

A MEETING OF THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS OF THE VILLAGE OF MONTEBELLO WAS HELD ON THURSDAY MARCH 16, 2023, AT THE DR. JEFFREY OPPENHEIM COMMUNITY CENTER, 350 HAVERSTRAW ROAD, MONTEBELLO, NY 10901. THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:00 P.M. FOLLOWED BY THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.

Present:	Rodney Gittens	Chairman
	Ezra Bryan	Member
	Elizabeth Dugandzic	Member
	Carl Wanderman	Member
	Janet Gigante	Member
Others Present:	Alyse Terhune	Assistant Village Attorney
	Regina Rivera	Planning & Zoning Clerk

Absent:

Member Wanderman made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of February 16, 2022, seconded by Member Dugandzic and upon vote, all were in favor.

1 Plum Hill Drive
Arnold Heinemann, A&B Improvements LLC
1 Plum Hill Drive
49.05-1-42

Application of A&B Improvements LLC on behalf of David Berger, owner of 1 Plum Hill Drive, Montebello, NY which was submitted to the Village of Montebello Zoning Board of Appeals for variances for: Front setback [required 50 feet, proposed 36.7 feet]; Front yard, [required 50 feet, proposed 36.7 feet]; Development coverage [required 20%, proposed 22%]; and Minimum off-street parking [required 2 spaces, proposed 1space] as per Section 195, attachment 2, Row h , and Section 195-17 of the zoning code of the Village of Montebello. The parcel is located on the south side of Plum Hill Road west of the intersection of Sycamore Lane in Zone RR-50.

Present on behalf of the homeowners were the Applicant Arnold Heinemann of A&B Improvements, LLC, Engineer Rachel Barese of Civil Tec Engineering & Surveying, Architect Eric Osborn and Designer Heather Scheiner.

Chairman Gittens read the application and the submissions into the record. Mr. Heinemann was sworn in and stated that he, as the project manager, was representing his client in this matter to construct an addition to an existing home. He explained that this home is on a corner lot and as such it has two front yards each requiring 50-foot setbacks which triggered the requested yard/setback variances. The homeowners wish to extend the kitchen, add a bedroom on the ground floor to accommodate their aging parents, and add two bathrooms on the second floor to accommodate extended family comfortably.

Engineer Rachel Barese was sworn in and explained that part of the existing garage is being converted to living space and that they are adding a one-car garage to replace the lost garage space. There is room in the driveway for off-street parking, but it does not fully meet the Village's official parking requirements, she said. The variance requested is for 22% Development Coverage where 20% is the maximum, not a significant increase, and part of the addition goes on top of the existing driveway which mitigates the variance without having to remove other hard surfaces, such as the pool patio, she said.

Chairman Gittens asked why there was so much asphalt on the plans, and Ms. Barese explained that the extra driveway space is necessary for access from Plum Hill Drive. The Chairman was not convinced that all that hardscape and the wide width was necessary. Ms. Barese countered that the existing driveway was 12 feet wide and that they were only extending the small triangle of asphalt at the top for maneuverability, where 20 feet is needed for turning radius. Chairman Gittens requested maneuverability chart be submitted for the next meeting and noted that it looked like a parking lot instead of a driveway. Ms. Barese said that the smallest variance possible is being requested, and that the original development coverage was 19% and they are only asking for 2% coverage over the code. She said they could work to reduce it a bit further while adding some landscaping to the front of the driveway, but not enough to eliminate the variance.

Chairman Gittens said that would be fine, but noted that drainage would be impacted with extra pervious surface. A setback variance is also being requested, he said and asked which variance they would prefer to have. At this point the designer Heather Scheiner was sworn in. Ms. Scheiner offered to replace much of the asphalt with pea gravel and an apron at the bottom of the driveway. Ms. Terhune recommended that she contact the Village Building Inspector to find out what kind of pervious materials would be acceptable since the village historically does count many types of porous materials towards development coverage.

Chairman Gittens asked about the landscaping in front of the house, and Ms. Barese said it will be marked out on the subsequent survey. A discussion about how to mitigate the development coverage further ensued, after which Ms. Barese stated that she will try to get the coverage down to 20%. She then asked the Chairman if he and the Board would be more amenable to the setback variances if the development coverage variance was eliminated. The Chairman answered only that her clients should choose which variances they wished to obtain.

Addressing the Architect, Mr. Osborn, Chairman Gittens asked that he include the square footage of each room and include square footage totals per floor as well as for the entire house. Member Bryan studied the survey closely and asked if the whole addition could be shifted a bit in a southwest direction. Ms. Barese said they looked at many alternatives to locations for the addition but that everything hinged on the interior of the house and the fact that the homeowners want to extend the kitchen into the additional space. Member Bryan said he was only suggesting they shift it back closer to the pool near the fence, thereby eliminating that setback variance. Ms. Barese said it still would not line up with the area of the house they wish to extend, but said she and her team will consider other options to reduce the variances. She then asked if the Board had any other comments. Member Dugandzic said that she was looking forward to seeing the square footage totals and the landscaping, which will give them all a clearer picture of what is being proposed.

No one having further comments, Member Wanderman made a motion to set the public hearing for the April 20, 2023, ZBA meeting, seconded by Member Dugandzic and upon vote, all were in favor.

Member Dugandzic made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:41 p.m. The motion was seconded by Member Wanderman and upon vote, all were in favor.