

Zoning Board of Appeals
May 8, 2020
11:00 a.m.
via Video-Conferencing and
Published by Local TV, Inc.

Those present were:

Lysbeth A. Marigold, Chair
Raymond J. Harden, Vice Chair
John L. McGuirk III, Member
Lawrence A. Hillel, Member
Craig R. Humphrey, Member
Christopher A. Minardi, Alternate Member
Elizabeth Baldwin, Village Attorney
Billy Hajek, Village Planner
Jonathan Tarbet, Attorney on behalf of Aberdeenshire, LLC and Brian Francis
Watson and Edwin Brooke LeMaistre
Mr. and Mrs. John Ford, Applicants
Leonard I. Ackerman, Attorney on behalf of 117 Lily Pond Lane LLC
Jason Nower, LTV Moderator
Pamela J. Bennett, Deputy Clerk

Ms. Marigold: Good morning ladies and gentlemen, I am going to start by calling our second meeting of the East Hampton Village Zoning Board to order. LTV has the agenda and you can call in both obviously any interested parties the number will be at the bottom of the screen. First, we have to approve the minutes of April 24, 2020. If there are no additions or corrections, I would like a motion to accept the minutes as submitted.

Mr. Hillel: Motion.

Mr. Humphrey: Second.

Ms. Marigold: All in favor?

Mr. Harden: Aye.

Mr. McGuirk: Aye.

16008

Mr. Hillel: Aye.

Mr. Humphrey: Aye.

Ms. Marigold: Next we have eight determinations. I will read the name, address, and the resolution after which Pam Bennett will poll the Board. The complete application is in Village Hall if people would like to go and look at it.

REQUEST TO RE-OPEN
James D. Danella – 49 La Forest Lane – SCTM #301-12-6-7

Ms. Marigold: The first one we have the James D. Danella, 49 La Forest Lane, it is a request to re-open the hearing. Ms. Bennett?

Ms. Bennett: You want to re-open then?

Ms. Marigold: It is a request...

Ms. Baldwin: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Ms. Marigold?

Ms. Marigold: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. McGuirk?

Mr. McGuirk: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Hillel?

Mr. Hillel: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Humphrey?

Mr. Humphrey: Yes.

DETERMINATIONS

Zee I LLC – 19 Chauncey Close – SCTM #301-15-1-6
Zon II LLC – 23 Chauncey Close – SCTM #301-15-1-5

Ms. Marigold: Then we have the two that went together Zee I LLC, 19 Chauncey Close and Zon II LLC, 23 Chauncey Close, the determination will be issued June 12th.

Mr. Hillel: So, we are delaying the determination.

Ms. Baldwin: I just have not written it yet.

Mr. Hillel: Okay, I just wanted to understand it, thanks.

DETERMINATION

Georgica LLC – 283 Georgica Road – SCTM #301-12-2-1.1

Ms. Marigold: Georgica LLC, 283 Georgica Road, the disposition of the application was approved.

Ms. Bennett: Ms. Marigold?

Ms. Marigold: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Harden?

Mr. Harden: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Hillel?

Mr. Hillel: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Humphrey?

Mr. Humphrey: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Minardi?

Mr. Minardi: Yes.

D E T E R M I N A T I O N
34 Darby LLC – 34 Darby Lane – SCTM #301-8-12-17

Ms. Marigold: Next we have 34 Darby LLC, that is at 34 Darby Lane, and the disposition of the application was approved.

Ms. Bennett: Ms. Marigold?

Ms. Marigold: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Harden?

Mr. Harden: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Hillel?

Mr. Hillel: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Humphrey?

Mr. Humphrey: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Minardi?

Mr. Minardi: Yes.

D E T E R M I N A T I O N
49 Hunting Lane, LLC – 49 Hunting Lane – SCTM #301-3-8-9.2

Ms. Marigold: Next is 49 Hunting Lane, LLC at 49 Hunting Lane, the disposition of the application was approved.

Ms. Bennett: Ms. Marigold?

Ms. Marigold: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Harden?

Mr. Harden: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Hillel?

Mr. Hillel: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Humphrey?

Mr. Humphrey: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Minardi?

Mr. Minardi: Yes.

DETERMINATION

**David Andrew Trust Revocable Trust – 27 Windmill Lane –
SCTM #301-10-1-12**

Ms. Marigold: Then we have the David Andrew Trust Revocable Trust, 27 Windmill Lane, it was approved and a letter will be sent to the applicant.

Ms. Bennett: Do you want me to poll?

Ms. Baldwin: You do not need to.

Ms. Bennett: Okay.

DETERMINATION

Pond Acquisition Corp. – 291 Montauk Highway – SCTM #301-6-1-9.1

Ms. Marigold: And Pond Acquisition Corporation at 291 Montauk Highway, the disposition of the applicant is approved.

Ms. Bennett: Ms. Marigold?

Ms. Marigold: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Harden?

Mr. Harden: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Hillel?

16012

Mr. Hillel: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Humphrey?

Mr. Humphrey: Yes.

Ms. Bennett: Mr. Minardi?

Mr. Minardi: Yes.

APPLICATION WITHDRAWN
Nicole and Allen Salmasi - 73 Davids Lane – SCTM #301-3-9-15

Ms. Marigold: We have one withdrawal of an application and that is Nicole and Allen Salmasi at 73 Davids Lane. Do I have a motion to accept the withdrawal?

Mr. Harden: I make a motion.

Ms. Marigold: Second?

Mr. Humphrey: Second.

Ms. Marigold: All in favor?

Mr. Harden: Aye.

Mr. McGuirk: Aye.

Mr. Hillel: Aye.

ADJOURNMENT
c/o The Maidstone – Premises of Lexington Lounge LLC – 207 Main Street –
SCTM 301-8-7-30.4

Ms. Marigold: Then we have a request for an adjournment c/o The Maidstone, Premises of Lexington Lounge LLC, 207 Main Street, they are requesting an adjournment until June 12, 2020. Do I have a motion to accept that?

Mr. Hillel: Motion.

16013

Mr. Harden: Second.

Ms. Marigold: All in favor?

Mr. Harden: Aye.

Mr. Hillel: Aye.

Mr. Humphrey: Aye.

Mr. Minardi: Aye.

ORIGINAL HEARING
John and Cecilia Ford – 90 Pantigo Road – SCTM #301-4-7-24.1

Ms. Marigold: Okay, now we go the new hearings, the first one is in the application of John and Cecilia Ford at 90 Pantigo Road. Ms. Bennett, could you read the application.

Ms. Bennett: Application of John and Cecilia Ford, SCTM#301-4-7-24.1, for an Area Variance from Chapter 278, Zoning, to legalize coverage. A 260 square foot variance is required from Section 278-3.A.(9) to legalize 3,931 square feet of coverage where 3,671 square feet of coverage is legally preexisting pursuant to a prior zoning board approval. The maximum permitted coverage pursuant to zoning is 2,970 square feet. The subject property is 12,351 square feet in size and is located at 90 Pantigo Road in Residence District R-20 and the Hook Historic District. This project is classified as a Type II Action in accordance with SEQR.

Ms. Marigold: Is the applicant present?

Mr. Nower: We have one applicant on the line, I will unmute them right now. Applicant, you are on the air. Hello, you are on the air. I am currently not hearing anything from them.

Mr. Ackerman: This is Len Ackerman, I am just on the call waiting for my hearing at 117 Lily Pond Lane and you can mute me and call me when you are ready.

Mr. Nower: Thank you very much Mr. Ackerman. That was the only person on the line.

16014

ORIGINAL HEARING
Aberdeenshire, LLC – 29 Huntting Lane – SCTM #301-3-8-5

Ms. Marigold: We can go to the next one, the application of Aberdeenshire, LLC, 29 Huntting Lane. Ms. Bennett?

Ms. Bennett: Application of Aberdeenshire, LLC, SCTM#301-3-8-5, for Area Variances from Chapter 278, Zoning, to legalize coverage, walkways and patios. A 660 square foot variance is required from Section 278-3.A.(9)(a) to legalize 7,058 square feet of coverage where 6,398 square feet is maximum permitted coverage. A 5-foot variance is requested from Section 278-3.A.(5)(b) to legalize a patio located approximately 10 feet from the rear yard lot line where the required setback is 15 feet. The subject property is 29,492 square feet in size and is located at 29 Huntting Lane in Residence District R-40 and the Huntting Lane Historic District. This project is classified as a Type II Action in accordance with SEQR.

Ms. Marigold: Is the applicant present?

Mr. Nower: We have two additional callers right now, I am going to unmute them both accordingly to see.

Mrs. Ford: Hi, this is Cecilia Ford, Cecilia Ford here of the John and Cecilia Ford at 90 Pantigo Road.

Mr. Nower: Okay, we will come back to that, we did not have you on the initial call.

Mrs. Ford: No, I could not get through so I should just stay on the phone?

Mr. Nower: Yes please.

Ms. Marigold: Aberdeenshire, Jon?

Mr. Tarbet: Jon Tarbet is here.

Ms. Marigold: Jon, would you like to tell us about it.

Mr. Tarbet: Sure, thank you, so sorry I am just trying to get myself set up technology-wise. So, I can see you guys but I have you muted so I will hear you through the phone. This is the property that actually my Dad re-did probably 12

years ago now, it was the old age home and he did a historic renovation there and has lived there for the last 12 years and has now sold it. As part of the C.O. process, we came upon a couple of things, one is the postman's walk from Hunting Lane to the house is just a little bit wider than 48 inches so that counts as a postman's walk and would need a variance. If you have been to the property and understand, well if you have not been under the current conditions, but if you have been to the property it is a real nice postman's walk, it is very historic looking and it is in cement so to cut it back to 48 inches would destroy the look of it, it is only a little bit bigger than that. And there is a couple of other brick walkways that have been added just around the property. One thing to keep in note is that before my Dad renovated his property, the old age home had basically paved the entire, if you look at the property from Hunting Lane, it was all driveway I guess you would call it, but it was essentially pavement on the entire, from the house to the property line on the entire left-hand side of the property, all that was ripped out and put to grass so in a way it is a lot better than it was, actually in all ways but we are looking for a variance to keep these walkways just because they really allow you to just get from either to the deck to the basement or from the driveway to the house without walking through grass or mud or what may be during certain times of the year, snow, and they are pretty small variances so we were hoping the Board would look favorably on the application.

Mr. McGuirk: Lys, I have no issues with it at all. They have done a great job over there at Hunting I think.

Ms. Marigold: Are you using the garage as a garage?

Mr. Tarbet: The garage has always been a garage. During the time, in the last 12 years it has just been a garage, it is nothing in there, it is completely empty right now. There is actually, I should take that back, there is a pool house, I guess it is less than 200 square feet that is part of the garage structure that faces the pool but that is all legal and then there is a bathroom in there.

Ms. Marigold: Okay.

Mr. Tarbet: And there is a second story in the garage which has always been storage.

Mr. Humphrey: That is a carriage house?

Ms. Marigold: It was.

16016

Mr. Tarbet: I believe it was originally a carriage house from 100 years ago or so.

Mr. Humphrey: I think it is a very attractive property and especially the garage and the second floor.

Mr. Tarbet: Thank you. They really tried to do something nice there.

Ms. Marigold: Ray, have you seen it?

Mr. Harden: Yes, I do not have a problem with this.

Ms. Marigold: Larry?

Ms. Baldwin: You have to unmute.

Mr. McGuirk: He is muted.

Ms. Marigold: Larry, do you have a problem or a comment?

Mr. Hillel: I am almost happy it is sold, it was a long time, and I think it was fixed up very nicely and I am okay with it.

Ms. Marigold: Okay well, I guess...

Ms. Baldwin: Any comment from the public?

Ms. Marigold: Any comment from the public?

Mr. Nower: Wait a moment, we will unmute accordingly. The only other people on the line are applicants.

Ms. Marigold: Okay. Do I have a motion to close the hearing?

Mr. Humphrey: So moved.

Mr. Harden: Second.

Mr. Hillel: Second.

Ms. Marigold: All in favor?

16016A

Mr. Harden: Aye.

Mr. McGuirk: Aye.

Mr. Hillel: Aye.

Mr. Humphrey: Aye.

ORIGINAL HEARING
John and Cecilia Ford – 90 Pantigo Road – SCTM #301-4-7-24.1

Ms. Marigold: Okay, so now we will go back to the John and Cecilia Ford at 90 Pantigo Road.

Mr. Nower: I am unmuting them now.

Mr. Ford: Hello?

Mr. Nower: You are on the air.

Mr. Ford: All right, this is John Ford. Can you hear me?

Ms. Marigold: Yes.

Mr. Ford: I think you have been out to see what we are talking about here. We would like to keep our existing brick the way it is and since I have built the garage...

Mr. Hillel: Can you speak louder please.

Mr. Ford: Sure. We would like to keep the brick the way it is. I think several of you have been down to see the property. I built the garage, our original intent was to take out the brick walk on the right-hand side and some from the side of the garage and some from the enlarged terrace itself also to make up for additional coverage that the garage entailed but once I added it up, it deemed appropriate to try to get us, grant us a, let us keep the brick the way it is. We have actually put a considerable amount of greenery on the property than was here when we initially moved in. There was a great big circular driveway and that is all gone and been replaced by lawn and so the garage really, I think compared to the original

footprint is probably not much more if anything in terms of coverage. I know that driveway does not actually count but that is why...[inaudible]...to say that.

Ms. Marigold: Craig, do you have any...

Mr. Humphrey: I have been to the property and I wanted to get back again but I did not. My impression is that the brick surrounding the pool is overkill, he has lost most of the backyard.

Mr. Hillel: I agree with you and I think 32 percent is excessive coverage which is 9 percent more than what was previously approved.

Ms. Marigold: Ray?

Mrs. Ford: Well the garage was built, not in the backyard.

Ms. Marigold: It is in the Historic District.

Mrs. Ford: Well the garage was put up in the driveway, not in the backyard.

Mr. Humphrey: I am talking about the brick around the pool.

Mrs. Ford: Right, but that is not relevant to the garage space, is it?

Mr. Hillel: We are talking about the total coverage.

Ms. Marigold: The garage counts as, I think we have been very hard on other places on Buell Lane or Mill Hill where we have asked people to take out showers and eight walkways and all kinds of other things and this is in the Historic District and you were granted first a pool and then a garage and the garage was a promise that you were going to take some of the coverage away. Now you put the garage in and you are saying, oh yes, we do not really want to take away. Well you know I mean it is natural.

Mr. Ford: I realize it sounded inappropriate. That was never my intent, we had initially drawn it up with removed brick, it was just a hope that you would grant us an additional easement. Considering that a considerable portion of the garage is a much smaller structure than we had originally asked to put up and a large part of it is over existing pavement so it actually has not affected the amount of coverage to a great extent and I am just asking if we can be granted relief on the rest.

16018

Ms. Marigold: Another thing, it is a Historic District and you have a car parked in the front lawn which does not look so great. I thought that was the reason for the garage.

Mr. Ford: We do not park in the front yard unless we are trying to unload something directly into the house because of the COVID situation, we never park in front.

Mrs. Ford: We have some relatives staying with us right now and we share the driveway with a back neighbor who, for obvious reasons, does not like to be blocked so we have an extra car here at the moment.

Mr. Ford: But we very seldom park in the front yard and that is really only if we are unloading groceries or something.

Mr. Humphrey: Is that the van?

Mrs. Ford: Pardon me?

Mr. Humphrey: Is that a van that you park there?

Ms. Marigold: No, I do not think so. John?

Mr. McGuirk: I think they need to lose some of the bricks in the backyard, it is too much of a variance. We did grant the variance a few years back, I mean if they want to come back to us and take some out, take it all out, I do not know what you all want to do but they have to lose some of it.

Mr. Harden: I agree.

Ms. Marigold: That seems like a consensus. Would you like to have us keep the meeting open, adjourn it, and you can come back with some suggestions of what you are going to do or how would you like to deal with it?

Mr. Ford: Well if you could give us some idea of how much in terms of square feet would actually have to come out.

Ms. Marigold: Well I guess take it back to the 3,671.

Mr. McGuirk: 3,671

16019

Mr. Hillel: I agree.

Mrs. Ford: We can do that from anywhere on the property? Can we do that from, take out the postman's walk? The brick around the pool is symmetrical.

Mr. Ford: It was counted in the original coverage.

Mrs. Ford: The brick around the pool is very symmetrical and very attractive.

Mr. Ford: The postman's walk was...

Mr. Hillel: It should be your decision.

Mr. McGuirk: We do not want to design it for you, you figure out where you want to lose the square footage.

Mr. Ford: Another thing to consider is that when the property was surveyed, the postman's walk was counted as part of our lot coverage and should not have been counted, it is 48 inches wide so there is that also to consider.

Mr. Hillel: Wait a minute, why should it not be counted?

Mr. Ford: It should not be counted as coverage.

Mr. Hillel: I think it should be part of the coverage.

Ms. Marigold: Let us adjourn this...

Mr. McGuirk: Yes, let us adjourn it and maybe he should talk to Billy.

Mr. Hajek: That is fine.

Mr. McGuirk: That is the best way to go, what is counted, what is included and what is not included.

Ms. Marigold: Can I have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

Mr. McGuirk: Motion.

Ms. Marigold: Second?

Mr. Hillel: Second.

Ms. Marigold: All in favor?

Mr. Harden: Aye.

Mr. McGuirk: Aye.

Mr. Hillel: Aye.

Mr. Humphrey: Aye.

Mr. Nower: Pardon me, Ms. Marigold, your audio is coming in rather faint, do you have a pair of headphones or something that you are working with?

Ms. Marigold: I took these off.

Mr. Nower: I can barely hear you when you are talking, it is fading in and out a little bit once in a while, you can unplug them and see what happens then.

Ms. Marigold: I unplugged it.

Mr. Nower: All right. Much better, thank you very much.

ORIGINAL HEARING
Brian Francis Watson and Edwina Brooke LeMaistre –
10 Jones Cove Road – SCTM #301-7-4-7

Ms. Marigold: We are going onto Brian Francis Watson and...

Mr. Nower: Pardon me, please repeat, your audio again...

Ms. Marigold: There is a lot of background noise from other sources.

Mr. Nower: Yes, very much.

Ms. Marigold: Brian Francis Watson and Edwina Brooke LeMaistre, 10 Jones Cove Road. Ms. Bennett?

Ms. Bennett: Application of Brian Francis Watson and Edwina Brooke LeMaistre, SCTM#301-7-4-7, for Area Variances from Chapter 278, Zoning, to legalize coverage and a patio. A 740 square foot variance is required from Section 278-3.A.(9)(a) to legalize 15,240 square feet of coverage where 14,500 square feet is maximum permitted coverage. A 16-foot variance is requested from Section 278-3.A.(5)(a) to legalize a patio located approximately 59 feet from the front yard lot line where the required setback is 75 feet, and any other relief necessary. The subject property is 80,000 square feet in size and is located at 10 Jones Cove Road in Residence District R-160. This project is classified as a Type II Action in accordance with SEQR.

Ms. Marigold: Is the applicant present? Jon Tarbet?

Mr. Tarbet: Hi, it is Jon Tarbet. Can you hear me?

Mr. McGuirk: We can.

Mr. Tarbet: Okay, great. So just everybody knows when you are watching it on LTV there is a delay so if you are trying to watch it and speak as an applicant you are actually seeing 20 seconds ago on the screen. It is a little discombobulating so I am not going to look at the screen, I will just talk into the phone.

Mr. Nower: Yes, please do that, focus on the audio from the phone.

Mr. Tarbet: Yes, work off the audio from the phone. So this is an interesting application in the sense that it is for sale also and when the seller came to me, we decided to go get an updated C.O. to try to prepare the property for sale and we used Dave Saskas a local surveyor and he came up with a coverage number that did not match the coverage that had been shown on the prior survey. So luckily the numbers are only a few hundred square feet apart but the prior surveyor had said that the property was at the maximum allowable coverage and using the exact same structures, Dave Saskas found it was a couple hundred square feet larger than what was shown on the previous survey. So, we are here asking for a variance partly to legalize what was already C.O.'ed years ago just using a couple hundred square feet in more coverage due to I guess the surveyor calculating coverage in different ways. And then as part of that process, we uncovered the fact that the owner had added two very small stone areas, one was 100 square feet and one was 200 square feet, all of these things together combined out of the property being just less than five percent over on coverage but the two patios, I am calling them patios, but they are tiny, one is for a, he put some stones underneath a grill and the other is over by

the tennis court area, you will see a couple of stones there as well. They cannot be seen from the street, they are tiny, they have been there for years and we are hopeful that the Board sees them as de minimis and has no problem granting those variances as well.

Ms. Marigold: Ray?

Mr. Harden: I do not have a problem with this, it is minimal.

Ms. Marigold: Craig?

Mr. Humphrey: Okay.

Ms. Marigold: John?

Mr. McGuirk: I am good.

Ms. Marigold: Larry?

Mr. Hillel: I am okay with it.

Ms. Marigold: I think we have to make it clear that this is a much bigger property so obviously the percentage is much less than the previous one we discussed, you do not see it and it is a lot of green, a lot of trees, a lot of grass and everything so I think we are fine with it. Do I have a motion to...

Ms. Bennett: Does anybody else want to speak on the application?

Mr. Nower: We currently have no other callers on the line except for Mr. Ackerman who is waiting for Lily Pond.

Ms. Bennett: Thank you.

Mr. Nower: Thank you.

Ms. Marigold: Okay, so back to a motion to close?

Mr. Harden: I make a motion.

Mr. McGuirk: Second.

Mr. Hillel: Aye.

Mr. Tarbet: Goodbye everybody. Thanks guys.

ORIGINAL HEARING
117 Lily Pond Lane LLC – 117 Lily Pond Lane – SCTM #301-13-12-4.3

Ms. Marigold: And last we have 117 Lily Pond Lane LLC at 117 Lily Pond Lane. Ms. Bennett?

Ms. Bennett: Application of 117 Lily Pond Lane LLC, SCTM#301-13-12-4.3, for Area Variances from Chapter 278, Zoning, to make alterations to a preexisting nonconforming residence and construct a cellar stairwell. A 19.3-foot variance is required from Section 278-3.A.(4)(a) to make alterations to a legally preexisting residence that is located 14.7 feet from the side yard lot line where the required side yard setback is 34 feet. An 11.1-foot variance is requested from Section 278-3.A.(4)(b) and 278-3.A.(5)(b) to construct a cellar stairway 8.9 feet from the side yard lot line where the required setback is 20 feet. The subject property is 60,144 square feet in size and is located at 117 Lily Pond Lane in Residence District R-160. This project is classified as a Type II Action in accordance with SEQR.

Ms. Marigold: Is the applicant present? Mr. Ackerman?

Mr. Ackerman: Yes, good morning. The property here under consideration is the carriage house of a very lovely older home on Lily Pond Lane and as part of the restoration of this property and the renovation expansion, they are requesting a minimum cellar variance for a stairway to serve the mechanicals. I have asked the client to speak to his neighbor to the west who to me is personally familiar with and that neighbor has voiced no objections to the application. So, I think based upon the fact that this is merely a stairway with serving just the mechanical room in the basement, I think it is a reasonable, sensible application and respectfully would ask for you to issue the variance.

Ms. Marigold: It is a beautiful piece of property and a charming guest house and when it was subdivided, the Bruckman property, the guest house was allowed to be closer to the side yard lot line than would have been. So, this new owner obviously is going to take advantage of that and also restore what was a quaint, charming English cottage.

Mr. Ackerman: Yes.

Ms. Marigold: I am glad to see that there is an opening between the house and the garage so it will not seem like a long, continuous house from one end to the other so that was very well thought out I believe. I do not have a problem with it. Ray?

Mr. McGuirk: I have no issues.

Mr. Harden: No problem.

Mr. Humphrey: I am very glad to see that the older part of the place is going to stay because it is beautiful.

Ms. Marigold: It is beautiful. Is there anybody on the line that would like to be heard on this?

Mr. Nower: Aside from Mr. Ackerman, we have no additional callers.

Ms. Marigold: Okay so.

Mr. Ackerman: All right, thank you.

Ms. Marigold: Close the hearing, motion?

Mr. Hillel: Motion to close.

Ms. Marigold: Second?

Mr. Humphrey: Second.

Ms. Marigold: All in favor? Aye.

Mr. Harden: Aye.

Mr. McGuirk: Aye.

Mr. Hillel: Aye.

Mr. Humphrey: Aye.

Ms. Marigold: And then we have a motion to close the meeting?

Mr. Hillel: Motion.

Mr. Harden: Second.

Mr. Humphrey: Second.

Ms. Marigold: All in favor?

Mr. Harden: Aye.

Mr. McGuirk: Aye.

Mr. Hillel: Aye.

Mr. Humphrey: Aye.

Ms. Marigold: Thank you everyone.

continued on next page

16026

NOTICE OF HEARING

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Incorporated Village of East Hampton will hold a public meeting at the Emergency Services Building, One Cedar Street, East Hampton, New York, on Friday, May 8, 2020 at 11:00 a.m., or via video-conferencing if necessary, on the following applications and to conduct such other business as may come before the Board:

Application of John and Cecilia Ford, SCTM#301-4-7-24.1, for an Area Variance from Chapter 278, Zoning, to legalize coverage. A 260 square foot variance is required from Section 278-3.A.(9) to legalize 3,931 square feet of coverage where 3,671 square feet of coverage is legally preexisting pursuant to a prior zoning board approval. The maximum permitted coverage pursuant to zoning is 2,970 square feet. The subject property is 12,351 square feet in size and is located at 90 Pantigo Road in Residence District R-20 and the Hook Historic District. This project is classified as a Type II Action in accordance with SEQR.

Application of Aberdeenshire, LLC, SCTM#301-3-8-5, for Area Variances from Chapter 278, Zoning, to legalize coverage, walkways and patios. A 660 square foot variance is required from Section 278-3.A.(9)(a) to legalize 7,058 square feet of coverage where 6,398 square feet is maximum permitted coverage. A 5-foot variance is requested from Section 278-3.A.(5)(b) to legalize a patio located approximately 10 feet from the rear yard lot line

where the required setback is 15 feet. The subject property is 29,492 square feet in size and is located at 29 Hunting Lane in Residence District R-40 and the Hunting Lane Historic District. This project is classified as a Type II Action in accordance with SEQR.

Application of Brian Francis Watson and Edwina Brooke LeMaistre, SCTM#301-7-4-7, for Area Variances from Chapter 278, Zoning, to legalize coverage and a patio. A 740 square foot variance is required from Section 278-3.A.(9)(a) to legalize 15,240 square feet of coverage where 14,500 square feet is maximum permitted coverage. A 16-foot variance is requested from Section 278-3.A.(5)(a) to legalize a patio located approximately 59 feet from the front yard lot line where the required setback is 75 feet, and any other relief necessary. The subject property is 80,000 square feet in size and is located at 10 Jones Cove Road in Residence District R-160. This project is classified as a Type II Action in accordance with SEQR.

Application of 117 Lily Pond Lane LLC, SCTM#301-13-12-4.3, for Area Variances from Chapter 278, Zoning, to make alterations to a pre-existing nonconforming residence and construct a cellar stairwell. A 19.3-foot variance is required from Section 278-3.A.(4)(a) to make alterations to a legally pre-existing residence that is located 14.7 feet from the side yard lot line where the required side yard setback is 34 feet. An 11.1-foot variance is requested from Section 278-3.A.(4)(b) and 278-3.A.(5)(b) to construct a

cellar stairway 8.9 feet from the side yard lot line where the required setback is 20 feet. The subject property is 60,144 square feet in size and is located at 117 Lily Pond Lane in Residence District R-160. This project is classified as a Type II Action in accordance with SEQR.

Said Zoning Board of Appeals will at said time and place hear all persons who wish to be heard in connection with the applications. Interested parties may be heard in person, by agent, or by attorney.

Dated: April 17, 2020

By Order of Lysbeth A. Marigold, Chair
Zoning Board of Appeals,
Inc. Village of East Hampton
41-2

VILLAGE OF EAST HAMPTON, NY
DATE: June 12, 2020
1:00 p.m.



16027