1	INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2	BOARD OF APPEALS
3	
4	Village Hall 196 Central Avenue
5	Lawrence, New York
6	November 18, 2015 7:33 p.m.
7	APPLICATION: Lowy
8	9 Lakeside Drive West Lawrence, New York
9	
10	PRESENT:
11	MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Acting Chairman
12	MS. ESTHER WILLIAMS
13	Member
14 15	MR. DANIEL HILLER Member
16	MR. KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ. Village Attorney
17	MR. GERALDO CASTRO
18	Building Department
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter
25	

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Lawrence. The meeting is called to order. Welcome.

Mr. Castro, do you have proof of posting?

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

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Terrific.

Chairman Keilson is not here tonight, nor is Mr. Schreck, but we do have myself, Mr. Hiller and Mrs. Williams. We're here to serve you.

I believe we have an adjournment request for this evening for the matter of Lowy. Is anyone here for that application?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: So we shall adjourn this to the next meeting. Is that what was requested? MR. CASTRO: It's just adjourned.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Adjourned until further notice?

MR. CASTRO: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Okay.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at

7:36 p.m.)

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

Mary Biner.

1	INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2	BOARD OF APPEALS
3	
4 5	Village Hall 196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
6	November 18, 2015 7:36 p.m.
7	APPLICATION: Marx
8	Marx 5 & 7 Keewaydin Road Lawrence, New York
10	PRESENT:
11	MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB
12	Acting Chairman
13	MS. ESTHER WILLIAMS Member
14	MR. DANIEL HILLER Member
16	MR. KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ. Village Attorney
17	MR. GERALDO CASTRO
18	Building Department
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	M =
25	Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter

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

MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter

1	INCO	RPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		
4		Village Hall 196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5		November 18, 2015
6		7:37 p.m.
7	APPLICATION:	Wolfson
. 8		1019 New McNeal Avenue
9		Lawrence, New York
10	PRESENT:	
11	11	MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Acting Chairman
12	4	MS. ESTHER WILLIAMS
13		Member
14 15		MR. DANIEL HILLER Member
16		MR. KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ. Village Attorney
17		MR. GERALDO CASTRO
18		Building Department
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		Mary Benci, RPR
25		Court Reporter

1 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: The matter of the Wolfson 2 residence. Is anyone here for the Wolfson 3 residence? 4 (No response.) 5 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: There's a request for a 6 six-month extension. The letter indicates the 7 reasons why, and exactly they're asking for six 8 months. I suggest we give them the six months 9 requested. 10 MEMBER HILLER: I agree. 11 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Mrs. Williams. 12 MEMBER WILLIAMS: I agree. 13 MR. GRAY: Just to clarify, that's an 14 extension to March 17th, 2016? 15 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: September to March would 16 be, yes, that would be correct. 17 MR. GRAY: Okay, thank you. 18 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: It's good to have 19 clarity. 20 MEMBER WILLIAMS: They were asking for six 21 months from September, not from today's date, 22 right. 23 MR. GRAY: Yes. That's the way I read the 24 letter. 25 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Right.

Wolfson - 11/18/15 (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 7:39 p.m.) Certified that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the original stenographic minutes in this case. MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter

1	INCORPC	RATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		Village Hall 196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5		November 18, 2015
6		7:39 p.m.
7	APPLICATION: Cha	Juniper Circle South
9		rence, New York
10	PRESENT:	
11 12		EDWARD GOTTLIEB ing Chairman
13	. [ESTHER WILLIAMS
14		DANIEL HILLER ber
15 16	II .	KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ. lage Attorney
17		GERALDO CASTRO
18	Bui	lding Department
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter
25		

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: The next item is the Chafetz application. Is there anyone here?

MS. ADLER: Hi.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Good evening, welcome.

MS. ADLER: I'm Esther Adler. I'm here from John Capobianco's office. I'm representing Sheldon and Rachel Chafetz. Sheldon and Rachel Chafetz are requesting relief from the code, from three sections of the code in order to construct a pool, a swimming pool.

Mrs. Chafetz suffers from osteoporosis, and the doctor has recommended that she exercise daily, and her preferred method of exercise is swimming. We have a doctor's note.

They're requesting relief from the code for surface area coverage. There's a maximum of 3,863 square feet allowed. There's actually a typo in the letter that was given to us. We requested 4,146 feet, which is an overage of seven percent, and the denial letter must have misread the four as a nine, so it's actually only seven percent instead of eight percent over.

They're also requesting a rear-yard variance. MEMBER WILLIAMS: One second. You said instead of eight percent it is --

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: So go back and tell us, which letter has the wrong amount? It's the denial letter from the Village?

MS. ADLER: The denial letter, yes. It should be 4,146.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: I see.

MS. ADLER: So it's really an overage of 267, I think, which is 7.3 percent.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Okay. I'm sorry, go ahead.

MS. ADLER: They're requesting a rear-yard setback variance for the pool, which we are hoping shouldn't be too much of a problem because there are no rear neighbors. There's only Rock Hall Road back there. So they're requesting 11 feet on one side, 12 feet on the other side.

And they're also requesting relief from the side-yard setback, which should be 15 feet, just for their filter and hot water heater. They wanted it screened. Where the house steps back a little bit on the edge, they're requesting six and a half foot side yard for that.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: I'm sorry, can you just point it out again. I was looking in the other direction.

MS. ADLER: Sure. Here the house steps back

2

3

4

5

6

7

a little bit, a few feet, and so they're requesting to put it here so it's shielded from the front, and of course, they'll screen it in with some planting.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Where are the current mechanicals for the HVAC?

MS. ADLER: That is also along that edge, existing.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Okay. Is pool equipment typically quieter than HVAC, or about the same?

MS. ADLER: It's slightly quieter, yes.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Okay. My concern is the proximity of the equipment to neighbors. You know, why is the HVAC against the neighbor's house instead of against the street where the sound wouldn't echo between the two houses?

MS. ADLER: That's a valid concern.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: But that's already there.

MS. ADLER: My clients, I think, are willing to negotiate on that because we have found out afterwards that the neighbors are not thrilled about this.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Are the neighbors here? MS. ADLER: Yes. Should I wait for them to talk first? I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: We will ask them to speak. We certainly will.

MS. ADLER: So that can be moved, if necessary.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Okay. So I have some fundamental questions about -- I don't know whether you are done or not.

MS. ADLER: I'm done.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: I have some fundamental questions about the application. We received these applications about ten days before. We look at it, and I see a proposed extension. And I don't see any interior plans, but I see there's something proposed here, and then I went to the house to look at it and the house is not as portrayed in the pictures. The pictures show a house that may have been there some time ago, but now when I look at the pictures it doesn't portray the house. The house was extended I don't know how many feet further back, because it wasn't clear, and I also didn't quite follow it on the zoning calculations on page N1 of 2. There's a principal building of 596 feet.

Now, what I'm confused about is that are we considering -- we're not talking about a principal

addition, but yet it's on the calculations, that there's a principal building, proposed patio, rear patio upper deck, driveways, walkways, brick planter, chimney and then a proposed pool at the very end of 490 feet.

So I was looking at this and I was rather confused. You're talking about a pool, and then on the application I'm seeing all these additional things, and by the way they don't add up because I think not all of it is added together.

MS. ADLER: Okay. So that must be -- those plans were submitted to the Village and they were as of right and they were already approved and so the work's already been done. That should have been taken off of this plan since this was a new application just for the swimming pool. It should not say proposed. It should say existing addition. That's that. And --

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Can I ask you, when was this work done?

MS. ADLER: When was the work done?

MS. CHAVETZ: Pretty recently.

MR. CHAVETZ: Finished May, June, May and June, completed this past June.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: You had four months to

amend this application.

MR. CHAVETZ: The pool was supposed to be applied for then, but there was no one here.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: You know what, can I ask you to step up. Come on up. We like to meet our neighbors.

MR. GRAY: Can we just have your name and address.

MR. CHAVETZ: Sure, Sheldon Chafetz.

The pool individual wanted to install the pool and wanted to get it done during the summer, but because of the surface -- I'm not even sure of the details, but we needed a variance to go through, and the application was put in but apparently there was no one here to review it for a few months. That's what I was told. And at that point now it was reviewable, and that's why we're here tonight.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Okay, thank you.

My concern, Mrs. Adler, was that I didn't quite understand the application, and maybe it should have been bifurcated into one part was for -- you know, I know Mr. Capobianco is certainly capable, and so are you, of preparing a different document so that we would better

2 3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

understand it.

MS. ADLER: Well, I did update it on this version tonight because I did see that that was an older version. I probably should have brought copies for everyone, but this one doesn't show -it just shows that house as existing and it has all the updated surface coverage breakdown.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: It's a little disconcerting, and what makes it more confusing is that usually when someone wants to work on a house they come with a total plan, and this Board makes their decisions based on the entire plan. So you're asking for X amount of overage. Had you come to us with the entire plan of the construction and the pool, together, that would have been a whole different picture than what you're giving us now in terms of our judgment. you realize that?

MS. ADLER: Okay.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Basically, you did everything you possibly could do, and now you want a variance on a pool.

MS. ADLER: Honestly, I'm not sure -- I don't think that's how it went down.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: I know, but that's the

position we're being put into.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. ADLER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: We could have had you talk about your willingness to negotiate something. At that point we may have said to you we can't possibly allow this, but if you bring the house in three feet, the pool might work. Now that's not an option to discuss. It's either the pool is yes or no. There's no --

MEMBER WILLIAMS: You put us in a very uncomfortable position.

MS. ADLER: I understand.

When you originally did the drawings for the house, was the pool like a decision that you did after?

MR. CHAVETZ: It was always thought of at the time, but we certainly didn't know and I didn't even think about the cost involved at the time.

MS. CHAVETZ: It was a cost issue. We wanted to see how much we would have left after construction. Then once we saw that there was something that we would be able to afford, that's when we decided and we went back to John and he helped us with that.

MS. ADLER: Because I know, personally, from

my standpoint, I wasn't even working at the office at the time when their construction was done. And I've been working --

MEMBER WILLIAMS: I'm not saying anything was done deviously. Don't misunderstand. I'm just explaining why this is a really uncomfortable way to bring it to us, because basically you're saying is this pool okay, and pretty much it's not. Had you done this a different way, it might have been.

MS. ADLER: So as far as I know, they wanted to do the construction, and the pool was an afterthought.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: They got their cake and eating it too, but it's not necessarily the way to go. I just wanted to explain it, and I'm not saying it was done in any devious manner. I'm saying it puts us in a position where we have to make a judgment on something that's much more difficult to judge than had it been done differently.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Not to mention, it's hard to read the plan.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: And John should know better.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: John knows better. He's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

been here very often.

MR. GRAY: Do you have smaller versions of that updated board?

MS. ADLER: No, I don't, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Would any one of the neighbors like to speak about the application?

MS. FISHMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Come on up.

MS. FISHMAN: My name is Rochelle Fishman. live at 205 Juniper Circle South, which is east of the Chafetz house.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: This is your house, correct (indicating)?

MS. FISHMAN: Right next-door.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: She's the house next-door.

MS. FISHMAN: From my understanding, they are putting the motor of the pool right adjacent to our house. They're building all the way out as far out, close to the end of the property, and the motor will be there, and it will create a lot of noise and a lot of disturbance to us. So we're suggesting if they could put the motor someplace else, near Rock Hall Road or on the other side near Lawrence Avenue, it would be much more

comfortable for us.

The second thing is that I -- from the plans that I saw, they're supposed to be putting a fence in between the two properties, and from what I understand now they're not putting a fence, they're putting in trees.

MS. ADLER: No, I believe they are putting in a fence.

MR. CHAVETZ: We are putting in a fence, yeah.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Mrs. Fishman, you're saying that you would prefer a fence?

MS. FISHMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: She probably would prefer both.

MEMBER HILLER: You're required to have a fence.

MS. FISHMAN: No, this is between the properties.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: So the plan is to have a fence?

MS. ADLER: Yes, all the way down.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Did you two have a discussion about this?

MR. CHAVETZ: Yes, a couple of hours ago.

1	MS. ADLER: It's in our plans also. It was	
2	in our plans.	
3	MEMBER WILLIAMS: So if they would move the	
4	apparatus and the fence would be put up?	
5	MS. FISHMAN: I have no problem.	
6	MEMBER WILLIAMS: Okay, thank you.	
7	CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Thank you.	
8	MS. ADLER: Thank you.	
9	CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: So let me go over the	
10	three variances again. When we're talking about	
11	the side-yard setback, and you mentioned that was	
12	for the apparatus?	
13	MS. ADLER: Yes.	
14	CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Are we in conformance	
15	with the side-yard setback for the pool?	
16	MS. ADLER: Yes.	
17	CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: So then the side-yard	
18	setback for the pool is 15 feet on each side?	
19	MS. ADLER: We have 16 on one side and 19 on	
20	the other.	
21	CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: And is the 19 because	
22	it's a corner lot, or that wasn't what triggered	
23	the 19? And again, I don't	
24	MS. ADLER: Well, because it's a 34-foot	
25	pool.	

1	CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: I mean, it's existing 19?	
2	MS. ADLER: No, no, for the pool. We're	
3	proposing 16 foot from one side and 19 feet from	
4	the other side.	
5	MR. GRAY: From here to the pool is 19 feet.	
6	CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: What is required?	
7	MS. ADLER: 15.	
8	MR. GRAY: 15.	
9	CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Okay. And 15 over here	
10	is required?	
11	MR. GRAY: And they have 16.	
12	CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: And there's no	
13	requirement for surface coverage on the pavers?	
14	MR. GRAY: No.	
15	CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: These are Danforth	
16	pavers?	
17	MR. GRAY: Around the pool?	
18	MS. ADLER: Pavers.	
19	CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: So if we move the if	
20	we ask you to move the equipment	
21	MS. ADLER: Yes.	
22	CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: to the other side or	
23	to a place that would be it's funny, that was	
24	the first thing I asked you.	
25	MS. ADLER: Yes, you were 100 percent right	

1 about that. CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: That would eliminate one 2 of the three variances, right? 3 4 MS. ADLER: Right. 5 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Let's assume you're going 6 to do that. Now, the next one is 20 feet rear yard versus 8 11 feet rear yard. I'm going in the order of how 9 it's easiest. And the third request is 7.3 percent overage in surface coverage. 10 11 Can I see the doctor's letter that you 12 mentioned you had? 13 MS. ADLER: Sure. 14 MEMBER HILLER: It's in the folder. 15 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: I didn't see it. 16 MEMBER HILLER: It's there. 17 MS. ADLER: It should be there. 18 MEMBER HILLER: Here it is (handing). 19 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Oh, I didn't know that 20 was a doctor's letter. Just give me a moment 21 while I think individually we consider this 22 application. 23 MEMBER WILLIAMS: Can I ask you a question? 24 MS. ADLER: Yes. 25 MEMBER WILLIAMS: What is the distance,

1 because it's really hard to see this, and tell 2 John this is really upsetting. 3 MS. ADLER: I will tell him. MEMBER WILLIAMS: The back of the house to 4 5 the pool, what's the distance? 6 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Do we have it there? 7 MR. GRAY: No, it's not, but you might be 8 able to calculate it. 9 MEMBER WILLIAMS: I want to know from the 10 back of the house, what happens when the house ends. It's hard to see. It's hard to see what 11 12 this is. There's a deck. MS. ADLER: Right. 13 14 MEMBER HILLER: There's a deck. The deck is 15 high. 16 MS. ADLER: There's an upper-level deck and then there's pavers underneath. 17 18 MEMBER WILLIAMS: And how many feet is that 19 going out? 20 MS. ADLER: It's something like 13 feet, 21 something like that. 22 MEMBER WILLIAMS: That exists now already? 23 MS. ADLER: Pardon me? 24 MEMBER WILLIAMS: Does that exist now 25 already?

MS. ADLER: No, that's proposed.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: 13 feet proposed.

Then comes the next.

MS. ADLER: There's like a five-foot gap and the swimming pool.

MEMBER HILLER: So 18 feet.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: So you have 18 feet, and then the swimming pool; is that right?

MEMBER HILLER: You could remove all of your problems by just shortening the pavers and moving the pool back to 20 feet from the back, and you have eliminated all of your problems.

MS. ADLER: I think the clients wanted a little bit of backyard space.

MEMBER HILLER: I understand. But they also

-- and everybody is happy that they're able to

maximize their home and build it to its limits,

but now you're asking for something additional

which by as of right you don't have, and also the

tendency would be to deny this application because

it violates things in the building code. So you

eliminate that problem if the pool is moved 9 feet

closer to the house, you have the 20 feet, you

have no problem and you'll work around that.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: And you'll eliminate the

variance.

MEMBER HILLER: You'll have the coverage, the surface coverage.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: You'll just have the surface coverage, but you're coming with one variance instead of three.

MS. ADLER: I don't know if there really is enough room though to the upper-level deck which is constructed already.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Okay. That's what I was trying to explain to you before. You really put me between a rock and a hard place. You put it up, and now I can't come up with any options. It says can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved by some other method. Yes, it could have been achieved by some other method.

MEMBER HILLER: We're trying to help you.

MS. ADLER: No, I understand.

MEMBER HILLER: So I understand that the upper deck is there. But by moving the pool, you are down to only one violation of the code, which would make it a lot easier.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Or, the pool is 14 feet wide?

MS. ADLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Is this to be a lap pool? Because maybe, and I'm not here to negotiate the size of your pool, but I'm here to try to get the variances minimized in the least possible way, maybe instead of 14 feet you could have a 9-foot pool.

MS. ADLER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: That would take off 105 square feet from your surface, and it would bring you in, so you're that much closer. These are options of which I'm sure you must have looked at or discussed with your clients.

MS. ADLER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Because our calendar is light tonight, we'll give you time to discuss it.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Do you want to talk to each other?

MS. ADLER: Okay.

MR. GRAY: We're going to go off the record at this point.

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

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Mrs. Adler, while you're talking with your clients, we realized that we're in November and you're probably not going to be

even starting this until the spring.

As a group, as a Board, we're very unhappy with these plans. We don't like the fact that we really can't see this, even with my glasses. I can't follow the plans. The pictures are not up-to-date. The application is really not acceptable.

So we're going to suggest that we adjourn this until a further date when proper plans can be submitted with proper pictures and a revised application. This will give you plenty of time to speak with your clients and perhaps come back with something that's more suitable.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: And please put in the new plans exactly where you plan to put the apparatus that Mrs. Fishman was speaking about.

MS. ADLER: Okay.

MR. CHAVETZ: Can I just interject a second?

The pool, they were planning on putting the

pool in before the winter and they were anticipating the October meeting and the end of September, and they couldn't get on because no one was here to review it. I'm just relaying what the pool people wanted to do. They wanted to put it in before the winter. They said they have a

two-week window until about December 15th to do it.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Any which way, you would have to amend the plans because they're not acceptable the way they are. I don't know how you would do that.

MR. CHAVETZ: That's beyond me, obviously.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Yeah, because we would have to make the changes that we talked about anyway, some of them.

MR. CHAVETZ: You mean the apparatus moving?

MEMBER WILLIAMS: A, the apparatus; B, the

positioning of the pool. We have to discuss it.

MR. CASTRO: And the other thing is that even if it was to be approved, the variances, you then have to submit structurals for the pool. They have to be reviewed before a permit is issued. So that also takes time.

MR. GRAY: Okay. So is there a motion to adjourn for a further $\ensuremath{\text{--}}$

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Are you okay with that?

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Unless you want us to vote
on it.

MS. ADLER: No. Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: So a motion to adjourn,

construction plan or the pool plan?

MEMBER HILLER: Both.

MR. CHAVETZ: If it wasn't possible and the construction plans were submitted to the Village --

MEMBER WILLIAMS: The construction plans are fine. There's nothing wrong with what you did. Except, technically, having done it, we should say no to the pool.

MR. CHAVETZ: I understand the scenario, you're right.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: We could have, had you made it -- the variance would not have been as complicated because you wouldn't have it.

MR. CHAVETZ: Okay. I understand what you're saying.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: If that deck wasn't there, you would say, okay, I'll move back the pool, no problem. Now it's there and you've got a major variance that you're asking for, as opposed to what might have been not such a major variance.

MR. CHAVETZ: The fact that there aren't any neighbors behind there, I'm not sure why --

MEMBER WILLIAMS: That's a very fair question and I'll explain to you what happens. You're

Chavetz - 11/18/15 1 going to get it, and there's no neighbors behind you. And the guy next to you is going to get it, and there's no neighbors behind him. And then the guy next to him says my two neighbors have pools, but there is somebody behind him. And then there's a snowball effect and everybody has pools and everybody has neighbors who have issues. So according to the law, you really shouldn't be able to have one. We're making an exception. We have to think through it very carefully of what the effect is. MR. CHAVETZ: Okay, granted. this out.

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 WILLIAMS: We want to help you work

MR. GRAY: So is there a motion to adjourn this matter?

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: There was a motion to adjourn and it had passed.

MR. GRAY: Oh, it did?

MEMBER WILLIAMS: Yes.

MEMBER HILLER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: And we'll get you on the calendar as soon as the application is submitted to the Building Department.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: And give our message to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
11

MR. GRAY: Motion to adjourn the meeting?
CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Motion to adjourn, yes,

MEMBER HILLER: Yes.

John.

8:00.

MR. GRAY: A new record.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 8:00 p.m.)

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

MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter

Mary Benci