| 1 | INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE |
|----|--|
| 2 | BOARD OF APPEALS |
| 3 | |
| 4 | Village Hall 196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York |
| 5 | July 20, 2011 |
| 6 | 7:35 p.m. |
| 7 | APPLICATIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT: |
| 8 | Popack. |
| 9 | 350 Longwood Crossing Lawrence, New York |
| 10 | HAFTR |
| 11 | 33 Washington Avenue Lawrence, New York |
| 12 | |
| 13 | PRESENT: |
| 14 | MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB |
| 15 | Chairman |
| 16 | MR. ELLIOT FEIT Member |
| 17 | MR. LESTER HENNER Member |
| 18 | MR. MARK SCHRECK |
| 19 | Member |
| 20 | MR. THOMAS V. PANTELIS, ESQ. |
| 21 | Counsel to BZA |
| 22 | MR. GERALDO CASTRO Building Department |
| 23 | MR. MICHAEL RYDER |
| 24 | Building Department |
| 25 | Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter |

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Good evening, Mary, and gentlemen. This is the Village of Lawrence Board of Zoning and Appeals July 20th meeting. I'd like to call the meeting to order. In the absence of Mr. Keilson, I will be presiding chairman for the evening.

Do we have proof of posting?

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

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Mr. Pantelis, can you explain a hot Board as briefly as you can.

MR. PANTELIS: Sure. The hot Board, because it's a hot night, but actually the Board of Appeals in this particular case the members are in almost all cases familiar with the properties that are before the Board. Typically, members go out, and if they don't have personal knowledge about a particular structure they will visit the structure and, therefore, a lot of the questions that you get are related to their observations. And you can expect that if the Board does not have questions then they have looked at the location.

What we'd like you to do is to come up when your case is called, give your name, your address, indicate your relationship to the applicant, if

Proceedings - 7/20/11

б

you're not the applicant, and to please explain to the Board as succinctly as possible the relief that you're requesting and why you're requesting it.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Thank you.

MEMBER FEIT: One last thing, could I remind everybody to put their cell phones on vibrate or turn them off.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: It's quite a crowd tonight, there could be quite a disturbance.

I'd like to start with the adjournments first. The case of Popack, 350 Longwood Crossing. Are there any representatives for that matter?

Otherwise, I have a motion to adjourn this.

MR. PANTELIS: There was a request made by the applicant, I understand.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: I believe so. Yes, the applicant's attorney.

MR. PANTELIS: Fine.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Do I need to vote on that?

MEMBER FEIT: We usually do.

MR. PANTELIS: Usually, you do, yes, I would think so.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Can I have a vote on the

Proceedings - 7/20/11

| 1 | adjournment for Popack. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MEMBER SCHRECK: Yes to the adjournment. |
| 3 | MEMBER FEIT: Yes. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Mr. Henner, for the |
| 5 | adjournment of Popack? |
| 6 | MEMBER HENNER: Fine with me. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Thank you. |
| 8 | The next case is the Hebrew Academy of Five |
| 9 | Towns, 33 Washington Avenue. Are there any |
| 10 | representatives for that matter? There's been a |
| 11 | request to adjourn that case as well, okay. |
| 12 | MEMBER SCHRECK: Yes, for the adjournment. |
| 13 | MEMBER HENNER: Yes. |
| 14 | MEMBER FEIT: Yes. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Okay, that passes |
| 16 | unanimously. |
| 17 | MR. PANTELIS: At this time would the Board |
| 18 | like to indicate publicly the date that we agreed |
| 19 | on for the next hearing or not? |
| 20 | MEMBER FEIT: August 24th. |
| 21 | MR. RYDER: The E-mail circulated. I have |
| 22 | one yea. If we could poll the Board members. |
| 23 | MEMBER SCHRECK: Yes. |
| 24 | MEMBER FEIT: You have mine. |
| | |

MEMBER HENNER: Yes.

Proceedings - 7/20/11

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: August 24th will be the next meeting of this Board, and the Hebrew Academy of the Five Towns application will be heard that evening.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 7:40 p.m.)

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

12 May Benc

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 | | July 20, 2011 |
| 6 | | 7:40 p.m. |
| 7 | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 8 | APPLICATION: | Hartman 74 Lawrence Avenue Lawrence, New York |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | PRESENT: | |
| 11 | | MR. EDWARD GOTTLIEB |
| 12 | | Chairman |
| 13 | | MR. ELLIOT FEIT Member |
| 14 | | MR. LESTER HENNER |
| 15 | | Member |
| 16 | | MR. MARK SCHRECK Member |
| 17 | | MR. THOMAS V. PANTELIS, ESQ. |
| 18 | | Counsel to BZA |
| 19 | | MR. GERALDO CASTRO Building Department |
| 20 | | MR. MICHAEL RYDER |
| 21 | | Building Department |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | Mary Benci, RPR |
| 25 | | Court Reporter |
| | | |

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: You know what, I'll start with the Hartmans, 74 Lawrence Avenue. Will they or their representatives please come up.

Good evening.

MR. MACLEOD: Good evening.

MR. HARTMAN: My name is Charles Hartman and I'm here to discuss my residence at 74 Lawrence Avenue and the extension to the back of the house. I would like to introduce Mr. MacLeod who designed the extension.

MR. MACLEOD: Good evening, John MacLeod, 595 Park Avenue, Huntington, New York.

This is a fairly simple request that we're asking for this evening. We're planning on adding a one-story kitchen addition to the back of the house and a two-story partial addition and expansion to the den with a bedroom and bathroom above.

The current property has a 33 foot nine inch rear-yard setback where a 40-foot rear-yard setback is required. We are actually adding to the house, but the rear-yard setback that we're requesting is slightly less than the existing. We are requesting 33 feet two, which still has an overage of six foot ten to the 40-foot rear-yard

setback.

I just wanted to point out for the record that in the petition there is a number which is typed incorrectly on page two, item six. It states that the existing rear-yard setback for the garage is 33 feet two inches, and on the survey on the plot plan you will see it's actually 33 nine inches, and further down in that same paragraph where it says that there was a 33 foot nine inch distance to the closest corner of the proposed kitchen it is actually 33 feet two inches. So we're actually asking for less than what was in the petition.

The purpose of the addition for the kitchen is to enlarge a very -- an existing very small kitchen which is roughly eleven by twelve -- ten by twelve, and due to a growing family they would like to have some additional living space in that area. They would also be able to expand the dining room and add a breakfast area to the kitchen which currently it does not have.

At the same time that we're doing this we would like to add another bedroom upstairs and bathroom, again for the growing family, and enlarge the existing den which is on the ground

floor which is somewhat drafty, it used to be an enclosed porch. So we'll be making an environmentally sound structure out of that.

MR. PANTELIS: When you say you're removing on your plan the one-story sun room, 182 square feet, you're actually replacing that with regular living area; is that correct?

MR. MACLEOD: That is correct, yes.

The second variance that we're requesting is the height setback ratio which is created by the new roof over the second-floor bedroom and bathroom. And although that part of the structure does meet the rear-yard setback at 40 feet two inches as shown on the plot plan, the height setback ratio is increased from 0.61 to 0.71 which is a very slight increase in the angle of the proposed.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Are you maintaining the existing height or does that portion raise the roof?

MR. MACLEOD: The proposed height of the addition is actually less than the existing height of the ridge.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: And the current height of the ridge is?

MR. MACLEOD: The current height of the ridge is 29 foot six, and the proposed height of the addition in the rear is equal to the other gable, which I'm afraid I don't have a dimension on that, but it would probably be in the order of 28 foot eight.

MEMBER FEIT: But you were already, as far as the ratio was concerned, you were already over the allowable at 0.61, but according to the code relief it says 0.55 is the allowable.

MR. MACLEOD: That is correct, 0.55 is the code and we are requesting 0.71.

MEMBER FEIT: And the existing is 0.61.

MR. MACLEOD: The existing is 0.61, correct. So we request your consideration in this matter, and if you have any questions we would be happy to answer them.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: My question is not with the height setback, just the line that we're referring to as 32.2 -- 33.2.

MR. MACLEOD: 33 feet two inches, yes.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: For what length is that encroachment? Do you follow what I'm asking you?

MR. MACLEOD: Beyond the 40 feet?

MR. PANTELIS: Another way of asking it would

4 5

be what, what portion of the rear of that building does not comply? We see you have 40 foot two inch.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Which does comply.

MR. PANTELIS: Right, which does comply.

MR. MACLEOD: For that particular portion of the construction, proposed construction, which is the kitchen area, has a width of 18 feet eight inches wide, and so that would be the length up and down the page that does not conform if you joined -- if you did an offset line of 40 feet from the rear property line, you can see where the 40 foot two mark is. So it's just the rear portion, the last five feet, the last -- actually, the last six foot ten inches of the one-story kitchen addition it would be nonconforming, and it is only a one-story structure with a flat roof terrace above.

MEMBER FEIT: Is this an irregular plot?

It's not a square plot?

MR. MACLEOD: It is irregular, correct, yes.

MEMBER FEIT: So actually your yardage from the rear changes because of the way the property is designed.

MR. MACLEOD: That is correct. The house is

parallel to the street but not parallel to the 1 rear property line, so you'll see the numbers do 2 get greater, the setback numbers increase as you 3 go down the plot page. 4 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Any questions from the 5 Board? Lester? 6 MEMBER HENNER: 7 No. MEMBER SCHRECK: No. 8 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Any questions, comments 9 from the audience? No one. 10 Do you have any letters of support from 11 neighbors? 1.2 MR. HARTMAN: No. 13 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Have any neighbors been 14 approached by you personally? 15 MR. HARTMAN: Yes. 16 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: And they didn't object to 17 18 it? MR. HARTMAN: Specifically the one who's 19 behind me. 20 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: The most affected 21 neighbor? 22 MR. HARTMAN: Yeah. 23 MEMBER FEIT: Has the Building Department 24

received any letters pro or con?

MR. RYDER: Phone calls inquiring, that's it. 1 MEMBER FEIT: General inquiries? 2 MR. RYDER: Yes. 3 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Do we need to confer? 4 I'll start with Mr. Henner as our first. How do 5 you vote? 6 MEMBER HENNER: Yes. 7 MR. PANTELIS: I think it's appropriate to 8 make a motion. 9 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Yes. So the motion is to 10 accept the application as presented. 11 MEMBER HENNER: I still vote yes. 12 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Mr. Feit. 13 MEMBER FEIT: I agree, I vote yes. 14 MEMBER SCHRECK: I vote yes. 15 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: And I would vote yes as 16 Thank you, good luck. You have -- how much 17 18 time do you need? MR. MACLEOD: If we could have eighteen 19 20 months? Two years. CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Sure. 21 MR. MACLEOD: Two years, two years. 22 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Two years. I believe you 23 have to go before the Board of Building Design. 24 You're familiar with that. 25

MR. MACLEOD: I am. CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: You've been here before. Thank you very much. Good luck. (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at 7:50 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 | INCORPOR | ATED VILLAGE OF LAWRENCE |
|----|----------|--|
| 2 | | BOARD OF APPEALS |
| 3 | | *************************************** |
| 4 | | Village Hall 196 Central Avenue Lawrence, New York |
| 5 | | July 20, 2011 |
| 6 | | 7:50 p.m. |
| 7 | | nigahora |
| 8 | | Marbridge Road wrence, New York |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | PRESENT: | |
| 11 | II . | R. EDWARD GOTTLIEB nairman |
| 12 | | R. ELLIOT FEIT |
| 13 | | ember |
| 14 | Ų. | . LESTER HENNER ember |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | n MARK SCHRECK Ember |
| 17 | | 2. THOMAS V. PANTELIS, ESQ. Dunsel to BZA |
| 18 | ME | . GERALDO CASTRO |
| 19 | Ві | ilding Department |
| 20 | | . MICHAEL RYDER ilding Department |
| 21 | | 5 1 |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | Mary Benci, RPR Court Reporter |

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: The Konigsberg application, would they or their representative please step up.

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

I would note prior to the commencement of the application that I would apologize for the application. I think that this petition perhaps sets a record for brevity and being concise, it cuts right to the chase.

I apologize on behalf of the applicants who had expected to be here themselves, and I was only retained in the past week because, as I say, they had hoped to be here and they felt they would be able to flesh it out on a more personal level and explain the need.

So again, I apologize for the brevity and the shortness of the petition, but I believe that through illustrations and through the presence of the architect J. Carlos DeFonseca, who is present with us tonight, will explain to the Board these folks have lived here since I believe 1980.

I'm not sure if the Board received a copy of

the letter that they presented as a response to the Building Department, I don't know if they even sent it, dated May the 23rd.

MR. PANTELIS: Yes, we have that.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Yes, we have it.

MR. GOLDMAN: So the entire Board has it.

Then that they had hoped would supplement their petition in terms of suggesting, one, that the home was built in 1965. They moved in since 1980. They've resided in the Village. So this is not sort of an arrival and an immediate dismantling or expansion. They need the additional space as they indicate because indeed they have a modest, modest kitchen.

They provided me with a photograph of that kitchen because that's essentially what this is about, and I would present it to the Board, as Applicant's 1, I guess, which shows you the tightness of the space, and thank God when it's an expanding family in terms of not so much children anymore but grandchildren and elderly parents that stop by and visit. If I might, as well, also a component is yet another photo of it so you can get a real picture of the necessity for the expansion.

MEMBER FEIT: Are you identifying these and marking these?

MR. PANTELIS: Yes, I am.

MR. GOLDMAN: And there's a third photo that shows you the proposed area that they want to expand in terms of the den. So the real issue before the Board is how they plan to do this expansion. And for that I would note that what they're essentially doing and I'll leave it to the architect, it's a little -- not deliberately misleading but when you look at it it's a high ranch so when you look at your plot plan as I did and it shows existing and proposed it sort of doesn't give you a full picture of it.

Essentially, what is happening is they have an existing, what is it, a den, which is -- well, if I may permit the architect to do it far better than I.

MR. PANTELIS: Your name and address, sir, please, for the record.

MR. GOLDMAN: The reporter has already been provided with his business card.

MR. DEFONSECA: Basically, what they have as existing, they have an extension on the first floor. We have basement on ground. Then we have

the first floor with all the living space. And we have the kitchen at this point. Then they have an existing extension which is a very small den.

MR. GOLDMAN: Which is what you see illustrated from within.

1.3

2.0

MR. DEFONSECA: What they -- basically, what we propose is to extend -- to extend the line of the existing den. That projection of the den to gain, you know, so much square feet for the kitchen. That portion of the first floor doesn't have a basement; it's exposed to the elements. So in order to make it more energy efficient and structurally also efficient we proposed also to just extend the basement so we could put a proper foundation and all that for the extension.

By the way, the soil condition of this area is very bad. You know, the existing house is built on piles, and so, you know, I think instead of having some columns and putting a lot of insulation I think this is better just to square the basement that at that point and provide a proper -- you know, a better foundation.

MR. GOLDMAN: Just if I might interrupt. If
I might provide you with a photograph as well that
sort of illustrates the hodgepodge status where

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

you have the overhang and then you have underneath it, but it has a ceiling, what we are now calling a basement, but I guess to some extent it's almost like a first floor and I think it's better illustrated.

You also see what is currently there in terms of a doorway and a ladder. Essentially, it's just a mess. And so essentially, what is being done is it's squaring off that top and it's enclosing the bottom, if you will.

It doesn't encroach on anyone except, of course, obviously there's more, if you will, another wall that would now be facing the That neighbor is the only adjoining neighbor. person, that it doesn't affect any side yards other than of course the neighbor. It's not going The only one that's affected would be the immediate neighbor right behind where the construction is happening and with whom there's a shared easement, so they've been neighbors for a very long time and cooperative and he's written a letter indicating this letter to state that as the nearest neighbor to the Konigsberg's home and therefore the most affected by any new construction that I have no objections to their

proposed construction plans, a kitchen extension facing our driveway, a small deck and enclosing the underneath of the extension. So I'm providing that, if I may, and that pretty much is not just a blanket endorsement in an isolated fashion but a real cognizance of what's going on and acceptance of it as well.

I have additional photographs that I can share with you that simply show just what a mess it is now, and as I say, there's a ceiling there. It's all there. It's just going to be enclosed.

MEMBER FEIT: Mr. Goldman, the property line actually goes toward the end of the easement, not the fence; is that correct?

MR. DEFONSECA: It goes beyond.

MEMBER FEIT: Right. So that driveway is actually the Konigsberg's property?

MR. DEFONSECA: Part of it.

MR. GOLDMAN: Part of this. They share that easement.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: But the driveway is owned by which house?

MR. DEFONSECA: Part of that is by the Konigsbergs.

MR. GOLDMAN: It's Konigsberg and apparently

when it was all constructed it was with the understanding that an easement would be granted to the neighbor and so there's no --

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: But there's an owner of that driveway?

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes.

1.8

2.0

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: And the driveway is owned by Hudson not Konigsberg?

MR. GOLDMAN: Konigsberg.

MR. PANTELIS: If you look at the second page, the basement plan and the first-floor plan, that dotted line that we see on the site plan was actually called property line; it's irregular.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: The second page?

MR. PANTELIS: Yes, of the plans. So it would be the basement floor plan, first-floor plan, both call out the property line.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Oh, I see.

MR. GOLDMAN: Where it says lower level.

MR. PANTELIS: And it indicates in this particular case that there's a distance at that point at least the one point of eight feet two inches and is that the closest point,

Mr. DeFonseca, or is it out, Mr. Goldman?

MI. Deronseca, of is it out, MI. doramam.

MEMBER FEIT: I think on the first-floor plan

| | | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , |
|---|----|--|
| | 1 | it shows 5.8. |
| | 2 | MR. DEFONSECA: 5.8. It's 5.8. |
| | 3 | MR. GOLDMAN: One has the 5.8. |
| | 4 | MR. DEFONSECA: The first floor is 5.8. |
| | 5 | MR. PANTELIS: That's right. You're going to |
| | 6 | the basement. |
| | 7 | MEMBER FEIT: Mr. Goldman, do they do they |
| | 8 | have the right the first time to square it off |
| | 9 | without even a variance? |
| | 10 | MR. GOLDMAN: I wouldn't we hadn't |
| | 11 | considered that but |
| | 12 | MR. DEFONSECA: No, we won't comply with the |
| | 13 | side yards. |
| | 14 | MEMBER FEIT: In other words, so you can't |
| | 15 | just square it off as of right? |
| | 16 | MR. GOLDMAN: No, we're just going to fill it |
| | 17 | in and square it off. |
| • | 18 | MEMBER FEIT: How high is the water table |
| • | 19 | there? I would assume they don't have a real |
| | 20 | basement. |
| | 21 | MR. GOLDMAN: No, they don't. |
| | 22 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: It's a high ranch. |
| | 23 | MR. DEFONSECA: It's very prone to flooding. |
| | 24 | MEMBER FEIT: So they couldn't put a well, |
| _ | 25 | let's call it basement under the ground because of |

the water table?

MR. GOLDMAN: Yeah, what we're calling a basement is probably really the first floor.

That's pretty much the application. And again, they regret that they were called out of the country.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: I understand that you're despite what I might call koshering up by squaring off a section, but you're also extending that, if I understand this correctly. You're enclosing the lower level where it's extended on the second floor, but you're also going out further, you're extending that; is that correct?

MR. GOLDMAN: When you say extending, we're extending -- we're extending a bit of the first floor though not running the entire side of the house.

MR. DEFONSECA: This portion. Over here we have a fence, you know.

MEMBER SCHRECK: But you're adding to that first-floor basement with that extension?

MR. DEFONSECA: Yes, for the rear first floor.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Is there a reason for the extension on that lower level?

MR. DEFONSECA: There are two reasons.

Number one is structural. Second, we don't want that to be exposed. If we leave that open --

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: No, no, no, I'm sorry. I understand you want to build below the second floor, but you're also extending it further.

MR. DEFONSECA: No, we don't. Only the area that is right below this portion. Only the area that is within where we have the existing small den and the kitchen. We're not going to go beyond that point.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: So where you're extending it is where the kitchen is?

MR. DEFONSECA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: You're extending it not the second floor, but only the first floor?

MR. GOLDMAN: The bottom, right.

MR. DEFONSECA: Yes. Here, see this portion, see this portion is the actual first floor and this is all open. So basically closing this.

This is the new portion.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: So the new portion. My question is why do you need the new portion?

MR. DEFONSECA: Because you have to provide foundation walls for the first floor, otherwise,

if we leave it it's going to be exposed. It's about going to be five feet of exposed floor.

MEMBER FEIT: It's for the kitchen.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Are you expanding the second floor here also?

MR. DEFONSECA: No, no, there's no second floor. We have a basement. The first floor is really the basement.

MR. GOLDMAN: The kitchen is on the second floor.

MR. RYDER: He's building under the cantilever it's called.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Under the cantilever.

MR. GOLDMAN: That's why the photographs are in.

MR. PANTELIS: I think Mr. Ryder was looking at the survey and they have some questions about the setback.

MR. RYDER: Mr. Goldman and Mr. DeFonseca, I just would like to go over the numbers with you because I see a discrepancy, but it may be beneficial to your application and I'm looking at the survey, if everyone can grab the survey and you will see from --

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Excuse me, Mr. Ryder, I

don't think we have surveys.

MR. RYDER: You don't have surveys, okay.

Pass it down to the Board. We have a site plan.

Mr. Goldman, if you would approach.

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

MR. RYDER: For the record, they explained that the second-floor cantilever is accurate at five feet how many inches?

MR. DEFONSECA: Five feet eight.

MR. RYDER: Five feet eight inches, and that the eight foot two inches is the measure from the southerly property line to the foundation line.

MR. DEFONSECA: Right.

MR. RYDER: Building the new foundation.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: The new foundation line.

MR. RYDER: The new foundation line.

MR. DEFONSECA: If you go -- the reason that we want this in the back is if we go the five feet then we don't have the space to walk on that back of the property because we have the fence, so we have to leave some space so you can walk from the front of the property to the back.

MR. GOLDMAN: Except in this case the fence is a positive thing because to the extent that

that new extension on the bottom near the driveway would be an imposition, it's not even seen now that the fence is there.

MR. RYDER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: So Mr. Ryder, regarding that two-foot space between new construction and the fence, that is going to be two feet or two feet eight inches is it?

MR. RYDER: It's two feet eight inches, that's my understanding.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Are there any safety concerns in terms of getting back there; access, egress?

MR. RYDER: It's a cantilever. You could still walk.

MR. DEFONSECA: Yeah, you walk from the front to the back of the property.

MR. RYDER: And that clearance, I think Mr. Gottlieb said --

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: But I thought it was solid coming down.

MR. DEFONSECA: No, the section, the first floor and then you have the foundation of the first floor is set back.

MR. GOLDMAN: So there's still sufficient

1 2

space for not only for people to walk but even firefighters.

MR. RYDER: I don't want to speak for the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: I don't know who I should be looking at. The question is the second floor and the first floor are not lining up. The second floor is going to be cantilevered over the first floor.

MR. DEFONSECA: Because we have a condition like this.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: The current condition.

MR. DEFONSECA: The current condition goes even beyond. It goes behind here. This is your first floor. This is your cellar, and this is where the fence is located now. If we extend the line of the kitchen floor, then this will be too narrow so you cannot really walk on that part of the property. So that's why we setting the basement wall foundation back so we have enough space that we could walk.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: We're going to call it the basement wall. What is the distance between the basement wall and that fence?

MR. DEFONSECA: It's approximately two feet,

about, two feet --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Two feet eight inches? MR. DEFONSECA: Approximately, yes.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: So what would be the distance between the first floor, the kitchen wall and the fence?

It's like a foot and a half, MR. DEFONSECA: one foot, approximately. I don't have the dimension to the fence. I have the dimension to the property line, but I don't have the dimension to the fence, but it's on the pictures. it's only maybe -- if you see it here, this is the fence and this is the existing first floor, the kitchen floor. This may be a foot eight inches, not that much. So basically, this is going to be filled out, but this line is going to remain. foundation wall is going to be set back to allow a walkway between, you know, in the cellar in the rear.

Closer to the house than the MEMBER SCHRECK: actual top?

Right, right, right. MR. DEFONSECA:

MR. GOLDMAN: But there would be space, but I believe the Board is concerned people can walk. Not only that, but also in terms of emergencies

there would be access.

MR. DEFONSECA: Exactly right.

MEMBER SCHRECK: But the extension is going to lead from that existing.

MR. DEFONSECA: Exactly. It's going to keep that line. Not going to go beyond.

MEMBER SCHRECK: Not going to go beyond?

MR. DEFONSECA: No.

CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Are there going to be stairs or is that sealed off?

MR. DEFONSECA: No, the access is going to be from the deck. The existing stairs that we have here now are going to be eliminated and just going to be, you know --

MR. GOLDMAN: A ladder apparatus.

MR. DEFONSECA: From the kitchen then we going to the deck and to the front yard.

MEMBER HENNER: How do you get out if you're going out that way?

MR. DEFONSECA: You go through the -- from the kitchen -- I'll show you on this one.

Basically, this is existing kitchen, this is the small den. So we have a set of sliding doors that go through there and you go to the yard.

MEMBER FEIT: So you don't -- so there won't

| | 1 | be a back door at all? |
|---|----|---|
| | 2 | MR. DEFONSECA: No, there won't. |
| | 3 | MEMBER FEIT: It's a side door. |
| | 4 | MR. DEFONSECA: Side door. |
| | 5 | MR. GOLDMAN: Exactly. |
| | 6 | MEMBER HENNER: There's no back door now |
| | 7 | either. |
| | 8 | MEMBER FEIT: There's steps. |
| | 9 | MR. DEFONSECA: Now you have to go through |
| | 10 | the side. |
| | 11 | MEMBER HENNER: You're eliminating the steps. |
| • | 12 | MR. DEFONSECA: Yeah, this will occupy with |
| | 13 | the extension of the kitchen. |
| | 14 | MR. GOLDMAN: It's in the photo that door |
| | 15 | that leads to nowhere with the steps going down. |
| | 16 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Are you adding that deck? |
| | 17 | MR. DEFONSECA: We're adding this deck. |
| • | 18 | MEMBER HENNER: These steps, the one over |
| • | 19 | there, is that the one being eliminated? Is that |
| | 20 | what you're talking about? |
| | 21 | MR. GOLDMAN: Yes. |
| | 22 | MEMBER HENNER: So in other words, if |
| | 23 | somebody goes out they have to turn right instead |
|) | 24 | of left to get out of there? |
| / | 25 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Is the deck a raised |
| | | |

| 1 | deck? |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. DEFONSECA: A raised deck. |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Is it on line with the |
| 4 | kitchen? |
| 5 | MR. DEFONSECA: Yes. |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: And how far off the |
| 7 | property line is the deck? |
| 8 | MR. DEFONSECA: The deck is going to be about |
| 9 | five feet eight inches from the property line. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: So the deck is an |
| 11 | extension of |
| 12 | MR. DEFONSECA: The deck is an extension. |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: On line with the house? |
| 14 | MR. DEFONSECA: Yes. |
| 15 | MEMBER SCHRECK: How large is the deck? |
| 16 | MR. DEFONSECA: It's eight feet by twelve |
| 17 | feet. |
| 18 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: What will be under the |
| 19 | deck? |
| 20 | MR. DEFONSECA: Open. |
| 21 | MEMBER SCHRECK: Right now there's a patio |
| 22 | there, right? |
| 23 | MR. DEFONSECA: Small patio there. |
| 24 | MR. GOLDMAN: Concrete. |
| 25 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: So there will be stairs |

from the deck. 1 MR. DEFONSECA: Yes. 2 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: So to leave the house you 3 have to walk out of the kitchen onto the deck and 4 5 down the steps? Right. MR. DEFONSECA: 6 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Any questions, gentlemen? 7 MEMBER FEIT: No. 8 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Any questions from folks 9 in the audience? 10 Can we confer for a moment. 11 (Whereupon, a discussion was held off the 12 record.) 13 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: We're back. Thanks, 14 Mary. We're ready to vote. So we have a motion 15 to approve the application as submitted with no 16 changes. I'll start with Mr. Schreck. 17 MEMBER SCHRECK: I will vote for. 18 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Mr. Feit. 19 MEMBER FEIT: For. 20 CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Mr. Henner. 2.1 That two-foot-eight thing MEMBER HENNER: 22 would I be able to fit through there? 23 MR. DEFONSECA: Yeah. 24 MEMBER HENNER: Then I'm in favor. 25

| 1 | MEMBER SCHRECK: Only if you vote for. |
|----|--|
| 2 | MR. GOLDMAN: Before or after the collation? |
| 3 | MEMBER HENNER: Yes. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: This motion passes. This |
| 5 | application passes. How long do you need for |
| 6 | construction, please? |
| 7 | MR. DEFONSECA: Two years. |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Two years. |
| 9 | MR. GOLDMAN: We know that we have to appear |
| 10 | before the Board of Building Design. |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN GOTTLIEB: Glad you mentioned that. |
| 12 | MR. GOLDMAN: We appreciate the courtesy of |
| 13 | the Board. |
| 14 | (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at |
| 15 | 8:15 p.m.) |
| 16 | ************** |
| 17 | Certified that the foregoing is a true and |
| 18 | accurate transcript of the original stenographic |
| 19 | minutes in this case. |
| 20 | |
| 21 | Mary Bence |
| 22 | MARY BENCI, RPR |
| | Court Reporter |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |