_		
1	INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE	
2		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		Village Hall
4		196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5		March 18, 2015
6		7:35 p.m.
7		
8	APPLICATION:	Bais Medrash of Harborview 210/214/218 Harborview South
9		Lawrence, New York
10	PRESENT:	
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
12		MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB
13		Member
14		MR. MARK SCHRECK Member
15		MS. ESTHER WILLIAMS
16		Member
17		MR. KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ. Village Attorney
18		MR. MICHAEL RYDER
19		Building Department
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter

1	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Good evening, ladies and	
2	gentlemen. Welcome to the Lawrence Board of	
3	Zoning Appeals. Please turn off your phones, and	
4	please, no conversations during the hearing. If	
5	you would like to converse, please step out into	
6	the hall.	
7	Okay. Mr. Ryder, is there proof of posting?	
8	MR. RYDER: Mr. Chairman, I offer a copy of	
9	proof of posting.	
10	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Ryder, is that posting	
11	by the Board of Zoning Appeals?	
12	MR. RYDER: That is by the yes, correct,	
13	by the Village.	
14	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: No, I'm asking you a	
15	question. Was that posted by the Board of Zoning	
16	Appeals?	
17	MR. RYDER: That was posted by the Village	
18	Administrator.	
19	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Do you mean was it	
20	authorized by the Board of Zoning Appeals?	
21	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's the next question.	
22	Was it authorized by the Board of Zoning Appeals?	
23	MR. RYDER: No, it was not.	
24	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Do you find that	
25	unorthodox?	

MR. RYDER: I do.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gray, in your experience did you ever come across a situation where contrary to the wishes of the Board of Zoning Appeals there was a posting?

MR. GRAY: It's my understanding under applicable law it's the Zoning Board that sets the agenda.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I see. So for the purposes of the record, I think, let's just make it clear, that there is an E-mail from Mr. Ronald Goldman, who is the Administrator of the Village of Lawrence, on Sunday, February 22nd, to myself, where he directed that the BZA meeting be held as scheduled and that the Bais Medrash matter be posted for that date. Thereafter, and we're going to put this on the record, okay, there was an E-mail from Peter Bee, who I believe is the Village Attorney; is that correct, from your firm?

MR. GRAY: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And that he sent an E-mail to the Village Administrator explaining that they had no right to direct that the BZA have that meeting or that the calendar be posted per the directive of the Administrator; is that correct?

At least that's what the E-mail reads. 1 MR. GRAY: I don't have the E-mail in front 2 of me. 3 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I'll pass it to you. 5 we'll also put it on the record, and it reads that, Mr. Peter Bee, writing to the Village 6 Administrator, "That the BZA is an independent body whose determination as to how and when it 9 will decide matters is independent of Village Administrator control." 10 11 So we're going to at least put that on the 12 record because we're very concerned about a 13 precedent. Do you want to take a look at it? MR. GRAY: I don't need to take a look at it. I understand what you read, and if that's the content of the E-mail, that's the content of the 17 E-mail. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Fine. much.

4

7

8

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you very

All right, the first matter to be considered is the Bais Medrash of Harborview. I believe counsel is here this evening. We received communication from Mr. Avrutine.

MR. AVRUTINE: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. Appearing for the

applicant, Howard Avrutine, 575 Underhill Boulevard, Syosset.

As I presume the Board is aware, that there has been a request from Christian Browne, as counsel representing the Septimus family, that tonight's hearing be adjourned to another date. I did correspond by E-mail with Mr. Browne earlier today. He did indicate that he would be here. It might very well be that he went to Village Hall not realizing that the proceedings were taking place here. So I don't know whether the Board is inclined to wait a few moments for Mr. Browne's appearance, because this technically is his request for a postponement. I'm here to just make sure things go as they should. So it's your pleasure, Mr. Chairman of the Board.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I will accept your suggestion, and let's see if we can move to the next matter and then come back to the Bais Medrash.

MR. AVRUTINE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken; the application was recalled.)

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We're going to recall the

Bais Medrash of Harborview. 1 Mr. Avrutine already gave his name. 2 Please. 3 4 MR. BROWNE: Christian Browne, B-R-O-W-N-E, 5 333 Earle Ovington Boulevard, suite 601, Uniondale, appearing for the Septimus family 6 7 tonight. I apologize for being late; I went to the Village Hall. 8 9 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Was anybody there? MR. BROWNE: No, it looked pretty secure. 10 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Thank you for that update. 11 12 So we received a letter from your firm. 13 MR. BROWNE: Yes. It was our application for an adjournment. As you know, my clients have been 14 15 away; they're coming back tonight. And to give Mr. Avrutine and I a chance to meet and discuss 16 17 and we're hoping we can come to a resolution of 18 everyone's concerns. 19 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That would be fabulous; put us out of business. 20 21 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I was thinking the same 22 thing. 23 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The question we have is 24 there was expected to be a traffic study.

MR. AVRUTINE: Yes. Well, actually, in light

25

of the adjournment, I thought it would be a good idea to update some of the data. So in the process of doing that, if that's acceptable to the Board.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I just want to have a date so that they will have an opportunity to review.

I'm sure they will have an expert witness, so I would like not to have to adjourn it again, because if they foresee it right before the hearing we'll have to go trough the whole process again.

MR. AVRUTINE: I will discuss that with Mr. Browne. Does the Board have a new date in mind?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I would say that we're going to put it on for the April 29th scheduled date.

MR. BROWNE: That should be fine.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: What would be fine?

MR. BROWNE: No, that date will be fine.

MR. AVRUTINE: I'll have the report. I'll reach out to our traffic consultant tomorrow and just verify when we'll have it in.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So I'd just like you to give the date to Mr. Ryder when you know it.

MR. AVRUTINE: Surely. 1 2 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And make sure that's 3 sufficient time for you to review and deal with 4 it. And we have Jewish holidays coming up. 5 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Can we request that it be 6 in within ten days, a minimum of ten days before 7 the meeting? 8 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: How much time do you think 9 you require? MR. AVRUTINE: I'll certainly have it in to 10 the Board within certainly ten days or more before 11 12 the hearing. Mr. Browne and I can work out our 13 own. 14 MR. BROWNE: I think that would be adequate. 15 I'm not looking to delay anybody. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: On the contrary, we wanted 16 17 to make sure that we rescheduled it, and since it 18 is of interest to a lot of people we want to make 19 sure that people clear their calendars and that it 20 will be heard on that evening. 21 MR. AVRUTINE: Sure. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Is there anything else we 22

wanted to mention in that regard?

23

24

25

MR. AVRUTINE: Will it be here as well? CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think so. I think so.

1	MR. RYDER: Mr. Chairman
2	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Or maybe downstairs,
3	depending on the size of the crowd.
4	MR. RYDER: I have to confirm that as
5	well, Mr. Chairman. I'm not 100 percent sure on
6	this location.
7	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: What was that?
8	MR. RYDER: I'm not 100 percent sure on this
9	location for the 29th.
10	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Well, we will be required
11	to have a large enough venue, because going back
12	many years one of the problems that arose was that
13	when it was in Village Hall there wasn't adequate
14	seating for the people.
15	MEMBER WILLIAMS: We had it downstairs and we
16	filled the room.
17	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Yes, correct.
18	MR. RYDER: Do you recommend that we use the
19	downstairs as well?
20	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I will say yes, the answer
21	is it will be downstairs.
22	MR. AVRUTINE: Thank you very much.
23	MR. BROWNE: Thank you very much.
24	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: As far as the Board is
25	concerned, adjournment?

1	MEMBER SCHRECK: Yes.
2	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Yes.
3	MEMBER WILLIAMS: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Very good. Thank you very
5	much.
6	MR. AVRUTINE: Thank you for your time.
7	MR. BROWNE: Have a good evening.
8	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
9	7:48 p.m.)
10	***************
11	Certified that the foregoing is a true and
12	accurate transcript of the original stenographic
13	minutes in this case.
14	
15	Macy Derici
16	MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter
17	Court Reporter
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

7		
1	INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE	
2	BOARD OF APPEALS	
3	Village Hall	
4	196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York	
5	March 18, 2015	
6	7:40 p.m.	
7		
8	APPLICATION: Carpenter 56 Club Lane	
9	Lawrence, New York	
10	PRESENT:	
11	MR. LLOYD KEILSON	
12	Chairman	
13	MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Member	
14	MR. MARK SCHRECK Member	
15	MS. ESTHER WILLIAMS	
16	Member	
17	MR. KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ. Village Attorney	
18	MR. MICHAEL RYDER	
19	Building Department	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter	

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The next matter to be considered is Carpenter of 56 Club Lane. Will they or their representative please step forward.

MR. SCHULZ: I'm Hermann Schulz, with the firm of Innocenti & Webel. We're landscape architects, I'm a registered landscape architect in the State of New York.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Please proceed.

MR. SCHULZ: May I read the variance application that was sent to the Board? I think that's probably the best thing.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We can summarize it, because we are a hot Board and we've read it and we visited the site, so I think we have some familiarity.

MR. SCHULZ: Okay. Pretty much storm damage. Sandy sort of devastated his lawn out front. In addition, it did some damage to the pool area. The water came all the way up to the house. And what we would like to do or the client would like to do is to bring in fill to bring it up to the grade that it was at at one time so he can utilize it again as a play field, and pretty much that's what we want to do. It's a matter of bringing in the fill and grading it.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So I guess the greatest concern with change of grade is how it impacts on neighbors' properties and the like, and I guess you will be happy to explain why it doesn't affect any neighbors' properties in this case.

MR. SCHULZ: The way -- well, the way it's graded it grades out towards the creek.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Right.

MR. SCHULZ: And with the permission that we've gotten from the DEC, they required us to put a 30-foot buffer of American beach grass from the water level on up. So the way we've got it graded it's just basically coming up another 18 inches grading towards that buffer, and that is what would be able to accommodate the amount of water that would be coming down there. Now, it is a fairly flat area to begin with.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Right.

MR. SCHULZ: So and one other thing that we'd like to do is plant some junipers or cedars along the property line and the neighbor's property line. This is the one opposite of the Village property. I'd like to plant a row of cedars down there. Again, I believe that's what was there in the beginning, which was devastated, so we would

like to put those back.

As to planting, there are a couple of dead trees there. There are some mullberries, there's a cedar there, there is a honeysuckle, which they're not in good shape anymore. So this is something we would like, you know, to take out, remove.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Are there any other properties being impacted by the change of grade?

MR. SCHULZ: No, just that one neighbor if you're looking towards the water on the left.

Except for the Village that's -- you know, that's the Village property.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I understand, okay. Any questions from the Board?

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Do you think that the neighbors will also need the same type of work, or it usually doesn't affect one house a storm like this?

MR. SCHULZ: No, it looks like the neighbor to -- again, looking out towards the water on the left-hand side, it looks like that neighbor's got a perfectly good lawn. Now, I don't know how Sandy didn't do any damage to his lawn. I can't really tell you.

Carpenter - 3/18/15

1	MEMBER SCHRECK: When was this picture taken?	
2	MR. SCHULZ: Excuse me?	
3	MEMBER SCHRECK: When was this photo taken?	
4	MR. SCHULZ: That was taken probably, I would	
5	say, in the middle of the summer.	
6	MR. GRAY: 2014?	
7	MR. SCHULZ: Uh-hm.	
8	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: And do you have a	
9	landscaping plan, or did I miss that?	
10	MR. SCHULZ: Well, yes. It's on this it's	
11	on plan sheet number SP.	
12	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I see it, yes.	
13	MR. SCHULZ: Again, if you look towards the	
14	water on the left-hand side, the planting that we	
15	want to do is that row of cedars. Other than	
16	that, we don't want to do any more planning.	
17	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: And the beach grass.	
18	MR. SCHULZ: And the beach grass, yes, that	
19	we have to do.	
20	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Okay.	
21	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. Any other questions	
22	from the Board?	
23	(No response.)	
24	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Anyone in the audience who	
25	wants to speak to the matter?	

1	(No response.)
2	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So we're going to discuss
3	the matter.
4	(Whereupon, a discussion was held off the
5	record.)
6	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mrs. Williams, how would
7	you vote?
8	MEMBER WILLIAMS: I will vote for.
9	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb.
10	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I'm for this application.
11	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Schreck.
12	MEMBER SCHRECK: I'm going to vote for.
13	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And I will vote for as
14	well. How much time do you think you require in
15	order to do the work? A year will be enough?
16	MR. SCHULZ: We hope to do some seeding in
17	May, so if we can.
18	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Let's say a year.
19	MR. SCHULZ: Hey, look, we want to get this
20	thing done by the summer.
21	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Wonderful. Very good.
22	Thank you very much.
23	MR. SCHULZ: Thank you, sir. Thank you.
24	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
25	7:45 p.m.)

Carpenter - 3/18/15

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

MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter

		riediei 3/10/13
1	INCORF	ORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		Village Hall
4		196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5		March 18, 2015
6		7:48 p.m.
7	APPLICATION:	Findler
8	ALL HICHITON.	34 Larch Hill Road Lawrence, New York
9		Hawrence, New York
10	PRESENT:	
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
12		MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB
13		Member
14		MR. MARK SCHRECK Member
15		MS. ESTHER WILLIAMS
16		Member
17		MR. KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ. Village Attorney
18		MR. MICHAEL RYDER
19		Building Department
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		Mary Benci, RPR
25		Court Reporter

Fiedler - 3/18/15CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The next matter is Fiedler. Will they or their representative please step forward and proceed. MR. LEEPER: Good evening. I'm Monte Leeper, the architect for the Fiedler residence. And as I understand it, contrary to most hearings that I go to, you already have my whole case in front of you. So I don't know if I should just reiterate that we are only over by 2.4 percent on an addition that goes into a hidden area of the side vard.

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

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think we have to correct the record because that's not accurate.

Mr. Ryder, what are the actual numbers?

MR. RYDER: The actual numbers for building coverage, I have it here, is 12 percent, I believe, and for surface coverage as per our letter of denial --

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: 28 percent.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: 28 percent.

MR. RYDER: -- 28 percent.

MR. LEEPER: Our overage is 28 percent? don't believe it is.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: The calculation that you're using are based upon overall building and surface

coverage of the lot. We use the overage based upon the percentage that you're permitted. That's why.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Do you want to withdraw your application?

MR. LEEPER: No.

2.0

2.4

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So when you take the overage and divide it by what's permitted, you're getting 12 percent for building and 28 percent for surface. What I believe you've done was you took the amount of overage and divided it by the total building lot coverage -- total building lot, rather, not coverage.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Size.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Yes, lot size.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Yeah. Actually, we apologize because normally the Building Department catches that and brings it to the attention of the applicant, that you don't come in and get --

MR. LEEPER: Caught off guard like I am.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's correct.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I believe it was in the denial letter, so that would be the notice to the applicant.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Very often, and I happen

1 to have E-mailed the Village on it, we are trying 2 to bring it to their attention so that, again, 3 they're forewarned and they can -- yes, 4 absolutely, it's in the denial letter. 5 MR. RYDER: I had this discussion with 6 Mr. Leeper at the Building Department as well. went over that. I explained that to you about the 7 8 numbers. MR. LEEPER: It says right here an overage of 9 10 342.43 square feet. 11 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Which is 12 percent 12 against the permitted. 1.3 MR. RYDER: Correct. I don't think I'm 14 connecting here with explaining this. 15 MR. LEEPER: So it's not 12 percent of the 16 entire property. It's 12 percent. 17 MEMBER WILLIAMS: That's what we look at. 18 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Twelve percent of overage. 19 MR. LEEPER: Of the overage, okay. So then I 20 will restate it that we're over by 342.43 square 21 feet. 22 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's correct. The Board 23 here though focuses on percentages. It's a very 24 important factor in our consideration, but

nonetheless, you can proceed with your

25

presentation and then we can discuss it. 1 MR. LEEPER: Okay. Well, I will not refer to 2 the side yard or the hard surfaces because now I'm 3 4 not sure that my numbers are correct. Were my 5 numbers acceptable? 6 MR. RYDER: Your overage square foot numbers 7 are correct. 8 MR. LEEPER: Okay. 9 MR. RYDER: It's your percentages. 10 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: He's asking about the 11 side-yard encroachments now. 12 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Those numbers are correct as stated. 13 14 MEMBER WILLIAMS: Those are fine. 15 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: It's five foot over on one and ten foot. 16 17 MR. LEEPER: Can we go off the record for just a moment? 18 19 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Absolutely. 20 (Whereupon, a discussion was held off the 21 record.) CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Back on the record. 22 23 MR. RYDER: Mr. Leeper, let me ask you a question. The letter of denial -- I don't want to 24 25 beat a dead horse -- but it shows the numbers

_ _

there. Did you not look at the letter of denial that I issued?

MR. LEEPER: Yes, but we didn't -- we had already submitted the notations that we had, and I didn't see a commentary on that, so I didn't notice that.

MR. RYDER: Okay. Because the petition comes in after the letter of denial. You need the letter of denial to file the petition.

MR. LEEPER: Right.

MR. RYDER: That's why I'm just --

MR. LEEPER: I understand.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And to put it in context, the percentages are very significant by our standards, very significant.

MR. LEEPER: All right. Well, I started this entire process with a conversation about this whole thing so that we were compliant, and the discussion about being compliant was at the time that we were compliant, and it was afterward with an apology that it turned out that we weren't compliant, and that's why we're here this evening, because instead of deciding to simply throw everything out, I guess we were encouraged to move forward because we were only adding a small area

to the property which is the 342 square feet. And because we were adding it into an area where at one time apparently there was a moratorium for the side yard and we had 10 feet, which is what we're continuing to propose, and because of where it is relative to the street view because it's -- if you're looking at the photographs again, as I mentioned in this petition, it's hidden, you really can't see where this addition is and it's 135 feet from the closest property on that side.

It meets the requirements of drainage. We had a soil boring done and did drainage calculations. We did shading to show that we are not shading significantly to cause any harm to any other property. That we're not really restricting access to emergency equipment or any safety conditions, that we meet the criteria of New York State law for the five reasons I gave to make this request.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So you have to understand, in the post-Sandy era, we have been very loathe and reluctant to allow any significant construction because the Village is suffering from issues of water, and we have to be very responsive to that problem. So unless there's some very,

very compelling needs or reasons, we are -- we look very -- what should I say -- we look very conservatively on any construction, and there has to be some very good reason to go forward with it.

MR. LEEPER: Well, one reason --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And certainly percentages of this magnitude we have not allowed recently.

MR. LEEPER: Well, one reason I can give based on what you just mentioned is that, one, we are, relatively speaking, approximately eight to ten feet above any flood area. We are uphill from where we actually are right now. This is actually high ground in the X zone. It's an excluded zone. So relatively speaking, this is one of the higher areas of Lawrence. So it's not in a flood area.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: One of our concerns is, yes, you're in a higher area, but that runoff is going to flow into the lower areas. It doesn't get absorbed into the ground. And that's what you're getting at, yeah, you're above the flood zone, well above it, but the folks below you are not. There is one other and I just --

MR. LEEPER: Can I just interrupt for just one moment?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Of course.

MR. LEEPER: The point of our drainage calculations and the dry wells that we're showing was for any built structure to collect that rainwater, and the only rainwater we otherwise would be talking about is the naturally occurring hillside or higher property which under any circumstances are not manmade and would have contributed to the downhill flow anyway. And I honestly thought that was the purpose of doing the drainage calculations and providing the proper retention.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: It's certainly one of the considerations, but again, we've been very reluctant to allow expansion in this post-Sandy era unless there's some compelling reason, or if it were a very narrow, you know, request. But we're talking about a property that has a lot going on already on the property. And the fact that the house, the other neighbor's house is at a distance is a consideration, but you are encroaching down to 10 feet to a property line. And we have not recently allowed any encroachment to that point.

MR. FIEDLER: I'm Marvin Fiedler, living at 34 Larch Hill Road. This is my wife Symma. We

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are the owners of 34 Larch Hill Road. living here already on that street for 25 years. I'm not doing this -- I'm not, you know, 35 years I'm not doing this for extra bedrooms or to make my house any nicer. I have spinal stenosis. I wear a brace on my foot. It's becoming more and more difficult for me to go up to the second And I can walk now; however, I look into the future, and I'm really looking to make a large bedroom there for myself when and if I need it. hope I don't, but that's really the main reason. It's not an aesthetic reason. It's not to make my house bigger. I'm not in that stage of life. And this is really why I'm doing it. So there is a very, very good reason. Because you're mentioning you don't really usually do it unless there's a This is a medical reason. reason.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We appreciate that. I know it was noted in the application and, of course, that plays an important role in our consideration. And then in such an instance we have to evaluate the size of the request, because we're supposed to really keep the approval to the minimum necessary to afford whatever kind of relief you may have. So at that point we would be

looking at, you know, exactly what's been
requested.

MR. FIEDLER: I mean, I have no neighbors at
all anyplace around me. I mean, the house that
was on Larch Hill Road, it's gone.

11.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: It's gone from the Heller estate.

MR. FIEDLER: I have the whole park. I used to have two houses there. There's a whole park there. I'm not really infringing on anybody's property. They can't even see it, there's nothing there, which I was very happy about it, but there's total privacy there. I can't see anybody. It's on the side there where nobody can even see it from the front of the house, from the side of the house, you know.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You won't tell anybody, right?

MR. FIEDLER: I won't.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So Mr. Chairman, if I can mention something to Mr. Ryder.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: One question: Was there ever a variance previously requested? You're over right now on existing on the surface area. Is that how the house has been all the years?

MR. FIEDLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So Mr. Ryder, and this is going back to your letter of denial in the third paragraph. I believe there's an error. So we need to adjust the variance accordingly, adjust the request. It seems to me on the plans there are two 10-foot side-yard requests, and on the denial it looks as if there's one 10-foot request for 25-foot aggregate. I believe it's 20-feet aggregate. It doesn't really change the application or its decision. It should just be pointed out that there are two side yards that are 10 feet.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Ed, what are you saying?

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: There's 10 feet on this

side, 10 feet on this side, but this indicates

there's an aggregate of 25 feet. The aggregate is

20 feet.

MR. RYDER: Fifteen on one side and 10 on the other. That gives an aggregate of 25.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I see two 10s.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: It's 10, 10 and 15. The 15 is the one.

MR. RYDER: The aggregate is the other side,

1 |

Ed.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: All the way to the left.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: It's 15, but on that same
-- on that same plane it's also 10 feet where the extension is.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Those are both 10. That's 10 and the other side is 15.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: But there's another side yard here. So you're considering that as one side yard?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Off the record.

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

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Back on the record.

Can you share with us what you're adding.

MR. LEEPER: In terms of space --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Whatever you're expanding has to relate somehow to the need. So if you can describe -- we're looking at the first-floor plan. I guess can you describe exactly what you're adding.

MR. LEEPER: Yes. We are adding a bedroom. We're adding a bathroom for that bedroom, and a laundry space that's expanded from the existing laundry that's adjacent to that. And we're

Fiedler - 3/18/151 expanding the kitchen. The kitchen is expanding 2 by -- well, two feet out into the area of what was 3 the room next-door. MS. FIEDLER: We're not adding a bedroom. 4 5 have a small bedroom there. We're just making it 6 larger. 7 MR. LEEPER: There is a bedroom. 8 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: One person speak at a 9 time, otherwise she won't be able to. 10 MR. LEEPER: There is a small bedroom, but we 11 are enlarging the footprint of that space, of that 12 bedroom space. 13 MEMBER WILLIAMS: That's where it says quest 14 room? 15 16 17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LEEPER: Yes, that is the guest room, and we are -- it was a bathroom. We are putting in a bathroom for that expanded bedroom. And as I mentioned, we have an expanded laundry that was expanded from the adjacent laundry which was part of the kitchen area, and the kitchen is being enlarged.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Which way is it going out, which way?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Let's go off the record. (Whereupon, a discussion was held off the

record.)

•

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: What's the size of the quest room?

MR. LEEPER: The new guest room is 13 feet one inch wide, and it's 16 feet deep.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: And the adjoining bathroom, please?

MR. LEEPER: The adjoining bathroom is 8 feet 4 wide, and it's 7 feet 7 and three-quarters to the angle. It's about 8 feet across, otherwise.

MEMBER SCHRECK: And the laundry room?

MR. LEEPER: It's just that there's a corner of it you can see is taken off mainly so that we meet the continued template.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So you wouldn't go past the 10-foot encroachment to keep it within?

MR. LEEPER: Exactly, exactly. Again, at the very beginning of the planning of this the information that I got was different than it was once we submitted it, and we had worked to a zoning requirement that basically changed. And in the process I had to go back to Dr. and Mrs. Fiedler and ask them did they want to continue because of the fact that the information had now changed. And they felt that yes, they

felt that we had gone this far and this was a need that he, Dr. Fiedler, has expressed to me several times that he really has a need for, and so I am compelled as his architect to proceed.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: When you said the information changed --

MR. LEEPER: Yes.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: -- the zoning laws?

MR. LEEPER: No. I make it a point with every municipality that I work with to go in first, present what we are planning on doing and discuss what we are planning on doing, and basically from that do a zoning analysis with the representative from the municipality. Not on my own, in an office somewhere, but at the counter or in an office at the municipality.

The reason I do that is because often, as often as possible, I like to avoid such a hearing as this if it's possible, and in that case the information I had to work from was what this was developed into. And later on, I found out that as I said, again, with an apology that what I had been told was not in fact exactly what needed to be done and that it would definitely require a zoning variance. Of course, that was a

disappointment to us as well because it wouldn't have been our pleasure to stand before a Zoning Board if we didn't have to. But we found ourselves in that situation, and the choice was then to try to modify this in some other way which presented a hardship in several different ways, and therefore, it would have cost the Fiedlers more for them to have to have us change everything. It would have taken space a different way. It would have caused structural issues. It would have caused plumbing issues. It would have caused drainage issues.

I had to look at all of that; I had to evaluate all of that. The decision was that since we weren't asking for a large area and that we were able to put this in the most innocuous place we could find on the property relative to the distance to the neighboring property and the distance to the street and the relative view from the street, this was the best choice and that's why we're here this evening.

MR. FIEDLER: If I may.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Please.

MR. FIEDLER: The problem was there is a -- in the very, very beginning we were told that we

1 were going to get a one-time exemption and somehow 2 that didn't work out either. I don't really 3 understand what it meant, but that's what they 4 told us. 5 MR. LEEPER: It was for the distance between 25 feet and 10-foot distance. 6 7 MR. RYDER: I can explain that. The one-time 8 exemption is for an existing house line. You're 9 allowed the one-time exemption to continue it 10 either front or back. Here this is an addition to 11 the house. There's no existing house line. 12 That's why the side yard. 13 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: That's how they get you. 14 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Bait and switch. 15 MR. LEEPER: It was concerning, to say the 16 least, and again, it's not our pleasure to have to 17 make this request. 18 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Most people enjoy coming 19 here. 20 MR. LEEPER: That was a nice way of putting 21 the fact that we really --22 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Capobianco, don't you 23 enjoy coming here? 24 MR. CAPOBIANCO: Love it.

MEMBER SCHRECK: How large is that laundry

25

1 room? 2 3 is exactly what I would want. 4 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Yes. 5 6 laundry room? 7 8 9 10 a closet in the existing house. 11 12 13 it? 14 15 16 17 18 MR. LEEPER: Correct. 19 20 21 (No response.) 22 23

2.4

25

MR. LEEPER: If I were a zoning attorney this MEMBER SCHRECK: What is the size of the MR. LEEPER: The size of the laundry space is 8 feet 4 -- I'm sorry, wait a second. It's 9 feet 2 by 5 feet 7 and a half. Currently, it's MEMBER WILLIAMS: Is that the entire second floor? Is that what it is? The picture we have here of the second floor plan, is it only part of MR. LEEPER: That's just a cut-away of the area that contributes to the load. MEMBER WILLIAMS: So there's more. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Is there anyone in the audience who wants to speak to the matter? CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Here's what we're going to do. As you indicated, there are statutory criteria that we have to observe in evaluating a

request for the variance. And the essence is to

Fiedler - 3/18/15

weigh the benefit to the applicant against any detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the neighborhood. I think if we look at your request, and take into consideration the particular circumstances of the applicant and his need to move the master bedroom to the first floor, and he's already warned me that I'm going to have to face that as well, so I think if we just focus on the fact that it's really only 342 feet of overage, and I think we can look at that a little bit differently, and I think we may give appropriate consideration to, you know, the particular need in this case. And so I would think that the benefit to the applicant in this case would outweigh, considering the fact that it doesn't look like there will be any issues of water spill-off and the like and it will be absorbed by the dry wells, et cetera.

And so I will pass it to my colleagues to vote. Mr. Schreck.

MEMBER SCHRECK: I'm going to vote for.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Gottlieb.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I vote for.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mrs. Williams.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: For.

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

Fiedler - 3/18/15

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And I will vote for as 1 2 well. And we'll give you two years, and so it 3 doesn't mean you have to take it. MR. RYDER: Mr. Chairman, I don't think it's 4 5 visible from the street, so no Board of Building 6 Design. 7 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Wonderful. Thank you very 8 much. 9 Thank you. MS. FIEDLER: Thank you. 10 MR. FIEDLER: 11 (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 12 8:08 p.m.) ****** 13 14 Certified that the foregoing is a true and 15 accurate transcript of the original stenographic 16 minutes in this case. 17 May Benci 18 19 MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter 20 21 22

23

24

25

1	INCORPO	RATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		
4		Village Hall 196 Central Avenue
5		Lawrence, New York
6		March 18, 2015 8:08 p.m.
7		L.
8	APPLICATION:	Gottlieb 96 Chauncey Lane Lawrence, New York
9		
10	PRESENT:	
11	II.	MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
12		MR. MARK SCHRECK
13	II.	Member
14		MS. ESTHER WILLIAMS Member
15		MR. KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ.
16	El .	Village Attorney
17	1)	MR. MICHAEL RYDER Building Department
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		Many Danai DDD
25		Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter

1	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The last matter this
2	evening is the family Gottlieb.
3	MR. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Chairman, I request that I
4	recuse myself in this application and I'll walk
5	away from the
6	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Well, you can advocate for
7	yourself.
8	MR. GOTTLIEB: I would prefer to do it from
9	the other side of the Bench.
10	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Of course, of course, and
11	you're bringing your entire family forward.
12	MR. GOTTLIEB: Okay, thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think, Mr. Gottlieb,
14	your colleagues would like to meet your family.
15	MR. GOTTLIEB: Family, would you care to step
16	forward.
17	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: All these years, we never
18	had the opportunity.
19	MR. GOTTLIEB: I'd like to introduce myself,
20	Edward Gottlieb, and Stefanie Gottlieb are the
21	applicants, 96 Chauncey Lane, Lawrence, New York.
22	I'm accompanied by my wife, Mrs. Gottlieb, and her
23	youngest and only son, but our youngest child,
24	Eric, who occasionally appears.
25	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Welcome to the Board of

Zoning Appeals.

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22 23

24

25

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

MR. GOTTLIEB: By introduction, I've been living in our house for 29 years, almost 30 years, living in the Village since we first got married in 1983. We're not new to the Village of Lawrence. We've been rather involved in various organizations and institutions within the Village, and we plan to stay in our home for the foreseeable future, and then some.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Did you have any prior variances?

MR. GOTTLIEB: Not that I'm aware of. Nor do I believe the prior owners had any variances. house dates back to 1892, and I believe that there were no zoning laws then by the position of our house.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The Indians were living there at the time.

MR. GOTTLIEB: So our proposal is a one-story addition to the rear of the house. It will consist of an enlarged kitchen, a small family room and a quest room.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Is there any need?

MR. GOTTLIEB: Yes. The need is that our house was built in 1892 and is substantially insufficient in size. We have a small kitchen. The house doesn't really function well in terms of in order to get to the kitchen from the front of the house you need to walk through a hallway, the living room, dining room, transition room, and then you're in the kitchen.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: By then you've lost your appetite.

MR. GOTTLIEB: By then you've lost half your groceries, I'm told.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I see.

MR. GOTTLIEB: So the need is that although we've been living in our house for many years and raised our three children here, my wife and I find that it's really quite insufficient in size, as well as it's -- as well as the flow.

Our architect, Mr. Capobianco, is here who has redesigned the home so that it's going to be a center hall -- center hall --

MR. CAPOBIANCO: No, it's a side hall.

MR. GOTTLIEB: It's still going to be a side-hall colonial, but there will be access. You can walk through the house instead of around the

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

house to get into the kitchen. I'll just make my few points.

So we live in a Residence C2, and in C2 the side yards are much closer than in perhaps much of the rest of the Village. So there are seven houses on Auerbach Lane. We are the seventh house from starting at Main Street going down Auerbach Lane, and our rear yard would be their side yard. They all have side yards that are parallel to Auerbach, but in our case it's called a rear yard.

So because it's our rear yard, we have a 30-foot rear-yard requirement, while our neighbor just to the north has a 15-foot side-yard requirement. We're asking you to consider that in our extension. We're not looking to go to the 15-foot line, only to approximately 23 feet.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: 22.9, yeah.

MR. GOTTLIEB: 22.9. I'm trying not to keep this going on too long.

There was no other practical way to accomplish this expansion without requesting relief of the Zoning Board. We've worked with our architect for over a year, and the intent was not to come before the Board. Unfortunately, we came so close and couldn't accomplish our goals without

coming before the Board; therefore, we are here tonight seeking a 7-foot rear-yard variance.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Can you bring it down to 5 feet?

MR. GOTTLIEB: Can we negotiate here? We are not going to request any surface coverage, building coverage, height/setback ratio, front yard, side yard, just one small 7-foot rear-yard encroachment.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: How do the neighbors feel about it?

MR. GOTTLIEB: Our neighbors, I do have a few letters of support, just a few. Some I believe were E-mailed to you.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Yes.

MR. GOTTLIEB: So we have letters from Kelly Gott, who has appeared before the Board before. I have a letter from the Oliners, the Cascardis, the Bienstoks who live directly across the street, the Brickells who are the house next door. They have also appeared before the Board. And the Steins, who are the most affected and they are next-door as well. In fact, you will find there are two letters from the Brickells.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: He and she?

MR. GOTTLIEB: I'm sorry?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: He and she?

MR. GOTTLIEB: No, actually they're both from he, but he sent them twice, two different letters, two different E-mails. So the seven letters I'll submit as an exhibit, the only exhibit, Exhibit 1.

MR. RYDER: Applicant's Exhibit.

MR. GOTTLIEB: Applicant's Exhibit, thank you.

Mr. Capobianco, would you care to explain.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: Yes. Architecturally, we're hoping to -- well, we're going to --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Hoping to.

MR. CAPOBIANCO: Well, we're going to match the existing siding, vinyl siding. It could be a cedar impression in a cream color, tan color. The roof would tie in to the existing roof. So basically, it's a one-story extension which will improve those lines, and it kind of just squares off the back of the house. And you've seen the elevation. There's also a fireplace that would project slightly -- which is a two-foot projection which would go into the rear yard as well. The fireplace would be in the center of the family room. It would be only a one-story height. It

would not be a chimney; it would be a gas type fireplace with a direct vent. And the deck to the side which is immediately to the east will be a Trex or some kind of a maintenance-free product that would blend in nicely with the siding. And the railing would also match the railing that was there before.

It's fairly simple, I think. The two sides line up. The extension lines up with the existing house both on the west and the east side, and it's really a low, low height. It doesn't create any, I think, shadowing or any issues with that, with the neighbor. And I think it's a pretty good application. It's holding 21.2 on the side, which is really considered a side yard, not a front yard. And the front yard that exists is 24.9 at the corner of the deck to 17.3 at the other corner of the front entrance.

So because Chauncey is the narrower of the two lengths, Chauncey is the front yard, Auerbach is really the side yard, and opposite Chauncey is the rear yard, and that's why we are getting the variance.

MEMBER SCHRECK: Is there a lot of flooding in that area? Do we have to be concerned about

water runoff?

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. CAPOBIANCO: Have you had a lot of flooding in the area?

MR. GOTTLIEB: During Sandy we were very dry, if that's an indication, and typically there is no flooding. We're not in the flood zone. I would like to also point out that while we're looking at a 23-foot rear yard, we're maintaining almost a 48-foot side yard, and that was the purpose of turning the house sideways, so we're going to have a much larger side yard which will also be quieter because it won't be on Auerbach, it will be on Chauncey.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: While you're here do you want to ask for more?

MR. GOTTLIEB: Should I sit there?

MEMBER WILLIAMS: You're putting the bedroom downstairs?

MR. GOTTLIEB: The bedroom downstairs we don't foresee for ourselves. We have both of our mothers who are well into their eighties. happened was while we were planning this out, Stefanie's mother was briefly hospitalized and then had to stay at her brother's house because there was no place else for her to go, and it made

1 us realize because we are doing this extension 2 that there wasn't very much more to put in a 3 roughly 10-by-10 room, and we had the ability to take care of either one of our mothers when we get 4 5 to that point. 6 MEMBER WILLIAMS: Very smart. 7 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Very noble. 8 MEMBER WILLIAMS: I think it's smart to have 9 a bedroom on the downstairs floor. 10 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. Any further questions of the Board? Is there anyone in the 11 12 audience who wants to speak to the matter? 13 (No response.) 14 MR. GOTTLIEB: Eric, do you have any 15 comments? 16 ERIC GOTTLIEB: No. 17 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Okay. The statutory 18 criteria suggests that we should weigh the benefit 19 to the applicant as opposed to any detriment to 20 the neighborhood. And I think having done so 21 we're very comfortable with the very modest 2.2 request before us. It's a nice change to have 23 Mr. Capobianco representing someone who is not

MR. CAPOBIANCO: Given the fact it's a rear

24

25

over the top.

Τ	extension and will match any siding, will this	
2	need to go before the Board of Building Design?	
3	MR. RYDER: Yes. But we could still move the	
4	permit along, if that's an issue.	
5	MR. CAPOBIANCO: Okay.	
6	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: That's a good idea.	
7	Mrs. Williams.	
8	MEMBER WILLIAMS: For.	
9	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Mr. Schreck.	
10	MEMBER SCHRECK: For.	
11	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And I vote for.	
12	How much time do you need, four years?	
13	MR. CAPOBIANCO: Two years.	
14	MR. GOTTLIEB: Mr. Capobianco says two years.	
15	MR. CAPOBIANCO: Two years.	
16	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And without further ado,	
17	we adjourn. Wishing you all a happy Passover	
18	season.	
19	MR. CAPOBIANCO: Thank you, you too.	
20	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at	
21	8:30 p.m.)	
22	***************	
23		
24		

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

MARY BENCI, RPR

Court Reporter