than happy to sit with you and show it to you. They said they wanted a copy of

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

the plans. We said we don't have a copy of the plans, a hard copy, but we'd be more than happy to sit with you. The first day they agreed, they said we'll meet you today, tomorrow, then they hemmed and hawed, and they just basically pushed it off and said that they spoke to Mr. Oliner, who used to be the mayor and he said, I guess advised them, that perhaps they had rights or whatever. We weren't trying to prevent them from looking at the plans. They just seemed like they were just -- I don't know what they were doing, just trying to procrastinate. I don't know what the issue But to say that we didn't have the plans available to them, we were more than happy to show them. In fact, the neighbors to the other side we did sit with the iPad, showed them the plans that we had, and it didn't really seem to be an issue.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You have to be fair, a person looking at a small iPad and trying to review the plans --

MR. FRISHMAN: I understand, I understand.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Please don't interrupt me. So that certainly somebody who is not skilled at it or schooled at it or has seen plans in the past, for them to understand fully, I think we

both can agree that it's really not that easy to discern exactly what the impact would be. Now, should they have gone down to the Village Hall and asked to see the plans? I guess we can all agree that probably would have been a very good idea.

But tonight we're faced with a situation with a neighbor who is most impacted, well, certainly, yeah, probably most impacted, mainly because of the driveway, et cetera, and has not fully appreciated what's going on. So normally in such an instance we certainly want to give them the opportunity to review the plans. And I would urge that you seek an adjournment till the next hearing date, and hopefully by then they will have seen or sat with them, perhaps, or they'll sit with the Building Department and get a keen understanding as to what exactly is happening and how it's impacting. I think that that would be the proper procedure I think at this juncture.

MR. FRISHMAN: Okay. I mean, the statement also that he said he's going to be looking at a garage is really not fair. That structure is there already.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Again --

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: You have to realize he

hasn't seen the plans and he's only hearing what we're saying. We're talking about a garage ten feet from his house. If I'm hearing this without visual -- the benefit of the visuals, it sounds like I'm going to have a garage.

MR. FRISHMAN: The offer was there to have them look at it. I hear you.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I understand that you want a bigger kitchen, you want a den, a kitchen, a master bedroom. It always makes total sense, but I think in speaking to your neighbors you can do it amicably.

MEMBER FELDER: Can they by right -- just out of curiosity, can the Frishmans by right put up 30-foot trees along their property line right now if they wanted to, without even -- forget about this, the construction request, forget about anything.

MR. GRAY: Yes.

MEMBER FELDER: They can. So I'm just curious what impact if your neighbor chose to screen in his entire property with 30-foot trees which by right he could do if he wanted to --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Felder, that's not an appropriate question. They haven't seen the

1

plans. Let them see the plans.

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 FELDER: I know, just out of curiosity.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I don't think it's an appropriate question, truthfully. They're not under scrutiny.

MEMBER FELDER: No, no, not at all. I'm just curious to see what impact it would have.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Is it appropriate if I ask one question to Dr. Statman?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Of course.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Because I think it's going to orient us a bit. This is going to come before us again so I think it will orient a bit everyone's thinking for the next meeting, and that is, could you explain in your own words are you opposed to any construction on this property? sounds like you have an issue that's sort of based on your preamble about the issue that you had with your prior neighbor. Are you opposed to any construction? Do you think that they should just basically stick within the existing footprint that they have right now? I want -- or is your concern more with respect to you have a view right now that may be impacted by the future construction

plans? I want to understand your perspective a little bit.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Dr. Statman, just understand a record is being created. You need not respond or you can respond, it's up to you.

MR. STATMAN: I'll be happy to respond.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Please.

MR. STATMAN: It sounds like it's a yes-or-no, either-or question, but in fact my answer is sort of in the middle. It's well known throughout the country, throughout all large cities, the increased rate of building of larger houses, tearing down old houses and building new houses and mega mansions and all this stuff. I have no problem with any construction being done next to me if it has zero impact on me. I have no -- I have some -- I may have little or no or some objection to construction that has a minimal impact on me.

And I think the question is what am I going to be left with? Am I going to be left with an impaired view? Am I going to be left with less grass and more driveway, concrete? Am I going to be left with less ability to look sideways when I go to the back of the house? And if I am, you

know, I'd like to have the views that I had when I bought the house. And I can't say anything that is done within zoning allotments or allowances, but I am here to speak if it's something that requires a variance. If it requires a variance, then I think I need to speak up. So you show me what is going to happen to me, and then I can give you my answer.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think also,

Mr. Moskowitz, our experience is that when
neighbors sit down and they review the plans, in
95 percent of the cases there's a meeting of the
minds, okay, and I hope that that's what will
happen here, that they'll both understand the
needs and aspirations of each party. It's the
worst thing possible to have a neighbor coming
down who has never seen the plans. It took us a
period of time to just digest them ourselves, and
now we're asking a neighbor who hasn't seen the
plans to absorb it, or having seen it on a small
device. It's not appropriate. I think
historically we've been able to come to terms with
variances, most admirably when neighbors sit down.

MR. STATMAN: I'd like to respond to a comment that's almost insulting to me.

Mr. Frishman said that, well, maybe he was trying 1 to procrastinate or something like that. 2 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I would appreciate --3 MR. STATMAN: We were told that there were 4 some privacy issues, that they didn't want us to 5 see the whole thing. That makes it sound, and it 6 could be taken any way, that there's something 7 that somebody didn't want us to see. 8 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That something nefarious 9 was going on. 10 MR. STATMAN: That's what we felt. 11 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You're asking for an 12 adjournment. Do you want us to vote on the 13 adjournment? 14 MR. GRAY: Before you do that, Mr. Young, is 15 it? 16 MR. YOON: Yes. 17 MR. GRAY: I notice the portion of the house 18 that you're proposing to convert to the garage, 19 what is that now on the side? 20 MR. YOON: It's currently a sunroom. 21 MR. GRAY: Behind that sunroom I see on 22 current plans that there's an air-conditioning 23

MEMBER FELDER: The little box.

24

25

unit there, correct?

one. So we will vote for an adjournment. MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Did they ask for an adjournment? CHAIRMAN KEILSON: They did. Mr. Moskowitz. MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb. MEMBER GOTTLIEB: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Hiller. MEMBER HILLER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Felder. MEMBER FELDER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Certainly, we vote for the adjournment. So it's incumbent upon Mr. Frishman to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) (Continued on the following page.)		
adjournment? CHAIRMAN KEILSON: They did. Mr. Moskowitz. MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb. MEMBER GOTTLIEB: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Hiller. MEMBER HILLER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Felder. MEMBER FELDER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Certainly, we vote for the adjournment. So it's incumbent upon Mr. Frishman to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) (Continued on the following page.)	1	one. So we will vote for an adjournment.
CHAIRMAN KEILSON: They did. Mr. Moskowitz. MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb. MEMBER GOTTLIEB: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Hiller. MEMBER HILLER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Felder. MEMBER FELDER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Certainly, we vote for the adjournment. So it's incumbent upon Mr. Frishman to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) (Continued on the following page.)	2	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Did they ask for an
MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb. MEMBER GOTTLIEB: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Hiller. MEMBER HILLER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Felder. MEMBER FELDER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Certainly, we vote for the adjournment. So it's incumbent upon Mr. Frishman to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) (Continued on the following page.)	3	adjournment?
CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb. MEMBER GOTTLIEB: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Hiller. MEMBER HILLER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Felder. MEMBER FELDER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Certainly, we vote for the adjournment. So it's incumbent upon Mr. Frishman to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) (Continued on the following page.)	4	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: They did. Mr. Moskowitz.
MEMBER GOTTLIEB: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Hiller. MEMBER HILLER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Felder. MEMBER FELDER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Certainly, we vote for the adjournment. So it's incumbent upon Mr. Frishman to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) (Continued on the following page.)	5	MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: For.
CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Hiller. MEMBER HILLER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Felder. MEMBER FELDER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Certainly, we vote for the adjournment. So it's incumbent upon Mr. Frishman to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) (Continued on the following page.)	6	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb.
MEMBER HILLER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Felder. MEMBER FELDER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Certainly, we vote for the adjournment. So it's incumbent upon Mr. Frishman to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) (Continued on the following page.)	7	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: For.
CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Felder. MEMBER FELDER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Certainly, we vote for the adjournment. So it's incumbent upon Mr. Frishman to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) (Continued on the following page.)	8	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Hiller.
MEMBER FELDER: For. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Certainly, we vote for the adjournment. So it's incumbent upon Mr. Frishman to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) (Continued on the following page.)	9	MEMBER HILLER: For.
CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Certainly, we vote for the adjournment. So it's incumbent upon Mr. Frishman to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) (Continued on the following page.)	10	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Felder.
adjournment. So it's incumbent upon Mr. Frishman to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) (Continued on the following page.)	11	MEMBER FELDER: For.
to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) (Continued on the following page.)	12	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Certainly, we vote for the
they can go to the Building Department. You can speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.)	13	adjournment. So it's incumbent upon Mr. Frishman
speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) 20 21 22 23 24	14	to make arrangements to meet with the neighbor, or
to show you the plans. (Continued on the following page.) 20 21 22 23 24	15	they can go to the Building Department. You can
(Continued on the following page.)	16	speak to Mr. Castro, and he'll be more than happy
19 20 21 22 23 24	17	to show you the plans.
 20 21 22 23 24 	18	(Continued on the following page.)
 21 22 23 24 	19	
222324	20	
23	21	
24	22	
	23	
25	24	
	25	

MR. GRAY: I already memorized it (handing). (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 8:20 p.m.) ****** Certified that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the original stenographic minutes in this case. MaySinci MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter

1	INCO	RPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		
4		Village Hall 196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5		August 17, 2016
6		8:20 p.m.
7	A DDI TOARTON	
8		Sletteland 223 Hollywood Crossing Lawrence, New York
9		
10	PRESENT:	
11	II .	MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
12		MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB
13	1	Member
14		MR. DANIEL HILLER Member
15 16	II .	MR. ELLIOT MOSKOWITZ Member
17		MR. AARON FELDER Member
18		MR. KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ.
19		Village Attorney
20		MR. GERALDO CASTRO Building Department
21	1	MR. DANNY VACCHIO
22	I	Building Department
23		
24		
25		Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The final matter this evening is Sletteland on Hollywood Crossing. Would they or their representative.

MR. HOPKINS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, Michael Hopkins, from the firm of Hopkins & Kopilow, on behalf of the Sletteland application. Good to see you all.

Mr. Chairman, I have my client here,
Miss Sletteland. You were asking some questions
before about need. There is a need because
Miss Sletteland wants to have her mother, aged 90,
who currently lives I believe in Garden City, to
move in with her. By moving in with her she wants
to, of course, have a safe place for the mother to
be, and at the same time to afford her some
privacy. As a result of that, the plans that you
have in front of you, the streetscape, the shadow
studies, et cetera, I would submit are very
reasonably done, at least I hope you find that
they are reasonably done.

There are only three zoning applications that are before the Board on the proposed work. The first one has to do with the side-yard setback height -- forgive me -- the side-yard height ratio. And if I can ask John, if you would be

kind enough, can you pull the page that shows the side where the --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Identify yourself for the record, John.

MR. NOVELLO: John Novello, 158 Irving Place, Woodmere, New York 11598. I'm here on behalf of Norman Wax, the architect on the project.

MR. HOPKINS: John, if you would be kind enough, I'd like to show to the Chairman and members of the Board the discrete locations where the setback ratio in question is located on the particular elevation where the improvement is to be done. Can you show that to them please, John.

MR. NOVELLO: Do you want me to show them the plot plan?

MR. HOPKINS: They have the plot plan. The one where you actually see the calculations for the setback ratios.

MR. NOVELLO: That would be sheet A3 and it would be the front elevation.

MR. HOPKINS: And what I wanted to point out to the Board is that the two dormers in question that are producing the proposed setback ratio, I believe it's of 1.9, they basically accommodate two windows. It allows light into the area of the

bedroom and specifically light into the area of where the bathroom is proposed to be constructed. If I can also show where the other elevation which actually shows the run of the property -- the next page -- what page is that?

MR. NOVELLO: A4.

MR. HOPKINS: And what I wanted to show to the Chair and members of the Board is that the two dormers take up a very small percentage, a very small percentage of that entire run of that particular elevation, as a practical proposition. But they are needed in order to provide light, it is submitted, particularly to the bathroom in question. I would suggest that it's a relatively minor variance which is being sought because it's not sought for the entire length of the proposed work, just for the discrete locations where the dormers are situated.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So are there major ones that we should be looking at?

MR. HOPKINS: Major height/setback ratios?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: No, major decisions. You said that is a minor request.

MR. HOPKINS: Well, the second minor request has to do, of course, with the side-yard setback

and the aggregate side-yard setback.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's minor?

MR. HOPKINS: Well, that remains for the Board to determine, of course. And if you would be kind enough, John, again, as you will see, the proposed property is going to have -- John calls it a breezeway, but it's a connecting hallway.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: What page are you on?

MR. NOVELLO: We could look at AO, which is
the plot plan, or if you want to see a more
detailed plan it would be the first-floor plan on
sheet A2.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: John, there is no A0 that we have.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: It's A1.

MR. NOVELLO: Well, Al. Let's look at the first-floor plan.

MR. CASTRO: A2.

MR. NOVELLO: A2.

MR. HOPKINS: Mr. Chairman, what is there, as you will see, is there's the -- we call it a hall on the plan, breezeway. It's designed to connect the proposed addition to the main body of the house. There had been some thought given to maybe moving the project back a little bit, and

therefore not being required to ask for this side-yard setback. But as a practical proposition, to do that was going to create a whole array of problems.

First of all, the connecting hallway would functionally be going through the garage, a physical impossibility to accomplish, as a practical proposition. If it were all moved back again, it would also create problems with ingress and egress to the garage, as a practical proposition. And the third thing, Mr. Chairman, had to do with the fact that moving it back, if you see the photographs we submitted with the application, would obscure the view from the main house out towards the roadway in question.

So realistically speaking, the only location that functionally worked is the location that is on the plan right now, as a practical proposition.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Why can't it be in the backyard?

MR. HOPKINS: Again, it will tend to remove the ability to see even through the backyard. The windows in the backyard, as a practical proposition, would be obscured by trying to put this addition up in the backyard.

1	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I didn't follow that.
2	MR. NOVELLO: The back of the house is a
3	kitchen and a family room. So putting any
4	addition would not allow light and ventilation
5	into those living spaces in the rear.
6	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So the plans we have don't
7	show the existing house, just the addition, right?
8	MR. NOVELLO: Well, there's a kitchen and
9	family room in the back.
10	MEMBER HILLER: How many bedrooms are in the
11	house at present?
12	MR. HOPKINS: I believe there are four,
13	right? You can speak. This is Miss Sletteland,
14	by the way.
15	MS. SLETTELAND: Jeryl Sletteland. There's
16	four bedrooms.
17	MEMBER HILLER: How many occupants are there
18	in the house at present?
19	MS. SLETTELAND: Sometimes six.
20	MEMBER HILLER: Six when your children visit?
21	MS. SLETTELAND: Yeah, well, they live with
22	me during the summer.
23	MR. HOPKINS: Mr. Hiller, the other thing
24	that I but I mean, I think it's honorable that

she would want to be able to take her mother in

25

who is aged 90. 1 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We applaud that. 2 asking a question as to the location where she has 3 to put her in. 4 MR. HOPKINS: Fully understood, fully 5 understood. But to afford some privacy, as a 6 practical proposition, to avoid --CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Who is the playroom for? 8 MR. NOVELLO: For grandchildren. MS. SLETTELAND: I have grandchildren. 10 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The playroom is new? 11 MS. SLETTELAND: No, it's an existing office, 12 but that's what we're naming it as a playroom. 13 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: But you're expanding it, 14 right? 15 MR. NOVELLO: The shape of it changed. 16 MS. SLETTELAND: The shape of it is changed. 17 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Is there a greater 18 encroachment as a result of the proposed 19 construction? 20 MR. NOVELLO: Right now the setback -- the 21 current southerly setback is 16.5, and we're 22 requesting 10 feet, a 10-foot setback. 23 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: For the playroom? 24 MR. NOVELLO: For the playroom and the

25

breezeway or hallway in connection from the mother's space into the main living area.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Is that so the mother can access the playroom?

MR. NOVELLO: Access the house. This is that hallway, and right by that playroom that is the access to the main house.

MEMBER HILLER: Your mother is going to the second floor? Does that pose a problem at 90 years?

MS. SLETTELAND: No, not at all. My mother can sit down on the floor and play with my grandchildren. She's very active. She lives in a large house in Garden City and it's three stories. And she does her own cleaning; she does her own cooking. The only thing she doesn't do is drive, and that's why I want her with me. My father just passed away in October, and they had -- this is a side-bar -- but 65 wonderful years, and so I'm the only child so she needs to be with me.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The issue that we have is when you're creating a mother and daughter situation you're permanently changing the configuration of the house here, and it's a significant encroachment when there seem to be

options, or we can't evaluate the options because we don't have the plans of the rest of the house.

MR. HOPKINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, the logic, as I say, you don't -- I apologize. Is it critical to have the plans for the rest of the house? If it is, let us know, and we will certainly do whatever is necessary to accommodate you. So that when Mr. Novello says, for example, that logistically siting it elsewhere is simply not available, that can be borne out by taking a look at those plans. If that is required, we certainly will supply it to you. We don't want any guesswork.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Mr. Hopkins and
Mr. Novello, you've both been here many times,
many applications, and we often get elderly
parents in need to stay with their children, and
we ask about bedrooms and bathrooms. I think one
of the problems is that we're adding a lot. We're
adding a living room, a bedroom, a hallway, a
second-floor bedroom, a kitchen.

MR. GRAY: Two bedrooms.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I don't think for the

14 years I've been here I don't think I've ever

added that much on for an elderly parent. It's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

kind of a first time for me that we are putting in a second kitchen.

MS. SLETTELAND: My mother does her own cooking.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I understand that.

MR. HOPKINS: I was about to say, I think, Mr. Gottlieb, what really is extraordinary is that this is an extraordinary woman who is capable of doing certain things. This is a woman who is immensely acute, sharp as a tack, physically aware, physically capable of doing things. I've even had some applications in front of this Board where people were seeking certain relief in order to accommodate an elderly parent nowhere near as vibrant as Miss Prose (phonetic) is, as a practical proposition. This is a person who, as my client was saying, is going from a relatively large house, no other children to take care of her. She is not going to be put into a home or anything of that caliber. She, meaning Miss Prose, would very much appreciate some privacy when everything is said and done, and yet at the same time safeguarding her by making sure that there is access and that these things can be accomplished.

And one final thing, if I may, Mr. Gottlieb,
I had talked with Miss Sletteland that most of
these questions would be coming up, as a practical
proposition, and with the passage of time if it
should become difficult for her to negotiate steps
there's always the ability to put in whatever
those mechanical seats are, as a practical
proposition. So this is not a person -- let me go
back for a second.

There is a need to take care of this person.

Miss Sletteland is ready, willing and able to take care of her mom. I know everybody here thinks that's a wonderful thing to do, but this is a vibrant person. This is not just an elderly person who is going into the room and not interacting with people, not seeing her daughter, not seeing her children or grandchildren when they're around.

So I really think that this particular application given this particular configuration is beyond the norm of what I've done on several of these, and I have been in front of this Board on applications involving the very elderly who are functionally incapable of taking care of themselves, as a practical proposition.

Miss Prose is not -- she's not and she should not be alone in a home by herself at the present time with nobody else.

I see Mr. Gray looking at me.

MR. GRAY: Yeah, Mr. Hopkins, if you can just

-- I think one of the concerns that the Board may
have is that the way it's designed is in essence
you're turning this into a two-family home and
that could be changing the character of the
neighborhood the way it's configured, and it's
being configured for the purposes of privacy, all
the reasons that you just stated. The concern is
that you've just created a two-family home that is
easily dividable and kept separate.

MR. HOPKINS: Well, of course.

MR. GRAY: And that may change the character of the neighborhood because the neighborhood is not comprised of two-family dwellings.

MR. HOPKINS: No, the neighborhood is not comprised of two-family dwellings. I know the Board is a hot Board. They know that this is probably the smallest parcel, as a practical proposition, in that neighborhood; that as a practical proposition, the properties on either side are many times larger than this particular

piece of property. They're talking acreage I believe on about 22,000 square feet.

And I've confronted this, Mr. Gray; you and I both do public sector work in this regard. The danger that you talk about in the abstract is and should be handled, at least theoretically, by code enforcement, and there are multiple ways of making sure that nobody at any time abuses that relief which would been granted, we trust.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's fairly disingenuous.

MR. HOPKINS: Why is that?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Because code enforcement -- Mr. Castro, is that disingenuous?

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: You have to rely upon a neighbor ratting you out, if you will.

Mr. Hopkins, it's not that it's the smallest property, it's just particularly narrow, which is why Mr. Keilson and the members were suggesting doing this work in the back of the house so it's not tightening up the front when you've only got 78 feet in the front.

MR. GRAY: And you may be able to accomplish that without the need for any variances.

MR. HOPKINS: At the same time when

everything is said and done, what has to be analyzed is whether or not, as a practical proposition, the expense involved and what impact that's going to have on this house in terms of looking out in the back, when you're talking about light, air and things of that nature.

I still like my code enforcement argument because I am confronted, Mr. Keilson, with what you're looking at right now within other villages. If it became absolutely necessary, as a practical proposition, there perhaps would be some covenants, some conditions imposed that would mitigate the concern that you have, and perhaps other members of the Board, that it not be inappropriately converted to an illegal two-family, as a practical proposition.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think, as a practical proposition, the use of the backyard cries out. You have such a deep backyard. What is in that backyard currently? Is there a pool or anything?

MS. SLETTELAND: There's no pool and, quite frankly -- I'm sorry. The house itself -- I mean, the house itself is a very simple house, and the addition that I want to put for my mother is a very simple addition.

If you go to other areas, this is not a mc-mansion. This is not bastardizing a structure. It is not even marrying two structures, which when I look in Lawrence and I see Palladian windows and columns and I see all this architectural design, I sort of am frightened about it.

This is a very simple structure that from the outside looking at it, it looks like it belongs — it looks like it belongs with the house. And in the back of my house I have a beautiful kitchen, that's a livable kitchen because it's the hub of the house, and I don't want to impede that view in the back.

And the front of the house is very simple what we've done. If you go up to other areas, if you go up to Cape Cod or you go up to New England, New Hampshire, this is sort of a typical house. We're not -- I don't want it embellished. I don't want it shouting from the front. It is very simple. And it's really to accommodate a very lively 90-year-old.

My grandmother lived until 102. She walked up a flight of steps in Brooklyn every day. She buried every single parish priest and she finally -- she finally succumbed to her age at 102, and

I'm hoping my mother lives that long and she's with me and she can enjoy my grandchildren and the environment that I've provided for her.

So, you know, my appeal to the Board is that I'd like to get this done. I don't want to see her alone in Garden City. I'm a full-time working woman. It's very difficult for me to even manage taking care of her in Garden City. But so that's why we're here, and I would not have -- I wouldn't have brought Michael in, and I certainly wouldn't have John do anything. I had worked for Richard Meier, who is a star architect. I understand architecture. I understand form and function. And I would never do something to that house or this community that would shout something that is not appropriate. So I'm sorry, I probably am not saying the things that you want to hear.

MR. NOVELLO: I'd like to point out a comment that Mr. Gottlieb had asked. The design of the living space, this is probably the smallest living space that we've ever designed. If you look at the size of the kitchenette and the living room and the bathroom, it's 23 by 18 including the staircase. This is probably — this whole living space is probably smaller than the previous

application's master bedroom, you know, it's very concise.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: For sure it is.

MR. NOVELLO: It's very tight. We tried -we tried not to, you know, exceed the front-yard setback and we tried to squeeze in as much as we I told Gerald that, you know, this is very -- it's not roomy enough, but she was happy. it's at its minimum.

Another point is that the house to our south is 110 feet away from our property line, and it's a humongous house. So we have -- and with our proposed ten feet we have 120 feet from this one-story addition to our southerly neighbor. you know, and we provided the Board with the sun studies so you can see that, you know, it has no impact to the neighbor to our south, and obviously, the addition has no impact to the northerly neighbor.

MEMBER HILLER: I'm very sympathetic, especially the beautiful presentation you made. was very impressed with it, and we do have understanding about taking care of elderly parents which is very commendable.

What I'm disturbed about is not seeing the

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

4 5

interior of the present existing house. It makes it very difficult to visualize why something can't be done -- why something can't be done to the rear of the house, maybe converting the den at the rear into the bedroom and building it further -- I shouldn't even say that.

The second question I want to ask is, before doing this did you consult with the Graffs, the neighbors that are 110 feet away from you on your south side? Have you consulted with them?

MS. SLETTELAND: No. I mean, to be perfectly honest with you, and I don't mean to be pejorative, but I'm the only Christian that lives on the block, and I mean, people, my neighbors, I'm not part of the community, I'm not worshipping where everybody is worshipping, so we are friendly and we clean up our streets and that's it. But we are not intimate and we don't dine in each other's homes.

MEMBER HILLER: I understand that.

MS. SLETTELAND: So I wouldn't go knocking on their door.

MEMBER HILLER: It's appropriate for anybody, regardless of their religion, to appropriately knock on the door of the neighbor when they intend

Sletteland - 8/17/16 to do construction which is abutting the neighbor's property, and I understand what you're saying. MS. SLETTELAND: The Graffs did construction I know, but nobody ever --MEMBER HILLER: I understand what you're saying. I don't fully agree with what you're saying, but I very much understand your feelings. But that would have been appropriate.

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

And also, as I said, I'm uncomfortable not having the interior of the house available.

MR. NOVELLO: To answer that question, it wasn't done intentionally as you can see.

MR. HOPKINS: He's not suggesting that.

MR. NOVELLO: That's a long house. wouldn't have fit on the sheet. If you look at the site plan, it's so long, so we purposely cut it off so you can see what we're proposing.

Again, as Mrs. Sletteland said, the back of the house, you're more than welcome to come over or look at the plans. I'm sure the Building Department -- there's a large kitchen with glass looking out to the --

MEMBER HILLER: The entire back of the house is the kitchen?

MR. NOVELLO: Kitchen and family room.

2 3

back too, yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SLETTELAND: And there's a library in the

MR. GRAY: Mr. Hopkins, I think based upon

consider and deliberate, one of the prongs of the

Mr. Hiller's comments and for this Board to

criteria that they have to consider is whether or

not what you're looking to do, which is

accommodate your mother, can be achieved by some

other method that wouldn't require a variance. So

I think that's something Mr. Hiller and the Board

is asking for.

MR. HOPKINS: Fully understood, Mr. Gray.

And Mr. Novello has said that it is

impractical for the reasons that he's already

stated. If perhaps the members of the Board would

like to go do a site visit and see what the parcel

is like in the back and what Mr. Novello said is

an accurate statement, certainly, everybody is

welcome to make the site visit to confirm

independently what we've been stating here on the

record. I think that would perhaps be a lot

easier than drawing up a whole new set of plans

showing the entirety of the house.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: We like to give John extra

work. I'm okay with a site visit.

MR. GRAY: Off the record.

(Whereupon, a discussion was held off the record.)

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: In order to achieve, you know, an understanding before the next hearing, there are existing plans. I'm not sure why it's so difficult.

MS. SLETTELAND: Maybe they are upstairs. Can somebody go up?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We're not going to find that now. But we have -- we have to see the plans. The encroachment is a significant encroachment, and notwithstanding the description of the mc-mansion and everything else, that has no bearing on this. We understand the nature of this construction. The issue is the encroachment and we've been very protective of side-yard encroachments, and that's one of the no-nos.

MR. HOPKINS: And I've been through them before, I'm fully aware. All I would suggest, Mr. Keilson, even with regard to the side-yard encroachment issue, it's in the context that the encroachment becomes aggravated or perhaps mitigated, and I think that's what Mr. Novello was

saying before, that the property adjacent to the subject parcel that would theoretically be impacted by this, the nearest point is 100 --

MR. NOVELLO: 120 feet away from our proposed addition.

MR. HOPKINS: So this is not, for example, as the good doctor said, if this is moved 10 feet closer to the property line I could have a real problem, I don't care what he does. Perhaps providing it doesn't impact me, and in terms of the analysis, of course you would have to look at the size of the encroachment that's being sought. But again, the analysis continues with the benefit to the applicant and the impact on the neighborhood, and in this case the nearest neighbor most impacted, at least in theory, is the neighbor 120 feet away, as a practical proposition, and I would submit that in context it's a relatively de minimis side-yard setback which is being sought, in context.

MR. GRAY: I'm more concerned with the character of the neighborhood going from one-family to two-family, and in the code there's a presumption if you have two kitchens it's presumed to be a multifamily house.

MR. HOPKINS: Of course, and I've been before this Board before when enormous houses have gone up with kosher kitchens, so it has been done before.

MR. GRAY: But with a kosher kitchen it's not structured in such a way that you can live as two separate families. The kosher kitchen is usually off of the kitchen and part of the main structure; it's not dividable. This, if you put a lock on one of the doors, you have a separate, freestanding, one-bedroom, two-bath apartment. That's all I'm saying.

MR. HOPKINS: And I'm simply responding to that by saying that the concept of the second kitchen has been sanctioned. And what you're also suggesting, Mr. Gray, is you have to put it into a context, which is what I was talking about with the side-yard setback as well. So keeping things in context as a proposition as we fully understand, we've discussed this amongst ourselves that this is an issue that might come up. And I don't mean to be cavalier about it, but the probability and the area of this thing ever going into the area of concern to you, I suggest, is nil to none. I suggest, I suggest is nil to none, but

I do understand the concern. I'm not suggesting in any manner, shape or form that the concern is absolutely far-fetched. It's not fully understood. The reality of the situation is when in theory could this become an issue? Presumably, upon the sale of the house or the death of a parent. When everything is said and done, as a practical proposition, could it become an issue in any other context? Probably not.

MEMBER HILLER: I think the major concern of the Board is that this could be remedied in a way that would not require a variance, and if that possibility exists without impeding the light and air, then we'd like to explore it, and we haven't seen on these plans anything to show us what the present house looks like.

MR. HOPKINS: I understand, and this is why I made the offer. If the Board wants to do the site visit, they're more than welcome, with or without a glass of wine. And as a practical proposition, I mean, if you could grant the relief subject to a satisfactory site visit, I would suggest --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Grant the relief subject to?

MR. HOPKINS: Doing the site visit and being

contented that the reality of putting it anywhere else on the property is really severely limited, both practically speaking in terms of light and air severe on the property and any number of other factors.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: As a practical proposition, that's never happened, so.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask, if you do come back, would you please ask, I guess Mr. Wax, to make a few corrections on the zoning chart. One of them is the rear yard, I don't think permitted is 15 feet for rear-yard setback. Also, on the side-yard aggregate and side yard there are mistakes in existing, and proposed. It's 19 feet.

MR. NOVELLO: I believe a separate zoning analysis was submitted that supersedes the zoning analysis.

MR. HOPKINS: The code relief.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: The code relief sheet does not show rear yard. I'd also like to see building and surface coverage not as a percentage but as correctly what's permitted, what's existing and what's proposed. And what I'm asking you for is what's on most applications. I'm not asking for

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

anything different than what we usually see. Mr. Hopkins, you know that.

MR. HOPKINS: Believe me, I know that too. But again, I think Mr. Novello and Mr. Wax's intention, because the house is somewhat long, is to literally focus your intention on the discrete part that is the subject of the inquiry.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: What I'm asking you for is just something that's on every application that vou ever submit here.

MR. HOPKINS: I'm not -- I don't disagree with you, Mr. Gottlieb, and if you're asking us to collect this information it will be done.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Just clarify it.

MR. HOPKINS: It will be done, as a practical proposition, and the site visit I would recommend as the easiest way of dealing with this and/or I quess we have no choice, as a practical proposition, John, to supply the --

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Moving over to page A2, can you just fill in some of the numbers. I don't see how wide the hallway is or how long it is. proposal is 23 feet by 18. Can you just fill in some of the missing numbers, how big the garage is, just so I have a better idea of what I'm --

Sletteland - 8/17/16 you know, is that hallway 10 feet wide? Is it 1 four feet wide? I have no idea. 2 MR. NOVELLO: Do you want the answer now or 3 when we resubmit? 4 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Just add those things in to 5 help us understand better. 6 MR. CASTRO: One more question. You show a 7 proposed basement with steps. It looks like it's 8 unfinished. Is that the --9 MR. NOVELLO: It's storage. 10 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Is there a basement on 11 this? 12 MR. NOVELLO: Yeah, storage. 13 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: How deep is that basement? 14 MR. NOVELLO: Nine feet, I believe, water 15 16 table permitting. MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Which is why I asked. 17 18 19

You're not just removing the surface coverage, but now you're removing the percolation of storm water. By having a nine-foot deep basement in that area there's less percolation for rainwater.

MR. NOVELLO: I don't understand.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Now, I understand there is a basement so I look at a basement and the impact of rainwater.

MR. NOVELLO: I believe we provided a dry well plan, so we addressed that.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Okay.

MR. HOPKINS: Mr. Keilson, I await your guidance. Is it your preference that we get this information back to you to continue the matter on the first available date hereafter?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Yes.

MR. HOPKINS: Thank you. Fully understood.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: I have one question from my perspective, one question. Is the sole and exclusive reason for this construction project your mom, or is there any other reason that you want to do this construction?

MS. SLETTELAND: Just my mother.

MEMBER MOSKOWITZ: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.

MR. HOPKINS: We'll get that information back to you then, sir.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: If she has the plans, they exist in the Building Department. We're not trying to burden you with more work.

MR. HOPKINS: Mr. Keilson, fully understood.
Mr. Castro will let us know if you have plans
upstairs buried somewhere. And let me ask, I'm

1	just trying to figure out, technically speaking,
2	obviously, you can't close the hearing if you're
3	going to be looking at additional stuff.
4	MR. GRAY: This will be adjourned and
5	continued at a future date.
6	MR. HOPKINS: I don't mean to be rude, but
7	would that be a September date, at least?
8	MR. GRAY: September 14th.
9	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Yeah, absolutely.
10	MR. CASTRO: The deadline for filing is
11	Friday.
12	MR. HOPKINS: Whoa, whoa, what do you
13	mean by filing? This hearing is continued;
14	there's no need to file anything more per se.
15	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Right. It will
16	automatically go onto that calendar.
17	MR. CASTRO: Correct.
18	MR. HOPKINS: All right, Mr. Chairman.
19	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. So you're asking
20	for an adjournment. I think from the Board's
21	perspective we're all in accord.
22	MR. HOPKINS: It will be done.
23	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you very much.

MR. HOPKINS: If anybody cares to make a site

visit in the interim, they're more than welcome.

24

25

Sletteland - 8/17/16 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think some people will. (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 8:55 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