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(The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Let's stand
for the Pledge of Allegiance.
(Whereupon the Pledge of
Allegiance was recited.)
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I think the first thing we should do, Joe, if it's okay, could we -- there are people -new faces here. Can we just go around the room; is that okay?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: That's a good idea.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Why don't we start by the door?

MR. ANTONACCI: Alex Antonacci.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Alex, you're the applicant?

MR. ANTONACCI: I am.
MR. HULME: Jim Hulme for the applicant.

MR. MACRONE: John Macrone, 734 and 739 Dune.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Aram Terchunian, First Coastal, for the Village.

MR. ATANASIO: Charles Atanasio, 747 Dune Road.

MR. PROKOP: Joe Prokop, Village Attorney.

MEMBER KRASNOW: Irwin Krasnow, 929 Dune Road. I'm on the Zoning Board.

MEMBER FARKAS: Jeff Farkas, 820A, on the Zoning Board.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Eric Saretsky, Zoning Board. CLERK SADELI: Angela Sadeli, Zoning Clerk, Village Clerk. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Okay. So I believe our first order is -- our only order, which is 738 and 742. So this is a continuation, Joe, right? ATTORNEY PROKOP: This is a public hearing. It's the beginning of the approval. MR. ATANASIO: What does that mean?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: It means it's the beginning of the public hearing. MR. TERCHUNIAN: The initiation of
the review of the application. MR. ATANASIO: If you don't mind, I don't want to cause any wrinkles in this. I've never done this before, so I'm --

CLERK SADELI: We'll just keep all public comments until the end. MR. ATANASIO: Can I ask questions?

CLERK SADELI: At the end. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Joe, we're going to let Jim give a presentation?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yes.
MR. HULME: Good morning. Good to see you all. Jim Hulme from Kelly and Hulme in Westhampton Beach for the applicant. We're here to look at the two properties, 738, 742 Dune Road owned by two different LLC's, both of which LLC's are -- the principal of which is my client to the left of me. We're looking to create -- we have two lots, we're looking to turn that into three lots. The property is located in the Village's R-40 Zone, which as we
all know requires 40,000 square feet of area and a lot width of 150 feet. Currently 738 is just shy of 70,000 square feet, and 742 is just shy of 65,000 square feet, and each of the lots has an existing lot width of approximately 119 feet. As proposed, we would create three lots, each of which would be on the plus side over 40,000 square feet, and each would have a lot width of approximately 79.3 feet in width. So as you can see the lots as proposed meet the area requirement but do not meet the -MEMBER KRASNOW: This is the stuff
you e-mailed us in August?
CLERK SADELI: This was e-mailed to Carlin while I was out. MEMBER KRASNOW: That's why I brought my computer in case you didn't have any.

CLERK SADELI: Yeah, I didn't know that she didn't send them out. But Joe said that it was reviewed so. ATTORNEY PROKOP: So basically --
the basic relief that we're looking for here is not lot area, but the lot width. Just before we get into the more details of the proposal itself, I just wanted to review, if I could, a little history of the property. This was -- the existing lots were subject to a Zoning Board determination back in 2000, an application brought by Nancy Fenner, one of the prior owners of the properties, and apparently there was some mistakes in the way that they were deeded, and they were accidentally inadvertently merged, the two lots, and this Zoning Board determination -- if you want to keep one and hand them down -- the Zoning Board determination reestablished -- undid that error and reestablished the lots as separately existing lots. So I did want to provide that to you. MEMBER KRASNOW: So in 2000 they made them into two separate lots? MR. HULME: Well, prior to 2000 they were two separate lots, and an
attorney apparently representing the Fenner's mistaken -- not understanding the law put both lots in title in the same name, and which under the Village Code caused a merger of the -MEMBER CASHIN: When you say same name, you mean same owner?

MR. HULME: Same owner. Same name. Both lots were put into -MEMBER KRASNOW: Separate deeds or one deed?

MR. HULME: I believe they were separate deeds, but they were -- had the same name on them as the owner. MEMBER CASHIN: Were they owned by the same person? MR. HULME: Yes, they were owned by Nancy Fenner. MEMBER CASHIN: I don't understand then.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Let me explain
it. The Fenner's have owned this
property for decades. They were
transferring the property into
different trusts to get it out of

| 1 | individual names, and they |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | inadvertently -- the attorney who was |
| 3 | doing that transfer put both properties |
| 4 | in the same trust and entitled both |
| 5 | properties in the same name when he |
| 6 | transferred the deed from them as |
| 7 | persons to them as a trust. And so |
| 8 | they came back to the Village and they |
| 9 | asked for two things. They said the |
| 10 | lots are of unequal width, one was 104 |
| 11 | and the other one was 100 and something |
| 12 | else. They said we'd like to make them |
| 13 | even, and we'd like to un-merge them, |
| 14 | which was done inadvertently in the |
| 15 | deed transfer. |
| 16 | MEMBER CASHIN: When was that? |
| 17 | MR. TERCHUNIAN: That was 2000. |
| 18 | MEMBER CASHIN: No, when was the |
| 19 | request to change the size and -- |
| 20 | MR. TERCHUNIAN: 2000. It's in |
| 21 | this decision. So this decision said |
| 22 | the merger was inadvertent, it was a |
| 23 | clerical error and then allowed them to |
| 24 | do what's called a lot line change, |
| 25 | which evened the width of the two lots |

to what they are today.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: But the decision that we just got handed out, it doesn't say that. Where does it say that? MR. TERCHUNIAN: Yeah, it does. MEMBER KRASNOW: So in 2020 -ATTORNEY PROKOP: I'm sorry, I apologize, it does say. I read the second page. It does say that. Thank you.

MEMBER KRASNOW: So in 2020, the Village granted them two nonconforming lots?

CLERK SADELI: 2000 .
MEMBER KRASNOW: 2000, but two nonconforming lots because they weren't 150 feet either. MR. TERCHUNIAN: So in 2019 they were two lots, separate names of unequal width, one was 104 and the other one was whatever that number is. MEMBER KRASNOW: You mean 1999. CLERK SADELI: So many years ago. MR. TERCHUNIAN: And so then the lawyer made this title change because

| 1 | they were putting things into trusts. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MEMBER KRASNOW: So they were |
| 3 | trying to be fair, split the property, |
| 4 | we'll give you the same, but they were |
| 5 | still nonconforming lots. |
| 6 | MR. TERCHUNIAN: Right. They were |
| 7 | nonconforming to begin with and they're |
| 8 | nonconforming at the end. |
| 9 | MR. HULME: Nonconforming as to |
| 10 | lot width only. |
| 11 | MEMBER KRASNOW: Yes. But isn't |
| 12 | that what -- we are discussing lot |
| 13 | width, right? |
| 14 | MR. HULME: Yes, yes, yes. And |
| 15 | just one other, $I$ don't know, useful |
| 16 | aspect of that is that the Zoning Board |
| 17 | at that time under SEQRA determined |
| 18 | that it was a Type II action and that |
| 19 | no further environmental review of that |
| 20 | project was required. And I bring that |
| 21 | up because after adding some additional |
| 22 | information to that, one of our |
| 23 | requests would be for this Board to |
| 24 | make that same determination going |
| 25 | forward. But anyway, that was just |


| 1 | really provided for historical |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | information. |
| 3 | So the matter at hand is the lot |
| 4 | width really. And so I took a look at |
| 5 | -- and one of the things that you look |
| 6 | at when you're looking at these kinds |
| 7 | of variances is what the community |
| 8 | looks like. Angela, if you could keep |
| 9 | one of those and hand those down. So |
| 10 | this is tax map of the area in question |
| 11 | where I've identified the two |
| 12 | properties owned by my client, 738 and |
| 13 | 742. And I didn't -- |
| 14 | MEMBER CASHIN: Jim, can I |
| 15 | interrupt you for a second? Are these |
| 16 | properties east or west of that brown |
| 17 | house that sits back off the road a |
| 18 | little bit? |
| 19 | MR. HULME: I think these are that |
| 20 | property. |
| 21 | MR. ANTONACCI: The cottage. |
| 22 | MEMBER CASHIN: The cottage is |
| 23 | included in this property? |
| 24 | MR. HULME: This is this property. |
| 25 | MEMBER CASHIN: So that would be |

razed as part of whatever you're doing?
MR. HULME: R-A-Z-E-D, yes.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: The cottage
sits on 742 , right?
MR. HULME: Yes, 742, yes.
MEMBER KRASNOW: What's the square
footage of the cottage?
MR. ANTONACCI: 300 square feet,
400 square feet. It's small.
MR. HULME: So it's bigger than this. We could have had the meeting there, I guess.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: The cottage was affectionately known as the bunny hutch.

MEMBER CASHIN: It's a survivor, right?

MR. TERCHUNIAN: It's a survivor. MEMBER KRASNOW: It's kind of featured prominently in the video. I mean -MR. ANTONACCI: So that's a consideration to move it rather than to take it down.

MR. ATANASIO: That was originally
on the ocean side.
MR. ANTONACCI: That's my understanding, yes. MR. ATANASIO: It washed to obviously where it is now, but that was originally on the ocean side. MEMBER CASHIN: Jim continues. MR. HULME: Yes, thank you. So I looked on the GIS, and I identified various surveys of the various adjacent properties. I didn't identify them all, but you can compare and contrast the existing lots to the east and the west of us and determine for yourself that they all are within the same range of widths. For example, five or six properties to the east it's a width of 63 feet. Four properties to the east it's 79 feet, the lot width. The property just to the east of us is 65 feet. I'll get to the Skudrna property in just a minute, and then you'll see the other side of Skudrna is 50 feet. So as I think you will agree, the lot widths that we are proposing here are
very much in keeping with the lot widths of this part of the community, which is the bay side of Dune Road in and adjacent to the properties that we own and that we're seeking to subdivide.

MEMBER CASHIN: Jim, what about the other widths? You only have, like, three --

MS. NANNARIELLO: What's across the street, what are those?

CLERK SADELI: We're just going to keep public comment to the end.

MR. HULME: I think that what I assumed that we could all do is you can interpellate for yourself, but I mean, I'm happy to fill in the blanks. But the 79.25 lot is probably the widest lot in the vicinity, and the 50 foot one is probably the narrowest one. All of the other lots are somewhere in between. And if you go further to the east I think you will see that some of them get even smaller than the 63 feet, or you know, more equivalent to the 50
foot wide. So defining the community as the north side of Dune Road on the bay, what we are proposing is very, very much in keeping as far as lot width goes, with the lot widths of our neighbors to the east and to the west.

Obviously the lot widths of some but not all of the lots across the street are wider, but you know, zoning boards have routinely looked at the ocean side community as something different than the bay side community, but even if that's -- even if you want to look at that, if you look further east and further west you'll see that there are some very comparably widthed lots as well along the ocean and it's really only the lots that are directly across the street that are -- match the current width, although that's a substandard width as well of our proposed lots. So moving on from that for a minute to the Skudrna project, and that's a variance that is a subdivision

| 1 | which hasn't been completed, but -- for |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | reasons unknown to me -- but it did go |
| 3 | through the Zoning Board process and |
| 4 | was granted Zoning Board relief to |
| 5 | create lots that were 66 feet in width, |
| 6 | to create three lots in 66 feet of |
| 7 | width, and that's the determination |
| 8 | that the Zoning Board reached, and this |
| 9 | is the map that was ultimately |
| 10 | approved. And so there was a |
| 11 | substantial and significant discussion |
| 12 | during that Zoning Board hearing which |
| 13 | took place in 2010, but the Zoning |
| 14 | Board did ultimately grant -- actually |
| 15 | it's more akin to -- because of the |
| 16 | open space parcel, and I'll address |
| 17 | that from our perspective in a few |
| 18 | minutes, this is essentially a three |
| 19 | lot subdivision with 83 -- I'm sorry, |
| 20 | did I -- the width of the lots were 83 |
| 21 | feet. If I said 66 -- |
| 22 | MEMBER KRASNOW: They're actually |
| 23 | wider than these. |
| 24 | MR. HULME: By about three feet, |
| 25 | three and a half feet wider than what |


| 1 | we're proposing, but you know, still |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | very much in keeping with the |
| 3 | neighborhood that surrounds it and |
| 4 | surrounds us. To -- |
| 5 | MEMBER CASHIN: Jim, I'm sorry, I |
| 6 | don't understand this. How can three |
| 7 | lots be 80 feet -- |
| 8 | MEMBER KRASNOW: Different |
| 9 | property, it's the property to the |
| 10 | west. If you look at the large -- |
| 11 | MR. HULME: The little map is |
| 12 | Skudrna, not us. |
| 13 | MEMBER CASHIN: Oh, got you. |
| 14 | MEMBER KRASNOW: Showing what was |
| 15 | granted previously, precedent. |
| 16 | MEMBER FARKAS: Jim -- |
| 17 | MR. HULME: Basically supporting |
| 18 | my argument that the lot sizes that we |
| 19 | are proposing, the lot widths that we |
| 20 | are proposing very much within the |
| 21 | scale and scope of the lot widths of |
| 22 | the lots to either side of us on the |
| 23 | bay side. |
| 24 | MEMBER CASHIN: So you're |
| 25 | comparing 83 to 79? |

MR. HULME: Yeah, I think they're comparable. I'm not sure that you could see that difference from the street without measuring it. I'm also comparing and contrasting it to 50 feet and 63 feet and 65 feet and 79 feet. So you know, if I were to take some kind of an average we would be well within the average of the lot widths. In fact, other than the subject property and the yet to be divided Skudrna -- so and the other thing I wanted to -- the other thing I wanted to point out about Skudrna is that the Board there under SEQRA determined that that three lot subdivision was a Type II action under SEQRA and therefore brought to an end any further environmental review of the subject property.

Now, the Skudrna, I think, which is very analogous to the relief that we're looking for had a couple of aspects or requirements that this Board sought as offsetting the impact of the

| 1 | narrow lots, and one of them was the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | preservation of some open space along |
| 3 | the shoreline as a separately created |
| 4 | and deeded lot, and the other |
| 5 | discussion had to do with view, |
| 6 | people's view from the ocean over to |
| 7 | the bay side, and they -- the Board, |
| 8 | your Board at that time accommodated |
| 9 | that particular comment by restricting |
| 10 | the development that could take place |
| 11 | on those lots in the rear yard, the |
| 12 | street yard, the Dune Road side, and |
| 13 | didn't allow for any accessory |
| 14 | structures to be constructed in what |
| 15 | would be the required rear -- the |
| 16 | street is the rear in this Village, |
| 17 | correct, and the water is the front? |
| 18 | So -- |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I believe that |
| 20 | was the plan. |
| 21 | MEMBER KRASNOW: Right. And then |
| 22 | we -- |
| 23 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: But it was a |
| 24 | reserve decision. |
| 25 | MR. HULME: Now, as far as that |

goes, we would -- if you're inclined to move forward with this in the manner that we've suggested that the way that we would prefer to handle that is through a conservation easement or through some kind of a covenant as opposed to actually extracting that part of the property from the lots, and the reason for that is that -- well, two reasons. One here, that would create another variance that we would require because it would then cause the lots that -- the developable that we are proposing to be less than 40,000 square feet, and so we would require an area variance for that. And but -- but perhaps that would be grantable as it was in Skudrna in return for the dedication of the balance of the property. The other issue, however, though is that we will ultimately need to get a permit for this subdivision from the Health Department and the Department of Environmental Conservation. The Health Department
requires 20,000 square foot lots, so that decision doesn't really impact that at all, but it's my understanding that the DEC requires 40,000 square foot lots, and so if we were to create this open space by reducing the size of our lots we would then require a more difficult variance to get from the DEC. But I think that we could accomplish the same end with a covenant that would -- a non-disturbance covenant of a certain portion of each of the lots so that the lots themselves remain above the 40,000 square feet, but the Village nonetheless got the benefit of creating this non-disturbable -- non-disturbable area on each of the lots, and certainly that covenant could contain enforcement requirements -- enforcement ability and things of that nature. So $I$ think that moving in that direction you would end up effectively in the same place, but you would reduce for us the number of variances needed to seek here and the number of variances we might need to
seek from another agency.
MEMBER KRASNOW: Can I ask a few questions on that? Would the
conservation type easement provide -similar to this one, would it provide public access, and would it then allow them to build docks out to the easement, or they wouldn't be able to build a cat walk?

MR. HULME: Well, the answer to the first question $I$ think is we'd have to consider that. It wouldn't necessarily provide for public access. I don't know that the Skudrna proposal provided for public access, I think it just provided -MEMBER KRASNOW: That's to me the definition of open space, so that's why I was asking you that question. MR. HULME: As far as the second question, we would want to reserve for ourselves the ability to construct a walkway across that -MEMBER KRASNOW: Wouldn't that be disturbing the property?

| 1 | MR. HULME: Well, that's why we |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | would have to agree to reserve that |
| 3 | out, and it would just be a four foot |
| 4 | wide walkway to get to the bay similar |
| 5 | to what, I believe, the Trustees and |
| 6 | the DEC -- the Trustees and the -- some |
| 7 | other land owners have done in the |
| 8 | settlement of the Southampton Town |
| 9 | Trustee lawsuit. There was -- that |
| 10 | land I believe was going to be |
| 11 | dedicated to the Trustees, but the |
| 12 | owners reserved for themselves the |
| 13 | right to build a four foot walkway out |
| 14 | to the water and to establish a dock. |
| 15 | So I don't think that would be an |
| 16 | unreasonable request, but as I said - |
| 17 | MR. TERCHUNIAN: Just an FYI, |
| 18 | sorry to interrupt, but we're getting |
| 19 | ahead of ourselves there. Just |
| 20 | understand that the Board, if they were |
| 21 | to agree to that, could constrain the |
| 22 | design and the materials and the manner |
| 23 | in which such a walkway could be done. |
| 24 | MEMBER FARKAS: Jim, would it be |
| 25 | one walkway for the three homes, or |


| 1 | would it be -- |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. HULME: Well, I think we would |
| 3 | prefer to have one walkway for each of |
| 4 | the homes, but, you know, we'll -- |
| 5 | we're happy to discuss with you any |
| 6 | reasonable restrictions that you might |
| 7 | like to put. |
| 8 | MEMBER KRASNOW: I'm sorry, I know |
| 9 | we're really jumping ahead, but since |
| 10 | you showed Skudrna, you showed open |
| 11 | space, and you said something similar, |
| 12 | and you said conservation easement, |
| 13 | that's why I was discussing that ahead |
| 14 | of -- because you went there, that's |
| 15 | why I was asking. |
| 16 | MR. HULME: Well, I would like to |
| 17 | withdraw that word from the record, |
| 18 | please. What I really meant to say was |
| 19 | some kind of a covenant that created a |
| 20 | non-disturbable natural condition, |
| 21 | whether there could be some public |
| 22 | access along the water or something, |
| 23 | that's certainly something we could |
| 24 | discuss, but not something that we |
| 25 | considered. But obviously -- well, |

yeah so that's --
MEMBER CASHIN: The settlement you referenced before, does that include -would that include the space? You're still going to need DEC permits?

MR. HULME: That settlement didn't involve this property.

MEMBER CASHIN: So you're still
going to need DEC permits?
MR. HULME: Yes, and that's why --
well, in the first instance we need DEC approval for the subdivision, and that's why we want to retain at least visibly for the DEC a 40,000 square foot lot because that makes that application a lot easier. It would be a separate application to the DEC for a walkway and a dock into the water, but whatever we design and took to the DEC in that regard would certainly be subject to whatever design restrictions that if this Board were inclined to grant these variances would impose. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: One thing I think I'd like to do, maybe Joe, if you
think it's okay, and Aram, I think we should just go back for the benefit of the people here and for the benefit of the Board Members who weren't involved in Skudrna, and just -- you covered much of it, but there are a few pieces I don't think you did. So one, we talked about the location of the homes, which the homeowners on the ocean side had wanted brought forward as opposed to setting them to their maximum back, and I think that Mr. Fenner, if $I$ recall correctly, was part of this. And again, this was -- this outcome was based on everyone's agreement; is that fair, Joe?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yes.
MR. TERCHUNIAN: Yeah, there was general consensus, and you hit the two points correctly. There was, number one, bringing it towards the road so that it wasn't farther -- even though it's closer to the road, it was better from a view point of view for the
people on the other side. And the other was staggering the homes so that it didn't block the view of the people to the east, which in fact, was Fenner, and he made that argument. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: The open parcel -MR. HULME: We don't have any issue with any of those requests. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So the open parcel was -- I'm not sure of the exact genesis of that. Again, it didn't really -- I don't think it really harmed Skudrna in any way. He still could have access. So again, if it's something consistent with that, I'm not sure that that -- there was some advantage to the Village of owning it, correct?

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Well, it was really more of a control issue $I$ thought. There is a provision in the DEC code that you can do what's called a cluster, they allow you to do a cluster, in which case you would get to
count the overall area towards your yield of three lots, but you're separating out this one parcel. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I don't think we did it as a punishment for the square footage, it was more an accommodation.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: The representative was a planner from the town, was experienced in things like cluster development, things like that, so he had come up with that idea and prosed it. It was something that was acceptable to everyone. MR. TERCHUNIAN: But to your point, if you chose a different -- if the Board chose a different vehicle, it could accomplish the same goal. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Again, not to get too far ahead here, but would the issue of the people that were on the ocean side concerned about views, I would say that now we are using this a little bit as a precedent, which we could talk about that momentarily. But
one concern, I guess, I have is the lot is slightly smaller, although probably not significant, the problem or the issue that offsets that, if there is anything, would be the setbacks.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Right. The side yard setback. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Side yard setbacks. MR. TERCHUNIAN: I should have brought a copy of the Skudrna subdivision map.

MR. HULME: I did. They have it.
MR. TERCHUNIAN: Did it define the -- so yeah, I think that looks like 16 feet on the side.

MR. HULME: 18.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: There was a concession they made as far as the setbacks.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: I think that was --

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Which, again, was something that for the people that are on the ocean side improved their

| 1 | light -- |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. HULME: I'd like to address |
| 3 | that, if I could, when you're finished. |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I guess, the |
| 5 | last point I was going to make is the |
| 6 | Skudrna -- well, whatever we're calling |
| 7 | the division -- was one lot converting |
| 8 | to three. This is a little different |
| 9 | in that we're taking two lots and |
| 10 | combining to three of which one of them |
| 11 | is a larger lot and for the sake of, |
| 12 | again, whatever it is for the math, |
| 13 | we're taking two to make three. That I |
| 14 | think has some concern with precedent |
| 15 | Of how -- in other words, the Skudrna |
| 16 | lot was 240 feet, and obviously it |
| 17 | wasn't really going to work as one |
| 18 | home. So dividing it to three 83 foot |
| 19 | lots at the time was -- I'm not sure |
| 20 | the right word, Joe, but it was in |
| 21 | keeping, I guess, with the |
| 22 | neighborhood; is that a fair way of |
| 23 | putting it? |
| 24 | MR. TERCHUNIAN: That was the |
| 25 | determination of the Board. |

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Okay. So
we're headed down a similar path, and now the question is how do we not
impede the oceanfront properties in some adverse way, which we're talking about, and at the same time not set $a$ precedent for, you know, some other small lot that wants to combine two to make three, or three to make four, whatever it is.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: I think Joe will agree with me is that the way that you do that is you treat the facts of this case as their own facts and you apply the five part standard that the State has identified for us, and you make an objective determination as to whether that fits with the character of the neighborhood or not regardless of, you know, anything that's happened before or will happen after.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: So Skudrna's decision determined that there would be a negative impact on the surrounding neighbor and the community, but that it
would be mitigated by the granting of -- 25 percent of the land area was set aside for this open parcel, and also the setbacks, there was concessions on the setbacks by the owner.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Three feet on each side.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: All different ways, I believe.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Okay. I just -- I wanted to just bring it up because I want to make sure everyone here understands what happened, the how and the why and then why we're here. And Jim, go ahead with your point now. MR. HULME: The -- I think that we can accomplish -- Counsel will advise you obviously about this, but I think we can accomplish with a covenant the same end as far as preserving 25 percent or whatever number that's determined, if any number at all is determined as being appropriate and an appropriate offset. So that's -- so but I think we can -- if that's
something that the Board would require in return for granting the variances, that's certainly something we could accommodate. The side yard setback and the offsetting of the homes is certainly something that we could take a look at as well. The moving the houses closer to the road, if that's something that the Board would like -CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: To that point, Jim, sorry to interrupt, that was a request, if I'm not mistaken, Joe, by the homeowners on the ocean side. It wasn't really a direct request from the Board at the time, but it was sort of, I guess, an accommodation if I'm -Aram, am I saying that right? MR. TERCHUNIAN: I think you're right, yeah. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So I think some of those people I know are here today, if that's in keeping with what would satisfy that issue then I think -- I don't want to speak for my fellow Board members, again, that's why that
happened.
MR. HULME: Right. Okay. So then -- and I think that we would be amenable to a reasonable request in that nature.

The other thing I wanted to talk about was the side yard setbacks, and I think because this is the $R-40$ and because it requires 20 foot setbacks and a total of 60 , the Board is going to have to take a -- we're going to ask the Board to take a position on what the side yard setbacks should be for these lots if the Board determines that the variances are warranted here. And so just kind of as a starting point for that, what $I$ looked at is if we were to provide the four tenths relief to the side yard setbacks for these three lots, we would end up with a total side yard of 47.2 -- no, I'm sorry, we would end up with a total side yard of 31.6 , almost 32 feet, and a single side yard of 12.7 feet. So the lots as they currently are constituted I believe are

| 1 | entitled to the four tenths setback |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | relief already. So what I did was I |
| 3 | compared the open space that would be |
| 4 | available to view through this lot |
| 5 | under either scenario. And so taking |
| 6 | the two lots and applying the four |
| 7 | tenths rule to the setback requirement |
| 8 | and then adding up the total side yard |
| 9 | setbacks for the, you know, right, |
| 10 | left, right left, I come up with 94.2 |
| 11 | feet. |
| 12 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Of total side |
| 13 | yard? |
| 14 | MR. HULME: Of total side yard. |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So what does |
| 16 | that work out to? |
| 17 | MR. HULME: If I apply that same |
| 18 | restriction and that same rule to the |
| 19 | three lots, we would come up with gaps |
| 20 | totaling 95 feet. So it's virtually |
| 21 | equivalent as far as the view through |
| 22 | the lot goes. |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I don't want |
| 24 | to speak on behalf of the owners from |
| 25 | across the street, but I would think |

that the open space is probably of less benefit to them than side yards that are more in keeping with Skudrna or exceeding it. Fair enough? MR. TERCHUNIAN: I would think that's a reasonable position. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I don't want to speak on anyone else's behalf, so we'll get to public --

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Just to follow -to complete Jim's math, if we're looking at 95 feet of total side yard on three lots, you're 31 foot and a faction for each, which is just under 16 feet.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So that would be two feet or a foot let's just say per side less than --

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Basically two feet, yeah.

MEMBER FARKAS: What would be the distance between the homes?

MR. TERCHUNIAN: It would be about 31 and a half.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Whereas on

Skudrna it's 36.
MEMBER KRASNOW: I have a
question. On the map you're showing 11.9 and 11.9 between them. I'm getting that as really 22,23 feet. MR. HULME: I think that's based on three tenths. MR. TERCHUNIAN: There's two rules in the Village, the three tenths rule if you put the side yards even and four tenths if you offset it.

MEMBER KRASNOW: But really you're not getting 95 feet, you're really getting about 63 feet. MR. HULME: Under the three tenths, yes. I'm suggesting a different analysis because -MEMBER KRASNOW: That's why the math wasn't adding up.

MR. HULME: I read Skudrna last night and I thought that three tenths might be a little bit of an overreach, so I said let's compare it at four tenths.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: So the three

| 1 | tenths is available if the principle |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | structure is centered on the property. |
| 3 | But I just want to point out that the |
| 4 | application didn't mention anything to |
| 5 | do with any of the setbacks, and so it |
| 6 | wasn't included in the notice. So it |
| 7 | wouldn't really be fair -- well, the |
| 8 | Board, you know, looks over the |
| 9 | application, but I don't think it would |
| 10 | be really fair to the public to be able |
| 11 | to respond today that now you're asking |
| 12 | for setbacks. |
| 13 | MR. HULME: We fully expect that |
| 14 | we're going to have to do some |
| 15 | modifications on the plan as proposed, |
| 16 | so that we'll be happy to come back at |
| 17 | the next meeting, and it will be |
| 18 | properly noticed at that point by the |
| 19 | Village. |
| 20 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: How do we know |
| 21 | what to propose to the public? I mean, |
| 22 | you basically excluded the public from |
| 23 | that discussion. |
| 24 | MR. HULME: Well, this is not the |
| 25 | only public hearing that's going to |

take place, $I$ imagine, relative to this project before this Board. What I'm suggesting is that after we complete our discussion today we will go back and absorb what the Board has indicated to us and make a further proposal as to what the subdivision should look like. MR. TERCHUNIAN: And if that proposal differs from your original application, you'll be required to re-notice.

MR. HULME: Well, I believe that Joe's position would be that the meeting would have to be re-noticed regardless, but yes.

So what I'm hearing is that by analogy to Skudrna, you would like us to take a look without any promises or commitments at the Skudrna type setbacks.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I'm saying
that as the Chairman, but I haven't discussed it yet with my fellow Board members. There are people here who also --- I'd like to hear what Aram and

Joe think about it as well. I'm just thinking that at the very least I don't think I'd want to do anything or propose anything that's in less keeping than Skudrna, unless anyone feels otherwise.

MEMBER KRASNOW: I think your comment earlier was Skudrna came from public input, and the public hasn't even given their input yet, so I think when we get to that point I think we should -- you know, this was a decision that the public said we like this, we like that, so I think the people that it effects should have a chance to give input on that in terms of trying to get everybody as happy as possible.

MR. HULME: I agree. We fully
expected public comments. I at least did not expect that $I$ would speak all these words of wisdom today and you would immediately jump up and say that's wonderful, granted. I understand that this is a process, and I'm happy to engage.

MEMBER KRASNOW: I'll give you first part, it's wonderful. I give you that part, Jim.

MR. HULME: So anyway, that's -oh, we did get a couple of letters from neighbors, which I'd like to make part of the record from 771 and -MEMBER CASHIN: That's across the street, I assume? CLERK SADELI: No. MR. HULME: And then 879 -MS. NANNARIELLO: No, it's down past Pike. MR. HULME: -- indicating they didn't have any objection. MEMBER KRASNOW: Is 771 the new construction, or is it the house east of that?

MS. NANNARIELLO: East of that.
MEMBER KRASNOW: You mentioned something about the Southampton Board. Can you -- what address was that? MR. HULME: No. Whoever was involved in that lawsuit, $I$ was not part of that lawsuit, so $I$ don't really
know much about that.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I'm not sure
that has -- from my understanding of that, that only has any real bearing -MR. TERCHUNIAN: I don't think anybody understands it.

MEMBER KRASNOW: Well, since he mentioned it, I wanted to --

MR. HULME: Including me. If Aram doesn't understand it then there's no chance that $I$ understand it.

MEMBER KRASNOW: Was that in the Village?

MR. HULME: Yes.
MEMBER KRASNOW: Was that 774 I'm guessing?

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I think it was
some sort of crazy land grab by the Trustees.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Well, it only took 16 years to resolve it.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Thankfully I think it has no bearing on what we're doing today.

| 1 | MR. HULME: I only brought it up |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | because there was a reservation in that |
| 3 | settlement that allowed for those |
| 4 | homeowners who are no longer on the |
| 5 | water to get a walkway to the water. |
| 6 | MEMBER CASHIN: Jim, can you |
| 7 | discuss again you think your client |
| 8 | would be willing to do in terms of open |
| 9 | space on this one? |
| 10 | MR. TERCHUNIAN: Could I interrupt |
| 11 | you for a second? I was just reading |
| 12 | the Skudrna decision, there was a |
| 13 | couple of points I wanted to clarify |
| 14 | because they weren't clear until I read |
| 15 | this. So it says on page 10 where the |
| 16 | open space land is not dedicated to the |
| 17 | Village but remains the property of the |
| 18 | owners of the subdivision. So the open |
| 19 | space that was created there is still |
| 20 | privately owned, it's not dedicated to |
| 21 | the Village. |
| 22 | MEMBER CASHIN: By whom? |
| 23 | MR. TERCHUNIAN: By the |
| 24 | subdividers. |
| 25 | MEMBER CASHIN: All three equally | as one lot?

MR. TERCHUNIAN: It doesn't -just all deeds of conveyance shall contain covenants which will guarantee the open space remains open and subject to a conservation easement in perpetuity. It doesn't go into who -MR. HULME: And since that hasn't been completed, it's still not -- it doesn't exist as the subdivision map shows. It exists as one giant lot. None of that exists yet.

MEMBER CASHIN: None of this exists. MR. HULME: But the Zoning Board requirements for that when that subdivision is completed is that if that space is not dedicated to the Village it will be subject to a conservation easement. MEMBER CASHIN: What is it your client seeks in that regard? MR. HULME: We would -- our preference would not be to transfer title to that property to the Village.

MEMBER CASHIN: Because of the square footage issue?

MR. HULME: Well, I think that Skudrna required 25 percent of the land to be preserved. We would have to look at that in detail, but $I$ think that that number or something like that number would work for us.

MEMBER FARKAS: You have to do the math.

MR. HULME: Exactly.
MEMBER CASHIN: You might want to do that before the next meeting.

MR. HULME: Absolutely. We wanted to come -- I was pretty sure that the setback issue was going to remain an open issue that we would have to come back on anyway, but we wanted to get -this is exactly the feedback and what the neighbors will say, we wanted to get that feedback as well so we can come back. I can't say that we're going to concede on every issue that was raised, but we will certainly consider --

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: The issue of
the open space I don't think was really to limit the size of what they could build. In other words, I'm trying to remember the exact reason. I just read through it. Joe, I don't know if you recall?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: It had to do with the views.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Yeah, and just
for general open space being there. But also in reading the decision $I$ just wanted to congratulate the Chairman on his 13 years of service on the Board. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: It's so long that $I$ don't remember.

But to Jeff's point that he made earlier, $I$ don't think it was ever intended that this was a public easement because that wasn't going to be something that benefitted the oceanfront people by having people go up and down nor the owners of Skudrna or in this case, this application. It was more just that it was going to be
some land that was going to be untouched, which essentially is untouched on everybody's property on the bay because --

MR. TERCHUNIAN: Although more or less of it, but less of it per lot.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: For the sake of I think us here, $I$ don't know that it changes things that much, other than maybe the mathematical calculations.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: I think that's fair.

MR. HULME: And the useful thing about the covenant is that covenant can contain enforcement requirements that go above and beyond what the Village can do anyway to, you know, if somebody were to encroach or to violate it. And it gets recorded against the property, so anybody who would try to do something would have to do it subject to whatever those restrictions were.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I mean, my personal opinion, and $I$ would defer to Aram and Joe, I don't want to do


MR. HULME: I don't think we've designed homes, but $I$ don't know.

MEMBER KRASNOW: What would you be allowed based upon the current code?

MR. HULME: We'd be allowed 20 percent lot coverage of the upland area.

MEMBER KRASNOW: Of the --
MEMBER CASHIN: That looks like a
lot of --
MR. ANTONACCI: The setbacks.
MR. HULME: The envelope merely
reflects the code.
MR. ANTONACCI: It wouldn't be the size of the home.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: You put your
finger on the right issue.
MEMBER KRASNOW: So can we kind of, like -- because the people across the street might want to know is this going to be a three story -- you know, and again, approximately how big? Just to give them an idea, you know.

Obviously by right you could build two houses of probably of a larger size, so
if they were building just kind of, you know, let people --

MR. TERCHUNIAN: I think with or without is a good analysis for the Board to look at. So without a variance, they have two lots, they're entitled to the three tenths rule and 20 percent coverage. You can do a calculation as to how big a building can be built, it's gigantic. With three lots and 20 percent coverage and different side yards, you can do a calculation of how big each one of those buildings can be. And further, after looking at that the Board can say well, that's nice, but we'd like it to be smaller, and you have the authority because you're granting a variance to say you can't have it that big, you can have it this big.

MEMBER KRASNOW: So would that be something, Jim, you can provide us the calculations and a sample? I think it puts things in perspective. It's hard to look at something in one dimension
that's going to be three dimensional for the people who are looking at it. MR. HULME: And we can show what would be the -MEMBER KRASNOW: -- an idea as to what house may be on Dune Road that would be similar to this. I think that would be --

MR. HULME: What we can provide is a principle building envelope, which would be limited to the 20 percent, and subject to -- and we can do a study of what three tenths would look like, what four tenths would look like, what Skudrna would look like. MEMBER FARKAS: That would help. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Also I think that -- sort of repeating, Aram touched on it, if the homes that are built there are built, you know, forward and back, you know, ocean -- bay to street, and the setbacks are greater like Skudrna then I think the people who are on the ocean side who may be the ones that benefit from greater views, better
views, and in keeping with the
neighborhood it's even better in the sense that we're not getting houses on top of each other.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: I think the type
of analysis that the Board has outlined would be very useful for that. MR. HULME: We can provide that. MEMBER KRASNOW: Maybe an elevation diagram. I don't know if you'll go 3D like I did. MR. HULME: You're looking for an opportunity to require that from somebody.

MEMBER KRASNOW: No, I don't want to inflict any pain that's been put on me on anybody else at all, but what $I$ do realize is that when you're trying to share it with Board or with the neighbors, there's a value in that type of --

MR. HULME: We can do some type of an elevation -MR. ANTONACCI: An elevation rendering.

MEMBER KRASNOW: We called it a view corridor, stuff like that. I think it helps visually.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Fenner was required to provide view sheds from all angles.

MR. HULME: Skudrna, right.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: Skudrna, I apologize.

MR. HULME: Okay. We'd be happy to do all of that.

MEMBER CASHIN: Ready to hear from the public?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: To hear the public do we have to close?

MR. TERCHUNIAN: No, no.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Ladies first.
I think --
MS. NANNARIELLO: I do, I do, and it goes to the continuity of the map -MEMBER KRASNOW: State who you are and where you live.

MS. NANNARIELLO: I'm Lauren
Nannariello, I'm 743 across the street from 738. And if you look at the maps
that are in front of you, all of the lots from the low 700 's, they all line up with each other. So we line up with 738. 745 lines up with 742. 747, 749, 751, all three of those lots lined up with Skudrna. So one of the reasons why we conceded Skudrna to give them three lots, if you remember, is because we really kind of went with each house having a house in front of it, not having five where he wanted to originally put five. We were, like, look, just be fair with the neighborhood. Keep it, like, you know, one in front of each other. That's more what we really wanted, to keep the continuity of the neighborhood of not putting three houses on where there should be two. Where we are front to back, Fenner owned 240 on the bay and 240 on the ocean. We have two houses that are 120 foot lots next door to each other and, you know, of course, we were promised we would get to buy those lots that faced our house, but that
ship has sailed. So when they want to put three there, I just strongly feel that the continuity of not just in front of my home, it's all the other homes that are before and after if you go to the east or the west, but let's go north to south because that's what we're looking at. And I think all the neighbors agree, and they weren't able to come here today, and we will send letters obviously to state the positions, it's not just me, it's just the continuity of this really special place that in this one area that really people just drive by and stop. I have videos, they just stop, they get out of the car, and they just look. It's such a beautiful area just to look at. So if these two lots are given a variance to put three lots, you see what's going up now, these houses that have supposedly three stories but it's really four. I mean, these things are monstrosities. And it's just something that we just would love to keep the

| 1 | neighborhood what it is. We can't |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | control what they put. If they want to |
| 3 | put two ten thousand square foot houses |
| 4 | in front of me, that's their right, and |
| 5 | I'm fine with that. But to break it |
| 6 | into three, you know, I'd have to see |
| 7 | obviously what the elevation is. Like |
| 8 | Mr. Saretsky was saying, what are we |
| 9 | looking at, what are you going to try |
| 10 | to put there for us? Whereas Skudrna |
| 11 | we really had a lot of neighborhood |
| 12 | impact. Fenner was really -- he was |
| 13 | really -- he was good because he really |
| 14 | wanted to keep -- not what happened at |
| 15 | 754 when that guy put the house back on |
| 16 | the bay and killed the other guy's view |
| 17 | forever. He was, like, you know, he |
| 18 | had three houses that were here and one |
| 19 | gets jumped in the back. So Fenner |
| 20 | said what I want to do is make sure |
| 21 | that going forward, if they're ever |
| 22 | sold, they're all going to have a line |
| 23 | where they really can't ruin someone's |
| 24 | view, like, they have, you know, a |
| 25 | continuity of the neighborhood. So |

that's what I'm really here to be strongly advocating for is the continuity. And the 120 feet lots is -- I don't know why they want to divide it. There's no hardship there, basically it's just money. Obviously it's a lot of money, but it's -- the Dunes is a place where $I$ just don't want to see it become, like, you know, all these houses bunched in. MEMBER CASHIN: Just so I make sure I understand, one of your concerns is that north to south the houses should line up? MS. NANNARIELLO: Correct. And if it goes through the Tax Map -MEMBER KRASNOW: Looks like they do right now. That's kind of like you're in this house over here, you're opposite 738? MS. NANNARIELLO: That's me. See these? With Skudrna, these three lined up with him. He wanted five, and Charles and Fenner and me and the guy that was here at the time, 749 , he sold
the house, we all were very, very vocal about, you know, we want the continuity. So we agreed with the 83, 83, 83. He's 100, they're 75, but they all line up.

MEMBER KRASNOW: What's your width?

MS. NANNARIELLO: 120. Yeah, so this is 120, this is 120, and these are all with that, and these guys are all together, and this guy with that, these guys all line up one to one. That's the continuity. If you put an extra width in there, it's just not going to give us the continuity of the neighborhood that we've had. And it's -- I mean, 50 years, to see the change like that, it's upsetting. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: The mathematical calculation of the various versions that Aram described, I think we're all trying to accomplish a similar goal. We all understand the value of views and everything like it and not having homes on top of each
other. I want you to know the Board, myself particularly, we want to achieve that. At the same time people have certain rights to build what they can and even -MS. NANNARIELLO: They need a variance.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: They have rights to do that.

MS. NANNARIELLO: With a variance.
MR. TERCHUNIAN: Well, they have rights without a variance.

MS. NANNARIELLO: That's what I said, you can do two houses. That's what they're legally allowed to do. MEMBER FARKAS: Once he does the calculations and provides some information, you might actually like it better.

MS. NANNARIELLO: I agree. I'm not disputing that.

MEMBER KRASNOW: If they do what I suggested, you might look at this and say --

MS. NANNARIELLO: You're right
because look at what I'm --
MEMBER KRASNOW: That's why I
think they should visualize it, then you can see and then decide. And then --

MS. NANNARIELLO: That's we did with Skudrna except that we were just concerned with, like, he wanted to put five. He said well, the next four are all 50 foot lots, so $I$ can do that. And we were, like, no, like, let's be reasonable here. So he did 83, 83, 83, which was a third, but they did line up with the houses across the street, which is why we sort of were, like, you know.

MEMBER FARKAS: Reasonable might be three homes. You might see it that way.

MEMBER KRASNOW: That's why I suggested that.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Because with the greater setbacks you might achieve more daylight through -MS. NANNARIELLO: Right. No, I
understand.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: And that was part of the Skudrna piece.

MS. NANNARIELLO: Yes. No, I agree.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Again, I
think --
MS. NANNARIELLO: I agree. I do know that as it is now they have the right to build a very large house.

MEMBER FARKAS: We're not making a decision today.

MS. NANNARIELLO: No, no, I understand.

MEMBER FARKAS: You might look at it and say wow, this is great. So keep an open mind at the moment.

MR. HULME: I think that we're going to be able to demonstrate that the views between the houses are going to increase if you contrast what we could build now versus what we could build with the three lots.

MEMBER CASHIN: Are you going to show elevations on yours?

MR. HULME: We're going to show simple elevations, yeah. But the elevation -- my comment about the elevation is that the elevation is going to be per code, and it's going to be per code whether it's two houses or three houses.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: It will help illustrate.

MR. HULME: So the real question to be asking is how much room between the houses will there be to view the, you know, on the rare day when you prefer to look at the bay as opposed to the ocean.

MEMBER FARKAS: It's always better to look at the bay, Jim. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I don't know if this is the right way to say it, but I would say it should be consistent with Skudrna at least.

MR. HULME: Understood. And we can offset the houses so that there's actually view windows that are larger.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Those are all
larger things that $I$ think will appeal to people.

MR. TERCHUNIAN: With the
elevation analysis you're going to do, I think it would be most valuable to the oceanfront people if the view is without a variance you have two houses, they're of this mass, and you're looking at it. And then you have a comparative analysis with the three houses, whatever the side yards you want to propose are, and they can see the difference.

MEMBER CASHIN: I think that would help.

MEMBER KRASNOW: As you living across the street you might want to -what $I$ would be curious is if $I$ was living across the street is where does this corridor compare to where my house is? Is it in my driveway, my window, or am I sitting on my second story window or my second story deck, and I can see right through the bay, or is it blocked where my deck is? And those

| 1 | are the things, you know, those are |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | personal things that would -- but they |
| 3 | -- obviously I know they directly |
| 4 | affect you. |
| 5 | MS. NANNARIELLO: Right, right. |
| 6 | MEMBER KRASNOW: I mean, you know, |
| 7 | any time there's a vacant property and |
| 8 | somebody wants to build on it, it |
| 9 | changes what you had, but you know, you |
| 10 | don't own it, so they have a right to |
| 11 | build on it. |
| 12 | MS. NANNARIELLO: Of course. |
| 13 | MR. HULME: And we're happy to do |
| 14 | the study, and we will do the study, |
| 15 | and we will try to do -- in the context |
| 16 | of our goals do the right thing. But |
| 17 | just keep in mind that there is no |
| 18 | absolute entitlement to view. The |
| 19 | people have the views that they have, |
| 20 | and they're subject to the ability of |
| 21 | what people can do on other properties. |
| 22 | MR. TERCHUNIAN: There is an |
| 23 | entitlement to air and light. |
| 24 | MR. HULME: Not really. We're not |
| 25 | building a 20 story high-rise. |

ATTORNEY PROKOP: The
difference --
MR. ATANASIO: There's no
entitlement to variance.
MR. HULME: There isn't. But there is process by which a variance can be granted.

MR. ATANASIO: There's a process where you can get a view too.

MR. HULME: True. I don't want to make a legal argument about that. If I have to, I will, but that's not the point.

MR. ATANASIO: I have lawyers.
MR. HULME: So do I. Oh, wait,
that's me.
ATTORNEY PROKOP: View is one of the impacts that the Board can take into consideration. Lauren, did you have anything else?

MS. NANNARIELLO: At the meeting in May you said you were going to send notices out to houses 300 feet from the property line. Did you do that? Because my neighbor --

MR. HULME: That's what he did, that's exactly what we did.

MS. NANNARIELLO: 300 feet from -MR. HULME: We got the addresses from the Village, and I verified with Angela that the people we noticed were within 300 feet, and we did it ten days ahead of time instead of the normally required five days.

MS. NANNARIELLO: From the edge of 738,300 feet?

CLERK SADELI: We looked at the GIS .

MS. NANNARIELLO: No one got anything.

CLERK SADELI: Who didn't get anything? MS. NANNARIELLO: 749, 737. MR. ATANASIO: I only got one thing.

MS. NANNARIELLO: But you're 747 .
749 didn't get anything.
MEMBER FARKAS: When you notice, do you notice to the house here, or do you notice to the address on the --

MR. HULME: I took the addresses that the Village provided me.

MS. NANNARIELLO: 737 didn't get anything, and they're right across the street. There should have been a lot of them.

MR. HULME: The addresses are generally where the tax bill goes and that's where the --

CLERK SADELI: When I looked it up on GIS, I looked for 300 feet.

MS. NANNARIELLO: How many houses got notified?

CLERK SADELI: Seven.
MS. NANNARIELLO: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
--- that's only --
MEMBER KRASNOW: Why don't you
read it to us?
CLERK SADELI: I'm I allowed to do that?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yes.
CLERK SADELI: Eric Nathan, Kevin Nathan, 743 Dune Road, 745. Mr. Atanasio, the Macrone's, and Skudrna.

MS. NANNARIELLO: So only me, you, Lynne, and the two driveways. That's not 300 feet.

MR. ATANASIO: It's wrong. Next. They got caught. Next.

MEMBER CASHIN: Not next. Let's make sure that -MR. ATANASIO: Get it right. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: We'll correct it.

MS. NANNARIELLO: Our neighbors
were all -- first of all, we received ours on January 3rd, and the neighbors were, like, when, when? Monday?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: We're going
over it today. We're not making a decision, so we'll update that accordingly.

CLERK SADELI: You're saying 739
didn't get noticed?
MS. NANNARIELLO: I'm saying 737. MEMBER CASHIN: Angela, are those certified mail? CLERK SADELI: Yes. MS. NANNARIELLO: Joe had said on
the meeting in May this should be a neighborhood thing and they were going to go 300 feet out from each property line.

CLERK SADELI: And I looked it up on GIS, and that was what --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Did we get the proof of mailing? CLERK SADELI: Yes. ATTORNEY PROKOP: So I think that's something we'll work on. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: We'll make sure it's correct. MR. HULME: If you give me another set of addresses, I'm happy to do the mailing. I'll mail it to wherever anybody wants me to mail it. MEMBER KRASNOW: And plus, these minutes will be available for your neighbors. This is all public, so your comments -MEMBER CASHIN: It's our responsibility to tell Jim where they have to go. MR. HULME: The addresses come
from the Village, and I notice based on what they tell me. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All right.

Let's -MEMBER CASHIN: I think, right, Joe, it's our responsibility to
determine the 300 feet?
ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yes. MR. HULME: And there's also a notice in the paper. MEMBER CASHIN: I read them every day.

MR. HULME: I study them every week myself, but $I ' m$ weird that way. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Any other comments?

MR. MACRONE: No, just what has been said, but we'll await the drawings and renderings -MEMBER KRASNOW: Can you identify yourself?

MR. MACRONE: Yes, John Macrone, 734 and 739. We'll just be awaiting anything you can provide with the size of the homes, where they'll be located,

don't know if you recall the reason?
MR. ATANASIO: I think if I understand what you're saying, I think the people east lost the sunset if it was further set back. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Okay. So maybe that's the reason. So by bringing it forward it helped Fenner. MR. ATANASIO: That's the interesting thing about who you send these letters to. If you're saying within 300 feet, and I had -- I want to stand corrected, I have gone through this very diligently, lawyered up, and I want through Skudrna, whatever his name was for three years, whatever it was. The only reason I said I had never been in the first meeting, they called me in later, so $I$ wanted to be clear on that. I do know a lot about what's going on and what went on. But I think that was the answer, the people east all the way down to the end. So why wouldn't they get a letter?

MEMBER CASHIN: It's not required.

MEMBER KRASNOW: But it's noticed on the Village website and it's noticed in the paper.

MR. HULME: The law in the Village and all Villages and Towns, there's a very specific noticing requirement, and the applicant is required to meet that obligation.

CLERK SADELI: Abutting and adjacent. And the Planning Board --

MR. HULME: There's nothing that prevents you from talking to anybody --

MR. ATANASIO: Just as a public service when these people are really getting affected. It isn't, like, I don't have to know that.

MR. HULME: Go talk to them.
MR. ATANASIO: Oh, I did. Believe me, we have.

MR. HULME: We --
CLERK SADELI: We have to speak one at a time.

MR. ATANASIO: You have no idea what you're in for. Trust me. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All right.

MR. HULME: This is not my first rodeo.

MR. ATANASIO: Is it my turn?
CLERK SADELI: Sure.
MR. ATANASIO: I went through this with the moron across the street.

CLERK SADELI: Mr. Atanasio, if you could just state your name.

MR. ATANASIO: Charles Atanasio,
747 Dune Road. I went through -- I lawyered up, we went to war.

Unfortunately we didn't really know what we were doing because it was like anything else in this neighborhood here, it's the wild, wild west, every year it's a different game. Okay. We didn't know what we were agreeing to, but we felt to be fair, and we did what we did, but the truth is nobody to this day wanted that. If you ask them to do that deal again, they'd say no in a heartbeat.

MEMBER CASHIN: What deal are you talking about?

MR. ATANASIO: To change that to
three houses. Skudrna. What's going to happen next? What kind of precedent is next? What are you going to do? You're ruining this neighborhood, and the only way you're going to find out is all these are going to get voted out. Okay.

I have two problems. When I
lawyered up -- Fenner came to me and asked me if he wanted -- if I wanted get involved with the problem that he had on his side because to be honest with you, didn't even know about it, didn't even care, didn't even know you could do anything. When $I$ got into it, I found out, so him and I became best friends. Best friends. That property that was across the street, your property, that was owned by his wife's family, and the deal I had with him was -- because he came to me and said do you want to buy the property? And at the same time Cooper came in and he was there, he just moved in. And I told him I'm going to buy the property. He
said well, why don't you do this? Let me buy the property, he says, I'll guarantee you that we will never build on it, he says, and I'll guarantee you that if $I$ sell it you get right of first refusal. I sat down with everybody in his family, they all agreed. They all agreed. Okay. What happened? I don't know. But how is this? I will find out. I will find out. Okay. Because something happened. Because Cliff don't need money. Okay. And I'm not sure, and I'm going to find out. Can you give us the owners of the LLC?

MR. HULME: He's sitting right here. MR. ATANASIO: Who is in the LLC, just you? You're the only person? MR. ANTONACCI: I have another member. MR. ATANASIO: Do we know who that is?

MR. ANTONACCI: I can let the Board know next time.

MR. ATANASIO: Okay. Am allowed to ask questions?

MR. HULME: No. Your comments should directed to the Board. And how he came into title has nothing to do with -- we're entitled to make this application. What deal you may or may not have had with Mr. Cooper on the side has nothing to do with this.

MR. ATANASIO: We're going to find out.

MR. HULME: We're here. You may have a cause of action against Mr.

Cooper. We're here --
MR. ATANASIO: Listen, my in house lawyers are working on it as I speak. This is not going to be a one and done. Trust me. This is not going to be --

MEMBER FARKAS: You have to address the Board.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: One thing to one of your comments. So if we're out 300 feet, it would be almost five properties at least to the east of 738, so we're going to look into those five

| 1 | properties. I think it will -- |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MS. NANNARIELLO: Sorry to |
| 3 | interrupt you, but the two properties |
| 4 | to the east of 738 are not buildable |
| 5 | properties. They're deeded properties |
| 6 | as Aram has clarified to me, but |
| 7 | they're a parking strip, and they're a |
| 8 | six foot lot, and they get notified. I |
| 9 | mean, I don't know how they have skin |
| 10 | in this game if they're just a parking |
| 11 | space. |
| 12 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: Well, they get |
| 13 | notified. It goes by owner. |
| 14 | MS. NANNARIELLO: Okay. But it |
| 15 | really can't be considered an owner. |
| 16 | It should be going to Macrone and then |
| 17 | White. |
| 18 | MEMBER FARKAS: 300 feet. |
| 19 | MEMBER KRASNOW: 300 feet is 300 |
| 20 | feet. |
| 21 | MEMBER FARKAS: So if each |
| 22 | property is approximately 60 feet, then |
| 23 | five houses or five lots to the east, |
| 24 | all five should have been notified; is |
| 25 | that right? |

MEMBER CASHIN: And across the street, and the other side.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: From a sunsetting concept, if you look at this map, you're welcome to take a look at it if you want, we should be able to help those people and yourself understand how it does or doesn't impact.

MS. NANNARIELLO: It doesn't really impact me, to be honest. I appreciate --

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: To your --
MR. ATANASIO: The sunset doesn't affect us. What affects us is the view to the bay, and that's why they conceded with some of these -- I forget what the number was between each house, it was larger than normal.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: It became 18 feet.

MEMBER FARKAS: 18 and 18 is 36
between the homes.
MR. HULME: I think we're going to be able to demonstrate to you that your
view with the three houses is going to be larger than your view with the two houses.

MR. ATANASIO: With all due respect, Counsel, that deal was wrong. MEMBER FARKAS: Charles, you have to address the Board. MR. ATANASIO: With all due respect, gentlemen, that deal was wrong. It's like saying to me we operated on this guy, it didn't work. Let's do the same operation because that was what was precedent. We did it wrong. Okay. We did it wrong as far as the community is concerned. Legally that's a different story, which I don't -- I do know, but if you ask anybody on that road would they want to have what happened there, they would all say no. I don't know where he got these two cronies down at 777 and -- okay. They don't even know what's going on. Why don't you ask the people that are around it?

| 1 | do this: Let us -- we're going to send |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | the notification to the people 300 feet |
| 3 | on either side. It's going to be at |
| 4 | least five properties. We'll make |
| 5 | sure -- |
| 6 | MEMBER CASHIN: It's going to be a |
| 7 | lot more than that because you have to |
| 8 | do across the street. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: I'm saying |
| 10 | five on the bay side to the east alone. |
| 11 | MS. NANNARIELLO: And west. |
| 12 | MR. HULME: To the west on the bay |
| 13 | Skudrna is over 200 feet. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Skudrna -- you |
| 15 | only have one house on the other side |
| 16 | of Skudrna. |
| 17 | MR. HULME: I don't want to -- you |
| 18 | tell me who you want me to notice, we |
| 19 | will notice them. |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: We'll take |
| 21 | care of that. |
| 22 | MEMBER FARKAS: Let's not get |
| 23 | ahead of ourselves. Let them -- let |
| 24 | him -- |

MR. ATANASIO: I just wanted to be
clear what the concern was.
MEMBER FARKAS: Let's see what the final product could look like -MR. ATANASIO: That was the process I got in when we had the last one. I got in when they showed us the maps and the this and the that. I get that. Okay. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Listen, Skudrna is not the barometer for everything. MR. ATANASIO: That's right. It shouldn't be because it's wrong. MR. TERCHUNIAN: Fair. MR. ATANASIO: It was wrong. MS. NANNARIELLO: Now it's precedent. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Skudrna is merely a comparison and an understanding of why and how, and we're not going to make our decision on that alone.

MR. ATANASIO: Good.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: We have to
have for smaller homes --

MR. ATANASIO: You can't set a precedent here, guys. We would be crazy to do that.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: As Board members, that's the one thing we don't want to do.

MR. ATANASIO: You can't do that. But we're going to fight. I'm fighting. I'm fighting with every --

MEMBER FARKAS: Can you at least see what you're fighting against?

MR. ATANASIO: I already know what I'm fighting against. I already know. I know their game. We all know their game. And they have the right to play that game, they do. Come on. I'm a realist. I didn't get to where I was without saying what isn't the truth. The truth is they want to do something which is good for them. God bless them. I want to do something that's good for community, not for me, the community. Okay. Okay. That's what I want to do, and if you guys don't want to do that, I'll vote you's out.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: We want to go through the proper process --

MR. ATANASIO: That's right. You should.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: And we have to follow the direction from -MR. ATANASIO: You should. It's your obligation to protect this community.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: And that's what we're going to do. MR. HULME: It's their obligation to follow the law. MR. ATANASIO: And they should. And if they don't --

MR. HULME: Their conclusion -THE COURT REPORTER: I need you to speak one at a time.

MR. HULME: If they conclude based on following the law that we're entitled --

MR. ATANASIO: And I will stretch this out for years. For years. MR. HULME: That's fine. MR. ATANASIO: Guaranteed.

Guaranteed.
MR. HULME: You don't need to
threaten me or anybody else.
MR. ATANASIO: I'm not threatening you.

MR. HULME: You are, sir.
MR. ATANASIO: I don't threaten anybody, $I$ just tell people what I'm going to do.

MR. HULME: I'm taking exception
to the rudeness.
MR. ATANASIO: I'm sorry you take
it that way. I live across the
street --
MR. HULME: I'm being polite to
you, I would ask that you extend me the same courtesy.

MR. ATANASIO: I won't take
being --
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Listen,
Charles, you have the right to do what's in your capacity to do, and we have to sort of --

MR. ATANASIO: I have to live across from the monsters. Okay. And
so does she.
MEMBER KRASNOW: We're listening
to --

MR. ATANASIO: Thank you. Listen, you all know of me in this town, I love this town. I don't have to live here. I can live any place I want.

MEMBER FARKAS: Charles, we love this town too.

MR. ATANASIO: I love this town, and if we don't protect this town, it's our fault, shame on us. We're the ones that are protecting -MEMBER KRASNOW: But they still have a right --

MR. ATANASIO: I understand that.
And he should have a right.
MEMBER KRASNOW: We have to listen
to --

MR. ATANASIO: I'm not arguing anything that's legal. I'm just saying as a resident here my heart is here because I love the community. Okay. That's what I care about.

MEMBER KRASNOW: I think we all
do.
MR. ATANASIO: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All right. So
I need to make a -- does anyone move to close the hearing?

MR. TERCHUNIAN: No, not close.
Adjourn for all purposes.
MEMBER FARKAS: Do we have any other residents here that want to speak?

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Alex, do you have a house here? Do you live here? MR. ANTONACCI: No.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So I --
ATTORNEY PROKOP: So it would be a motion to adjourn the public hearing not to a specific date. MR. ATANASIO: I want to ask a question. Can you give me a time schedule on when the next -- so I can make sure if I need people here to help me, lawyers. Can you give me -- how fast will I -- when will I be able to know when the next meeting is?

CLERK SADELI: When one is set. MR. ATANASIO: Is there -MEMBER KRASNOW: They have to provide us the public notice. MR. HULME: They need to send the date. As soon as that date is set, we will provide all the information that we provide all the information that we promised to provide.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Wait a second. It's not going to go like that. We don't set dates and then we get the information the day before the date. We need you to supply the information. When we feel that you've met your requirements, then we'll set the date. We can't have last minute submissions. MR. TERCHUNIAN: Mr. Chairman, if I may speak? What $I$ plan on doing is summarizing what I've heard at the meeting, providing a memo to you and the Board and to Joe what I believe the information needs of the Village are, and then asking that to be forwarded to the applicant. When the applicant has
indicated to us that they have that information, I'd like the Board to set another meeting date.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: And we have to give notification at least 7 to 10 days.

MR. HULME: 10 days.
CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: So you're going to have plenty of time to be notified, plenty of time to -MR. ATANASIO: A month? Two weeks?

MR. HULME: It's probably more in the order of a month plus. Sir, please feel free to call my office any time you'd like.

MR. ATANASIO: I will have people call your office. I need your card. MR. HULME: I don't have a card with me.

MR. ATANASIO: I'm done. I'd have my people call your people.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I have a problem with you writing a memo to the Board. I'll discuss that with you separately.

| 1 | Because I don't want your particular |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | opinion on the application. I don't |
| 3 | want -- |
| 4 | MR. TERCHUNIAN: I'm not going to |
| 5 | do an opinion -- |
| 6 | ATTORNEY PROKOP: I would prefer |
| 7 | that what we do -- because this is |
| 8 | something that comes up every time. |
| 9 | I'd prefer that what we do is we |
| 10 | discuss now what we want him to |
| 11 | provide, the applicant to provide |
| 12 | between now and the next meeting, and |
| 13 | it goes into the minutes so we have a |
| 14 | clear record. So my -- just to start |
| 15 | that, and my understanding is that |
| 16 | we're going to get an analysis of the |
| 17 | as of right construction with the lots |
| 18 | the way that they are, and the as of |
| 19 | right construction with the lots as a |
| 20 | proposed subdivision. And I'd like |
| 21 | that to also include with that land |
| 22 | reserved in the back, okay, to see what |
| 23 | the impact -- what that would impact. |
| 24 | So that's really three things. And |
| 25 | then I'm suggesting to the Board that |

you request these things called a view shed. So an elevation, you're basically just looking at the house, but the view shed will actually show you what the view will be like. That's what we required Skudrna to do. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: Okay. I think that would be helpful.

MEMBER CASHIN: That will include the building envelope.

MR. HULME: Just to put a little
finer point on that, what we plan to show is the -- what we can construct at three tenths, four tenths, and Skudrna. CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All that is helpful.

MR. HULME: And we'll provide the view shed information as well as the as of right for two lots.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: There's another discussion that we have to have that we -- the Board sent you a letter several months ago suggesting that what we do is the two lots that exist, that the application be to take basically a
third of each, the innermost third of each lot and then merge those thirds. Right? So basically you would subdivide a third, one third off of each lot, the inner third, the adjoining thirds, and then merge those thirds together, so then you would have three lots, right? You would have the two thirds -- the two combined one thirds, and the two thirds on the other side. They was an objection -- as I understand it, there was an objection -- although I never got a communication directly, except you requesting a meeting with the Village, as I understand it there was an objection by you because you claim that the Board was requiring you to merge the lots. I would just like to point out to you that your application, what your application states is that -- the application that you made to the Board, I don't know if you'd like to change it or reconsider it. The application you made to the Board was to merge the two
lots and then to subdivide them. So I would like you to --

MR. HULME: For getting this variance.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I'd like you to clarify what --

MR. HULME: We had a discussion about this, Joe. We met with the Board, and the Board decided that this application would move forward as one application. We're not going to merge these lots prior to any determination, and we're not required to merge these lots before any determination. Whatever we may have said --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Again, I'm not going to have an intellectual debate over whether or not you're required to merge them or not. I don't think -I'm just trying to accommodate what your application was for. Your application in your June 1st letter was to merge the lots and then to subdivide them. If you could just clarify on the record what your application --

MR. HULME: My application is get the necessary variances so that when we do merge the lots we have those variances in place so that we can go back to the Planning Board and get the final map approved.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: What is the mechanism that you want for merging the lots? You want us to merge it into one tax lot or just --

MR. HULME: I don't want you to do anything until we're done. Until we have final Planning Board -- final Zoning Board approval, if that's forthcoming, and then final Planning Board approval. We will then prepare a map that though shows the three lots. We will record that map in the County Clerk's office, and the County will then assign three separate tax map numbers to these lots.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Right. I don't think you have --

MR. HULME: Until that point, there's nothing to be done in that
regard, other than continuing to prosecute this application.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: I think your statement of the process is correct, and I don't think that that involves the merger that you suggested in your June 1st letter. That's all I'm getting at. If this ever was to become approved or some version of this was to become approved, I think you just need to file an updated map showing whatever the approved configuration is. MR. HULME: I agree with you. ATTORNEY PROKOP: Is there a subdivision map that needs to be abandoned? Your research indicated that there's a subdivision map that needs to be abandoned in order to do this?

MR. HULME: I don't recall. ATTORNEY PROKOP: We'll have to -I'll have to work on that for the Board.

MR. HULME: I don't understand the point, but I'll provide whatever
information that you require of me. But we're here.

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Those are the only two things I have. Thanks. MR. ATANASIO: Could I ask one question? The letter that you're going to send to everybody east of the property concerning the sunset, who is going to draft that letter? CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: It's not a specific thing on sunset. It's just going to be a notification of the meeting we're going to have, and then we're going to provide at the meeting the information.

MR. ATANASIO: Oh, so you can't say anything about sunset on that letter?

CLERK SADELI: No.
MR. ATANASIO: Why?
MR. TERCHUNIAN: Because it's
really a notice that a meeting is going to be held, and you're welcome to come
to the meeting and hear everything that's said. Not one thing,
everything.
MR. ATANASIO: I get it but --
ATTORNEY PROKOP: The notice is
going to say -- the notice will say -we're going to add language in this notice that says that the minutes of the January 7th meeting are available on the website.

MR. HULME: Give me the minutes, I will include them in my mailing. MR. ATANASIO: Is it against the law to say concerning your sunset?

ATTORNEY PROKOP: Yes. We're not going to put -- we can't suggest an impact on the public notice. It's going to be a public notice, the regular public notice, but it will include language so that the public knows that the minutes are available on the website from today's meeting. And if they read those minutes, they'll see all the concerns that were made. MR. ATANASIO: So there's no other way of doing it? MR. TERCHUNIAN: No.

MR. ATANASIO: Are you sure?
MR. TERCHUNIAN: Yes.
MEMBER KRASNOW: From the Village.
MR. ATANASIO: From the Village?
I don't know what that means, but I'll --

ATTORNEY PROKOP: We have to be fair to both sides.

MR. ATANASIO: I said I don't know what that means, but I'll accept it. I generally don't do that. I have a question. I know you're a lawyer.

MR. HULME: I am.
MR. ATANASIO: Are you a lawyer?
MR. ANTONACCI: I am.
MR. ATANASIO: Do you work for Harvey?

MR. ANTONACCI: No. Who is Harvey?

CLERK SADELI: I don't think this is appropriate.

CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: We're going to
move to close the meeting -- adjourn
the meeting, sorry.
MEMBER FARKAS: I'll make a
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CHAIRMAN SARETSKY: All in favor? MEMBER FARKAS: Aye. MEMBER KRASNOW: Aye. MEMBER CASHIN: Aye. (The meeting was adjourned at
```
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