1	INCC	RPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE
2		BOARD OF APPEALS
3		
4		Village Hall 196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York
5	9 8	October 14, 2015
6		8:30 p.m.
7		
8	APPLICATION:	119 Laurel Lane
9		Lawrence, New York
10	PRESENT:	
11		MR. LLOYD KEILSON Chairman
12		
13		MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB Member
14		MR. MARK SCHRECK Member
15 16		MS. ESTHER WILLIAMS Member
17		MR. DANIEL HILLER Member
18		
19		MR. KENNETH A. GRAY, ESQ. Village Attorney
20		MR. GERALDO CASTRO Building Department
21		Bulluing Department
22		
23		
24		
25		Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter
		ă .

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The last matter of the evening is Haas, 119 Laurel Lane.

MR. CHARLES: Good evening, members of the Board. My name is Adam Charles, representing the office of John Capobianco, 159 Doughty Boulevard, Inwood, New York, and Mr. and Mrs. Haas, Adrian and Rachel.

If we look at our proposed addition at 119 Laurel Lane, we have a handful of existing nonconforming issues; side yard, rear yard, garage requirement, and height/setback ratios.

Essentially, what we're trying to do for the proposed addition is align it with the existing.

On the south side of the building we're building over an existing garage, as well as in the rear.

Mr. and Mrs. Haas have four children, four boys, and we're asking for a five-bedroom addition where there's existing five bedrooms.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I'm sorry. You have a five-bedroom house and you're looking to build a five-bedroom house?

MR. CHARLES: Correct.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Okay.

MR. CHARLES: Well, they have four growing boys and they need space to live.

Haas - 10/14/15MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So they're going to be larger bedrooms? MR. CHARLES: Larger bedrooms and they're each going to have their own bedroom on one floor. MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So it was five bedrooms not on one floor currently? MR. CHARLES: That's correct. MS. HAAS: No, four, we're four bedrooms. MR. CHARLES: Oh, existing four bedrooms, excuse me. you're doing this to add something.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: We're glad to see that

MR. CHARLES: The Village of Lawrence zoning code has a one-time exemption of ten feet which we're asking -- we have an existing condition of 9.1 side yard. And what we're asking for is to comply with that 9.1, as opposed to holding back a ten-foot side-yard requirement. Holding ten feet back, we would have to set the house, the addition, ten inches, which would be not cost effective for Mr. and Mrs. Haas, as well as not aligning with the existing architecture.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Do you mind if I interrupt you during your -- or do you want to speak?

MR. CHARLES: Of course, yes.

	11000 10711710
1	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Let's go, it's late.
2	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So what you're saying is
3	that as of right you could build the side yard,
4	you can build the addition on the where you
5	want to do this by right if it was just ten inches
6	over.
7	MR. CHARLES: That's correct. If the side
8	yard was ten feet.
9	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Right.
10	MR. CHARLES: We have an existing
11	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: You're ten inches short?
12	MR. CHARLES: That's correct.
13	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Because the ground floor is
14	ten inches closer to the neighbor.
15	MR. CHARLES: Essentially, an existing
16	nonconforming.
17	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: That's what's bringing you
18	here today.
19	MR. CHARLES: That's correct, as well as the
20	rear yard.
21	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: We didn't get to that yet.
22	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Well, let's get to it.
23	MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Okay.
24	MR. CHARLES: There is a rear-yard
25	requirement of 30 feet. The existing

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Tell us about the terrace.

Did it come out of the ground? Who built it?

MR. HAAS: Can I elaborate on that?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Step forward, provide your name and address for the record.

MR. HAAS: Adrian Haas, 119 Laurel Lane.

when we originally purchased the house, I think it was about nine years ago, we were living in Brooklyn, and we used a contractor by the name of Gus Contracting Company who originally filed the permits for the original work we were doing, and at the time we were supposed to build a deck. And I don't recall how it was drawn out by John Capobianco, but when it was actually built it ended up being built larger than what we requested from him. And that is how our rear terrace ended up being larger than it was.

Now, at the time, I don't recall exactly who from the Building Department came down to look at it or inspected it. I was still in Brooklyn; I wasn't even here yet. I just moved in, and in the hustle and bustle of moving we actually never closed out the original building permit which is why we are --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You have no C of O? 1 MR. HAAS: I don't believe we did on that 2 3 terrace. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Was that the only work 4 done before you moved in? 5 MR. HAAS: We put a new kitchen. You're 6 talking about from the exterior of the house? 7 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Anything that required 8 9 variances. 10 MR. HAAS: No, we didn't need any variances 11 the first time around. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Obviously, you did, right? 12 MR. HAAS: Well, John would have come here 13 14 and requested a variance. 15 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Don't you think we should 16 have John here tonight? Did he brief you on how 17 to --MR. CHARLES: Not on the application from 18 nine years ago, no. Just on the addition. 19 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So Gerry, can I ask you a 20 question. Can you have a CO on a house without 21 22 the entire premise being CO'd? 23 MR. CASTRO: It depends on how they permitted 24 it. If there are two permits, one for the 25 terrace, one for the house.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: It could be that they're living in a CO'd house, but there's no C of O for the terrace.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Do you have a CO on the house?

MR. HAAS: I don't believe we do. At the time whatever the contractor --

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: They had open files for years. Mayor Oliner made every effort to try to clean that up. Letters were sent out, threatening people with all kinds of evil.

MR. HAAS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: You've got a problem.

You've got a terrace that wasn't supposed to be and somehow is.

MR. CHARLES: Before the meeting started,
Mr. Wilamowsky, who resides just west of the
property, right behind his property, signed a
drawing that he's in support of this application.

Mr. Wilamowsky is not in charge of the Building Department or the Board of Zoning Appeals. If everybody did everything they wanted, we'd have

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I understand.

MR. CHARLES: Yes.

anarchy here, right?

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So I'm a little disturbed
that Mr. Capobianco is not here. He has the best
knowledge.

MR. CHARLES: For the application nine years
ago, yes.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I'm sure his memory is
still sufficiently acute to remember.

MR. HAAS: I spoke to Mr. Capobianco about the rear terrace. He told me that one of the issues in filing and going forward with this filing was that we had to close out the original building permit.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Well, it was that or it wasn't permitted.

MR. HAAS: Right.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: We're talking about a 30-foot requirement, right? The building is 25 feet and the terrace is ten feet. That's a fairly substantial terrace. Okay, so that's one of our problems.

MR. CHARLES: Are there any concerns on the addition to the house?

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Go ahead.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: What's the -- just first of

all, I was not aware that there was an issue that 1 this has an open CO since before you moved in. 2 That's a concern. But putting that aside for the 3 moment, we'll talk about it, what's the height of 4 the attic? 5 MR. CHARLES: I believe seven feet. 6 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Can you show me where that is or if that is in the plan. 8 MR. CHARLES: Do you have -- there's an attic 9 plan or a roof plan. 10 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: The last page, A4, okay. 11 MR. CHARLES: I believe it should say seven 12 feet. 13 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So you've got a first-floor 14 plan and then you have the part attic floor plan. 15 MR. CHARLES: And we're complying with 16 height. 17 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: You mean you're complying 18 with the 30-foot height? 19 MR. CHARLES: Correct. 20 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I was asking what's the 21 height of the attic, the interior space. 22 MR. CHARLES: To the inside of the structure, 23 seven feet. 24

MR. CASTRO: Do you have collar ties in the

1 roof? 2 MR. CHARLES: Yeah. MR. CASTRO: So it's seven feet to the collar 3 ties, not to the ridge? 4 5 MR. CHARLES: Correct. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Do you have drawing A2 6 7 available to you there? Because I don't understand A2. 8 9 MR. CHARLES: No, I don't have it in front of 10 me. A2 -- A2 is --11 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The height/setback ratio, the front elevation. 12 MR. CHARLES: The front elevation. 13 14 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The height/setback ratio, 15 you have it there, top left? 16 MR. CHARLES: Yes. 17 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The legend there I don't 18 understand: Required by schedule. That's the --19 MR. CHARLES: Well, there's two codes in the 20 Village of Lawrence. There is a schedule and 21 there is a code for the district it falls into, a 22 C1. So there's two requirements and then we have 23 the proposed. 24 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I've never heard of this

before. We've never had a presentation.

MR. CHARLES: We're essentially showing both. 1 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: No, I hear what you're 2 saying, but I'm not familiar with it. We've been 3 having height/setback ratios for --4 MR. CHARLES: In the code there is a 5 height/setback ratio and the schedule there's a 6 height/setback ratio as well. 8 MR. CASTRO: Each district has requirements, and the schedule of dimensions has requirements. 9 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Heretofore it was never 10 portrayed this way, so I'm trying to understand. 11 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: This could be that there 12 were two. Usually, the architect will come in 13 14 with the most stringent. MR. CHARLES: Whatever is more strict. 15 16 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: In this case you're showing both, but one is irrelevant. I'm not sure which 17 18 one is irrelevant. I guess the one that's least restrictive is irrelevant. 19 MR. CHARLES: That's correct. 20 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So it's there to confuse 21 22 us, okay. 23 MR. CASTRO: And it worked. 24 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: It worked.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: So what you have is the

most egregious part of that is the attic dormers. 1 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: So we're talking about 2 trying to eliminate. Did you have a conversation, 3 Mr. Castro? Were you successful? 4 5 MR. CASTRO: Yeah, we spoke about the dormers encroaching through the height/setback ratio and 6 7 possibly pulling it back or changing the roof line. 8 MR. CHARLES: If we have to, we'll set them 9 back to comply with the height/setback ratio. 10 dormers we're essentially trying to provide 11 12 natural light and make the building more 13 aesthetically pleasing. 14 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: Natural light to the 15 storage area? MR. CHARLES: Correct. Well, if someone is 16 up there moving a box in the daylight, it's nice 17 to have the light come in. 18 19 MEMBER HILLER: Maybe I missed it. Can you show me where you show the height of the --20 MR. CHARLES: I'm not sure if it's on the 21 22 attic plan. We're proposing seven feet. MEMBER HILLER: I remember -- maybe I 23 24 miscalculated it. I remember coming up with eight

feet, but I don't know if I'm correct or not.

MR. CHARLES: Seven feet would be to the 1 2 underside of the collar ties. 3 MEMBER HILLER: I don't see a plan here. MR. CHARLES: That would be in a section. 4 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I don't want to belabor 5 this, but we're not going to get the answer, and I 6 7 think we need to get the architect in. CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think it would be 8 helpful to have John here too so we can find out 9 10 what exactly has transpired. MR. CHARLES: From the previous application. 11 12 CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think so. MEMBER WILLIAMS: Also, maybe you can give us 13 14 an attic plan. 15 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: And I'll explain why I am 16 concerned about the attic plan. I want to know if 17 it's potentially or if it's possible to make that 18 into living space after you get your CO here. MR. CHARLES: No, storage. 19 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: I don't see how you can say 20 21 that when you have a seven-foot height and that 22 can certainly be turned into bedrooms or 23 playrooms.

MR. CHARLES: Well, I mean, there's four

This house we have the five bedrooms, and

24

25

boys.

boys are going to need sports equipment, and there's miscellaneous storage throughout the house that we are requesting.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: I think, number one, don't interpret our impatience with this as indicative of how the vote will go. It's just when a plan comes in and there are so many open questions, we're uncomfortable.

MR. HAAS: I understand. So aside from the rear porch that was built nine years ago, you know, what are the open questions? I'll talk to John about it. I just want to make sure.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The attic question that's just been raised.

MR. HAAS: I thought he answered that.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: The attic plan.

MR. HAAS: Oh, the attic plan, okay.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Anything else?

MR. GRAY: Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out, and I know everybody is familiar with the application, but one of the requests is to alter the garage and have it be 17 feet wide by 15 feet deep.

MR. CHARLES: Once again, this is an existing nonconforming.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Pre-existing, right? 1 MR. CHARLES: Pre-existing. I believe the 2 existing garage does not comply. And what we're 3 asking to do is decrease that by two feet. 4 MR. GRAY: It may not comply with the width, 5 but the depth, I just wanted to point out to the 6 Board they're bumping into the garage, now 7 limiting it to maybe not even a functional garage. 8 MEMBER WILLIAMS: What's the code, twenty 9 10 by what? MR. CHARLES: The existing garage deep is 11 nineteen-six, so it doesn't comply. We're asking 12 to decrease that by two feet making it 13 14 seventeen-six. MEMBER WILLIAMS: It doesn't fit a car. 15 MR. CHARLES: It doesn't fit a car. 16 MEMBER WILLIAMS: So you're making a 17 non-garage. 18 MR. CHARLES: Correct, for storage purposes 19 only. 20 MEMBER GOTTLIEB: The application should say 21 no garage. If you can't use it, it's not a 22 23 garage.

MR. GRAY: I just wanted to point that out.

MR. CHARLES: Correct, by the Village of

24

Lawrence standards, correct.

MR. GRAY: I mean, I drive a GMC Acadia, or my wife does, I should say, and that's 16 feet 9 inches long.

MR. CASTRO: It's tight.

MR. GRAY: So if you're going to be asking Mr. Capobianco to address some issues, that's something that I just wanted to bring out.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: That's something that I didn't see and it wasn't on the code relief that we're going into zero garage, you know.

MEMBER WILLIAMS: We came a long way from going from two to one. I don't think we're ready to go to zero.

MEMBER GOTTLIEB: And it's also that there may be no CO on this, so you really can't consider it pre-existing nonconforming when it's pre-existing non-CO'd. It's more egregious I think in that regard. Again, it's not that we're saying no, you can't have it, but we need to understand it better.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: All right, so we'll adjourn it to November 18th.

MR. CHARLES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN KEILSON: And hopefully --

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	
1	MEMBER WILLIAMS: You know the information we
2	need.
3	MR. CHARLES: Yes.
4	CHAIRMAN KEILSON: Off the record.
5	(Whereupon, a discussion was held off the
6	record.)
7	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
8	8:48 p.m.)
9	***************
10	Certified that the foregoing is a true and
11	accurate transcript of the original stenographic
12	minutes in this case.
13	
14	May Benci
15	MARY BENCI, RPR Court Reporter
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	