INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF WESTHAMPTON DUNES
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
General Meeting
April 15, 2023
9:00 a.m.
914 Dune Road
Westhampton Beach, New York

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Eric Saretsky - Chairman
Irwin Krasnow - Member
Jeff Farkas - Member
Jim Cashin - Member
Joseph Mizzi - Member

## ALSO PRESENT:

Joseph Prokop - Village Attorney
Angela Sadeli - Village Clerk

TAKEN \& TRANSCRIBED BY:
Amy Thomas - Court Reporter
(The meeting was called to order at 9:17 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All right.
Let's call the meeting to order. Let's do the Pledge of Allegiance.
(Whereupon the Pledge of
Allegiance was recited.)
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All right. We have an agenda today of three issues. The first one $I$ believe is 2 Cove Lane.

CLERK SADELI: Right.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Gentlemen, the
last we left things you were going to look at what you have and --

MR. DAVIS: And you had made request of us, the Board had made requests of us, and I think we accommodated them. One of the requests was to give similar to a radius map, it's an overlay basically of our proposal on the lot compared with a 200 foot radius around it to see -basically to show the Board that what we're asking for is very similar to what has been already approved and on

| 1 | the ground. We have a lot directly |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | across the street on Cove Lane that has |
| 3 | a border in the front yard that is |
| 4 | actually closer than what we have |
| 5 | requested. |
| 6 | MEMBER KRASNOW: Do you have |
| 7 | copies for everybody? |
| 8 | CLERK SADELI: You mailed it. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I didn't bring |
| 10 | it. |
| 11 | CLERK SADELI: I have an extra in |
| 12 | there. |
| 13 | MEMBER CASHIN: I've got one. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Why don't you |
| 15 | go on in the meantime? |
| 16 | MR. DAVIS: So what we're asking |
| 17 | for, this is a nonconforming lot in an |
| 18 | R-40 zone. The relief we're asking has |
| 19 | already been granted, and if you look |
| 20 | it's superimposed what we're asking |
| 21 | for. The rear yard relief, the front |
| 22 | yard reliefs have all been previously |
| 23 | given, and I think the picture actually |
| 24 | depicts a pretty good showing of |
| 25 | exactly what is there. We also had |

supplied plans to the neighbors, which was requested of this Board, and there were certain items missing on the survey that have been addressed as well showing the rear yard to the corner of the house. You wanted to see how far the steps were to the front yard, that was taken care of. We imposed the IA system onto the survey so you could see exactly where that is going to be, and I believe that those were the requested items. So we're here seeking approval based on -THE COURT: So some time has passed -MR. DAVIS: Two months basically, yes.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: And some of the questions that came up when we were together last week -- or last month I should say, did you submit a new drawing showing how the house could or might fit into a pyramid to achieve what you want?

MR. DAVIS: I don't believe that
was requested, and I do not believe -CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I think it was part of the -- maybe we didn't make it clear enough, but $I$ think the issue partially is that maybe we can find some comps with other homes, but I think we would like to see what you are trying to achieve in program in what you can do as of right. I mean, Aram, am I saying that out of tune? MR. TERCHUNIAN: That's correct. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So again, what

I was sorting hoping today was that your architect was going to look at what you can accomplish to achieve. I mean, I think you wanted three masters or two master bedrooms, one downstairs, one upstairs, but the house is not -doesn't have a third story, if $I$ recall correctly, and again, the variances you're looking for are to sort of accommodate a program for a three story house of what you want, but again, it would be great to see what could work. MR. DAVIS: I don't think you can
accomplish building any house on this lot without the variances. You have a 60 foot front yard setback, you have a 70 foot rear yard setback, and this lot is only 116 feet in depth. You cannot meet anything under the code. This is a nonconforming lot within an $R-40$ zone. So there is no way a house can be constructed on this lot without relief. And we're trying to limit the amount of relief that we have requested, and we also tried to be in conformance with what is also on the ground. And I think that we have accomplished that, and I think that this depiction of the site plan with the -- our survey and superimposed on it pretty much shows that we have accomplished what we need to in order to comply with the rest of the neighborhood. MEMBER MIZZI: Would it be possible to just review the relief that's being sought? CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Yeah, why
don't we just go through that again, the variances that you're looking for? MEMBER MIZZI: I want to make sure I understand. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: It's been a while now.

MEMBER MIZZI: And we didn't have -- I missed a meeting, but the last meeting $I$ was at we didn't have the plans, and then we got mailed the plans, so now that $I$ have the plans in front of me, $I$ want to -MR. DAVIS: So the first variance is lot coverage. So what is required under the code is 20 percent, we're seeking 22 percent, 2 percent over what is required under the code. MEMBER CASHIN: So lot coverage? MR. DAVIS: Okay. Lot coverage we have 20 percent is required under the code, we're asking for 22 percent. Front yard setback for a principal structure, 60 feet is required, we are asking for 43.8 feet, so we're asking for relaxation of 16.2 feet.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Can $I$ ask a question on that? So on the front yard setback I think part of the issue is you're also asking for the driveway to be on the Dune Road side, does that have any impact on that variance?

MR. DAVIS: No, it does not.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Go on.
MEMBER KRASNOW: Did you look at -- since he mentioned that, we had asked or I thought I had asked you to look at putting -- the address is Cove Road, and you kind of put the house on Dune Road. Did you look at putting the -- at least the -- I wanted to say the way the house faces, I understand you want to have it, but the driveway on Cove Road to take -- you know, especially when people are backing out into Dune Road when it's busy, I mean, any time $I$ do a project on it, they always want me on the less trafficked side, and I had thought we had asked you to take a look at that. I'm not saying make you turn the house around,

I know you probably want a Dune Road address, and it's probably more valuable, but can you move the driveway?

MR. DAVIS: Well, we have the IA system there and --

MEMBER KRASNOW: Can you move the IA system?

MR. DAVIS: It's at the highest point, and if we put it any other place it would pose other problems and possible retaining walls, so we're tying to avoid all of that.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: The problem we're going to have, and we're going to look to Aram for part of this and to Joe, we're supposed to judge things based on a negative impact, whether something is self-imposed and some of those reasons. This is self-imposed, and it is a negative impact to have a driveway that goes -- an additional driveway that goes into Dune Road when it doesn't have to, and clearly that's not where it's intended to be. So
we're sort of starting I think at a point where this is a little bit of a problem. In other words, we should be looking at how the system goes where it can go, where it should go, and at the same time where the driveway should be as Irwin mentioned. So again, my opinion, I'm not going to speak for the whole Board here, but I think that they probably are in the same camp as I am with that, so let's continue down the list of variances. MR. DAVIS: Okay. So I was at front yard setback for the principal structure. And then we're asking for a front yard setback for the principal structure on Cove Lane as well because you have a double front yard, so we need front yard relief where 60 is required, we're asking for 38.7 . MEMBER MIZZI: Can I ask a clarifying question? Joe or Aram, is that -- we typically -- it's not a matter of establishing a front yard and then considering the other a side yard,
we have to both street sides --
MR. TERCHUNIAN: It's a corner
lot, both are front yards. MEMBER MIZZI: Just asking. MEMBER KRASNOW: You're right because I'm dealing with a property that's got four -- and they're killing me because we've got the whole block, and they're killing us on it. MR. DAVIS: Four front yards. MEMBER KRASNOW: You got to be kidding me. MR. DAVIS: Then we're asking for rear yard setback for the principal residence where 70 feet is required and we've asked for 49 feet, so a variance of 21 feet. ATTORNEY PROKOP: Which side are you using as the rear yard? MR. DAVIS: The northerly side, the northerly property line. Then we're asking for the front yard setback for an accessory structure, 70 feet is required, we're asking for 57.3 for a variance of 12.7
feet.
MEMBER CASHIN: Which accessory structure would that be? MR. DAVIS: The pool. MEMBER CASHIN: What's the required?

MR. DAVIS: 70 .
MEMBER CASHIN: And you're asking for 57?

MR. DAVIS: 57.3, yes.
MEMBER FARKAS: 57 is the setback?
MR. DAVIS: Yes.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: Where is that
indicated on the plan?
MR. DAVIS: It's not. It shows
the 50 foot to the corner of the house from Dune Road to the southeasterly corner of the house, and then you have another setback of 7 feet that gets you to the beginning of the deck for the pool.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Where is that setback indicated?

MR. DAVIS: It's not.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: So you need to
have that, please, Mr. Davis, have that indicated.

MR. DAVIS: No problem.
MEMBER KRASNOW: Excluding your lot coverage, which you're asking for 10 percent, everything else you're asking for almost 30 percent.

MR. DAVIS: Two percent for lot coverage -- oh, yeah, ten percent, yes.

MEMBER KRASNOW: Well, it's ten percent of the thing, but everything else you're asking for almost 30 percent.

MR. DAVIS: Correct because we have nonconforming lot, so that's the reason for the --

MEMBER KRASNOW: I'm not saying you shouldn't get it, I'm just saying it's a significant percentage some people would consider.

MR. DAVIS: I don't consider percentages when we're dealing with nonconforming lots because based on the code every single variance you get has a large percentage on it, so I look at

| 1 | what's on the ground more than anything |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | else and how it conforms to the |
| 3 | community that we're asking for the |
| 4 | relief in. And I truly believe that |
| 5 | this falls right within that community |
| 6 | standard. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So the other |
| 8 | five houses that are on Cove Lane on |
| 9 | the same side and opposite, you have |
| 10 | studied those, and how do they fall |
| 11 | into what you're asking for? That was |
| 12 | one of the things I think we talked |
| 13 | about. |
| 14 | MR. DAVIS: Correct. And I think |
| 15 | that this depiction of it shows it very |
| 16 | well. |
| 17 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So the one on |
| 18 | the corner -- |
| 19 | MR. DAVIS: Right. So this is |
| 20 | Mr. Colucci's house, I believe. |
| 21 | MEMBER CASHIN: Which corner are |
| 22 | you on? |
| 23 | MR. DAVIS: They right here |
| 24 | (indicating). So it shows his setback |
| 25 | to be pretty much the same as -- for |

the accessory structure, the deck and the pool, to be in line with his front yard setback. Ours happens to be behind it. So we're asking for less relief than he has already on -- that he's been established and given on Dune Road.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So one thing, and I'm going to look to Aram and to Joe, it's hard for us to give variances in pieces as we do things. So as far as a front yard setback, I understand the issue, again, not speaking for others, but I don't think we can do this, tell you that's okay, go fix the rest, okay.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: You know, you're right. And, you know, pardon me, I haven't been introduced to you before, and I come late to the application, but I have some observations I'd like to share. First of all, and I don't want you to twist around, but so this is a corner lot and with two front yards, and the way our code is written is that
the rear yard is the yard opposite the shortest front yard. So the shortest you have 100 and -- where is that? You have 106 on the south side and 91 on the west side, so that would make the east property line your rear yard. So and that would make then your north property line your side yard. Okay? So let's just orient ourselves in that manner. The second part of it is that because you are a small lot you have automatic relief under the four-tenths rule and the three-tenths rule. So the four-tenths rule and the three-tenths rule apply to side yards only. So the three tenths rule only applies if you center the building on the lot, which you're not doing here, so we'll move to the four-tenths rule. The four-tenths rule says that you are -- that your side yards will be equal to four-tenths of the lot width, and that's for total side yard.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Combined side yard, you mean.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Combined side yard. And then the minimum side yard would be four-tenths of four-tenths. In this case that is actually $I$ believe less than you're looking for on the rear yard. Let me just do the calculation quickly. I thought I just did it. So this is 116 feet times four-tenths, times four-tenths, so your side yard, which is the north, is allowed for the principal building at 18.56 feet.

MR. DAVIS: So we're in compliance?

MR. TERCHUNIAN: So you're in compliance. But your angles have room to give, number one. Number two, the rear yard is calculated on a small lot with the three-tenths rule. So in this particular case, you're at three-tenths of the lot depth, so that will be three-tenths of 131 feet. So you would be entitled to a rear yard on the eastern boundary of 39.3 feet. MR. DAVIS: For the principal, not
for any accessory?
MR. TERCHUNIAN: Not for the accessory.

MEMBER MIZZI: What is this
dimension? I see 20 to the pool, and I don't see this dimension. What's the dimension from the house to the property line?

MR. DAVIS: Well, he didn't do that because we thought that was the side yard and we were in compliance.

MEMBER MIZZI: I just wanted to understand what the dimension is. What scale is this? Let's verify. MR. TERCHUNIAN: It's a 20 scale. MEMBER MIZZI: It's a little greater than 20.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: So --
MEMBER MIZZI: It's 40 some odd feet.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: So my point in bringing this up is that you can actually push this house north and west, and that changes the relief you're asking for.

MR. DAVIS: Understood.
MR. TERCHUNIAN: And so I think that you should take a look at that. The second part of it is you've provided an excellent aerial photo and described it, but you're asking for very specific relief, and so if you're going to rely on this aerial photo, you really need to tabulate the data that you're showing us in written form as opposed to a picture that enables the Board to understand the particular cases that you're pointing to. If there's a particular setback -- and a neighborhood analysis doesn't look at just one building, it looks at the neighborhood, which is what the Board is -- that's what they have to consider.

MR. DAVIS: Understand. And we have almost two different neighborhoods here. You have south Dune Road, which are very skinny and long lots where there is --

MR. TERCHUNIAN: But Cove Lane is
its own neighborhood.
MR. DAVIS: Correct. That's where
I was headed.
MR. TERCHUNIAN: And my
recommendation is look at Cove Lane, there's a limited number of lots, do the front yards and side yards on those -- it's actually all front yards, look at the front yards, specifically look at all of the corner lots and tell us what those dimensions are. Because if you fall within the character of the neighborhood, that is a major consideration of the Board, but without that information there's no way to know if you do.

MR. DAVIS: I got you.
MR. TERCHUNIAN: The last point I
would make would be that $I$ fully concur with the Chairman and Members that backing out of Dune Road is from my perspective very, very dangerous, and I would urge you to consider strongly moving your driveway to Cove Lane because it's simply unsafe.

MEMBER KRASNOW: And the other house you're referencing has their driveway on Cove Lane.

MR. MERONE: I thought Mr. Colucci said that the benefit was on Dune Road because he's on the side over here, that's what he was saying the last time.

MR. DAVIS: Just so you know, you're going to have engineering issues with the Health Department and sanitary. You're going to have to do a covenant and build it properly.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: You can relocate that sanitary system to the Dune Road side, it's not a problem. You have plenty of depth to ground water. Elevation here is plus 9 and a half, it's not a problem.

MEMBER CASHIN: Aram, do you know without doing a lot of math whether by moving that house I think he said north and west, does that eliminate his need for the variances?

MR. TERCHUNIAN: No, not eliminate
it, but it does reduce it.
MEMBER KRASNOW: It might take it
from 30 to 20 percent, I mean, just statistically.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Yeah. And it may, if you do the analysis of all the other corner lots, you may be the same, who knows, but without that information you can't understand it.

MEMBER CASHIN: The other thing I would say is that in my opinion $I$ think the house has to face Dune Road. I wouldn't want looking at the side of the house from Dune Road in terms of the driveway and all that. I think the house should face Dune Road. MEMBER FARKAS: The house can face with the parking on the side. MEMBER CASHIN: That's what I'm saying. I'm just making sure. I wouldn't want to see it flipped. MR. DAVIS: They're going to have to move the sanitary over here, put the driveway over here, shift this house northeast on --

MEMBER KRASNOW: I'm not sure -- I think it's northeast, Aram, because west he's already short over there.

MR. DAVIS: So it's moving it northeast, not northwest.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Correct.
MEMBER KRASNOW: It would go to the right.

MEMBER CASHIN: East, right.
MEMBER KRASNOW: That was
confusing me.
MR. TERCHUNIAN: Thank you for clarifying that.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So we'll
adjourn this?
ATTORNEY PROKOP: Can I ask you a question? Did we get elevations, or could we get elevations? I would recommend that we get elevations.

MR. DAVIS: I think you have.
MR. TERCHUNIAN: I think they're in the file. They're in the -elevations, your building elevations, or the ground elevations?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Maybe it was
in the first set of plans?
MR. TERCHUNIAN: They're in there, they're, like, page five or something. There they are. I think it's the second or third page from the back, Joe.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Can we get additional copies then? Does everybody have a copy?

CLERK SADELI: I mailed it out.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: Oh, we do have, I'm sorry.

MEMBER MIZZI: So because this is skinnier than 116 versus 131 this becomes the rear, that becomes the side, and what are we recommending, other than the driveway?

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Well, you know, conform to the four-tenths rule for the side yard, and to the three-tenths rule for the rear yard, and that allows this to come off of Cove Lane and a small amount but a larger amount off of Dune Road. And the setback should be to this covered porch, not to the
building. The setback has to be to the covered porch because it's got a roof, and even if it was just a deck, it's attached to the house and part of the house, so the setback really needs to be --

MEMBER MIZZI: This is a deck, right, that's the house?

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Yeah, this deck goes all the way across the house.

MEMBER FARKAS: Aram, you said you could go to 18 feet here, so they can move it back 10 feet assuming -- well, it depends where this goes. MR. TERCHUNIAN: That's I think -MR. DAVIS: That includes -- the 28.1 takes it to the principal structure, so I don't know that we can move it too far.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: I mean, you got a 7 foot wide deck back there. What are you doing with that?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: It's a walkway.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Not at 7.7 feet
wide, that's the width of this room.
MEMBER FARKAS: You can move the whole house back. MR. DAVIS: I got it. MEMBER MIZZI: Are we of the opinion that once it's shifted that the footprint of the house is in conformance?

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Well, no, I think that the analysis becomes once you conform to the side and the rear yards, then the question is look at the other corner lots on Cove Lane, what are their front yards? Are you within that average range?

MR. DAVIS: We'll never be in
compliance with the code.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I think where
Aram is headed is front yard setbacks we have -- this Board has in the past made adjustments in unique situations particularly when it was consistent with others.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: There's at least one case that this Board decided ten
years ago on the corner of Cove Lane at the -- on the inside bend in the northwest corner.

CLERK SADELI: 812 Dune Road.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: As far as the setbacks to the neighbors that would probably have an opinion about it, whatever you can do to move the house as Aram described so that you're asking for less, and then we can look at what you're going to give us in some sort of grid layout of -- comps basically is what we're calling it.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Basically. And I don't know if -- if this is a covered porch, that has to be in lot coverage.

MR. MERONE: It is.
MR. TERCHUNIAN: What about these enclosed HVAC units and stuff, are that in the lot coverage as well?

MR. DAVIS: I don't know. Not sure.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: We talked about trying to combine those for logical reasons and putting them in a
spot where you could, one, for your own efficiency but more because I think it -- I think the neighbor who was on the Zoom call with us mentioned it.

CLERK SADELI: And they are on the Zoom call now.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Again, I don't think you really want four condensers at four different corners. I've never seen that done before. There's a builder here, and he'll tell you.

MR. BURNER: It's not cost effective.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So I would
find the side where it's the least
offensive of an issue and try to --
MR. MERONE: It will be in line with the house. I know over here shows that it sticks out, but they would not be sticking out.

MR. DAVIS: So he's got to show it then where it's actually going to be so that they'll understand and you understand, but like he said, four is just not cost effective for you.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I mean, that's not our reason for it.

MEMBER MIZZI: It --
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: But $I$ don't think you want that.

MEMBER MIZZI: You want to check if you want it. But look, if they're somehow under the house, aligned with the house in different locations we wouldn't know it because if it's indicated differently in the plan. Right now it's indicated as bumping out.

MEMBER CASHIN: You don't want them under the house.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: You don't want them under the house.

MR. MERONE: Not inside, but right on the edge.

MEMBER CASHIN: You don't want them enclosed.

MR. MERONE: They're going to be -- you know, it will be just the pylons with the lattice.

MEMBER CASHIN: On a platform. I
wouldn't even put lattice around them but --

MR. TERCHUNIAN: It's the salt, the salt just eats those things.

MR. DAVIS: So question for you, Mr. Prokop, with these changes in variances, the notice is still going to be asking for more than what we are going to change this footprint to. Do we have to re-notice, re-mail, re-post, do all that? Because our relief is actually going to be less than that, so since the relief is less than that --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Well, we have a policy that we re-notice anyway. We do a notice every time, so what $I$ was going to do, $I$ was waiting until the discussion ended, if you could get us whatever your changes are about two weeks ahead of our next meeting, and then we'll have time to do -- well, actually a little bit before that, and we'll have time to look at it and see if we have any questions and then also get a notice in. We will re-notice it
and send it to the neighbors. MR. DAVIS: I'll talk to you outside what we have to do.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I think did you have the application from the beginning?

MR. DAVIS: Yes.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: It was a nice
job, professional job that you did.
Thank you for your work on it.
MEMBER CASHIN: Aram, if an HVAC unit is on a platform, does that count for lot coverage? MR. TERCHUNIAN: I got to check with the building inspector. MEMBER CASHIN: I don't know the answer to that. MR. TERCHUNIAN: I don't know. MEMBER FARKAS: The house across the street on Cove, did they get any variances here?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Not that I recall. At least not in my tenure. Aram, $I$ don't know if you recall, the house on the corner, that didn't have
1
any variances?
MR. TERCHUNIAN: No, because that was preexisting.

MEMBER MIZZI: One comment. If you do end up looking for, like, a variance in this direction, I think it's going to be hard to approve an extra two feet for this bump out. There's a walk-in closet that's sizable, and there's an 8 foot hallway here, so I don't know that this little bump out is doing much if you're ultimately going to be asking for relief from here to here as opposed from here to here.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: That was my point sort of in the beginning that $I$ thought you were going to have your architect look at, I mean, Joe sort of has that background, so he's really looking at it that way, but I thought today we were going to look at a set of plans that were going to show that you tried to make an 8 foot hallway 6 feet, and you were going to take a closet and
whatever so that you wouldn't need something. Because we have people who are on the Zoom connection, and we're going to ask them if there's any comments from them in a moment. But again, we're here trying to help you get through this. MR. DAVIS: I appreciate that. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: But we really need that to make it happen. Again, if you can't get to some point, well then you'll raise your flag and tell us, but we need you to try.

MR. DAVIS: Sure. I understand. MR. TERCHUNIAN: Mr. Chairman, my apologies, but $I$ have another meeting I have to go to.
(A discussion was held off the record.)

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: For everyone who is on the Zoom call, are there any questions on this application? We want to open up comments for people on the Zoom call. CLERK SADELI: So if there's
anybody who wants to raise their hand, I'll un-mute you, or $I$ think you can un-mute yourselves.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Maybe --
MS. BLACKSBERG: Michelle
Blacksberg at 4 Cove Lane. Can you
hear me okay? It was a little bit hard to hear on Zoom, if you can just clarify is the setback between 2 Cove Lane and 4 Cove Lane now considered the side or the rear? I'm sorry, it was really hard to hear.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: It's
considered the side.
MEMBER MIZZI: Side.
MS. BLACKSBERG: Okay. So I do have an objection to the increase in lot coverage. I know you mentioned it already, the increase from 3,311 square feet. Developing the property with adherence to the maximum lot coverage will not create any hardship to the Owners. However, increasing the lot coverage will negatively effect the view, the sunlight, and the overall

| 1 | enjoyment of 4 Cove Lane. It would |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | also negatively effect the property |
| 3 | value. I believe your request for |
| 4 | variance is a self-created hardship for |
| 5 | preference to make the house bigger at |
| 6 | the cost of the property value of the |
| 7 | neighbors. And so I'd like to object |
| 8 | to that increase. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: 4 is to the |
| 10 | north. |
| 11 | CLERK SADELI: Nellie, are you 4? |
| 12 | MS. BLACKSBERG: This is Michelle, |
| 13 | this is Nellie's daughter, we are 4 |
| 14 | Cove Lane. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Again, I think |
| 16 | we understand your concerns, and I |
| 17 | think today we came to sort of a |
| 18 | crossroad where we're going to have him |
| 19 | redraft it and remeasure some of these |
| 20 | things to see what can be done to make |
| 21 | things perhaps more compact. At the |
| 22 | same time, some of his as of right |
| 23 | construction will be what it is, and |
| 24 | then what variances, if any, are issued |
| 25 | will be -- we're going to consider your |

concerns as well as any others, if that answers the question. In other words, we're not making a decision today.

MS. BLACKSBERG: Okay. I
appreciate that. Thank you so much.
MEMBER FARKAS: When is the next
hearing on this?
CLERK SADELI: So our next date that we had scheduled was for May 6th, but I think that that is too soon, and I'm not available the following weekend.

MEMBER KRASNOW: Mother's Day.
CLERK SADELI: It's my son's communion, my daughter's first birthday, Mother's Day. I think the 24 th.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Is that Saturday
of Memorial Day weekend, the 24 th?
CLERK SADELI: No, Memorial Day
Weekend is the following weekend.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So the 20th
sounds like the date.
CLERK SADELI: Oh, yeah, 20th.
MS. BLACKSBERG: I have one more
question. Are all the HVAC units and everything still going to be located, I guess, what now would be considered the side yard facing 4 Cove Lane? MEMBER CASHIN: I think we don't know yet. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: We don't know yet, but we've expressed our concerns with it and try to put it in a location that would be least offensive to yourself or anybody else.

MS. BLACKSBERG: Great. Thank you so much.

MEMBER FARKAS: If the meeting is going to be on May 20th, people should probably try to come in person. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Yeah, if you can.

CLERK SADELI: What what the Board members are saying is if, you know, since it's going to be in May, you know, maybe you could come in person. We'll still offer it by Zoom.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: We're going to work on that, but we still think that
being in person, if you can -- we're going to try to accommodate you in any way we can, but if you can come in person it would be great. So Joe, to move on from 2 Cove, we're going to leave the hearing open.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: It's just a motion to continue the hearing to the next date.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So can $I$ get a motion to continue?

CLERK SADELI: Do we want to just make sure there's no more public comment?

MEMBER KRASNOW: Sorry, yes. Absolutely.

CLERK SADELI: Is there anymore public comment? Dave, do you have anything?

MR. ALVILLAR: No. I appreciate very much the comments of the Board and Michelle. I share the concern about the driveway being on Dune Road versus Cove Lane. Sounds like you guys all agree with that. I was looking at all
corner lots going from Dune Lane to Widgeon's Way, they all have Dune Lane and Widgeon's Way driveways, not Dune Road driveways, and I think that the owner will also find that to be more helpful to them. Pulling in and out of Dune Road is very difficult, and having more driveway space you'll find to be very helpful. So I share that concern. Otherwise, thank you very much for including us and -MEMBER CASHIN: Can you just identify yourself for the recorder?

MR. ALVILLAR: David Alvillar, 813
Dune Road.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So move to close -- or I should say to keep it open --

MEMBER KRASNOW: Anybody else?
CLERK SADELI: I don't think there's anybody else on for this one. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Okay. So move -- can someone make a second to -MEMBER CASHIN: Second.

MEMBER FARKAS: All in favor?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All in favor?
(Aye said in unison.)
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: See you soon.
CLERK SADELI: We're done with 2
Cove Lane, if you don't want to stay on for the rest.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Can you give us a typed list in Word of -- not PDF, but Word of what the list of the variances -- the new variances.

MR. DAVIS: I'm going to redo it based on the changes.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: So I can copy it into the notes. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Jim, we're going to do 772 now, right?

CLERK SADELI: So the next application is going to be 772 Dune Road.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All right. So one request that $I$ have on behalf of the Board is we had this on our calendar for two months ago, Angela, am I saying that right?

CLERK SADELI: No, we never had it
on the calendar.
MEMBER FARKAS: We got the paperwork in February.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So we got some paperwork, but can we start from the very beginning.

MR. HULME: Yeah, I don't think I've presented this to you.

MEMBER FARKAS: There has not been a presentation on this.

CLERK SADELI: We did get the paperwork a while ago.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Can $I$ have the file, please?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Angela, I
should probably give you this. This is the -- Aram's environmental assessment form that you should hold.

CLERK SADELI: Yes, he said he was going to give it to me.

MR. HULME: So for the applicant, James N. Hulme, 323 Mill Road, Westhampton Beach. Good morning, all. I think it's still morning. I'm here on a subdivision application far a lot
located at 772 Dune Road, which is
located in the Village's R-40 Zoning District. Just a little bit of history on this property, the -- there was some very similar relief already granted a form of this property back in 2006, and I'll talk to that in a minute. But at that time, the property was 52,000 plus square feet, and it was 70 feet wide by 640 feet deep, and it was and still is improved with a two story house with associated (inaudible) depicted on the survey that we submitted, the subdivision application that we submitted. So in that context back in 2006, variances were sought to undertake a subdivision of this property at that time, and the Board approved a plan that was two lots that were 19,000 square feet in size, and then an open space along Moriches Bay of 13,000 plus square feet. The actual additional variances granted were lot width, lot area, side yards, total side yard, all very similar to what we're

| 1 | asking for today. And it was -- that |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | relief was granted on a couple of |
| 3 | conditions, one was that the footprint |
| 4 | of the house on the vacant lot that |
| 5 | would have been created was limited to |
| 6 | 2,000 square feet, the four-tenths rule |
| 7 | would apply to the side yard setbacks |
| 8 | for that lot, no further subdivision, |
| 9 | and the open space requirement. So |
| 10 | armed with that, if things hadn't |
| 11 | changed, and I'll explain that in a |
| 12 | moment, we could have gone onto the |
| 13 | Planning Board and completed the |
| 14 | subdivision. However, as you know, |
| 15 | since then and maybe at that time there |
| 16 | was litigation between this property |
| 17 | owner as well as others and the Town |
| 18 | Trustees over the actual ownership of |
| 19 | the property. So that as it pertains |
| 20 | to this lot, that litigation was |
| 21 | recently settled, and the settlement |
| 22 | involved dedicating a portion of the |
| 23 | original lot to the Town Trustees and |
| 24 | -- to the Town Trustees, and then the |
| 25 | remaining lot being confirmed as being |


| 1 | in title for the owner. And so since |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | that changed some of the relief that is |
| 3 | necessary to do that, we filed a new |
| 4 | Zoning Board application based on the |
| 5 | new configuration. And the new |
| 6 | configuration after subtracting almost |
| 7 | 20,000 square feet that is going to the |
| 8 | hands of the Trustees and will be |
| 9 | forever preserved and un-developable, |
| 10 | that reduced my client lot from 52,000 |
| 11 | plus square feet to a little less than |
| 12 | 33,000 square feet. So and now it's |
| 13 | instead of being 70 by 640, it's 70 by |
| 14 | 470 feet. And so what we're hoping to |
| 15 | achieve here as far as subdivided lots |
| 16 | is a front lot with the house of 12,430 |
| 17 | square feet, and a vacant lot behind it |
| 18 | of 20,400 square feet. |
| 19 | MEMBER KRASNOW: So you're doing a |
| 20 | flag lot? |
| 21 | MR. HULME: Yes. The flag lot was |
| 22 | what was approved last time as well. |
| 23 | So really the only thing that has |
| 24 | changed from the last grant in 2006 was |
| 25 | that the lot with the house on it is |


| 1 | not 19,000 square feet, it's reduced to |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | about 13,000 square feet. And that's |
| 3 | because the amount of land that the |
| 4 | Town took increased by that same |
| 5 | amount. So the overall percentages and |
| 6 | development of the overall original lot |
| 7 | is exactly the same as it was. You end |
| 8 | up with a preserved lot, which was key |
| 9 | to the determination last time, but |
| 10 | it's preserved by the Town as well as |
| 11 | -- as opposed to being preserved by the |
| 12 | homeowner. |
| 13 | MEMBER KRASNOW: Question. Aren't |
| 14 | you choosing how you're dividing the |
| 15 | lot up? |
| 16 | MR. HULME: Yes. |
| 17 | MEMBER KRASNOW: In theory this |
| 18 | could be 25,000 feet and this could be, |
| 19 | like, 8,000? You are making the choice |
| 20 | to make the house that's already there |
| 21 | and exists and trying to keep this as |
| 22 | conforming, you're kind of choosing it? |
| 23 | MR. HULME: Yes, yes. You know, |
| 24 | the larger lot on the water side I |
| 25 | think is a more valuable commodity |


| 1 | anyway, but yes, that's exactly. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MEMBER KRASNOW: I would imagine |
| 3 | the problem is the lot that should have |
| 4 | been here, let's say for argument's |
| 5 | sake this was 30,000 feet and this now |
| 6 | would be 10 because you lost 20. |
| 7 | MR. HULME: Right, yeah. |
| 8 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: You gave us the |
| 9 | decision of the prior -- |
| 10 | MR. HULME: I did. |
| 11 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: What? |
| 12 | MR. HULME: The prior decision? I |
| 13 | did give you a copy. |
| 14 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: I was going to |
| 15 | ask you a question, I'm sorry. |
| 16 | MR. HULME: Okay. Forgive me. |
| 17 | Please, proceed. |
| 18 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: Thank you. You |
| 19 | gave us the decision from 2006; do you |
| 20 | have a copy of the plans, the survey |
| 21 | from 2006? |
| 22 | MR. HULME: I don't have it with |
| 23 | me. I can provide it, if I didn't |
| 24 | provide it already. I will certainly |
| 25 | provide that. |

MEMBER CASHIN: Is this the first time this has come before us, this Board?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Yes.
MR. HULME: Yes.
MEMBER CASHIN: Because I'm not familiar with this at all, and I'm going to ask a stupid question. This house is here?

MEMBER KRASNOW: Yes.
MR. HULME: Yes.
MEMBER CASHIN: And you had a decision with respect to the balance of that lot -- for this back lot, and then it's changed because of this taking or --

MR. HULME: Yes, essentially. The original lot was this and included this part, and this Board in 2006 granted all the necessary variances to create a 19,000 square foot lot, a 19,000 square foot lot, and a 13,000 square foot open space.

MEMBER CASHIN: That was granted, but they didn't approve anything built
on this lot?
MR. HULME: The only comment in the prior decision that was part of the condition of that decision was that the side yards needed to be subject to the four-tenths rule.

MEMBER MIZZI: It would be helpful to see the depiction and plan of what was approved last time.

MEMBER KRASNOW: So and now this is going to be a 13,000 foot lot?

MR. HULME: The house will be almost 13.

MEMBER KRASNOW: Smaller than the lot we were just working on.

MEMBER FARKAS: Jim, the reality of this is this is always going to be open space.

MR. HULME: Yes.
MEMBER FARKAS: So if this was 15,000 -- if lot two was 15,000 square feet, you still have the benefit -this lot will still have the benefit of the open space. So if you do the math, I mean, it's a pretty impressive parcel
on the bay side.
MR. HULME: Okay.
MEMBER FARKAS: Right? How much
-- the open space is what?
MR. HULME: It's a half acre, it's 19,000 and change. MEMBER FARKAS: 20 and 15 would be 35.

MR. HULME: True. MEMBER MIZZI: Are there houses on these lots?

MR. HULME: Yes, to the west is -CLERK SADELI: 776. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: This drawing shows -MEMBER MIZZI: I was going to say it would be helpful for us to see that too. I have the packet, I don't know if it's in mine. It didn't come in my packet.

MR. HULME: This is a Google map. Would you like one, Joe?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Sure, please. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So immediately
to the west there is -- that's 776 I
guess. So 774 is the next westerly lot, right?

MR. HULME: Right.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Which there's nothing at the moment is what your survey shows, formerly Merle Debuski (phonetic) and Gary Vigliante. MEMBER KRASNOW: Isn't there a big house down here now? CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: That's two over, that's 776.

MEMBER KRASNOW: It's right here.
MR. HULME: This house is the Mancini house. This is us here. This is Harvey Gessin's house, I believe. MEMBER FARKAS: No, this is Harvey here.

MEMBER KRASNOW: Isn't this the big house that's being built on the bay right now?

CLERK SADELI: You just need to talk one at a time. MR. HULME: And there is a big house being built apparently in front of the Mancini house.

MEMBER FARKAS: Could I borrow that marker for a second?

MR. HULME: That's not a marker, it won't mark.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So maybe you could explain for me, the big house that's being built on the bay right now, that's 774 or 776 ?

MR. HULME: Right.
CLERK SADELI: That's 774A.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So it's the next property to the west.

CLERK SADELI: It's behind.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So that's on
your survey it's shown as Gary Vigliante, right?

MR. HULME: Yes. I don't believe he's in title any longer.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: But he was once?

MR. HULME: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So that house is being built, and that is building as of right, correct?

MR. HULME: I --

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Personally I don't know of any variance that has come before this Board.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: You can't make that determination, you can just -- we just know that there was no application to this Board.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Okay. So I guess what I'm trying to understand, Joe, and maybe I'm asking it the wrong way is I and Joe who are the oldest members of this Board were not involved in the 2006 decision. So this property, 774, it was subdivided into two lots, right?

CLERK SADELI: 772 .
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: 772, I'm sorry. That's done.

MR. HULME: It was never divided. The Zoning Board decided in 2006 the variance is necessary to do that, but the Planning Board -- it was never went to the Planning Board for them to approve the subdivision.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Legally, if we

| 1 | just talk about the law for a second, |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | you know, if you could transition. |
| 3 | Legally we have a decision on this |
| 4 | property. The Zoning Board has a |
| 5 | decision on this property, so I think |
| 6 | you need to at least decide whether you |
| 7 | consider this to be a rehearing. I |
| 8 | think you need to tell us -- and I'm |
| 9 | not giving you advice what to do, but |
| 10 | just mention in your application |
| 11 | whether you consider this to be a |
| 12 | rehearing of that application, or |
| 13 | whether you consider this to be new |
| 14 | matter because of changed |
| 15 | circumstances. Because we address -- |
| 16 | they have to be addressed differently. |
| 17 | You don't have to tell us now. |
| 18 | MR. HULME: No, I'm just making a |
| 19 | not, and I will ask for time to think |
| 20 | about that, but I will answer that. |
| 21 | So what I hear you all saying on |
| 22 | this end at least is that maybe lot |
| 23 | number two should be little smaller, |
| 24 | lot number one might be a little |
| 25 | bigger. |

MEMBER MIZZI: It would be helpful for me to see -- I mean, I see the thing, but if the discussion is this and ultimately any restrictions on the placement of the house, it would be nice to see a plan that laid out the current structures and what seems to be under way.

MEMBER KRASNOW: With the risk of getting shot in this room, one of the concerns we were discussing with the -another application we have in front of us is a similar situation where you have 70 foot lots, and then you want to have two flag lots on them, and not having a precedent of two lots becoming six lots, so how do we navigate this while we're navigating that, but we're trying not to have everybody start dividing all of their lots in half and in backs and fronts and then we're, you know, trying to keep some semblance of the neighborhood, and I know there are some flag lots, but $I$ just have a concern there.

MEMBER MIZZI: I guess I was just asking to see what -- how this fits into what's around it.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I mean, I'm echoing what Irwin's saying in that, again, I'm most concerned with precedent setting things. And again, I'd like to understand what was done in 2006. So again, I think the Board wants to better understand that with some help from Joe maybe, but maybe in the meantime you can give us a sketch showing what you're proposing.

MR. HULME: You mean, as far as the building envelope on lot two? CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Yeah, I mean, I guess the how and the why of this, you know, I don't have yet. I'd like to understand that, you know, from Joe, I guess, to help us with it, what actually took place in 2006, and at the same time going forward echoing what Irwin was saying, I mean, $I$ don't want to go down Dune Road and have, like, flag lots every lot. I mean, how do we
prevent that from happening? Again, how is this different? If it's different that in 2006 it was already done, well then it's fair and so be it. MR. HULME: Whether this is a rehearing or a new application, the 2006 decision should be of interest to you, and it is, and I'll provide -- I provided the decision, $I$ will endeavor to find the approved map. MEMBER MIZZI: That would be great, that would be helpful. MR. HULME: And we can probably update our survey to show the structures in the surrounding area. MEMBER KRASNOW: What is the definition of a front yard setback on a flag lot?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I have to review the code. MEMBER KRASNOW: Is it from the street, is it from the house behind? I'm just wondering how do you consider that.

MR. HULME: I think it's from the
internal lot line, not from the street. MEMBER KRASNOW: So it would be 60 feet behind the house or something. I just -- not something -MR. HULME: I think. MEMBER KRASNOW: That's why -THE COURT REPORTER: If I could just have everyone speak one at a time. MEMBER CASHIN: Are we bound by the 2006 decision?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: You're not bound by it, but how you proceed is different based on whether this is -- whether Mr. Hulme would like us to consider this a rehearing or a hearing based on new circumstances, but you're not bound by it.

MEMBER KRASNOW: Now, again, another hypothetical question. If this lot is 20,000 feet or 15,000 , whatever the number comes out to be, do you guys have a -- kind of a spec plan in mind that will fit into the envelope that won't be requiring a lot of relief, or whatever size it is it will still be
requiring a lot of relief?
MR. HULME: I don't think we have
a particular house designed, but I
think we can place some type of a
building envelope on the lot to show
that we can meet the four-tenths.
MEMBER KRASNOW: So you probably wouldn't need much additional relief?

MR. HULME: No, other than the -we'll take a look at that, but at the moment, other than the determination -a condition that if you approve this that it would be subject to the four-tenths rule for side yard setback.

MEMBER KRASNOW: So the larger the lot, the larger the house you can build.

MR. HULME: Right.
MEMBER KRASNOW: Okay.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Say that again.

MEMBER KRASNOW: Let's say for argument sake they have 30 , about 35,000 feet, Jim?

MR. HULME: Yes.

MEMBER KRASNOW: So you have 35,000 feet here, they cut this off at 15, they get 20 , they can build a larger house. If they make this 20 and 20 , or 20 and 15 , so that's how --

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I understand.
A reconfiguration of the existing --
MEMBER KRASNOW: Right. So depending on how they decide to split it would possibly decrease the amount of possible relief they might need for the new house. So it's advantageous at this point to --

MR. HULME: And it occurs to me, and maybe this is against my own interest, but if we make the front lot a little bit bigger, we reduce or eliminate some of the relief that we need.

MEMBER FARKAS: That's where I was going.

MR. HULME: That's what I figured.
MEMBER FARKAS: Tell me, what are the driveway requirements for a flag lot?

MR. HULME: We've shown a 10 foot wide driveway.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I think the requirement is larger than that. We have to go back and see -- what we have had a few of these that we've decided, we'll go back and see what they were. MEMBER MIZZI: There was some landscaping, I believe, that we asked for.

MR. HULME: And it also occurs to me that a condition requiring both the front and the rear lot to get access from one point as opposed to two driveways might alleviate your concern about driveway, driveway -- driveway, driveway -- driveway, driveway.

MEMBER KRASNOW: But when you do the driveway, does that make the lot in front narrower because you're giving up the space, or is it an easement?

MR. HULME: No, I mean, both of
them could come in the ten foot
flagpole, and then the front lot you could just turn in after you're in the lot.

MEMBER MIZZI: Yeah.
MEMBER KRASNOW: In this case, your driveway is on the other side of where you're doing this.

MR. HULME: Right.
MEMBER KRASNOW: So you might move the driveway?

MR. HULME: Well, there is a parking area right here that's close, you know, so if we -- if that were ultimately a condition of the approval, we could accomplish that, and then give the front lot an easement over the flagpole so that they can get there.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Okay. I mean, again, $I$ think you are going to give us this other additional information.

MR. HULME: I have a nice long list, yeah.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: And the maybe, Joe, if it's okay, he can send it to us ahead of time ideally we can meet the third week of May and --

MR. HULME: The 20th, right?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: And we'll be able to --

MEMBER FARKAS: Is there a driveway to the west or to the east on this? I mean, I don't think there's -CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: To the east it goes into this center opening. MEMBER FARKAS: Right. So a that's no.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: And to the west.

MEMBER FARKAS: Because there's a house back here, where is the driveway for this home?

MEMBER KRASNOW: It's to the west of 772 and the right of the -- that little California type house. So the driveway would be almost next -- the driveways would almost be next to each other.

MR. HULME: This might be even more helpful. Here is our lot, this is that adjacent lot, and this shows a flag to get to -CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So they'd be
side by side?
MR. HULME: Right, right.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I don't know
if that's good or bad.
MEMBER FARKAS: Can you do the driveway on the east side?

MR. HULME: We could take a look at that.

MEMBER KRASNOW: I don't know whose property that is. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: On the east side you probably -- if you're reconfiguring this house in the front, you have more space, but that is a choice.

MR. HULME: Right.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Particularly
if you're redoing --
MR. HULME: If there's a driveway
here, and there's a driveway here, is
that better than driveway, driveway?
MEMBER MIZZI: I don't want to say
that -- people configure their houses
knowing that they have a driveway, like, where there's one driveway to

> your side or two, rather than having one on each side.

MEMBER KRASNOW: I would almost say it would be nice if, you know, they could -- the driveway that Harvey is putting in, if they could almost get an easement to just turn off of that and just have that one driveway there and then access -- that would have to require somebody else giving permission, but it would just make it a lot cleaner than having the two driveways and paving over more, or you know, obviously more impervious. MEMBER FARKAS: Maybe all four houses can share the same driveway. MR. HULME: I know Mr. Gessin -MEMBER KRASNOW: I'm not saying it's required, I'm just saying since it's there -MEMBER MIZZI: He's got that car collection, he'll be coming out of the driveway, all those cars. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All right. ATTORNEY PROKOP: With these next

| 1 | applications, could we agree on the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | record on the date that we need the |
| 3 | material by? Otherwise it will |
| 4 | automatically kick over to June. |
| 5 | CLERK SADELI: I looked at the |
| 6 | calendar, and we gave the last |
| 7 | application two weeks prior, so that |
| 8 | would be a date of May 5th to have |
| 9 | everything submitted to be reviewed. |
| 10 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: Okay. So can we |
| 11 | -- Eric, can we just agree on the |
| 12 | record that if we don't get material -- |
| 13 | the requested material by May 5th, it |
| 14 | will automatically go to June. |
| 15 | MR. HULME: That's fine. |
| 16 | MEMBER KRASNOW: Angela, May 5th |
| 17 | gives you enough time if you have to do |
| 18 | notices, are you just doing notices to |
| 19 | the neighbors and not having to publish |
| 20 | it? |
| 21 | CLERK SADELI: Jim notices the |
| 22 | neighbors and then sends me the |
| 23 | certified receipts, and Joe puts |
| 24 | together the notice. |
| 25 | MR. HULME: You have a five day |

notice requirement. Except for this application, there's a five day notice requirement.

CLERK SADELI: Just one at a time.
MR. HULME: So if I get everything to you before the 5th, there's still 15 days.

MEMBER KRASNOW: I wanted to make sure you didn't get caught up in the publishing, which has happened to people before too, and notices. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All right. Joe, so I make a motion to -- sorry, does anyone on the Zoom call have any comments?

CLERK SADELI: I don't think anybody is on for this application. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All right. So I'm going to make motion to adjourn this --

CLERK SADELI: We don't want to adjourn it, we want to continue it, right?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Keep it open until our next meeting.

MEMBER FARKAS: Second. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All in favor?
(Aye said in unison.)
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All right. So now we're moving on to 738 and 742. So why don't we do this, if it's okay, because some people weren't at the last meeting, maybe we could just do a little recap of where we left off, and probably better you do it than me. MR. HULME: Sure. We'll see. So just -- so what we're here for is we are seeking the necessary variances so that we can return to the Planning Board and get approval of the creation of three lots from the two lots that my client owns. So that's what we're here about. The background on this is that the property is located at -- the two properties are located at 738 and 742 Dune Road adjacent to each other. They're in the $R-40$ Zone, and as I indicated, we're seeking variances necessary to at the end of the day end up with three lots. That necessitates

| 1 | only one variance for each of the lots, |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | which is a lot width variance. As you |
| 3 | know, and as we discussed, the |
| 4 | requirement under the code for lot |
| 5 | width is 150 feet, and we are seeking |
| 6 | 79.3 feet lot width for each of the |
| 7 | lots that we're hoping to create. |
| 8 | Right now 738 is almost 70,000 square |
| 9 | feet in size, and it's 119 feet wide. |
| 10 | And 742 is almost 65,000 square feet in |
| 11 | size, and it's also 118 almost 119 |
| 12 | square feet in size. The proposed lots |
| 13 | are all oversized from the area |
| 14 | requirement. They range from 42,000 to |
| 15 | 46,000 square feet in size, and as |
| 16 | indicated, they'll have 79.3 foot lot |
| 17 | widths in each particular case, and |
| 18 | that's the source of the only variances |
| 19 | that we're seeking here. |
| 20 | The last time we were here we |
| 21 | provided a neighborhood analysis that |
| 22 | showed that the neighbors -- the |
| 23 | neighboring lots in this area range |
| 24 | from 50 to 80 feet, so even at 79.3 |
| 25 | feet these lots will be at the upper |

end of the neighborhood lot widths.
And in addition, we spent a lot of time talking about the Skudrna application, which was a three lot subdivision from the early 2000 's, as I recall.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: To the west of these three.

MR. HULME: Just to the west, yeah.

MEMBER FARKAS: I'm looking at a Skudrna survey from 6/15/09. MR. HULME: So and that -- the end result there was an approval of lots that were 66 feet in width. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I thought there were 83. MEMBER FARKAS: 83.33. MR. HULME: I'm sorry, I had the wrong number.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: They were
slightly larger.
MR. HULME: So they're at the high
end of the range of the neighborhood, as are we.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I'm sorry, continue.

MR. HULME: Okay. And --
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: While you're thinking, the point $I$ was going to make about Skudrna was we had lot area -lot setbacks on the sides of greater than normal, which was part of the variance agreement. And we asked you, I believe, to follow in suit.

MR. HULME: Right.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So I'm sorry
if I interrupted, but that's where you're headed?

MR. HULME: Yes. So you had asked us to do a number of things based on the details -- well, as you will also recall one of the things of great concern here was the view, and we went through an analysis of showing the impact the as of right would have on the view and the proposed would have on that view. And I think we went through a lot of mathematical calculations to show that the actual view area was

| 1 | larger for the neighbors across the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | street with the three smaller houses |
| 3 | than it was with the two as of right |
| 4 | houses. You asked us to provide |
| 5 | setback details, which we have done on |
| 6 | both the as of right as well as the |
| 7 | proposed. We've provided the specific |
| 8 | size of the homes, which you also |
| 9 | requested. And the other thing that |
| 10 | you had asked for was to have |
| 11 | superimposed the as of right on top of |
| 12 | the three lots. So that's what that |
| 13 | shows. And I think this just |
| 14 | emphasizes -- it gets a little busy, |
| 15 | but it just emphasizes the fact -- |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I think it |
| 17 | helps to see it. |
| 18 | MR. HULME: The three lots have |
| 19 | less of an impact on the view than the |
| 20 | two as of rights. |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So with your |
| 22 | new proposal, what is the setback |
| 23 | between the homes? |
| 24 | MR. HULME: Okay. So 32 feet |
| 25 | total. |

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So it's 16
feet?
MR. HULME: Well, it averages 16
feet.
MEMBER MIZZI: 19.7.
MR. HULME: So it's 12 feet, 19, 15, 15, 19, and 12.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: And how much
does that exceed what the normal without a variance would have -- in
other words, how much greater is it?
MEMBER FARKAS: Are you asking how much greater it is than the two houses?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: No, not the two houses. I think it's really -when we agreed to the Skudrna piece back in '06, whatever it was, the setbacks between these houses were greater than normal, in other words; am I say that right, Joe?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Well, I don't know because --

MEMBER FARKAS: The side yards.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: The side yards

ATTORNEY PROKOP: It depends on the size of the house, but what was -excuse me, what was agreed to in Skudrna was that there would be a total side yard of at least 36 feet with a minimum on each side of 18 feet. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Right. So I thought we had left it that to be in keeping with what we did for Skudrna that we were going to try to achieve something similar. MR. HULME: For example, the middle proposed lot the house is centered, and under the three-tenths rule that would give us 12 feet on each side, but instead what we've shown is 15.8 feet.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I know, but the problem is that -- excuse me, I'm sorry, if you don't mind, the problem with that analogy is that the applicant would be getting considerable relief, and this is what happened in Skudrna by the allowance of the subdivision, and therefore you can impose conditions
that are separate from --
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So I guess where I'm headed is that I think we wanted to make sure the Skudrna lots are 80 feet in width, these are 79.

MEMBER FARKAS: It's 83 versus 79 .
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Okay. I'm
sorry, 83 --
ATTORNEY PROKOP: If I could just give another thought before I lose it. The 30 percent rule would be based on the normal. The logic of the 30 percent rule is based on the minimum lot width, which is whatever is 100 feet.

MEMBER KRASNOW: 150 feet.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: So the 30
percent rule never really conceived, you know, these minimum lot width variances also. When we started out with that rule it was mainly -MEMBER MIZZI: I have a question when you're done.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Go ahead, Joe.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: That was it, I
just wanted to make that point.
MR. HULME: We're at 32 feet is
what we've shown here, which is not 36 , but it's 32.

MEMBER MIZZI: My question was
regarding the 12 foot side yard for the two houses. Was that something that was discussed last time? I wasn't here.

MR. HULME: I think we were just
trying to open up the space between the houses by shifting --

MEMBER MIZZI: Are there
neighboring houses that --
MR. HULME: There's a neighboring
house here, there's nothing here. This is Skudrna, which is completely vacant. This is 734, and this is the location of the 734 house. There's some -MEMBER MIZZI: There was a building zone though agreed upon for Skudrna? Like, when we granted that -MEMBER KRASNOW: That subdivision is about 83 feet. MEMBER MIZZI: I'm saying when we
grated that, didn't we, like, agree, like, that the houses would be placed in a certain place? CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: For whatever reason, Jeff has an old -- something old, I thought we staggered them, but I think instead -- and Joe, correct me if I'm wrong, $I$ think what we did is we just brought them closer to the street because that's what the owners across on the ocean side wanted. And I think that's how it got -- at least that's showing on this survey how it got left. It would be nice if they were staggered not unlike the ones we're proposing for this just because it certainly looks good but -MEMBER MIZZI: It's been a long time. I thought we established, like, an area where they could develop the house, and it give them some -MEMBER FARKAS: It gave them this line in the rear. MEMBER MIZZI: I think, like, a zone in which they could --

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Correct.
MEMBER MIZZI: -- place the house.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I think that's what it was left at.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: So the idea was -- I'm sorry, the idea was that there was a line to the north, and they could not be built farther north than that line. The reason why is because they didn't want to block the view of the houses to the east. And what's happening here -- I just want to make this comment, not as -- I don't want to become a planner, because I'm not. When you stagger -- if you have a house that's 60 feet from north to south, or a row of houses that are 60 feet from north to south, the massing of the blocking of the view is 60 feet. If you stagger three houses that are 60 feet, then it could be 180 , it could be 120.

MR. HULME: Which is the logic of this. This improves the views.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: It blocks --

MS. BREEN: It doesn't improve my view.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: My point was
that it blocks --
MR. HULME: It has to block somebody's view.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: My point is that it has a larger negative impact on the side views because instead of looking at one house that has a depth of 60 feet, you're looking at three staggered houses, and one goes 20 feet farther, the other --

MEMBER MIZZI: Yeah, like, if you were viewing from here, instead of seeing this, you're seeing I guess.

MR. ANTONOCCI: But all up here would be worse.

MR. HULME: All up here would be more akin to this. This as of right -this configuration here is a vast improvement over this from a point of view of views from across the street.

MS. BREEN: Not if you're looking west.

MEMBER MIZZI: You're talking about from a difference perspective, not head on.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yeah, and if you're east of this looking to the west, you would have a greater negative impact on your view.

MR. ANTONACCI: I don't agree with that.

MEMBER FARKAS: I think what Joe the attorney is saying is that this proposal, the proposed house is not the best view, but it's better than the two homes. The three homes in a line would be worse.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I don't want to make a planning comment about this application, I'm only making comment about having sat through the Skudrna application. That was the logic of the Skudrna. I'm not submitting that as a planning consideration in this application. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Joe, if I follow what you're saying is if you

| 1 | take the three homes and you line them |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | up then the view from here -- in other |
| 3 | words, you're getting this whole swath. |
| 4 | In other words, 60 feet, whatever it |
| 5 | is, you're getting 100 and something |
| 6 | that's sort of blocking your view as |
| 7 | opposed to if they were lined up, |
| 8 | right? |
| 9 | MEMBER MIZZI: If you were looking |
| 10 | from say -- say you were looking from |
| 11 | over there. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: From 737. |
| 13 | MEMBER MIZZI: Like if it's |
| 14 | staggering back -- |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: You're |
| 16 | blocking more. |
| 17 | MEMBER MIZZI: You're blocking |
| 18 | more, yeah. |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: But if you put |
| 20 | three that are forward that are lined |
| 21 | up not unlike it possibly could be done |
| 22 | on Skudrna because we gave a boundary |
| 23 | let's call it, I mean, ideally it would |
| 24 | be nice if whoever builds these homes |
| 25 | staggers them in such a way that, you |

know, forward, back, forward, back, whatever, but I'm not sure maybe what the right thing to do is because you're -- I'm sorry, your name?

MS. BREEN: Rosanne Breen, 733, so I'm this house that's not on the -- my first question would be can you please indicate on either of these or the one that has the superimposed where the bunny hut is? Because that's what we all call that house that is existing, so is that on here?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I believe it's the middle of this.

MEMBER KRASNOW: We have an aerial.

MR. ANTONOCCI: Survey of existing lots with the structure on it right here.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So it's slightly --

MS. BREEN: Oh, so there you go.
MR. HULME: Is that this here?
MR. ANTONOCCI: It should be, yes.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: That's it.

MS. BREEN: I would like to see it on this one because this is the one -MEMBER FARKAS: Which is your
house?
MS. BREEN: Where is the public walkway?

MR. HULME: Over here.
MR. ANTONOCCI: That is not the public walkway.

MEMBER FARKAS: This is your house?

MS. BREEN: Yes. So if you are --
THE COURT REPORTER: I just need one at a time. I'm sorry. MS. BREEN: The only view that really I think people care about is when you're looking west because that is the sunset view. The sunrise view is on the ocean side, so our views of the sunset are what's impacted. So like these houses aren't really quite as impacted as these houses. MR. ANTONACCI: I think these houses are closer than these houses, so they have more of an impact than these
houses.
MS. BREEN: Not for the sunset.
MR. HULME: I think what you need is you need to contrast it with what we can do without any relief at all. And this is an improvement over that.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: My only --
MR. HULME: This is an improvement over that.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: But Jim, the only thing I think, if $I$ understand your point, is that if this house were pulled forward, so maybe they're like this, they're set up as an arrow or whatever, a $V$, maybe it helps these two homes with what you're looking for.

MS. BREEN: I just want -- on this -- you think this spot here is here?

MEMBER MIZZI: There's a map that shows both. These are on the same --

MS. BREEN: Right. So okay. It does, and I'm here.

MEMBER FARKAS: What number are you, 737?

MS. BREEN: No, 733. I'm this
next house. So this house is
problematic I think.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: If you think
of it like this, so your view is
something akin to that.
MS. BREEN: This house is going to
block it anyway.
MEMBER FARKAS: The as of right house would block you anyway.

MEMBER KRASNOW: Were you here for the last meeting?

MS. BREEN: I was.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: SO I'm just doing this to show you the angle. I think we're trying to sort of find some common ground here because what they can do as of right by building these two homes, you know, seems to hurt you perhaps more. If it's this home that's really the problem, I mean, I think pulling it forward doesn't really -- I don't think it really hurts anybody.

MR. HULME: Well, if she's here, these houses -- she's not going to see this house because there's a house here

| 1 | and a house here. If we pull this |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | back, that's actually going to detract |
| 3 | from her view here. |
| 4 | MS. BREEN: Are you influenced at |
| 5 | all by the fact that every single house |
| 6 | east is lined up straight. I don't |
| 7 | know if it's because of the way the bay |
| 8 | came in, but really and truly all of |
| 9 | those houses are lined up straight. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I believe - |
| 11 | MR. HULME: Can I consult with my |
| 12 | client for 30 seconds? |
| 13 | MR. ANTONOCCI: Just one thing |
| 14 | before, the staggering was the |
| 15 | recommendation of the Board at our |
| 16 | first meeting. So we took that and - |
| 17 | CLERK SADELI: One at a time. |
| 18 | MEMBER KRASNOW: Again, we're |
| 19 | trying to -- |
| 20 | THE COURT REPORTER: I need |
| 21 | everyone to speak one at a time. I |
| 22 | can't take a record. |
| 23 | CLERK SADELI: She can't do the |
| 24 | record if we're talking over each |
| 25 | other. |

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: One at a time. MEMBER CASHIN: You need to identify yourself also, please. MR. ANTONACCI: Alex Antonacci, I'm managing member of the LLC that owns the two properties.

So the staggering, again, was done at the request of the Board. In order to improve views for not just one house, for numerous homes, and the homes across the street initially were perceived to be impacted more so than homes that are not that close. So we can go all the way down the line of Dune Road, everybody is going to have a different impact, but we were looking to see the overall benefit to all of the homes, and that's what the Board came up with, and we accommodated that. We staggered the proposed locations of the homes, and but that can be adjusted as well, but $I$ don't know which is better or worse for which property. MS. BREEN: That's valid, that's definitely valid.

MR. ANTONOCCI: Our initial application was I believe they were lined up, and then we staggered them accordingly.

MEMBER KRASNOW: I think what we've been trying to do here is get input from people like you and the neighbors who are the most effected and see what is the best solution out of the two alternatives. And just to, you know, recap what I pointed out at the last meeting is that they can build these two very large houses as of right and start construction tomorrow in theory. If we are granting them the variances then we can put restrictions and covenants in there so if it's better to have the houses staggered, we would have them staggered for your benefit. If it's not good to have the houses staggered, we would keep them in line for your benefit. You would also have the control as to the size of the house, what they might look like, and also when they can construct because
somebody had an issue about constructing during the season. So again, those are -- so it's a trade off. So whichever at the end of the day you think is going to make your -something is being built there. So it's a matter of now -- you know, as I always say, something is happening there, it's not going to be vacant. It was great that it's been vacate all this time. So now it's a matter of working out a solution that is kind of the compromise to the best of both worlds that, you know, will make this gentleman happy and will also make the neighbors happy because, you know, it's going to get done, so it's a matter of which, you know -- and yes, maybe if you're at 733 and somebody is at 737 it might be little bit different as opposed to the people that are across the street. You know, it's not going to be -- everybody is going to have a little bit of an issue with the location, the size. It's not going to
be perfect, but he is entitled to build something, and it's just a matter of working with everybody, and that's why we have these meetings to, you know, come up with what's going to make everybody the most satisfied or the most -- the at least upset. MEMBER MIZZI: Equally unhappy. MEMBER FARKAS: So if he's building two houses -- I'm just going back to the angle here, this house here is going to block it worse than the three.

MS. BREEN: Yes. And I'm not going to speak for all of my neighbors, but I personally would rather see three smaller houses than two gigantic houses.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Well, I think
just -- I think we're at this crossroad now because they've agreed to build three smaller houses than the two original that are as of right. So like Irwin said, we are now at this point where we can approve this in such a way
-- perhaps the way to do it is not unlike the Skudrna with coming up with a line. I mean, maybe we come up with a line, and then we allow the builder to decide where these houses would be best done, forward or back, something along those lines. Joe, is that a fair --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yeah, well, I think you need to decide the impacts, you know.

MS. BREEN: So your original plan
was to build three houses somewhat straight across?

MR. ANTONOCCI: Correct.
MS. BREEN: That was your original
plan. And you staggered them at the recommendation of the Board thinking possibly --

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I don't think
it came from us as much as it came from --

MR. HULME: It came out of a discussion on what on the whole were the least impacts to the view.

MEMBER KRASNOW: And that's why they drew these view corridors and these lines to show the people that we're effecting what might transpose based upon the different designed.

MEMBER FARKAS: Also if I'm saying
this right, the sunset starts out early in the season over here, and it basically moves. So I think that if you're concerned about this, it's really only early in the season. I don't think that later in the season your sunset is going to be effected.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: One of the things the Zoning Board can do is you can make a request to the Planning Board to give you a recommendation on things like this. So if you want you could vote to -- if you have a question like this, as an example, you know, that way you bring in a larger consensus, and it's just, you know, an important consideration like this for the Village, it's just not this Board acting on its own. You can get
additional input that way.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I mean, I
think we -- how do I say it? I think we've gone where Joe is now, I think we've exhausted the options. In other words, like Irwin said, he has the right to build these two homes. We thought, and I think your neighbors agreed that three smaller homes like this were a better compromise, lesser of all evils, whatever you want to call it.

MR. HULME: There's nothing evil about any of this. MEMBER KRASNOW: Wasn't my word. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Let's just the lesser impact perhaps. MR. HULME: Yes, thank you. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So the only question in my mind is -- and maybe we should do what Joe is saying, that we should allow the Planning Board -- who is the Planning Board, by the way? ATTORNEY PROKOP: I don't know, but they have a PO Box. It's the

Village Board.
CLERK SADELI: It's the Board of Trustees.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Maybe we should kick this to them and let them help decide on which they would prefer. My thoughts on this are sort of a more 10,000 foot approach of these are unique lots as were the three Skudrna lots that have not yet been built. They exceed in my mind 75 feet, and when Joe and I were on the board for that ruling I don't want this to become a precedent for all sorts of other things. This is a unique situation, and these -- something is going to get built on all six of these someday, so having six homes that are tastefully built in such a way $I$ think are going to compliment Westhampton Dunes. I don't want to see this turn into 12 flag lots or something else.

MS. BREEN: We talked about not making that --

MEMBER FARKAS: A house here and a
house here by variance.
MS. BREEN: I got it, I got it.
MEMBER FARKAS: That would

> really --

MS. BREEN: Which is a possibility if you didn't grant this variance because of the rules.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Because if we grant it we can do what Irwin said and we can put these, you know, covenants on it, what it can and can't be.

MS. BREEN: So I know what it's like to have the bunny hut there, I know what it does to my views, so I would really think having that third house somewhat be on the footprint of where the existing house is. We all know what it's like to have that house in that spot, so I think that would be reasonable.

MEMBER FARKAS: The problem is is
that we've already -- the other
neighbors have already --
MEMBER CASHIN: And we have other people on here too.

CLERK SADELI: And one has a question, so if we want to take that question now, or do you want to wait? MEMBER MIZZI: I had one question because $I$ wasn't at the last one, but I don't personally, like, $I$ don't have an objection, but it seems we are allowing, like, these two houses to be placed in a way that is nonconforming if it was just a single lot, like, it would be the four --

MR. ANTONOCCI: I don't -- I'm sorry.

MEMBER MIZZI: Can I finish, please?

MR. ANTONOCCI: Yes.
MEMBER MIZZI: It would be the four-tenths rule and an 80 foot lot, if it were centered, would get the benefit of four-tenths. If not, it would need to be three-tenths, and so this side yard -- this 12 foot side yard wouldn't be permissible.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: There's a claim
that the three-tenths rule is
applicable, but we went through this before, but my comment to that is that the three-tenths rule really doesn't apply because you can -- as a condition you can impose whatever setback you want really because you're --

MEMBER MIZZI: I guess what I'm saying is -- let me ask the question differently. If it was a single 80 foot lot, and someone went to the building inspector, they would be able to offset the lot to get --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: If they centered the principle structure they would have the possibility of going to the three-tenths rule.

MR. HULME: This is four-tenths what we've shown here.

MR. ANTONOCCI: And it was moved with the intention of getting bigger yards in between the homes.

MEMBER MIZZI: Okay. I guess, I'm not proposing centering, I'm just saying this is four-tenths, this is -if this was a single lot off-centered
it would be able to get to 12 .
MR. HULME: And 80 foot lot under the four-tenths would have a total side yard of 32 feet and single side yard of down to 10.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: So Aram -- I'm sorry, excuse me, I apologize. So Aram mentioned something before about the small lot rule. So we're going to have to look at that and bring that up to the Board because there's another overlay to this, but just in terms of the four-tenths and three-tenths, what you said is correct. MEMBER KRASNOW: Can I ask you a technical question? Going back to what Eric was originally saying before about Skudrna and they had 36 feet between each lot, or about 18 feet, if again, as part of a variance we were granting we could also ask for a minimum of 36 feet between each lot. I mean, so forget about the four-tenths, we could ask for that as part of it, right? We have the -- I mean, that's -- again, I
don't know if it really was going to make a difference for anybody's view for what it's worth.

MR. HULME: It might because if we had to narrow the houses, we might choose to make them longer.

MEMBER FARKAS: You're 35 and a half here.

MR. HULME: Yes.
MEMBER KRASNOW: No, no, I'm just
asking if we -- if for somebody -- what
Eric was talking about, the precedent before that we granted, if we wanted to stay within the same precedent, we could say we wanted 18 feet, you know, side yard setback. I'm not saying we should, but again, we have flexibility. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Whatever that percent of the Skudrna was. So Skudrna, I'm not sure whether it was three-tenths, or four-tenths, or what percentage, but it landed on 36 feet for an 83 foot house. You could have the same -- you should have -- in my opinion, you should have the same or
greater.
MR. ANTONOCCI: So we had proposed four-tenths, which was recommended to us, and also I think that the Skudrna was four-tenths. So the numbers might be a little different because the property is a little wider, but still the four-tenths that was requested.

MEMBER FARKAS: I think if anybody did the math there $I$ think that they are probably in compliance with Skudrna.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I think that would be my guess. That to the people who live near this, getting that four-tenths rule of that setback and the space between it, you're getting something better than what you might get if he built two houses as of right.

And at the same time, the homes that are built there get the luxury of having a bigger space between them. So in a way $I$ see it as a benefit for Westhampton Dunes of its existing residents and new residents.

MS. BREEN: Well, the benefit also is that you can impose rules that you can't impose on the two house situation.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Correct, correct.

CLERK SADELI: Are you interested in hearing --

MEMBER CASHIN: Sure.
CLERK SADELI: So there were two questions here, buy Mr. Grande was first, so I'm going to un-mute him.

MR. GRANDE: Yes, hi, everyone. My name is Frank Grande, 749 Dune Road. I'm kind of across the street, I'm on the other side of the house. So I just -- this is the first I'm kind of -I've heard some rumors of what was going on, so bear with me a little bit.

Can you guys hear me okay?
CLERK SADELI: Yes.
MR. GRANDE: All right. So are these plans available digitally? Because I'm not in New York, I probably won't come back for another couple of
weeks. I am a developer in New York also, so I kind of understand. Listen, they're going to get built, that's great, that's progress, right? It's like you guys are talking about plans that nobody can see when we're on Zoom. So is there a way to get access to these digitally, or even a link? CLERK SADELI: I have them in e-mail.

MEMBER KRASNOW: We only have -we're only looking at site plans, and we're not looking at any elevations or anything like that, but yes, I think whatever Angela has in digital I think she can share it or put it on the website. However you -- whatever is the easiest way for you to share it. CLERK SADELI: If you want to e-mail me and request it? MR. GRANDE: Perfect. CLERK SADELI: And I'll send it to you or whoever wants it then can e-mail me and request that.

MR. GRANDE: Yeah, I'll find your

| 1 | e-mail. And so now these three lots, |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | the proposal is to merge them into two |
| 3 | lots, correct? |
| 4 | MEMBER KRASNOW: No, we're going |
| 5 | from two lots to three lots. We're |
| 6 | going the other way. |
| 7 | MR. GRANDE: Oh, they want to go |
| 8 | from two lots that are there now to |
| 9 | three lots? They're building two |
| 10 | houses. |
| 11 | MEMBER CASHIN: Three. |
| 12 | MEMBER KRASNOW: Possibly three. |
| 13 | They can build two as of right and |
| 14 | three with a variance that they're |
| 15 | seeking the relief for. |
| 16 | MR. GRANDE: Okay. So do we know |
| 17 | -- so again, forgive me for my |
| 18 | ignorance, but what's the FAR? So in |
| 19 | Other words -- (inaudible). But really |
| 20 | how big are these houses going to be on |
| 21 | the lots? So if it's two versus three, |
| 22 | that's where it kind of throws off the |
| 23 | neighborhood with some of the houses |
| 24 | going down back and forth, you know, if |
| 25 | it's going to be a five, six thousand |

square foot house, then there's going to be three of them, that's probably going to be an issue.

MR. HULME: Well, those details are all on the map that Angela will be sending you, but the houses are a fair bit below the allowable FAR in this area and certainly less than the as of right.

MEMBER KRASNOW: What was
originally the estimated as of right, it was about 8,000 feet of house or something like that?

MR. ANTONOCCI: 8,000 footprint.
MEMBER KRASNOW: They were very large, they were about 8,000 foot footprints if they just built two houses. They're very large.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: You could have a 16,000 foot --

MR. GRANDE: Got you. They want three stories or two stories? That's the other thing. You understand that's where I think a lot of the -- at least from what I gathered from the people

on the ocean can do the same.
MR. HULME: And again, if I -MR. GRANDE: Okay. I'll just e-mail for the plans to get an idea because for because for me I need to see the plans so I can get a better understanding. I thought it was the other way around, three houses down to two, and I'm like what's the big deal with that? But if it's two lots going to three then that does change dramatically what it can and can't be and what it's going to look like over there. And my personal concern is I'm on the other side, what I'm looking straight at at my house, so on the other side of the little house. Now, if you're going to do that over there and then it's going to be a precedent to do it over here, and it's really going to throw off -- I knew when $I$ bought my house I'm not going to have that view forever, right? It was great while it lasted. But you know, you also have to make sure that you're not
going to basically put up a brick wall of three or four houses right in front of you and you're not going to be able to see anything.

MR. HULME: Well, the purpose of the discussion today as well as at the last hearing and the analysis -- the view shed analysis that we provided demonstrates that your view would be more interfered with by our as of right two lot construction as opposed to the proposed three lot construction. And as far as the height, we could, you know, the as of right can go to the maximum height permitted under the code and would therefore also interfere more with your view than what we proposed even at the same height. You get a better -- you're not going to keep your view, but you're getting a lesser impact.

CLERK SADELI: We can only hear one person at a time.

MR. GRANDE: I'm sorry. So you're saying three houses will be less

| 1 | imposing than two houses? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. HULME: Yes, as far as your |
| 3 | ability to view. And that's what's |
| 4 | demonstrated on the drawings that |
| 5 | Angela will be sending you. |
| 6 | MR. GRANDE: That's great. So you |
| 7 | know what, I'll stop. I can't really |
| 8 | make any good, you know, I guess |
| 9 | judgments for lack of a better word, |
| 10 | you know, until $I$ see kind of what's |
| 11 | going on with what's being proposed on |
| 12 | the plans. But thank you for your |
| 13 | time. |
| 14 | MEMBER FARKAS: I just want to add |
| 15 | to that that across the street from 749 |
| 16 | there's already a subdivision of three |
| 17 | homes that's been approved in 2009 |
| 18 | so -- |
| 19 | MR. GRANDE: Isn't that size a |
| 20 | little bit larger that the others? |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: They're almost |
| 22 | the same size. |
| 23 | MEMBER KRASNOW: A couple of feet |
| 24 | larger each lot, nothing significant. |
| 25 | MEMBER FARKAS: The lots across |


| 1 | the street from you are 83, and the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | lots that are proposed that we're |
| 3 | talking about today is 79. |
| 4 | MR. GRANDE: Got you. Okay. |
| 5 | CLERK SADELI: Lauren, do you |
| 6 | still have a question? |
| 7 | MS. NANNARIELLO: I do. |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Let her |
| 9 | identify herself. |
| 10 | CLERK SADELI: Lauren, can you |
| 11 | just state your name and the address |
| 12 | for the record? |
| 13 | MS. NANNARIELLO: Lauren |
| 14 | Nannariello, 743 Dune Road. |
| 15 | CLERK SADELI: Okay. Go ahead. |
| 16 | MS. NANNARIELLO: My concerns, I |
| 17 | guess, are pretty much the elevations |
| 18 | being that they've increased over the |
| 19 | past couple of years. They can start 3 |
| 20 | to 6 feet higher than our houses in the |
| 21 | surrounding areas. So when you are |
| 22 | going to be building these homes, |
| 23 | they're going to be starting a lot |
| 24 | higher, and with the pyramid they're |
| 25 | going to go much higher than people |


| 1 | realize. It's like 63 feet right now, |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | that type of home, so it's going to be |
| 3 | there. They're going to maximize their |
| 4 | space obviously, you know, if they can |
| 5 | go as high as they want to go. |
| 6 | MR. HULME: We can go as high as |
| 7 | the code will allow us to go, but we |
| 8 | can go there as of right without any |
| 9 | variances with two houses that will |
| 10 | interfere more with your view than the |
| 11 | three houses will. |
| 12 | MS. NANNARIELLO: That's an |
| 13 | opinion. |
| 14 | MR. HULME: Yes, it is. Based on |
| 15 | the facts as presented. |
| 16 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: You should read |
| 17 | the code for the height -- you should |
| 18 | read the code for the height |
| 19 | limitation. |
| 20 | CLERK SADELI: Go ahead, Lauren. |
| 21 | MS. NANNARIELLO: If you have the |
| 22 | two homes there that are front to back |
| 23 | with 743 and 745, you'll have 36 feet |
| 24 | between the two homes, if not more. I |
| 25 | think that's what we have between our |

two homes.
MR. HULME: That's correct for the as of right.

MS. NANNARIELLO: So, I mean, by saying that you're going to put three homes there with 12 feet side yards, it's 12 feet.

MR. HULME: If you take the two lot configuration and you add up the side yards, and you take the three lot configuration and you add up the side yards, you get a bigger number for the three lots.

MS. NANNARIELLO: With the three-tenth rule.

MR. HULME: No, with the four-tenths rule as shown. MR. MIZZI: Is there a way to show?

MS. NANNARIELLO: We would be more apt to obviously the four-tenths rule, and that's to go into the same rules that Skudrna had to comply with. MR. HULME: I think it's been concluded that the same calculus was
applied.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Right now the plan is, if we agree to something, it would be to follow consistent with the Skudrna approval. MS. BREEN: With the ability to put restrictions. MS. NANNARIELLO: I just feel like the lines (inaudible) a couple of meetings ago, each house lines up one to one in the whole area up to Pikes Beach besides the last two houses that are -- you know, it's the continuity of the neighborhood, not to just put as many houses as you can. It's a huge variance they're requesting. It's a large variance, it's not a small variance. MR. HULME: Again, I have to take exception to that. My opinion. But the lot widths that we are proposing are very consistent and, in fact, at the high end of the lot widths in the neighborhood. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: And I don't
know if you heard what $I$ said earlier that we wanted to put something in the approval, if we agree to it, that this would be only for homes that are in excess of 75 feet in width so that it would help not set a precedent for something in the future.

MS. NANNARIELLO: We already got that with Skudrna, right?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: No. With
Skudrna, I mean, they're 83 foot wide lots that are very similar in size. And again, this is somewhat in keeping with that, but it's very different from other homes in Westhampton Dunes that are, you know -- these would be on the bay side some of the largest width lots.

MS. NANNARIELLO: I know. So let me ask you, you said that as far as, like, the neighborhood being flag lot thing, that really wasn't pertaining to this situation? There's no chance of it going -- the DEC won't even let you go beyond the lots of the envelope.

MEMBER FARKAS: If we approve the three lots, there will be no flag lots behind these homes.

MS. NANNARIELLO: They couldn't be there is my point.

MEMBER KRASNOW: I don't know if that's true or not.

MS. NANNARIELLO: My whole biggest problem is if it was front to back, that was my first thought, which is what I wanted to have it for the continuity with the neighborhood, but they gave us this schematic, this footprint with the house that would be 4,200 to 4,500; is that just the first two floors, is that including the third floor? How much third floor are they going to build? You've seen what's been going on. The houses are like brick walls going up lately. So every house has character in this neighborhood, every house is a little bit different. And you know, they're trying to maximize the square feet, it's square, and it's high because the
height levels are at least 3 to 6 feet higher than they were when we built our home, so its' definitely -- it's not going to go with the neighborhood to be honest, but we can't control the fact that you guys -- I mean, it's better of course the height is now raised. It's good. But I'm saying it's not going with the houses that are there now. They're all built around 2000, the late 90's. Mike Roski's (phonetic) house past Skudrna, that house was built, like, '99, '96, whatever it was. So those houses aren't high. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I think the explanation maybe we could give you, or at least my understanding of this, the three houses versus the two houses, you wind up with greater space between the homes, and if they want to make the houses fit within that pyramid with a small third floor, I mean, again, we can't really stop them from doing that with a two house scenario. MS. NANNARIELLO: Actually voice
our opinions to make them smaller. If we do the three lots, we should have a say in what the max square footage should be in the homes.

MEMBER KRASNOW: We would. If we grant the variance, we do have conditions and restrictions we can put on the homes that we're trying to say to the neighbors if this is better for you, then we will work to accommodate you. If we don't grant a variance, they can build two houses with about an 8,000 footprint each, and they can go three stories high, whatever the code allows them as of right, and they can construct any time of the year.

MS. NANNARIELLO: I understand
that. And I actually don't have a problem with that to be honest. If that was the case, $I$ don't care. But if we can get the four-tenths rule, and get the square footage under control, and see a schematic like Frank was saying, that would be helpful. MEMBER KRASNOW: I apologize, you
said you don't have a problem with which scenario? I'm not sure what you're referring to.

MS. NANNARIELLO: I don't have a problem -- I actually don't have a problem with the two house scenario because I feel it lines up. You know, my house is 7,000 square feet, and I'm on the same size lot as 738, obviously I have to expect a 7,000 square feet home across the street from me. That's what it is. But like you're saying, the only reason why $I$ would even really be okay with it is if we do the four-tenth rule, and also make sure the houses aren't going to be, like, a schematic so it conforms to the neighborhood, not have three identical houses and look like 653 where it's just a big block of house. That's what's been going up lately because they want to try to maximize the square footage and get more money for their homes. They're going to sell them. So I mean, to keep the continuity of the

| 1 | neighborhood, these homes were al |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | built 20 years ago, 25 years ago in the |
| 3 | 90's. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I understand |
| 5 | your concern. You know, this Board, |
| 6 | you know, is tasked with we follow |
| 7 | certain rules, certain training that |
| 8 | we've had, and we've kind of gotten to |
| 9 | this point of three versus two. You |
| 10 | know, if you look at the size of the |
| 11 | houses to the immediately to the east |
| 12 | Of it, the two homes they could build, |
| 13 | while they're closer in size to your |
| 14 | home on the ocean, they're considerably |
| 15 | smaller or I should say considerably |
| 16 | narrower than the homes on the bay |
| 17 | side. You know, as far as what's in |
| 18 | keeping, that's opinion, and I respect |
| 19 | yours. We're just trying to come up |
| 20 | with a solution here that everybody can |
| 21 | live with. |
| 22 | MS. NANNARIELLO: I think that the |
| 23 | gentleman that said before that it |
| 24 | should definitely be the same as |
| 25 | Skudrna, if not more. It should be at |


| 1 | least the 18 feet side yards. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I think that |
| 3 | we're following that ratio right now. |
| 4 | We'll double check that. |
| 5 | MS. NANNARIELLO: The ratio is |
| 6 | less. It's 79 feet by -- because I |
| 7 | think Mr. Hulme was saying the side |
| 8 | yards they're requesting, or is it 15? |
| 9 | I'm confused. Was he saying 12 or 15 |
| 10 | feet side yard? |
| 11 | MEMBER FARKAS: Between the two |
| 12 | homes it's 35.5 feet, Skudrna is 36 |
| 13 | feet. The Skudrna property is 83.33 |
| 14 | feet wide, and these lots are 39.33. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I mean, it's |
| 16 | inches. |
| 17 | MEMBER FARKAS: So the ratio is |
| 18 | higher for this proposal. You're |
| 19 | talking now about the side yards to the |
| 20 | east -- to the house on the east and |
| 21 | the house on the west? |
| 22 | MS. NANNARIELLO: Right. |
| 23 | MEMBER FARKAS: Which is 12 and |
| 24 | 12. |
| 25 | MEMBER KRASNOW: What was |

Skudrna's on the east and the west?
MS. NANNARIELLO: Skudrna I
thought was 36 feet.
MR. ANTONOCCI: I thought it was just the envelopes, $I$ don't know -MEMBER FARKAS: 18 to the east and the west?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: On the west you can scale it, but it doesn't really show. It shows all but that one spot.

MR. ANTONOCCI: I also wanted to mention these are deeper lots, so they're bigger lots than Skudrna in lot area. So that's a consideration as well. The bigger lots might be a little bit wider, but these are bigger lot area.

CLERK SADELI: Lauren, do you want to make just one more final comment? And then we're going to take it back to the Board.

MS. NANNARIELLO: NO, I think what the gentleman was saying about the side yards is positive. Larger side yards.

CLERK SADELI: Are there any other

| 1 | questions from any other Zoom members |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | or anyone here in the room? |
| 3 | MR. MACRONE: I actually have a |
| 4 | question. John Macrone, 734 and 739 |
| 5 | Dune Road. The issue concerning as of |
| 6 | right, the two properties that could be |
| 7 | built without any relief, my question |
| 8 | is if 150 feet width is required and |
| 9 | it's approximately 120 each, 240 total, |
| 10 | I don't know if it's divided equally, |
| 11 | but there's no relief required with the |
| 12 | 150? |
| 13 | MEMBER KRASNOW: They're |
| 14 | preexisting. |
| 15 | MR. MACRONE: And the right to a |
| 16 | view, that's a question that comes up a |
| 17 | lot. Does anyone actually have a legal |
| 18 | right to a view? |
| 19 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: It's relevant to |
| 20 | this Board as far as impacts. And I'm |
| 21 | saying that as somebody when $I$ owned a |
| 22 | house on the ocean in the Village, I |
| 23 | had a one mile unobstructed view with |
| 24 | nobody to the west of me for one mile. |
| 25 | But it's not -- whether or not there's |


| 1 | a legal right to a view is not -- can't |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | be determined by this Board, but what's |
| 3 | relevant to this Board is the impacts |
| 4 | of obstruction of the view or |
| 5 | mitigating the obstruction. |
| 6 | MR. MACRONE: And one final |
| 7 | question, the five part test, which |
| 8 | number three, the substantial nature of |
| 9 | the variance, you know, to go down to a |
| 10 | 79 foot lot, does the Board think |
| 11 | that's somewhat substantial to grant |
| 12 | that type of relief? Even based on |
| 13 | Skudrna, is that typically something |
| 14 | that is granted? |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I'm not sure I |
| 16 | understand the question. |
| 17 | MEMBER CASHIN: From what to what? |
| 18 | MR. MACRONE: To go down to 79. |
| 19 | MEMBER CASHIN: From? |
| 20 | MR. MACRONE: From I guess it |
| 21 | would be it's 120 now, so approximately |
| 22 | 240 total. |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Do we think |
| 24 | it's substantial? I mean, you know, |
| 25 | substantially good or -- |

MR. MACRONE: Just a lot of relief based on what the lot is existing to go down to 79.

MR. HULME: As a percentage of the requirement, it's a large percentage, but it's my understanding of the law in that area that you have to look at that in the context of the neighborhood. And in the context of the neighborhood, an 80 foot wide lot is the neighborhood. There aren't any lots that are 150 foot wide in the area of this lot.

MEMBER KRASNOW: I think the lots run from about 40 feet to maybe a little over 100, but you know, we have a lot of lots that are 40, 50, 60 feet in the neighborhood.

MR. HULME: So you can't look at that in a vacuum.

MR. MACRONE: Not as the percentage but as --

MR. HULME: That would be my position.

MR. MACRONE: That's exactly the
question $I$ had. So it's more based on the neighboring properties or other ones in the community more than the percentage.

MR. HULME: Yes, I would say.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: So the Village's opinion on that is it's a balancing. There's several considerations. One of them is the proportion or whether it's a substantial variance. In a balancing of that is the -- one of the other -one or two of the other considerations is whether or not it's consistent with other lots in the neighborhood, whether or not there's been variances granted. Some of the lots that Mr. Hulme was talking about that are smaller lots may have been the product of other variances that were granted, which also has relevance. So it's the conformity with the -- substantial is determinable -- is relevant on its own, but it also has to be taken into consideration with the conformity with existing circumstances in the neighborhood, and
that also has to be taken into consideration with whether some of those existing circumstances were the product of other variances that were granted. That's relevant also. MR. MACRONE: Thank you.

MS. BREEN: I'm under the impression that the bunny hut was an original surviving structure from the storms in the 80's that has been updated and whatnot over time, just recently actually. Is there a plan for the bunny hut, preserving it, moving it?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I think there was chat about it, but $I$ don't know. MEMBER KRASNOW: I think -CLERK SADELI: What about a donation to the Village? MEMBER KRASNOW: I think you were okay with it, the question was where to put it.

MR. ANTONOCCI: Yes, I'm not looking to the demolish the house, just looking to repurpose it elsewhere in
the Village, elsewhere on the property, something to that effect. MEMBER KRASNOW: I think that was discussed, and he was very open to that, so it's just a matter of if we could find a place to put it.

MR. HULME: Find a home for the home.

MS. BREEN: Does our Village have an Architectural Review Board? CLERK SADELI: No.

MS. BREEN: It does not. So when plans are submitted, the Building Department approves them basically? CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Right. So if it's as of right, meaning it complies with the pyramid and all those zoning rules, this Board does not get involved.

MS. BREEN: And you can build two identical houses. I think that was one of Lauren's worries. I would hate to see three identical houses. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So one of the things we could -- that this Board, if
we grant this variance we could say that we would like to have the three homes have different character, whatever, something. I mean, we can come up with something. MR. HULME: The only thing -CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: But we don't dictate --

MR. HULME: Yeah, and since there is not an Architectural Review Board in the Village, and there's no Historic District in the Village, there's no standard by which that can be judged. And we agree that you can condition this on a lot of things, but the conditions have to be related to the relief that we're looking for, and I'm not sure the style of the home has anything to do with that. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Well, in my experience on the Zoning Board, there are things that we have -- Joe, particularly, and I have done. There's landscaping issues, if there are septic system, walls, and there are various

| 1 | things that we have been able to |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | instigate. In other words, say hey, |
| 3 | listen. There are other rules that |
| 4 | exist that, you know, we could -- there |
| 5 | are lighting rules, there are things |
| 6 | that exist without us that need to be |
| 7 | complied to. We can be more specific |
| 8 | about it to some degree. I mean, look, |
| 9 | we're not trying to make this a |
| 10 | hardship for someone who is building |
| 11 | it, and at the same time we could try |
| 12 | to come up with something and ask for |
| 13 | their best intent to do certain things, |
| 14 | but we can't really say this house, |
| 15 | this one is going to be a Mediterranean |
| 16 | house, this one is going to be |
| 17 | traditional, and this one is going to |
| 18 | be -- |
| 19 | MS. BREEN: Modern, whatever. |
| 20 | MEMBER MIZZI: Would it be |
| 21 | objectionable if there was a request |
| 22 | not to have them all be exactly the |
| 23 | same? |
| 24 | MR. ANTONOCCI: Well, it's not |
| 25 | going to be to our benefit to make them |


| 1 | exactly the same. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MEMBER MIZZI: No, I'm just saying |
| 3 | -- but my question was -- I mean, |
| 4 | that's your question, right? |
| 5 | MS. BREEN: Right. You don't want |
| 6 | it to look like three houses have been |
| 7 | built for a little development. I |
| 8 | mean, when you go up and down starting |
| 9 | from where the pillars are that say |
| 10 | you're entering the Dunes, from that to |
| 11 | that there's almost not one house that |
| 12 | matches. |
| 13 | MEMBER MIZZI: Let me give you an |
| 14 | example, I think your house, right - |
| 15 | those houses were built -- |
| 16 | MEMBER CASHIN: There's three of |
| 17 | my house. |
| 18 | MEMBER MIZZI: Those houses were |
| 19 | built together, but they were built |
| 20 | slightly differently so they don't look |
| 21 | exactly the same. |
| 22 | MEMBER CASHIN: They're pretty |
| 23 | much the same, but they're separated by |
| 24 | other houses. The one two houses west |
| 25 | of me is an exact duplicate -- east, |

east of me. MEMBER FARKAS: I think the owner would agree.

MS. BREEN: You hear the request that they don't look like a development?

MR. ANTONOCCI: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: What you're really saying is you don't want each window for each house to be exactly the same, and certain things to give it character so that they're slightly different. But at the same time we can't totally dictate -MS. BREEN: No, I get that. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So I think --

I don't want to speak for you. MR. ANTONOCCI: You can. My
intent is not to make them identical. MS. BREEN: There you go. MEMBER KRASNOW: They're going to be fraternal triplets. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I think you touched on it by saying it's not in his interest to build three, like, clones
of each other.
MR. ANTONOCCI: Correct, correct. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: For various reasons. MEMBER FARKAS: Eric, I'd like to address Lauren's comments about the side yards on the end property. So the house to the east, what is -- is there a driveway, a non-buildable driveway to the east of that?

MR. ANTONOCCI: There are two
independently owned lots, so there is more of a buffer between the house to the east because of these two parcels. MEMBER FARKAS: Are either of
those buildable?
CLERK SADELI: No. They're just easements.

MR. ANTONOCCI: They're deeded,
somebody owns them.
CLERK SADELI: Yeah, and they were noticed.

MEMBER FARKAS: But you can't build on them?

MR. HULME: No.

MS. BREEN: Unfortunately because I would build some place just so they couldn't park 20 cars there.

MEMBER FARKAS: So the side yard you're proposing 12 on the --

MR. ANTONOCCI: With the intent of making the center a little bit wider.

MR. HULME: I think what you're getting at is the effective side yard between 734 is, in fact, larger because of those two access ways.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I'm not sure
if the people on the Zoom call
understand that, I'm not sure if you understand that.

MS. BREEN: No, I totally get it.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So it gets better.

MEMBER FARKAS: I'm trying to say it gets better. So now, how would we address because if Skudrna is doing 18, and this proposed is 12 , that's only 30 feet, and I think that was one of the objections.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So that would
be one we would need you guys to look at. In other words, on this side you pick up that extra space, and that's great, it helps make people's views better. But on this side where we only have the 12 foot, if you could center -- put this centered, however you want to do it, we would want that to be at least what Skudrna has. Right now you have 12 plus -MEMBER FARKAS: Well, at least it should be the four-tenths rule, and you're already over the four-tenths rule according to my math. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I don't think that's really a hardship for you because, again -MR. HULME: Are you suggesting that this house here be just centered? CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Yeah. Right? Wouldn't that help you? MR. HULME: That would help here, but does that help here? I mean, everything we give we're taking away. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I guess,
maybe --
MR. HULME: Our attempt was a balance.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So if it's 18 feet on this side, maybe you shift this over a foot or two, whatever it is, or maybe you leave it. Maybe -- I don't know. Listen, no one has built a house yet on Skudrna. You'll be first. MR. HULME: If we're ahead of them presumably then they can build based on what you may approve here.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Right.
MR. HULME: They don't have to build to the limits of that side of the house.

MS. BREEN: So that property
that's not developed yet, their variances are already in place, so once they decide to build they have the as of right.

MR. HULME: That is correct, but they have to go to the Planning Board. MS. BREEN: To get the -MEMBER KRASNOW: Their subdivision
is approved, not their variance. ATTORNEY PROKOP: Whenever you're ready, I have a suggestion. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Joe, let's hear -- I think we've have covered everybody's comments. Guys, hang on one second.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I think you're at the point probably where, you know, what you should do is to communicate to the Planning Board slash Trustees that you'd like input on the question of whether the houses should be -- whether there should be a north -- definitive north line, or staggering, or both. And then also seek public comment on that from the people that are online, now they can submit public comments -they can submit comments. The other thing I think you might consider happening just to see if you can come to -- if there's going to be a middle ground that you can come to with the applicant is to request the applicant's attorney to provide a proposed covenant
based on the Skudrna decision, Skudrna, and also based on the comments that he's had so far here so we don't have to spend another two or three meetings going over a covenant.

MR. HULME: I can do that.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: And I don't have to sit in my office on a Sunday doing it.

MR. HULME: I get to sit in my office on a Sunday doing it.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All right. So
for everyone that's on the Zoom call, we'd ask for you to give us any comments you have, correct, Joe?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yeah. And we encourage specifically comments about whether the houses should be staggered or --

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Versus in a row.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Or a definitive north line.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Or a border like Skudrna had. And then, I guess,
the other question is as far as any -Irwin mentioned it before -- any considerations that we're looking for, we'd like those too. So any comments that people have that you want a landscaping request or you want a -MS. BREEN: No pile driving between the 4 th of July and Labor Day. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Whatever it is within reason.

MS. BREEN: No. At all. I'm not saying no building, I'm saying no pile driving.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I don't think you're -- well, I don't know what the rules are right now, so I can't speak to that, but in any event, give us what you have in writing to Angela and try to get it to us in the next couple of weeks so that we have it --

CLERK SADELI: By May 5th so we have everything to review.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Okay.
CLERK SADELI: Lauren, did you
hear that?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: We'll send an e-mail out saying that. The idea is that when we get together next time we are --

MS. NANNARIELLO: Yes, I heard that.

CLERK SADELI: So any public comment, just send to me, if you have it. Okay?

MS. NANNARIELLO: Yes.
MR. HULME: Procedurally, how -maybe this is a question for Counsel. How do we get in front of the Trustees?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: You don't do anything. We're going to send a communication to the Trustees.

MR. HULME: And the drawings?
ATTORNEY PROKOP: Angela has the drawings.

MEMBER KRASNOW: Just technical question, back to the beginning, does he have to merge the lots and then subdivide --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: So here's what happened with this application. I try

| 1 | to say this at least once a meeting, |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | was going to try to avoid it today. I |
| 3 | was contacted by the Village -- excuse |
| 4 | me, I was berated by forcing -- because |
| 5 | it was said that I was forcing the |
| 6 | applicant to merge the lots and then |
| 7 | un-merge them. If you read the |
| 8 | application, what it actually says is |
| 9 | that the application is to merge the |
| 10 | lots and then un-merge them. So it |
| 11 | wasn't my recommendation. But what's |
| 12 | going to happen here I think is that |
| 13 | there will be a plan filed, which is |
| 14 | basically just dissolving the two lots |
| 15 | into three lots. There's going to be a |
| 16 | superseding plan filed with Suffolk |
| 17 | County, which will be the plot, the new |
| 18 | plots of this property, which will be |
| 19 | three lots instead of two lots. The |
| 20 | question that we need to have the |
| 21 | applicant resolve, hopefully amicably, |
| 22 | with the Village and my office is |
| 23 | whether you want the same name on those |
| 24 | three lots or different names, and how |
| 25 | you want us to handle that. You know, |


| 1 | because you're taking a lot that is |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | owned -- two lots that are owned by two |
| 3 | different entities, and we're going to |
| 4 | go to the County and say we want these, |
| 5 | so the first thing the County is going |
| 6 | to say is well, what's the name? You |
| 7 | probably want to transfer one of them |
| 8 | into the -- excuse me, one of the two |
| 9 | into the same name as the other one so |
| 10 | then they can have the same name, or |
| 11 | your attorney will advise you on how to |
| 12 | do that, but that's the next step that |
| 13 | you have to be thinking about. |
| 14 | MEMBER KRASNOW: Suffolk County |
| 15 | Health Department will have to approve |
| 16 | this also. |
| 17 | MR. HULME: Yes. |
| 18 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: So the answer to |
| 19 | your question, the short answer is I |
| 20 | don't think we can go through the |
| 21 | merger line, the merger process. I |
| 22 | think it's just going to be an overlay |
| 23 | of a new plot map that's going to be |
| 24 | given to the County. |
| 25 | MEMBER KRASNOW: As long as you |

guys have a blueprint for it, $I$ just wanted to make sure that -- I didn't -I had the feeling --

MR. HULME: I agree with Counsel.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Okay.
MEMBER FARKAS: What's the
timeframe based on everything we've heard today as to when construction would start?

MR. HULME: Tomorrow? Probably
not until the fall at the earliest, I would think. The question is really when will we be fully approved to start construction?

MEMBER FARKAS: How long does it typically take?

MR. HULME: The Health Department is going to take several months. That's going to be the big driver of time here. And the reason why we haven't applied yet is because obviously there's been a lot of interest and concern, and we didn't want to apply for something that wasn't going to get approved.

MEMBER FARKAS: I'm just thinking when are you going to start driving those piles for two houses or three houses?

MR. HULME: Probably sometime in the winter.

MEMBER FARKAS: Unlikely before Labor Day.

MR. HULME: No, not a chance.
MS. BREEN: I only mention it because 2017 was our first summer, and for, like, three weeks I don't know where it was, but there was pile driving. And we spent a lot of time out at the house during the week, and you could really like, you know, drive a nail into your head because it's so rhythmic and so long.

MR. HULME: And if there's more than one going on at the same time, that's got to be terrible.

MS. BREEN: 4th of July to Labor Day is kind of sacred out here. And I'm not suggesting that you can't do construction, I'm just suggesting the
pile driving.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: We certainly put that on the list and we'll try to make it so that -CLERK SADELI: Will you build all three houses at the same time? MR. ANTONOCCI: Probably not. Maybe two, or start one and then stagger the build. See how things are when all approvals are in place. MEMBER KRASNOW: You're waiting for interest rates to go up more before you start? CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All right. So I can make a motion to keep this open and close --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: No, we're going to adjourn the public hearing open until the next meeting date. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Someone second? MEMBER KRASNOW: Aye. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All in favor?
(Aye said in unison.)
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Thank you for
all coming. Thanks for listening. MEMBER MIZZI: I have one comment before we go. I think just procedurally, I'm not sure it's the case, but it seems to be the case, we're inviting people to a Zoom meeting, when $I$ accept the invite to a Zoom meeting, I assume that the materials that are being shown are going to be available, and it sounds like people are just giving comments based on not, like -- if we're going to do Zoom, we should do a screen share, documents that people are looking at. MEMBER KRASNOW: And we need a speaker. We need an external speaker. MEMBER MIZZI: Otherwise it's wasting time if people are giving comments that are not relevant because they're not looking at the materials. ATTORNEY PROKOP: Do we have anything else on the agenda today? I just had one item. (Handing). So Angela, what I did was -- I thought I had so many copies of this.

Oh I do. Angela, what $I$ did was I made one copy of what we're going to talk about. I think this is what we're looking at, and I copied the transcript, I copied the transcript from the last date that we actually voted on it, and I pasted it in the file after the decision so that way it will actually become part of the decision so we can see what we talked about. So this is what will go into your office, and then we need to discuss this.

So here is my recommendation for decision. I'm sorry you're getting it today, but it basically lists the meetings that we talked about this. It was a relatively simple application based on the comments and what took place at the last meeting. If you look at Page 4 after -- where it says therefore, I have the maximum lot coverage variance at 3.7 percent is granted. We have to talk about that. One of the conditions is the applicant

| 1 | is required to pay the -- reimburse the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Village prior to a building permit |
| 3 | being issued for stenography, |
| 4 | consulting, and professional costs. |
| 5 | The letter -- okay. There's a note in |
| 6 | this -- I made a note here because it |
| 7 | somehow has to be dealt with. The |
| 8 | Building Inspector sent an applicant a |
| 9 | letter midstream that said that the |
| 10 | side yard is not compliant. The side |
| 11 | yard is shown as being 20.3 feet, and |
| 12 | the minimum is supposed to be 20.8 |
| 13 | feet, and there was no variance |
| 14 | requested for that. So I don't know, |
| 15 | do you have any explanation? |
| 16 | MR. HULME: We adjusted. The |
| 17 | final version of the map we adjusted |
| 18 | that side yard setback so that it |
| 19 | complied. |
| 20 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: Okay. So I'll |
| 21 | take that out and then have Eric sign. |
| 22 | And then the other thing is your |
| 23 | survey -- you made a comment at the |
| 24 | last meeting that your survey showed |
| 25 | the lot coverage was 23.8 percent, but |

what was applied for was 23.7 percent, so how do you want to deal with that?

MR. HULME: Well, I think what
happened was when we updated the survey and reduced the side yard, the lot coverage was recalculated based on the current conditions. So we'll need the larger relief.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Also Joe, I remember when you said this, we agreed that they would put no extra solar panels on that side, but you write here that there shall be no additional solar panels added. In other words, is that -- I though you said we couldn't prohibit that?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: You could if it's going to be an impact. You think it's --

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I guess, what I'm saying is if they wanted to add a solar panel in a place that's not offensive to the neighbor --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Okay. Not on that side.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I thought
there was some issue with the State, you couldn't -- we can only prohibit them --

CLERK SADELI: I think in a location.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: -- language
that I think is okay.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: What about
approving exterior lighting, you want to do that, or no, you don't care? CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I think we wanted to.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Okay. So I added that in. And then the ground floor, there was a comment by the applicant that the ground floor is to be used for storage and garage use only.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: That's okay with me.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Okay. I asked him that. So then we -- so otherwise what I'd like to do basically is kind -- I know it's kind of backwards
because you're getting this today, but maybe we could vote to approve this, and then everybody take it with them and have, like, a week or two to edit it if you want, and then we'll have Eric sign it based on whatever comments we get. Don't sign that one because I have to make the adjustments that we talked about.

MEMBER KRASNOW: So we're approving it as potentially modified?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yes, with the comments that we got today.

MEMBER MIZZI: Approved as to be noted.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: If that's okay. MEMBER KRASNOW: This helps him so he can get started, is that why we're trying to --

CLERK SADELI: Yeah, so once we have the signed decision and he pays the fees to the Zoning Board, which he's already paid the first fee, so it would be for the second meeting, then he can get his permit.

MEMBER MIZZI: Approved subject to there's no objections to the further modifications.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yes, you can make that motion.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I'll make a motion to approve it.

MEMBER CASHIN: I'm going to abstain, unless it matters because I wasn't at this meeting and $I$ don't know anything about this.

MEMBER MIZZI: I was at prior meetings, $I$ was not at the last meeting, so $I$ can vote on it, but I -you know.

MEMBER CASHIN: If you don't need my vote, $I^{\prime} l l$ abstain.

MEMBER FARKAS: You should make the motion should be for Eric Saretsky to sign the approval.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: My name is already on it.

MEMBER FARKAS: I understand.
You're going to get all the comments and you're going to say this is okay,

| 1 | this is not okay. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MEMBER KRASNOW: As noted slash |
| 3 | modified. |
| 4 | MEMBER MIZZI: I'm just saying I |
| 5 | was at other meetings that are noted |
| 6 | here, I wasn't at the last meeting. |
| 7 | I'm willing to -- if it's okay for me |
| 8 | to vote, I'm willing to vote. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All in favor? |
| 10 | (Aye said in unison.) |
| 11 | MEMBER CASHIN: One abstention. |
| 12 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: We can close -- |
| 13 | MEMBER KRASNOW: All right. Make |
| 14 | a motion to adjourn the meeting. |
| 15 | MEMBER CASHIN: Second. |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All in favor? |
| 17 | (Aye said in unison.) |
| 18 | (The meeting was adjourned at |
| 19 | 11:36 a.m.) |
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