1	TNCOR:	PORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE	
2	BOARD OF APPEALS		
		DOARD OF ALLHADO	
3		Village Hall	
. 4		196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York	
5		August 24, 2011	
6		7:33 p.m.	
7			
8	APPLICATION:	Seltzer 10 Sterling Place	
9		Lawrence, New York	
10			
11	PRESENT:		
12		MR. LLOYD KEILSON	
13		Chairman	
14		MR. ELLIOT FEIT Member	
15		MR. EDWĄRD GOTTLIEB Member	
16		MR. THOMAS V. PANTELIS, ESQ.	
17		Village Attorney	
18		MR. MICHAEL RYDER Building Department	
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25		Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter	

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Lawrence Board of Zoning Appeals. I request that you turn off your cell phones. Please, no talking during the proceedings. If you have to speak, please go outside.

Okay, Mr. Ryder, proof of posting.

MR. RYDER: Yes, I have proof posting,
Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you very, very much.

And Mr. Pantelis, would you like to open with your preamble.

MR. PANTELIS: Just by way of some procedure, we would ask that the applicants when they come up please give your name and address and the relationship to the application. If you're representing an application or an applicant, please indicate that.

We would like you at least to make a succinct presentation regarding what you are asking for, the relief that you are asking from the Board.

And, of course, the Board in this particular case is a very hot Board in the sense that they have visited the properties, are very familiar with the properties and have taken a very good look at your

applications. So to some degree you may find the Board may cut to the chase and ask you a lot of questions.

So with that in mind, we have a three-member Board so far this evening, which means that you would need a unanimous vote of the three members present in order to have an application approved. We may have one member who may be here shortly, and we'll indicate that on the record when that happens.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Absolutely.

The first matter this evening is the matter of Seltzer. Would they or their representative please step forward.

MR. SAVALDI: Yes, good evening.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Good evening.

MR. SAVALDI: Amiel Savaldi, 1 Meadow Drive, Woodmere. Good evening to the Board.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Good evening.

MR. SAVALDI: We are here this evening requesting the Board to grant a variance for a second-floor addition of a rear bathroom to the existing master bedroom suite of the Seltzers.

This addition was part of a variance which was granted by the Board in 2003, I believe. And if

4 5

you go to drawing A-4 --

MR. PANTELIS: You're referring to a set of plans, Mr. Savaldi. Would you please indicate what those plans are; title box, prepared by, date, and just the sheet on the plans.

MR. SAVALDI: I'm referring to plans prepared by me and dated on 8/8/2011.

MR. PANTELIS: That's the last revision date, correct?

MR. SAVALDI: That's the last revision date and drawing, A-4. And if you'll look on the upper right side you will see at the bottom you'll see the existing bedroom and then a walk-in closet that is going to be on the existing area of the current bathroom and the closet. And beyond that is the addition which is an addition of the master bathroom on the existing den and it extends beyond the existing one story by two feet.

MR. PANTELIS: If we look at drawing A-3, would that show that?

MR. SAVALDI: If you look at drawing A-3 you will see the dashed line indicating the overhang, and the dashed area is indicating the net addition which is a very small area. It's --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Twenty-four square feet.

1	MR. SAVALDI: Twenty-four square feet,		
2	correct.		
3	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So tonight we're		
4	discussing the 24 square feet?		
5	MR. SAVALDI: That's correct.		
6	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Which is over and above		
7	the previously approved variance?		
8	MR. SAVALDI: That's correct.		
9	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Are there any other		
10	variances this evening?		
11	MR. SAVALDI: We originally asked for a		
12	swimming pool and deck, and we are withdrawing it.		
13	So the Seltzers are not prepared to do it at this		
14	time.		
15	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: In terms of our review of		
16	this evening's request it's simply the building		
17	coverage issue?		
18	MR. SAVALDI: And the rear-yard setback, I		
19	believe.		
20	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The ratios.		
21	MR. PANTELIS: Height setback ratio.		
22	MR. SAVALDI: We are encroaching into the		
23	30 feet required rear yard at that point, and we		
24	are at the most severe place or the shortest		
25	distance is 25 feet and a half. So which makes it		

four and a half feet short. 1 MR. PANTELIS: And as you're going across the 2 rear of the residence does that depth increase, 3 and at what point would you say that it meets, if 4 it does, the 30-foot required yard? 5 MR. SAVALDI: It meets at, I would say, 80 6 7 percent where you go into toward the deck. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Well, on the pre-existing 8 approved variance what was the depth of that? 9 That was the exact condition. MR. SAVALDI: 10 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Twenty-six ten. 11. MR. SAVALDI: That was exact. 12 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Nothing changed in that 13 14 regard. 15 MR. SAVALDI: Nothing changed at all. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The only change is that 24 16 feet, in essence. 17 MR. PANTELIS: Twenty-four inches. 18 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Twenty-four square feet. 19 MR. SAVALDI: Right. Which is the same as we 20 requested was granted earlier. 21 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Right. 22 Okay, any questions of the Board? 23 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: No. 24 MEMBER FEIT: No.

25

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. Is there anyone in 1 the audience who would like to speak to the 2 matter? 3 (No response.) 4 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. 5 6 MEMBER FEIT: Any correspondence, Mike, on 7 this? I do not have any. MR. RYDER: 8 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So in reviewing the 9 criteria that normally apply in terms of 1.0 evaluating the proposed variance, the five 11 criteria, I think without even going into detail, 12 the benefits certainly outweigh any sort of a 13 detriment or issue regarding the community. 14 So we'll vote. Mr. Gottlieb. 15 16 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: For. MEMBER FEIT: For. 17 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And for. 18 Thank you very much. MR. SAVALDI: 19 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Indicate how much time you 20 need. 21 22 MR. SAVALDI: Two years. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Two years. 23 (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 24 7:40 p.m.25

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

MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter

1	INCORE	PORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		Village Hall
4		196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5		August 24, 2011
6	·	7:40 p.m.
7		
8	APPLICATION:	Fistel 100 Cumberland Place
9		Lawrence, New York
10	-	
11	PRESENT:	
12		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
13		MR. ELLIOT FEIT
14		Member
15		MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Member
16		MR. THOMAS V. PANTELIS, ESQ.
17		Village Attorney
18		MR. MICHAEL RYDER Building Department
19		
20		
21		
22		•
23		
24		Mary Benci, RPR
25	•	Court Reporter

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The matter of Fistel, would they or their representative please step forward.

1.8

2.2

MR. FISTEL: David Fistel, my address is 100 Cumberland Place in Lawrence. And I'm requesting three variances tonight.

One is -- I'm trying to put on a 30-foot by 29-foot-9-inch addition in the rear of the house. And in order to do that I'll only be 25 -- 25 feet three inches from the -- as a rear-yard setback instead of the required 30. And my house currently is only nine foot -- nine feet from the property line of my next-door neighbor, instead of the required ten feet. And I would like to have the addition continue in a straight line rather than having to build in one foot.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: On the same nonconforming line?

MR. FISTEL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Just further down.

MR. FISTEL: Right. And then the third variance is side-yard aggregate which normally needs to be 25 feet, and we're asking that at the shortest point, I believe it's -- I wrote on the petition I believe it's nineteen and change.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Nineteen nine.

MR. FISTEL: Yeah, nineteen and three-quarters at the shortest point, and then it slopes greater, you know, you have more room as

you go further back, till I think in the way back

it's probably just about 25 feet.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Tell us a little bit about what you're adding in terms of the bedrooms and the like and the need.

MR. FISTEL: Right now we have -- we have, you know, a starter house, a three-bedroom house with a den and a playroom. And we've been forced to turn the den and the playroom into bedrooms. We have -- you know, we've had two kids since we've been in the house, which has been three years, and we anticipate more. And we need a den and a playroom for those kids, but at the same time we need a place for those kids to sleep.

Also, my wife has ten siblings who each have a lot of kids and they live in Florida most of them and --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I don't think you have enough bedrooms for all of them.

MR. FISTEL: Yeah, I know, not if they all come at the same time. But I'm working on that.

2.0

But even if one of them comes with their family, you know, we need at least one guest room and then we could probably pile some of their kids with our kids. So I feel like we need -- like we're going to need seven bedrooms.

And this plan really calls for six bedrooms and a playroom off of the den. But the playroom will have sliding doors where it can be used as a bedroom, you know, when it's necessary. And I want to remind -- I guess you guys all know the property, but it's on the -- it's on Cumberland Place, right, and my neighbor in the back is the Long Island Rail Road tracks.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Right.

MR. FISTEL: It's not even --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Do they keep you up at night? No more than the babies.

MR. FISTEL: Not more than the babies, no, definitely not.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.

MR. PANTELIS: In addition to your relationship to the railroad, can you continue to describe the other surroundings adjacent. I think that's important in this particular case.

MR. FISTEL: Yes, right. So that's the back.

So and we're not -- we're not in front of a station. We're between the Inwood station and the Lawrence station, but we're very close to the opposite end of the Inwood platform and there is -- there's Lord Avenue. You guys may recall that it used to go through, but now they've cut it off and there's a little -- a little cul de sac with a rotary that's directly on the east side of the property where we're asking to build out five extra feet. Although it's not extra for that side but it's extra in the aggregate.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Understood.

MR. FISTEL: So basically, we don't have any neighbors.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Who's the neighbor on the right? I think that's the most we're concerned with.

MR. FISTEL: So that was -- well, it was actually the Heslins until last -- until last Wednesday, and a new family just moved in.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: They're moving because of your construction?

MR. FISTEL: Yes, brought them to the neighborhood. So they're all for it; without it they're moving out. No, but they are aware of

what we're doing. They've seen the same documents that you're looking at.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Who's moving in?

MEMBER FEIT: Who moved in?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Moved in, sorry.

MR. FISTEL: Kapelowitz. They didn't have official notice because I gave in the radius maps before they moved in, and I didn't know who they were. And the Heslins were keeping it secretive; they were paranoid they wouldn't be able to close. But so I sent it to them but --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Understood.

MR. FISTEL: -- but -- but when they moved in, you know, we've seen each other and we're friendly. And we showed them our house in case they were wondering how to lay it out, and we showed them our plans and we mentioned what we're doing.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So they can come here and ask for the same.

MR. FISTEL: If they want to.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: At some later date.

MR. FISTEL: I don't think they have the money to do that right now; they just got here.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Mr. Fistel, is there any

way you could have designed the addition being four feet nine inches shorter, such that you could maintain the 30-foot rear yard?

MR. FISTEL: So that's how we -- originally, we weren't sure if we were going to ask for that variance. The problem is that, you know, the existing house -- in other words, really to -- like you can't have a bedroom that spans from -- you can't have a room really that spans from the current house into the addition on the -- on that side, on the left side of the house, because then the room would be oddly shaped and it would be kind of --

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I understand, sure.

MR. FISTEL: So we started there and you can see there's a schematic and we found that in order to -- in other words, all the bedrooms basically had to -- I mean, even bedroom three was difficult to -- you know, we didn't want it to be in the living room and in the dining room.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Bedroom three is on the upper level?

MR. FISTEL: That's on the upper level.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Got it, okay.

MR. FISTEL: Yeah, the upper level was the

24

25

most challenging because if you have the master bedroom on the upper level and you can't have higher ceilings or anything on the lower level, and the living room and dining room belong on the upper level, so and then in order to do that if we have two infants at a time so we can't put them on the lower level. So we squeezed in bedroom three on the upper level instead of putting it on the bottom because we -- because they'll wake each other up if they're in the same room. So I felt we needed a little bedroom, that bedroom three over there; and once you have that you need a bathroom that services those two bedrooms. wife has a lot of clothes, a lot of clothes. the walk-in closet is important.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Is that a political statement for this evening?

MR. FISTEL: And basically, my office, I'm an accountant, and my office is as it is, four feet wide by ten two.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Just so I can find your office.

MR. FISTEL: It's all the way up in the corner. So it's not exactly -- you know, I would love for it to be five or six feet so I could

actually fit a chair inside, but you know, as it is we're trying to -- we're trying to --

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Are you planning on putting a deck or swimming pool in the back or other structure?

MR. FISTEL: No.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: It would just be a grassy area.

MR. FISTEL: Yes. We don't want to lose the whole back. A swing set might go into the back at some point.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: That's not what I meant, but okay.

MEMBER FEIT: Is there a typo on this code relief? You said existing is eighteen eight and proposed is nineteen.

MR. FISTEL: That's correct. I mean, I think that's correct.

MEMBER FEIT: Aggregate side-yard setback.

MR. FISTEL: Yeah, because in the front, like I said, it's sloped, you know, since we're the corner lot. So our property slopes sort of like this (indicating), and it gets wider as you go back. So all the way in the front the existing structure is actually only eighteen eight

aggregate side yard in the front where the garage is, but as you go back it gets more. But then when we build the addition we're building it out five feet more but we're already -- we're already seven feet or six or seven feet more width than we had at the outset, so that's what I meant by that. Maybe I wrote it not correctly.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's fine.

Is there anyone in the audience that wanted to speak to the matter?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Gentlemen, any further questions?

MR. FISTEL: My wife is for. She just doesn't want to speak. Probably doesn't want to wake the baby.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay, so in reviewing the five criteria in terms of area variances, weighing the benefit of the variance to the applicant as opposed to the concern for the neighborhood.

And I think we'll vote at this point. Mr. Gottlieb.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I will vote for this, and bearing in mind that there is no area -- rather, surface coverage or building variance that is

required. I want to mention that in particular. 1 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Feit. 2 MEMBER FEIT: Considering that his backyard 3 neighbor is the Long Island Rail Road, I vote 4 for. 5 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And I'll vote for as well. 6 MR. FISTEL: Thank you. 7 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Indicate how much time you 8 need. Two years, take two years. 9 MR. FISTEL: Two years, that's what I was 10 thinking. 11 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So you don't have to come 12 back and ask for an extension. 13 MEMBER FEIT: You have to go to Building 14 Design. It's your first time here. Mr. Ryder 15 16 will fill you in. 17 MR. FISTEL: I was hoping for ten years, but 18 two years we should be able to finish. (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 19 2.0 7:50 p.m.21 22 23 24

25

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		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		Village Hall
4		196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5		August 24, 2011
6		7:50 p.m.
7		
8	APPLICATION:	
9		33 Washington Avenue Lawrence, New York
10		
11	PRESENT:	·
12		MR. LLOYD KEILSON
13		Chairman  MR. ELLIOT FEIT
14		Member
15		MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Member
16		
17		MR. MARK SCHRECK Member
18		MR. THOMAS V. PANTELIS, ESQ.
19		Village Attorney  MR. MICHAEL RYDER
20		Building Department
21		
22		
23		
24		Maror Donai DDD
25		Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter

2

4

6

5

7 8

9

10

11

1.2

14

13

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22 23

24

25

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The final application this evening is the Hebrew Academy.

MR. GOLDMAN: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and good evening, members of the Board. For the applicant, Ronald Goldman, 130 West 42nd Street, New York, New York.

Good evening, Mr. Chairman. It's always a pleasure to appear before the Board on either side of the railing.

It's always a pleasure to CHAIRMAN KEILSON: see you as well.

MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you.

I'm joined here tonight on behalf of the Hebrew Academy of the Five Towns and Rockaway by its executive director, Reuben Maron.

MEMBER FEIT: Mr. Goldman, can I just interrupt you, just so the record is clear. president of this institution fifteen years ago, a long time ago. I just about have nothing to do with it. My youngest child just turned 31, and my two grandchildren are in different schools. So I have no children or anything of a relationship with this school other than being a fifteen-year-old past president.

MR. GOLDMAN: Well, I feel bad for your other

grandchildren that they're not availing themselves of the best education in the Five Towns.

But having said that, I would note that we do indeed have the executive director of the school, as well as the incoming Chairman, Joshua Wanderer, as well as a principal of the school, Miss Naomi Lippman, as well as, of course the architect who will introduce himself, Mr. Capobianco, who is well known to this Board. And should it become necessary in the course of the conversation, the traffic engineer who studied the site, Mr. Robert Bornholdt.

I would note that traditionally before coming to this Board it's this Board's responsibility to check and confirm and compare the benefit to the community -- the benefit to the applicant as compared to any detriments to the community.

That's your burden.

In this case what has happened is the applicant has taken that burden upon themselves and have really given thought to it in a very responsible fashion.

As a long-time resident of this community it was always my assumption that the lot that has been occupied by the Herald building until its

untimely fire would naturally be filled by a structure. And indeed that was the earlier application. Then the common sense point of view would have been just to plop a gymnasium down in that vacant space.

The Hebrew Academy took the thought and said, you know what, that's probably not in the best interests of the community. It's on Central Avenue; it might pose a problem in terms of traffic flow. It might pose a safety issue in terms of the people coming and going onto Central Avenue. Certainly, the buildings adjacent or across the street might be impacted. And instead --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That wasn't their argument that evening though.

MR. GOLDMAN: Well, you know what, that's one of the reasons why the Board was gracious and made effective arguments then, but having reconsidered and with a change of demographics in the community and the needs of the school, they reconsidered and thought that there was perhaps a better alternative. That was a good idea but this is a better idea.

MR. PANTELIS: Mr. Goldman, are you referring

to the existing athletic field as indicated on the plan?

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes.

MR. PANTELIS: I just wanted to be clear. That is adjacent to Central Avenue.

MR. GOLDMAN: Correct. And originally, in proposing the idea, that was again the common sense. I would note too that that was a different architect and that we're blessed with a very talented one who came up with a more creative idea, not to be critical of anyone else, but of putting the exact same structure but in a location that would absolutely have no detriment to the community, whether it be to neighbors, whether it be to adjoining facilities, or institutions.

And so we come here tonight to basically say to the Board that whereas we might have impacted substantially on, for example, surface coverage by removing green grass and land and presenting it in that fashion, what has happened now is that the current location, and of course the architect will speak to it far more clearly than I and describe it better, but nevertheless it will now be displacing simply other concrete. In other words, it's going down on a playground area that is

currently the surface. It's not increasing surface coverage by any means; and rather than that, it is preserving the green grass that currently exists as counsel has indicated in what is now not only referred to as an athletic field but indeed is an athletic field.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: On the zoning chart it shows there was an increase in surface coverage, although the Village in the denial letter makes no reference to additional surface coverage.

MR. GOLDMAN: I'm advised that there is no additional surface coverage because it's going straight on what is currently not an athletic field but a playground area which is in fact covered and concrete, if you will.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: Asphalt.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Well, the zoning chart indicates variance required for additional area of 12,000 square feet.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: That's the area of building.

MR. PANTELIS: State your name and address, please.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: John Capobianco, architect, 159 Doughty Boulevard, Inwood.

Yeah, the area of 12,000 square feet would be

.

1.4

1.2

2.0

2.2

the -- well, we're leaving the athletic field the way it is, but we're actually placing the building 7,500 square feet on an existing playground area which is presently macadam. I don't see where the additional surface coverage is changed.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: No, it happens to be the Village agrees with you, but I'm just reading the zoning table.

MR. PANTELIS: You say at the bottom existing 116,967. That's on the chart, surface coverage. And proposed 129,044. And your own notation indicates variance required. So we were just looking at how that actually came about.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: Oh, I see what you're saying.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Maybe it was that other architect.

MR. PANTELIS: If you think it's an error, Mr. Capobianco.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: I think it's an error and I think that we'll correct that error. I would like to state on record that it is a replacement of surface coverage. You know, the existing surface coverage is basically unchanged.

MEMBER FEIT: Mr. Goldman, the parking

2

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

agreement between Beth Sholom and HAFTR, is it still in existence where Beth Sholom allows HAFTR to use their parking lot after hours?

That's correct. There's been MR. GOLDMAN: no change from the time that indeed there were discussions as to required parking and the variance for the parking. There has been no I would note, since you mentioned that, change. that I would submit to the Board a letter of support from Congregation Beth Sholom, and there's no indication that their understanding as to the availability of parking for HAFTR has changed in any way. And with the Board's permission I'm submitting copies for each member of the Board and one for, of course, counsel and signed by the current president of the institution. misstates it's not front, it's actually Frost Lane.

And rather than -- even though you've thrown me off, Mr. Feit, as long as we're submitting letters of support I would note too that the Brandeis School, which is across the street on Frost Lane, has indicated to us that they're supportive of this application.

And finally, and I respect the fact that the

primary -- or a primary concern would be the feelings and approach of an attitude of the fire department, because at the end of the day --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Let me just interject,

Mr. Schreck, an alternate sitting in this evening,
has joined us in motion.

(Whereupon, Mr. Schreck has entered the hearing room.)

MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you.

And I would note that the fire department was consulted as it had been on the prior occasion.

They're supportive of the application as well, and I have copies of their letter of support for each member of the Board as well and of course for counsel.

So in terms of Beth Sholom, the fire department and the school opposite, the Brandeis school, they're all in support.

There are no neighbors, resident civilians, if you will, who will be impacted by this. This is going dead center in the middle of the property and then, of course, the question would become that assuming it's there, what's the reason for it.

That which was said back in 2007, I believe

1.0

it was, remains the case. The school is committed not to increasing its student population. This will not impact by in terms of additional students and the burdens that might be concomitant with that. It's not going to increase the number of staff who are truly the drivers to an elementary school, but there's not going to be an increase of staff.

There's a necessity for this. This building was built I think back in the 1960s. It does indeed have a gym, as we talked about in 2007, but that gym is woefully inadequate on many levels.

One, because it just is in terms of just its size and in terms of facilitating and allowing spectators. Now, the question might come up, well, if you're building a bigger gym you're going to have a few spectators and rival Yankee Stadium. That's not the purpose of it. They're going to have the same number of spectators, but in the current situation those spectators because of the size of the gym by the virtue of their existence negatively impacts on any sport activity that's taking place. So much so that that gym is not considered really sort of regulation, if you will, and it requires when they play or when the high

school certainly comes over to play regulation games they're forced to go to another facility because this gym, the current gym is so inadequate, both as I say from a safety point of view of the spectators and also from the terms of regulation, et cetera. So the current gym will not be attracting more people, it will just be facilitating the activities that much more.

In terms of buses that will come, they're provided for. There won't be any additional parking required, though that can be addressed certainly by the expert who's here in terms of traffic. It won't have an impact on Central Avenue because it isn't going to be on Central Avenue, nor is it going to be facing Central Avenue.

The school has indeed -- it's not coming to you as a new resident. It's not coming because it just bought a piece of property that's inadequate for its needs. It's coming to you as a long-time resident. It's been in compliance with earlier variances that were granted, cooperative and supportive of the Village. So it's from this point of view no increase in numbers, and there's no opposition that we know of.

1.4

In times past people were concerned in terms of height, et cetera. That's all being consistent and it's all interior so there won't be any impact on anyone. Certainly no impact on the environment. There's no detriment. There are alternative ways to do this, and we're living proof of that because we merely have to go back to the 2007 variance and we'd see that indeed there was an alternative, but it was not in the best interests of the community, the school, the Village or any of the residents.

That being said, that's pretty much my not so succinct and certainly not so brief, but it's certainly my application and, of course, all the parties that are here can address the issues if you have concerns about either the parking, the architectural component or any element of the school's necessity or any commitments on the part of the school in terms of the use of this facility.

MEMBER FEIT: Mr. Goldman, on Frost Lane I think they have now the tennis courts. You have Frost Lane, new park area, existing asphalt and the 75 spaces. That is where the buses usually go during the school year, am I right? So

that would accommodate any buses that comes in, let's say, at night for a game they would be right on property?

MR. GOLDMAN: Correct. And to date the commitment was made earlier on, there's concern and that's why the fire department was supportive of the application that Washington Avenue should not become that kind of a location where buses would collect or student players or whatever be discharged, that wouldn't happen. That's precisely why this is a secure area and the Village was quite ingenious in terms of making sure that that provision was made on Frost Lane, and the school has been in compliance with it.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Mr. Goldman, how many parking spots were on-site for this facility before and after the proposal?

MR. CAPOBIANCO: There were 38 existing parking spaces which was entered off of Washington and now there's an additional 75 at the rear which would be on the existing macadam area that would be used.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So in effect you're adding
75 parking spaces without increasing the
enrollment or any teachers or any other supportive

staff?

MR. CAPOBIANCO: That's correct.

MR. GOLDMAN: That's correct.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: Also, I'd like to point out on the schedule and site plan that on the surface coverage section we showed that the existing surface coverage remains unchanged. That's why I was confused about the extra 12,000 square feet.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I just did some quick math with surface coverage. I used both of your numbers. You had a proposed of 129,000 surface coverage and an existing 116,967.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: Right, but that didn't change, the one sixteen nine.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So we're going to base it on the 116,967.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: That's correct.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Just to be sure of something, the area on Central Avenue that's currently grassy, that is not owned by HAFTR at this time, correct?

MEMBER FEIT: Part of it is.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: The site adjacent to Chosen Island?

MEMBER FEIT: The Nassau Herald is owned by

HAFTR.

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 Nassau Herald is owned MR. CAPOBIANCO: by HAFTR.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Right, the Nassau Herald is owned by HAFTR.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: Right.

MR. GOLDMAN: I don't mean to interrupt. it's not only owned by HAFTR and certainly maintained and being used indeed as an athletic field.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: And the additional parcel next to that is the former medical center.

MR. GOLDMAN: That is not owned by HAFTR.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So the existing athletic field, as we'll call it, that is part of the total number of 136,000 as your total?

MR. CAPOBIANCO: That's correct. That has nothing to do with that lot.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So I quess even though we're not changing the surface coverage, you do have 86 percent surface coverage. My question is regarding flooding and excess water flow. there currently -- I guess I shouldn't be asking you this. Perhaps I should be asking somebody with the Village. Is there a runoff problem at

this time that there's no place for water to percolate?

MR. RYDER: Would you like me to answer?

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Mr. Ryder, I think I'm

directing this at you.

MEMBER FEIT: The buck stops.

MR. RYDER: There's a drainage problem throughout the Village.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: But this is an 86 percent surface coverage where most other parcels are substantially less than that.

MR. RYDER: Right. If I may, the question should be asked to the applicant what the existing dry wells or catch basins are.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: This area is a good area in terms of drainage. There's existing dry wells which are there now which takes the runoff, you know, you know the impervious services that are adequately handling it. And actually when we construct the building we'll probably have to relocate dry wells that are in the way of the new construction because of -- we'll have to replace them. And you know, at that point we don't expect to have to add additional dry wells because they're already handling the same amount of

impervious surface that the area that will be increased will be just roof area. But we're thinking of bringing new dry wells.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Since new construction is being done and if there is a problem with water runoff this will be a good time to address it and put in any necessary dry wells.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: Yes. We plan on putting a few extra dry wells in anyway for the roof area.

MR. GOLDMAN: I had held back with my dramatic conclusion to provide the Board with a rendering of what the site will look like, but I'm being pre-empted by the architect who would like to do it right now, and I'd be happy to share it and make it part of the record. You see it will blend right in, have no negative impact on the adjoining properties.

MR. PANTELIS: We'll have these actually marked as an applicant's exhibit.

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes, please.

MEMBER FEIT: Mr. Goldman, am I correct that the school, the institution right now is maintaining what we referred to as a medical building even though they don't own it, but is that correct that they're maintaining that lawn

and the grass there?

MR. GOLDMAN: I would not know the answer to that.

MR. MARON: Yes, we are maintaining that.

MEMBER FEIT: Identify yourself.

MR. MARON: Presently we have a lease on that property. My name is Reuben Maron, executive director of HAFTR.

Presently, we are leasing that property and we -- in the lease we maintain the property, we fenced it in properly. And I don't know if you remember about two years ago there was always a problem with the fencing there. Once we took the place over, we put in a new fence, we grassed the area, we levelled it and we keep it as green as possible.

MEMBER FEIT: So it's no longer an eyesore, it's actually something attractive.

MR. MARON: Absolutely. Thank you.

MR. GOLDMAN: It's all part of the component of maintaining Central Avenue.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Goldman, does the traffic expert have anything to contribute in a succinct fashion?

MR. GOLDMAN: Unlike the lawyer.

MR. PANTELIS: I do have a question. You made reference to a prior variance, and I see your parking here is calculated on the additional space for the gymnasium. Do you know what the required parking would be for the institution, what the prior variance was that was granted, and I think as I understand it you were saying you are increasing that parking by 75 spaces, whatever that particular number is.

MR. GOLDMAN: I just need a second. I do have a copy of the findings of fact that were written back in 2007. There's reference, theoretically, they would have required 232 parking spaces, and that's exactly right, and it was granted. It was then concluded that the ones that were provided were more than sufficient and indeed were increasing from those.

MR. PANTELIS: So then the total number of spaces to be provided on-site will be?

MR. GOLDMAN: Right now --

MR. CAPOBIANCO: 113.

MR. GOLDMAN: -- 113.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: If you look at the gym portion of the parking requirement which is 102 based on occupancy, load and dividing it by five,

1.0

one per five, that you would need 102. So the fact that there may be an event in off-school hours, after-school hours there would be 113 spaces on-site available.

MR. PANTELIS: No, I think it's just more important that ultimately the record reflect what the parking requirements are, what was previously granted by this Board and what we are going to end up with.

MR. GOLDMAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think it's very clear that the municipal parking is across the street, and that also has to be taken into consideration. Certainly during the hours that are being proposed for the events we're talking about that municipal parking is at its minimum use.

MR. GOLDMAN: That is correct. We wouldn't want to necessarily rely on that, nor would it be appropriate to do so. But that is the reality, it's there.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: One of the other things I wanted to mention was that, you know, in building this building we were planning a basement which would help the storage problem that exists at the

school which hopefully will alleviate those trailers that are on the side of the building which right now fall partially into a fire lane. So those -- we're hoping that they will -- we're planning that those will be removed once the building is built and the basement is available for the storage that they need.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you.

MR. GOLDMAN: I don't know -- if you want to be succinct, by all means, but I don't know if the Board has any specific questions.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: He made a study, didn't he?

MR. GOLDMAN: We'll hear from him. I have copies for the Board.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We want you to get your monies' worth.

MR. BORNHOLDT: My name is Robert Bornholdt, Sidney Bowne Engineering, 235 East Jericho Turnpike, Mineola.

MR. PANTELIS: Sir, do you just want to indicate if you have professional qualifications would you like to submit or just verbally indicate to the Board what your expertise is.

MR. BORNHOLDT: I was director of traffic

safety for Suffolk County for the last, I guess, for seven years, and now I'm working for Sidney Bowne.

MR. PANTELIS: Do you have expertise in traffic review and engineering?

MR. BORNHOLDT: I do, 40 years' worth.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Do you have any recommendations for Rockaway Turnpike?

MR. BORNHOLDT: I didn't study it.

MR. GOLDMAN: He's an expert, he's not a miracle worker.

The record will reflect, please, that

Mr. Bornholdt has submitted -- just describe it

for the record, please.

MR. BORNHOLDT: I was asked to take a look at the impact, the traffic impact of the gymnasium. And I was told, and as Mr. Goldman says there's no impact during the day, there's no increase in enrollment. So the gymnasium is just a net zero gain during the day.

So we did a study between 6:00 and 8:00 on a typical weekday evening, just to see what type of parking would be available in addition to what we're providing on site, and we took a look and we've got a substantial amount of vacant spaces

within walking distance of the gymnasium and the Hebrew Academy.

MR. PANTELIS: Well, basically, so we can summarize your report, you indicated a number of areas within I assume this is walking distance and indicated in areas A, B, C, D, and E on your chart.

MR. BORNHOLDT: Right. It's the lot across Frost Lane. It's parking along Frost Lane. It's parking on the far side of Central Avenue. It's parking on the academy side of Central Avenue. And it's the parking on Broadway.

MR. PANTELIS: And in the vicinity then what would be the number of potentially available spaces on this after-hours period?

MR. BORNHOLDT: I don't know that.

MR. PANTELIS: I see you have a lot of numbers here.

MR. BORNHOLDT: Well, it's the total at the end that would be important. As you can see -- as you can see on this last column (indicating), the total available spaces during each of these ten-minute time periods gave the technician enough time to go around and count within a ten-minute period.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Mr. Bornholdt.

MR. BORNHOLDT: Yes.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I'm looking at column A, if you will, and it shows on the top going across seventeen spaces.

MR. BORNHOLDT: Yes.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: But then below that it shows available is 116.

MR. BORNHOLDT: That's a mistake. That's a typo. It should have been 171 spaces because that's the municipal lot.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Fine.

MR. BORNHOLDT: That was a typo. I apologize.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Now I can follow it more clearly.

MR. BORNHOLDT: It does make a little more sense. Anyway, the last column is the important one because of all these areas for any given ten-minute time period you've got a minimum of 154 spaces available within walking distance of the gym, in addition to what's being provided by the applicant.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: What athletic teams participate in the leagues or the like?

1.0

MR. GOLDMAN: Well, I believe I have a representative of the school, but it's my understanding that there's, of course, basketball; there's a varsity and a junior varsity, there's floor hockey, both varsity and junior varsity. There's a girls' basketball as well as boys, this being a co-educational institution. So there's essentially four basketball teams that are playing, and needless to say needing different time frames as well. That's one of the reasons that the pressures have been on the gym because it's just a finite amount. There is floor hockey.

You know what, if we may, we'll ask

Miss Lippman who is the former -- current

principal of the high school as well as the former

principal of the junior high school, and indicates

as well to my mistake that it's not only the high

school teams, but there's a junior high school as

well, so it's doubled. In other words, there's a

girls' varsity and a girls' junior varsity, and a

boys' varsity, et cetera, et cetera. So these are

all -- they had been all using pretty much the

same facility.

MR. PANTELIS: But would it be fair to say you're going to essentially have one team at a

time or event at a time?

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes.

MR. PANTELIS: So the more important element is during those period of times, as your traffic expert is indicating, there seems to be more than adequate number of spaces within the area.

MR. GOLDMAN: That is correct. At any given moment there would be consistency in terms of the use. It's not going to be all four teams.

MR. PANTELIS: Would it also be fair to say perhaps, and the principal or the director could respond to that, when you do have teams visiting that they will very often come in their own van or bus?

MR. MARON: They come in their own van or bus.

MS. LIPPMAN: They come in their own.

MR. GOLDMAN: And we have provided for that certainly off the street.

MEMBER FEIT: Mr. Goldman, is it fair to say also that -- well, let me ask Mr. Maron who is actually the executive director, or Miss Lippman, that the number of teams are going to be staying constant; you're not going to be adding any?

MS. LIPPMAN: That's correct.

MR. MARON: No.

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 SCHRECK: Mr. Goldman, will there be any non-athletic events in this gym, like open houses or bar mitzvahs or dinners?

MR. GOLDMAN: No, this is not going to be used; it's certainly not going to be rented out. It's not going to be made available to the public, nor is it going to be advertised as such. fair to say that indeed it will be used for school plays which currently the current facility is, but it's so much smaller, and I don't know if they even graduate --

MR. MARON: No, not big enough.

The graduation is off-site MR. GOLDMAN: because of the increased number of parking, et cetera. There may be, as I say, school plays, class plays, et cetera. But it is not going to be marketed as a facility, nor will it be marketed as a gathering place for other institutions or an overflow, et cetera. That's never been the history of the school and nor will this, even though the facility is there, that would not change.

MR. MARON: That's correct.

MS. LIPPMAN: That's correct.

MEMBER FEIT: Mr. Goldman, this facility, this is going to be used for educational purposes; is that correct?

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes, in the broadest sense, and so far too it's an athletic facility, so it's an educational component in the broadest sense. Good sportsmanship, et cetera.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Is there anyone in the audience that would like to comment or question?

(No response.)

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I just want to go back to the traffic study one more moment. Your study was done on pretty short notice. You didn't have six months to do this. So you chose Thursday, August 18th, which is probably one of many vacation weeks and it's certainly during the summer.

Do you think there would be much of a difference in the period of September through May, versus Thursday, August 18th on the availability of parking within the Village within the public lots?

MR. BORNHOLDT: That's an excellent question.

Typically, there is an increase in traffic when school starts again, although I observed the school, I was down there personally and observed

the school and there was a lot of activity going on during the day.

MR. GOLDMAN: That's correct. There's a camp facility.

MR. BORNHOLDT: So in the evening these activities we're describing I don't know what the parking availability would be at that time.

MR. GOLDMAN: Just so the record is clear, however, as the Board well knows this is not contiguous to any shopping center of major impact. This is not where Gourmet Glatt, for example, would be, where on a Thursday night it's safe to say this is off by the firehouse, et cetera. Across the street are a karate school, a vacant building and, of course, one of the co-ops or condo, not 360, the other one, the Carlyle.

MEMBER FEIT: That's where your athletic field is now. You're not building that.

MR. GOLDMAN: That's correct. Opposite that there would not be. So there will be no impact on those residents as well.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. Having reviewed all these matters, are there any further questions before we -- okay.

So in terms of observing the criteria for

1	evaluating the granting of a variance we weigh the
2	benefit to the applicant as opposed to any
3	detriment to the community, and taking that into
4	consideration we'll now vote. Mr. Gottlieb.
5	MR. GOTTLIEB: Just so I'm clear, there are
6	three variances that are being asked for, not
7	four, right?
8	MR. GOLDMAN: No, the fourth one it looks
9	like it's surface coverage but it isn't; it's
10	building coverage.
11	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So three variances?
12	MR. GOLDMAN: Right.
13	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I will vote for.
14	MEMBER FEIT: For.
15	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Schreck.
16	MEMBER SCHRECK: For.
17	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And I will vote for as
18	well.
19	MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you.
20	MR. MARON: Thank you.
21	MR. CAPOBIANCO: Two years.
22	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Take the two years.
23	MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you.
24	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you very much.

MR. GOLDMAN: Board of Building Design as

25

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at

8:20 p.m.)

well.

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

MADY BENCT DDD

MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter