

Zoning Board of Appeals
Village of Tarrytown
Regular Meeting
February 13, 2017 7:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairwoman Lawrence, Members Maloney, Jolly, Weisel and Rachlin;
Counsel Addona; Village Engineer Pennella; Secretary Meszaros

Chairwoman Lawrence's called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – January 9, 2017

Ms. Weisel moved, seconded by Mr. Jolly, that the minutes of January 9, 2017 be approved as submitted. All in favor. Motion carried.

Chairwoman Lawrence moved, seconded by Mr. Maloney, that the Board go into Executive Session to discuss procedural matters. All in favor. Motion carried.

The Board left the Board room at 7:32 p.m. and returned at 7:38 p.m.

Mr. Maloney moved, seconded by Ms. Weisel, that the Board go back into regular session. All in favor. Motion carried.

CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING - Trevor Spearman, RA – 12 Storm Street
(Variances for a rear addition to a single family home)

Trevor Spearman, RA, representing Mr. Phelps, also present, said in addition to what was given to the Board with the application, they have added some composite photos of Storm Street and Central Avenue (the rear street) which depict 2 to 3 structures on either side of the home.

He briefly presented and explained the street profiles that he prepared which compare the proposed roof line of 12 Storm Street to other homes in the area:

1. He showed 12 Storm Street looking directly across the street and explained that he ghosted in 12 Storm Street to compare how the roof heights blend in with the houses across the street. He noted that 12 Storm Street is ever so slightly taller than the 2 properties, but a bit lower than the properties to the left and right, and certainly lower than the multi-family house at the corner. The roof pitch proposed is an 8 and 12 roof pitch and most of the homes in the area and across the street are 9 to 12 and 12, but there are a couple of 16 and 12 roof pitches.
2. He showed the property looking directly at it from Storm Street. Immediately to the right he pointed out 2 homes, one with a similar profile and the other with a little bit of a different set up (1 ½ story), and the multi-family on the corner. He

noted that there is a vast distance between 12 Storm Street and the multi-family home which is where the large parking lot is located. This comes into play since this is where variances have been requested for the side-yard setbacks, which are critical.

3. He showed the rear of the residence, looking directly at 12 Storm Street. He noted that immediately to the right is the mechanics yard and a couple of the backs of the residences to the right of Storm Street.
4. He showed the last profile looking directly across Central Avenue. Most of the homes are built up a full story where there are 14 steps to get to the first floor. Most are 2 ½ story structures. He ghosted in the 12 Storm Street profile to see the relationship of the height to these homes.

Mr. Spearman referred to the height of the roof and said that the streetscape submitted shows that the roof line certainly blends into the neighborhood. The desire for the pitch is more for a maintenance issue.

With regard to the number of stories, Mr. Spearman explained that the attic level of the house is only 7 feet at the ridge. The attic is unfinished and not livable space. No livable space is proposed. They are pushing out the rear of the house, and it is the basement that is actually triggering the 3rd floor, so the 2nd floor is essentially the 3rd floor. The attic level pushes out but there is a need to pitch the roof for maintenance. He noted that New York State Law (International Building Code with NYS supplements) still considers this height a two-story since there is a different calculation that they use.

Ms. Lawrence said that the Board members were at the site visit yesterday. She felt that the balloon height in the front blended in with the character of the other homes, but from the rear the height seemed much higher. The owner explained that part of that had to do with the pitch of the land. Ms. Lawrence asked Mr. Spearman to explain.

Mr. Spearman explained that at the rear of the property, the view of the house is from a lower vantage point so it makes it appear higher. He would not be opposed to hiping the rear perimeter of the roof and sloping it back toward Storm Street. Ms. Lawrence said the back of the property is more commercial. She said this sounds like a good alternative.

Ms. Lawrence asked if the current roof is pitched. Mr. Spearman said it is a bit but water does collect on the roof, which is a problem; the weight of the house creates a soft spot in the middle of the house. They are trying to alleviate this water problem with a higher pitch.

Mr. Maloney asked if the roof comes out to the back end of the back of the house.

Ms. Lawrence said the roof is going from the edge of the addition. Mr. Phelps said our goal is to take off the current roof and make one continuous roof, but we are open to other options.

Mr. Jolly asked if they are going to make roof look lower in the back. Mr. Spearman said as we go back, it will be a foot lower, but we can also hip it as suggested.

Mr. Phelps said the current drawing is preferred but we are open to hipping it. Mr. Spearman said it is ever so slightly more costly to do this.

Mr. Lawrence asked if anyone in the public had any questions or comments.

Diane Tuohy, 11 Storm Street, is again here to support the project. She thought the balloon test was very helpful. She is very supportive of the project. She feels she will not be in the shadow of this home; it will be in conformity and will blend in with the street. It will help with resale values as well. She was mostly worried about conformity and is pleased.

Nick and Kelly Martucci, 13 Storm Street, are here in support of this project. They are very pleased that improvements are being made. They feel that it will blend in and improve resale values.

Ms. Lawrence said this appears to be the only way to get what you want. From the back, there are 2 different streetscapes. Even though Storm Street is small, going down to the corner the houses are taller, and as you turn corner they become smaller and older.

Ms. Lawrence asked if anyone else had any questions or comments. No one appeared.

Mr. Maloney moved, seconded by Mr. Jolly, to close the public hearing. All in favor. Motion carried.

In advance of this meeting, Counsel Addona prepared a draft Resolution which the Board had a chance to review and Mr. Pennella weighed in on it as well. She advised the Board that she would read through the draft Resolution and will incorporate their comments discussed. She advised the Board that if they are so inclined, they can vote on the application this evening.

Counsel Addona read though the draft Resolution and made 2 additions as follows:

1. With regard to the side yard setback variance, she asked the Board if they wanted to add in that the side yard setback variance is also “adjacent to a large parking lot”.

The Board wished to add this into the Resolution.

2. In the special conditions section, she made a new condition #3 and added that, prior to getting a building permit, the applicant must submit revised plans to the satisfaction of the Village Engineer/Building Inspector to reflect the proposed hipping of the roof in the rear of the house as offered by the applicant as an alternative.

The Board also wished to add this into the Resolution.

Chairwoman Lawrence asked for a motion on the proposed Resolution.

Mr. Jolly moved, seconded by Ms. Weisel, to approve this application, subject to the conditions of approval as discussed and revised in the proposed draft Resolution. All in favor. Motion carried.

Counsel Addona advised the applicant that a final version will be sent to him once revisions have been made and it has been signed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Maloney moved, seconded by Mr. Jolly, and unanimously carried, that the meeting be adjourned – 8:14 p.m.

Liz Meszaros- Secretary