A Regular Meeting and Public Hearing was held by the Zoning Board of Appeals on Thursday, February 24, 2022 at 7 p.m. with Boardmembers participating via Zoom, live-streamed via WHoH-TV (Channel 75 or FIOS 43), and online at WHoH-TV.org


Attorney Whitehead: It's 7 o'clock.

Chairman Dovell: Good evening everyone and welcome to the Thursday, February 24th Zoning Board of Appeals meeting.

"General ground rules: In order to keep the meeting orderly and ensure we get a clear recording please follow these ground rules. When you are given access to speak please state your name and address. Boardmembers, please "mute" yourself when you are not speaking. Boardmembers, I will call on you one at the time to speak to avoid everyone speaking at once. If you wish to speak at any time when I'm not calling on you, you may do so by using the raise-hand function, or literally raise your hand, so I can see you and call on you. We will use roll call voting for purposes of all board motions. This is to ensure that the record is clear.

Thanks everyone for their patience as we negotiate this way of doing things."

Are the mailings in order, Buddy?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Yes, I have been informed by my staff that all the mailings are in order.

I. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON

Chairman Dovell: There are three cases on the agenda this evening. And the one administrative item, the election will be put off until later.

The first case is number 02-22.
II. **AGENDA**

**Case No. 03-22**  
Jonathan & Lori Slater  
14 Bellair Drive

Relief from strict application of the Village Code Sections 295-68F.1(c), 295-68F.2(a)(2) w/ 296-60D to replace a nonconforming garage at their home at 14 Bellair Drive. Said property is in R-10 Zoning District and is also known as SBL: 4.20-11.13 on the Village Tax Maps

Variances sought for nonconformities for the rebuilt garage are as follows:

1. Accessory Structure Side Yards: Existing and Proposed – Side 1/Side 2: 2.83’/0’; Required Minimum – Side 1/Side 2: 8’/8’ {295-68F.1(c)}; Variance Required – Side 1/Side 2, 5.17’/8’

2. Developmental Coverage: Existing and Proposed – 55.1 percent; Required maximum – 35 percent {295-68F.2(a)(2)}; Variance Required – 20.1 percent

3. With effects of serious damage: {295-60D} – Damage over 50 percent

**Chairman Dovell:** Who will be speaking on behalf of the applicant?

**Mitch Koch, project architect:** Hi, it's me. I'm helping the Slaters with this project. If you're ready I'll share my screen and just walk you through it very quickly.

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** Just make sure you emphasize the particular situation this property is in.

**Mr. Koch:** Oh yeah, it's very peculiar. Bear with me, please.

**Attorney Whitehead:** The dog can do it.

**Mr. Koch:** Bring him in.

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** Get that Kipper over here. C'mon.

**Mr. Koch:** All right very briefly, I'm going to go look at the survey of the property. Can everybody see it?
Chairman Dovell: Yes. If you could pull it up a little, Mitch, it would be better. There you go.

Mr. Koch: This triangular, or trapezoidal, wedge on the end is the part of the property that actually lies in Hastings. Most of the property's actually in Dobbs Ferry. We've been through the Planning Board and the ARB there. The issue is that there's an existing below-grade garage in the hillside. You can sort of see it on the left of this picture on the bottom left, with stairs ascending to the right of it. It is a mess. I don't think the Slaters ever used it actually. You can see there's just some storage in there, but it's totally unsafe. The concrete has fallen off the rebar and it's really time to replace it. The goal is to replace it exactly in place. But the possibility exists that we will use the back wall to buttress the hill, actually use it as a one-sided form, and put our back wall for the garage in front of it. Which is why I'm asking – and I'm gonna zoom down here to get permission to move the garage westward to accommodate that possible retention of the back wall. You can see it in this section drawing.

Chairman Dovell: And that additional encroachment is 12 square feet?

Mr. Koch: Yes, that's correct. But let me just walk you through this very quickly. I mean, it's crazy. Of course, I'm using accessory building requirements, and you can see that because it goes beyond the borderline of Dobbs. On the left side of the Hastings property the entire 8 feet of the required accessory building setback is encroached upon. And on the right side approximately, I don't know, 6 feet of the required 8 feet is encroached upon. It's just a weird site. Notably, probably we're going to put a CULTEC in the driveway which also falls on the Hastings side of the property. That's the gist of it. The garage is going to be exactly where the existing garage currently is, and we will be putting pavers on the roof. Most of which, of course, occurs … most of the work occurs in Dobbs Ferry, right? Conversely, most of the garage is in Hastings.

So that's it in a nutshell. Oh yeah, one last point. I'm probably going to have to remove the concrete stairs just to do the form work. It might be possible to retain them, but I'm a little bit dubious about that. But they would go back exactly as they were. I think that's it from me unless you have questions, of course.

Chairman Dovell: So it's basically replacing it in-kind, but the variances are basically two side yard issues pertaining to an accessory building, correct?

Mr. Koch: Correct.
Chairman Dovell: Because you have to view the Hastings parcel in complete isolation as a standalone lot. That's why you get the two side yards. So it is weird. I figured it out looking at it earlier, but it's a strange condition. I don't really have any questions about it. I think it's nicely done, it's a very simple structure, it is keeping it in traditional Hastings fashion. It's built into the side of the hill. That occurs all over Hastings, and it's a nice feature, it's kind of unique. And it's fixing up something that was decrepit, an improvement, and certainly in character with everything you see in Hastings. It's sensitively done and I personally have no further comments. It's just a curious situation in all regards because you have to evaluate everything in isolation: lot coverage and everything else, correct? So if you viewed it holistically – which we can't do, we can't view it holistically with both parcels – we can understand it's a handsome single-family house on a large lot with a sliver in Hastings. I have no comment, I think it's nicely done and appropriate.

Why don't we go around and see what others think. Josh?

Boardmember Heitler: I just had two quick questions. The top of the garage you're proposing to have as a paved patio. What is currently on top of the garage? Is it just turf?

Mr. Koch: That's correct. There's turf on the top of the garage currently.

Boardmember Heitler: So you would just be creating a permeable patio there, but use-wise it was always a usable space.

Mr. Koch: Yes, and as a matter of fact there's an impervious surface just below turf so there's really no change in that regard. Well, I would like to call it impervious. Of course a lot of the water's running right through the garage now.

Boardmember Heitler: [Laughter] Understood. Then my second question may not be for the applicant. It's just a curiosity question. Given this project, what Building Department and permit jurisdiction would the construction be under?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: Both.

Attorney Whitehead: Both.

Chairman Dovell: How convenient.

Boardmember Heitler: That's all I had, Ray.
Chairman Dovell: David, your thoughts?

Boardmember Chen: I don't have any questions, Ray, and I concur with all your comments. I think it makes a lot of sense and it looks good.

Boardmember Quinlan: I just have one question, Mitch. This garage you're going to build, except for the possibility of the 12-inch west wall, is going to be the exact same as the current garage?

Mr. Koch: That's correct, yes.

Boardmember Quinlan: And you said it's a probability about the 12 inches. What does that mean? I know you haven't decided yet.

Mr. Koch: We hired engineers who came up with a design to remove material at the angle of repose behind the garage so we could take that wall down without having a cave-in. But an alternate plan that other contractors have brought up as we've gone through was to keep that existing wall in place. Now you don't have to stockpile all that material and essentially you dismantle the garage in pieces and buttress that wall temporarily until the new structure itself anchors that wall. But it might be a smarter way to build it, just given the fact that there's actually a swimming pool uphill from it that we don’t want to crack if we can avoid it. A cave-in would be a big negative. I wouldn't call it catastrophic, but we want to manage that hillside.

Boardmember Quinlan: Okay, I have no further questions. Thank you.

Chairman Dovell: That seems like a perfectly sensible thing to do and I think in any motion we should mention that.

Mr. Koch: Thank you.

Chairman Dovell: Anyone from the public wish to be heard on this? I don't think we have much of a public this evening.

Frances Greenberg: I would like to just make a couple of comments because I am the next door neighbor to the south of the Slaters. I understand what they are doing is very, very necessary. Their deterioration I can observe, and it really needs to be reconstructed. My concerns, being to the south, are that as I read the plans things are basically going back in place. In other words, the staircase that's at the very southern end of the property next to the
garage will stay the same. They don't plan on shifting towards the south, which would be towards my house and my property. I would just ask for that assurance, if I'm reading the plans correctly.

Mr. Koch: That's absolutely correct.

Ms. Greenberg: Okay. The other thing is a very minor issue for the construction but a difficult issue for me. Which is, I have tied my deer fence into the Slaters' fence that goes around their property and just would like to ask that I be given adequate warning if there's no longer a barrier existing between me and possible deer invading so I can make adjustments and get a deer fence up to make up for the lack of barrier that may exist during the construction.

Mr. Koch: That's a good catch, yeah,

Ms. Greenberg: I have spoken to Lori about that and she's aware I'm concerned about that. She's been very understanding and I just want to put it out there to the Zoning Board.

Mr. Koch: Right. There might be, I'm gonna guess, a 10-foot or 15-foot section of fence that may be disturbed when the stair is removed, if it is removed. In that case we'll put up a temporary fence anyway. Or if you want to come in and put in deer fencing, probably best to wait for construction is over if you're going to do anything permanent.

Ms. Greenberg: Okay. I may need to do something temporary and would like to be given adequate warning. However we can work it out I would like a barrier to be up so I don't have to deal with deer.

Mr. Koch: Duly noted.

Ms. Greenberg: Okay, that's all I need to say.

Chairman Dovell: Anyone else? Then may I have a motion, anyone from the board?

Boardmember Quinlan: I'll make the motion, Ray. Case number 03-22, Jonathan and Lori Slater, 14 Bellair Drive. Variances are sought for the accessory structure Side Yards: Existing and Proposed – Side 1/Side 2: 2.83’/0’; Required Minimum – Side 1/ Side 2: 8’/8’. Variance Required – Side 1/Side 2, 5.17’/8’. Developmental Coverage: Existing and Proposed – 55.1 percent; Required maximum – 35 percent; Variance
Required – 20.1 percent. Again, I just want to note that the garage is going to be the same size as the current garage. I don't think there's a variance for number 3.

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** Oh, it's not a variance. That's why it's here, due to the effects of serious damage.

**Boardmember Quinlan:** Which is over 50 percent. So that's why we're here today.

**Chairman Dovell:** Okay, all in favor? Josh?

**Boardmember Heitler:** "Approved."

**Boardmember Chen:** "Approved."

**Boardmember Quinlan:** "Approved."

**Chairman Dovell:** And I "approve."

On MOTION of Boardmember Quinlan, SECONDED by Boardmember Chen, with a roll call vote of all in favor the Board resolved to grant the variances sought in Case No. 03-22 to replace a nonconforming garage at 14 Bellair Drive.

**Chairman Dovell:** It's all approved. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Koch:** Thank you. See you around the 'hood.

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** Thanks, Mitch. Good luck.

**Male Voice:** Good night, Kipper.

**Chairman Dovell:** The second case is number 04-22.

**Case No. 04-22**  
**Annabelle Rolland**  
**60 Washington Avenue**
Relief from the strict application of the Village Code Section 295-36A for reduction of required off-street parking for the conversion of a single-family dwelling into a two-family dwelling. Said property is in MR-1.5 Zoning District and is also known as SBL: 4.70-53-2 on the Village Tax Maps. Variance is sought for the parking requirement nonconformity.

Parking requirement: Existing and Proposed – one spot; Required – three spots {295-36A}; Variance Required for three off street parking spaces.

Chairman Dovell: Who will be speaking on behalf of the applicant?

Annabelle Rolland, 60 Washington Avenue: I am the applicant, and I will be speaking. I'll share my screen right away, if you don't mind. Can everybody see this? So 60 Washington is located near the intersection of the Aqueduct and Washington Avenue, as shown by the red dot on the slide. Before I show you the zoning analysis I want to familiarize you with the appearance of the building now, and as proposed. You see 60 Washington right there, circled. I wish to convert 60 Washington to a two-family dwelling. It's located within a multi-family district, MR-1.5, and was used as a two-family for as long as anyone can remember, with two kitchens, two electrical meters, and two gas meters. I would not be adding any need for additional parking over what has existed for many years. I plan to renovate the upper two floors as my residence and create a one-bedroom apartment on the lower level. I would like to rent the apartment for income. Because I live mostly on my own – my daughters are adults – I would feel safer with someone else in the house.

This photo shows the driveway located to the west of the house. It can accommodate one car, two in tandem, so I therefore need a variance for three off-street parking spaces. This is what the house currently looks like. I would like to renovate it to its former glory. This here is the proposed entrance to the one-bedroom apartment, as shown here in red. Am I going too fast? The zoning analysis here shows no changes, except on the last line, from a one-family to a two-. So permitted is two-family; existing is one-, proposed is two-. Here's the proposed plan for the one-bedroom apartment with the new entry you just saw in red, which would be right here. Then this is the existing west elevation. You currently go in right through here. This is the proposed elevation with the new door. This opening just remains, but becomes a window.

That's it. Do you have any questions?

Chairman Dovell: Did Planning opine on the parking situation, Linda?

Attorney Whitehead: It wasn't actually heard by Planning because it was improperly there
for an accessory dwelling. There had been a request for a parking waiver as part of that. There were a number of public comments received by the Planning Board in support of the application.

**Chairman Dovell:** I'd like to first just focus on the site plan …

**Ms. Rolland:** Okay, I'll go back.

**Chairman Dovell:** … just to get an understanding of what the actual configuration is of that.

**Ms. Rolland:** Here we go: the existing stairs of the house, if you remember the front elevation. And the new entrance would be right here in this corner.

**Chairman Dovell:** But then you have some areaways along the side of the house which are not shown. You have an areaway, two areaways, for windows and such that are not shown.

**Ms. Rolland:** I'm sorry, English is my second language. I don't understand what you mean by "areaways."

**Chairman Dovell:** Go to A-0. Where the have the bedroom, there is an areaway there where it says "egress window."

**Ms. Rolland:** Oh, yes.

**Chairman Dovell:** That is probably a concrete retaining wall that goes around that window.

**Ms. Rolland:** It's a small planter so I kept it for now. Let me go back to the proposed elevation.

**Chairman Dovell:** There you go. So it is, in fact, a little areaway.

**Attorney Whitehead:** It's required for egress for code purposes.

**Chairman Dovell:** I understand what it's for, but it then limits the width of the driveway to 8 feet, correct?

**Ms. Rolland:** Well, further than the driveway. Because the driveway's here – and the second spot, the tandem spot, is here – and this is further.
Chairman Dovell: Right. But what is the condition beyond the concrete driveway?

Ms. Rolland: It's gravel.

Chairman Dovell: But the two strips are parking strips there?

Ms. Rolland: They're pavers. I can show the photo. I think it was taken in the snow, but I can probably explain better with the photo. You barely see the pavers here because of the snow, then you have grass and then the small planter.

Chairman Dovell: So two cars could physically fit in there in tandem, as you said, easily. If you extended it you could fit three cars in there in tandem. I can see the lack of practicality. Otherwise you'd have to drive all the way—or you'd have to pave—a large part of your lot.

Ms. Rolland: I know when I bought the house there was an old car at the very end in the garden. So they got it there.

Chairman Dovell: They got it in there.

Ms. Rolland: I mean, I've never tried it but there was a car right there.

Chairman Dovell: But then to get to a garage area, to make a complying parking space, I don't believe tandem parking is permitted. Is it, Buddy?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: It's not counted because every spot has to have its own access to the street.

Chairman Dovell: Right. But for practical purposes you could fit two cars, three cars, in there. If you were having a party and somebody wanted to come you could say park in the grass, come in and park in tandem. So there's a safety valve there in the event of a lot of parking. I can see the one spot is all that would practically be provided there unless you completely disrupt the rear of the house and create a parking lot.

Ms. Rolland: I'm trying to find the photo again.

Chairman Dovell: Basically create a parking lot in the back of the house, which would bring in development coverage and other issues. So I can see how it's a hindrance to get
them in and I think it would be a disruption to actually provide four spaces here short of completely obliterating the backyard and creating a parking lot for four cars plus maneuvering space. I can see what you're up against here. While Washington has a lot of parking on it, it is possible to park there. I park there sometimes to walk to the train station. So I can understand the situation and I understand the reasons for it. I don't have a problem with what you're proposing, but I would like to hear what other members of the board have to say.

**Attorney Whitehead:** Ray, it's people like you who park on Washington to go to the train that are causing the problem [laughter].

**Chairman Dovell:** I know. That's only if I have time to walk. But I just had knee surgery so I'm driving right to the parking space. I don't have a further … I think the proposal for house is quite nice, it's going to be a lovely addition. I know Baldwin & Franklin are good architects. They've done a lot of work on the street so it's going to be a real enhancement. I really don't have an issue. And again, I can see the issues you would confront trying to park for conforming parking back there. Without further comment – Josh?

**Boardmember Heitler:** I think I generally agree with what you said, Ray. I guess for my own curiosity – from a zoning point of view in other jurisdictions – there are sort of waivers for parking if you're close to public transportation and the like. Knowing the town like we do, this is very much walking distance to the train location-wise, where you could imagine that either residents of the one- or two-family part of this might therefore need less cars potentially.

**Chairman Dovell:** That's a good point.

**Boardmember Heitler:** So factoring that in. I might have more concern with it in a different part of town.

**Chairman Dovell:** Anything further, Josh?

**Boardmember Heitler:** No, thank you.

**Boardmember Chen:** Some letters of support that were submitted to the Planning Board were mentioned. I was just curious, are they going to be entered into the record for this board?

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** They have been entered into the record from the last board to this
Attorney Whitehead: But Buddy, were they provided to the boardmembers?

Boardmember Chen: I haven't seen them, that's why I'm curious.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: I don't think we transferred them over. We have them in the file.

Boardmember Chen: That's fine.

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: I'd be more than happy to produce the letters for anybody that would want to see them.

Boardmember Chen: Were they all in support, Buddy?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: All in support. We've gotten no negative letters on this property. I got a couple of phone calls with some questions during the last couple of weeks, but that was it. Everybody understood, once I spoke to them, and we've gotten no objections whatsoever.

Attorney Whitehead: I think the neighborhood all know it has been used as a two-family for years so they don't see it as making anything worse.

Boardmember Quinlan: Ms. Rolland, when you bought the house did you convert it from a two-family house to a one-family house, or did you buy it as a one-family house? I'm looking for just a little history here.

Ms. Rolland: For a long time I thought I was buying a two-family house because it really looked everything like a two-family. Then when we went through the paperwork we discovered that actually it was not a two-family, and I hesitated. Then I thought, Um, I'll still buy it and do an accessory apartment. It was quite an ideal accessory apartment because it's exactly the size, et cetera. Then I realized at the last meeting I could not, so here I am tonight. Does that answer your question?

Boardmember Quinlan: That clarified it, thank you.

Attorney Whitehead: Jerry, on the records it shows as only a one-family. But it had clearly been illegally used as a two- if there were two meters and everything else. And I think the existing plans show two units. So it had been used as an illegal two- without permits for a
number of years. Ms. Rolland is now really trying to do the right thing by getting the actual permits to legalize it as a two.

**Boardmember Quinlan:** I think that's great. I'm just trying to learn, since we only have three cases today, and I'm just going to take a few more minutes of your time. You applied to the Planning Board for having an accessory apartment?

**Attorney Whitehead:** There was some confusion there.

**Boardmember Quinlan:** Educate me there so I can learn.

**Attorney Whitehead:** Sure. Since I'm the one who caught it at the Planning Board …

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** I had to learn the hard way, too, Jerry.

**Boardmember Quinlan:** Well, this is the easy way, Buddy.

**Attorney Whitehead:** We originally thought this would be an accessory apartment, and have her apply to the Planning Board for an accessory apartment. But in fact, accessory apartments are only permitted in your single-family zoning districts. This is a multi-family district so it doesn't have to be an accessory apartment, it can just be a second unit. You're permitted as-of-right here. It doesn't need an accessory apartment permit. So when it was applying as an accessory apartment the Planning Board had the right to grant a parking waiver for it. When we determined it couldn't be approved as an accessory apartment it instead needed a parking variance from your board. But the unit is a small one-bedroom. And that's the way the Planning Board looks at them, and very often grants parking variances for those, or parking waivers. But that's why it went there first, mistakenly, and is now before you.

**Boardmember Quinlan:** Okay, thank you. I have no problem with the variance, I'm just getting a little bit more of the history. And this is something we could talk about maybe in the future. In this kind of neighborhood the requirement for four spots I think really doesn't fit the neighborhood anymore, does it? That's just one of my comments.

**Chairman Dovell:** You're up against the width, Jerry. We confront this over and over. It's the width issue, and the fact that to get parking you would have to exceed the development coverage and really ruin any yard you have.

**Boardmember Quinlan:** I know, Ray, and you and I have had this discussion that some of
the requirements we have don't really make any sense for the neighborhood. That's just one of them. You may not agree with me, but I think it is.

**Chairman Dovell:** No, I do agree with you.

**Attorney Whitehead:** As an example, that's why we just reduced the parking requirement in the MR-O.

**Boardmember Quinlan:** Exactly.

**Chairman Dovell:** For the narrow-width buildings, yes – narrow-width lots.

**Boardmember Quinlan:** I just wanted to mention that for the record. About the parking, there are a lot of cars parked on Washington anyway, there's no doubt about it. I drive up and down, and sometimes even my street, Hillside, is almost like a one-way street a lot of times when there's a lot of cars moving around. Nevertheless, I have no problems with the variances. I think it's a great idea for a two-family house. It makes it more affordable for you, it makes it more safe for you. And from the record I've heard so far there's absolutely no opposition from the neighbors, which is very important to me because they have their own parking problems on that street. Not only from residents but more from nonresidents who park on that street. That's where the real problem is.

**Chairman Dovell:** That's me then, Jerry. I take full blame for that.

**Boardmember Quinlan:** You're not a nonresident though.

**Chairman Dovell:** No, I'm parking to walk to the trains. I'll never do it again.

**Boardmember Quinlan:** [Laughter], no that's fine Ray. I'm just saying it's for people who live out of town that are really doing it. Anyway, yeah, I wish you luck. I think it's a great plan and I have no more to say. Thank you.

**Ms. Rolland:** Thank you.

**Chairman Dovell:** Anyone from the public at all want to be heard? Is anyone out there?

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** Nobody's out there.

**Attorney Whitehead:** There is *no* public.
Chairman Dovell: Okay, I'll stop asking the question. In that case, may I have a motion?

Boardmember Heitler: I can take a try on this one. Case number 04-22, 60 Washington Avenue, looking for relief from the strict application of the Village code for reduction of required off-street parking. Parking required: the existing is one spot, required is four, variance is required for three off-street parking spaces.

Chairman Dovell: All right, Josh?

Boardmember Heitler: "Approve."

Boardmember Chen: "Approve."

Boardmember Quinlan: "Approved."

Chairman Dovell: And I "approve," so it's unanimous.

On MOTION of Boardmember Chen, SECONDED by Boardmember Quinlan, with a roll call vote of all in favor the Board resolved to grant the variance for Case No. 04-22 for three off-street parking spaces at 60 Washington Avenue.

Chairman Dovell: Thank you for presenting and good luck with your project.

Ms. Rolland: Thank you very much.

Chairman Dovell: Should be very nice.

On to the third and final item on the agenda, case number 05-22, which was originally number 15 from 2020 for reinstatement of a front yard variance in connection with construction of a vestibule and covered porch. This was previously approved by this board.

Case No. 05-22
(Originally 15-20)
Jessica Murphy
30 Ravensdale Avenue
Renewal of a previously approved variance from the strict application of the
Village Code Section 295-68F.1(a) for a front foyer and covered porch addition at her single-family dwelling located at 30 Ravensdale Road. Said property is in R-10 Zoning District and is also known as SBL: 4.120-131-6 on the Village Tax Maps.

Variance sought for Front Yard Nonconformity:
Addition in the Front Yard: Existing – 28.4’; Proposed – 21.4 feet;
Required Maximum – 30 feet; Variance Required – 8.6 feet {295-68F.1.a}

Chairman Dovell: Who will be speaking for the applicant on this one?

Brian Crowley, project architect: I will.

Chairman Dovell: Go ahead and take control.

Can everyone see the set of drawings on the screen? Good evening, I am representing the homeowners, Jessica Murphy and Rex Gibson, 20 Ravensdale Road, as already stated. We were in front of you in the December 2020 ZBA meeting for the same variance request. For a variety of reasons, Covid and life and everything else, things were put on hold. And we applied for the actual permit a couple days after the expiration, therefore we are in front of you again for the same 8 foot 6 front yard setback variance request.

If we look at the site plan as it exists now, this is the front stoop in front of the front door. We are proposing a modest 57 square foot vestibule covered entry on the front. The house is preexisting nonconforming in that the 30-foot front yard setback is not being met by the existing house. So we're just enforcing that condition by 8-1/2 feet, which would result in 21.4 to the front yard. Just to show you a couple elevations of what is being proposed, it's simply a place to stand in front of the front door without getting your head wet in the rain while you're waiting for the front door, and somewhere to step into the house, take off your shoes, sit down, and hang up your coats. It will result in something like that.

Some context images. Here's our property; Farragut, Ravensdale, our project site. Here are the guys across the street, 2 and 3 and around the area. When with were before you in December of 2020 we were proposing a much more significant renovation addition. That's all been put on pause, but they still would like to get their front entry vestibule. So this is the house as it exists today, and we would just remove the front stoop and replace this with something like that. That is essentially it. The board was nice enough to grant our variance a little over a year ago. Hopefully you guys will do the same thing tonight for us so we can proceed and apply for a building permit. I am happy to answer any questions anyone may ask.
Chairman Dovell: What's the total square footage of the vestibule and the little portico, covered portico?

Mr. Crowley: Sixty-seven square feet.

Chairman Dovell: So it's a pretty de minimis ask here and certainly an improvement to the house both visually and practically. We approved it once before in a slightly more ambitious form. I think it's appropriate and in character, and it's minimal so I think it meets all the criteria for granting a variance for it. Beyond that, I have nothing more to say so I'll put it out to Josh first.

Boardmember Heitler: I agree. Again, I think it seems reasonable, practical, and an improvement to the façade. I guess the only small question I have is that in past similar variance requests we've looked at some of the neighbors and the context in terms of where they are relative to the front property line. But I'm not sure that's necessary in this case, again because this board has already approved it and I don't think there is a more minimal version of what's proposed we could ask for. So I have no issues with it.

Boardmember Chen: No questions from me, Ray.

Boardmember Quinlan: No questions.

Chairman Dovell: Okay, may I have a motion?

Bldg. Inspector Minozzi: You've got to check the public, Ray.

Chairman Dovell: Anyone from the public wish to be heard on this? There is no public out there, I believe.

Attorney Whitehead: We still have no public.

Boardmember Chen: I can take a stab at the motion, Ray. In the matter of case number 05-22, originally case 15-20, for Jessica Murphy of 30 Ravensdale Avenue. Applying for a previously approved variance from the strict application of the Village code, section 295-68F.1(a), for a front foyer and covered porch addition at her single-family dwelling. A single variance is sought for the front yard nonconformity, an addition in the front yard: existing is 28.4 feet, proposed 21.4, required max 30, and variance required therefore 8.6 feet. Move to approve the variance as requested.
Chairman Dovell: Okay, Josh?

Boardmember Heitler: "Approve."

Boardmember Chen: "Approve."

Boardmember Quinlan: "Approved."

Chairman Dovell: And I "approve."

On MOTION of Boardmember Chen, SECONDED by Boardmember Heitler, with a roll call vote of all in favor the Board resolved to grant the previously approved variance for Case No. 05-22, formerly Case No. 15-20, for the front yard setback at 30 Ravensdale Road.

Congratulations, the vote is unanimous. Good luck with it, hope we don't have to see you a third time.

Mr. Crowley: Except for this one.

Chairman Dovell: Okay [laughter].

Mr. Crowley: Appreciate your time this evening, have a good night.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting of December 2, 2021
Regular Meeting of January 27, 2022

Chairman Dovell: The only thing we have left this evening is approval of two sets of minutes, the first from December 2nd and the second one from January 27th. Comments on the December 2nd public hearing minutes?

Boardmember Chen: I was not actually present for either of these.

Attorney Whitehead: I was going to say, you can only do the December 2nd. I don't think
you can do the January 27th.

**Boardmember Quinlan:** I have no comments.

**Boardmember Heitler:** I have no comments on December. I wasn't here for the January.

**Attorney Whitehead:** But three of you were there for the December meeting.

**Chairman Dovell:** Yes, we were. May I have a motion?

On MOTION of Boardmember Quinlan, SECONDED by Boardmember Heitler, with a voice vote of all in favor the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of December 2, 2022 were approved as presented.

**Chairman Dovell:** Unanimous, for those who can vote. Why can't we approve the 27th meeting?

**Attorney Whitehead:** Because only two of you were in attendance. Actually only one of you was there.

**Chairman Dovell:** I was not there.

**Attorney Whitehead:** Only Jerry was there.

**Bldg. Inspector Minozzi:** We'll defer that 'til next month. No problem.

**IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Next Meeting Date – March 24, 2022**

**Chairman Dovell:** Well I think that's it. Our next hearing will be March 24th, my last hearing.

**Attorney Whitehead:** We'll have a party for you, Ray.

**Chairman Dovell:** A virtual party?
Attorney Whitehead: You never know. If the governor does not once again extend the emergency declaration we could potentially be in person.

Chairman Dovell: Maybe do it in person. Okay, we'll look forward to it.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Dovell: So that concludes the meeting. Thank you very much, everyone.

Chairman Collins adjourned the Regular Meeting.