

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

M I N U T E S
OF THE MEETING
OF THE
BOARD OF ZONING AND APPEALS
INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF LAKE SUCCESS

September 15, 2025
7:30 p.m.

PRESENT:

- DAVID N. MILNER, CHAIRMAN
- STEPHEN LEVINE, MEMBER
- DAVID FALICK, MEMBER
- ANDREW ACKERMAN, MEMBER
- JEFF GOODWIN, ALTERNATE MEMBER

ANDREA CURTO, ESQ. - ATTORNEY TO THE BOARD

Also Present:

- Robert S. Bonnie - Building Department Superintendent
- Stefan DeAlbuquerque - Building Department
- Lawrence Farkas - Liaison Trustee

1 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Good evening,
2 everybody. I want to welcome you to the
3 September meeting of the Zoning Board of
4 Appeals.

5 I would like to welcome members of our
6 esteemed Planning Commission to the meeting
7 tonight. Welcome.

8 Our first order of business, I believe,
9 there is an application pending for a rehearing
10 of a variance that we had granted.

11 So I am going to poll the Board to see
12 if there is -- we need unanimity in order to
13 grant the rehearing.

14 So, Jeff?

15 MEMBER GOODWIN: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Stephen?

17 MEMBER LEVINE: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN MILNER: David?

19 MEMBER FALLICK: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Andrew?

21 MEMBER ACKERMAN: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN MILNER: I vote yes.

23 We approved your ability to make a
24 reapplication. Would you please present your
25 case. Please step up, identify yourself to our

1 court reporter.

2 MR. YANG: Hi, my name is Leon Yang. I
3 represent 335 Lakeville. There is owner. And
4 I am here to present the case today.

5 CHAIRMAN MILNER: I just ask that you
6 speak a little louder. I'm hard of hearing and
7 everybody wants to hear you.

8 MR. YANG: Sure. So at last -- let me
9 grab my phone.

10 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Let me make it
11 official, this is a rehearing of Case Number
12 2025-0067C, which is a request by the homeowner
13 of 335 Old Lakeville Road for a variance to
14 exceed the Village's established height of
15 30 feet.

16 And by way of background, we met about
17 a month ago and granted a variance giving them
18 permission to extend the height by, if I am not
19 mistaken, 2.7 feet.

20 MR. DEALBUQUERQUE: Yes, it's just
21 under 3 feet.

22 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Right.
23 Please.

24 MR. YANG: So now we try to proposing
25 extra amount of about 2 feet so we can meet the

1 floor to the ceiling height to 8 feet.

2 So as per Architecture Review Board,
3 that way it looks more continuous and it's less
4 of -- more unified for the design throughout,
5 that's why making that request to make this
6 height here 8 feet from previous one was, I
7 believe, 6 feet 1.

8 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Okay. And the reason
9 behind that?

10 MR. YANG: So reason behind that, the
11 design for the exterior facade looks more
12 continuous, so the proportion will look more
13 natural compared to first floor to second
14 floor.

15 MS. CURTO: Could you show us what was
16 approved versus what you are proposing?

17 MR. YANG: Yes, give me one second. I
18 am not sure if you can see from my phone.

19 CHAIRMAN MILNER: We can't work off a
20 phone.

21 MR. MINDEL: He has the plan.

22 MEMBER FALLICK: Excuse me. What's
23 your affiliation to this?

24 MR. YANG: I work for the architect.

25 MEMBER FALLICK: You are with the

1 architect's office?

2 MR. YANG: Yes.

3 MEMBER FALLICK: Thank you.

4 MR. YANG: No problem.

5 MS. CURTO: Is what you are showing the
6 Board right now, is that what's being proposed,
7 or that was approved?

8 MR. YANG: That's being proposed today.

9 MS. CURTO: That's being proposed?

10 MR. YANG: Yes.

11 MS. CURTO: Do you want to show that to
12 them?

13 CHAIRMAN MILNER: That's a rendering.
14 We need to work with the plan.

15 MR. YANG: That's the plan here.

16 MEMBER ACKERMAN: This is.

17 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: This is what was
18 approved. This is what was approved.

19 MR. YANG: So the argument is this
20 height here is 6 foot 1, too short, not as much
21 proportional to the first floor, therefore, we
22 trying to pull this to 8 feet so will match the
23 first floor.

24 CHAIRMAN MILNER: This is the --

25 MR. YANG: This is newly proposed one.

1 MEMBER ACKERMAN: It looks like the
2 windows are above the roof line.

3 MEMBER FALLICK: I have a question.

4 MR. YANG: Yes.

5 MEMBER FALLICK: We recently received
6 this vertical section for the inside of the
7 house.

8 MR. YANG: Right.

9 MEMBER FALLICK: Are you saying that
10 the 8 foot dimension that is shown on this is
11 between the second floor, right?

12 MR. YANG: Right.

13 MEMBER FALLICK: From the floor level
14 to the ceiling --

15 MR. YANG: Yes.

16 MEMBER FALLICK: -- based on this
17 elevation, at one time in the original design
18 was 6 foot 1?

19 MR. YANG: No, only the exterior, only
20 the part close to the window is 6 foot 1.
21 That's why we have the window here as offset to
22 the roof.

23 MEMBER FALLICK: Again, so the floor
24 height was 8 -- you still had 8 foot interior
25 height?

1 MR. YANG: Yes.

2 MR. BONNIE: The difference though is
3 the roof is on display and 8 foot is up here
4 and top of the plate is down here.

5 MEMBER FALLICK: Got it.

6 MR. YANG: That's correct.

7 MEMBER FALLICK: It was not clear in
8 the original presentation, so that's why I
9 asked the question.

10 MEMBER ACKERMAN: Can I see that
11 picture?

12 MR. YANG: Sure. This one?

13 MEMBER ACKERMAN: No, the picture.

14 MEMBER FALLICK: The rendering.

15 MEMBER ACKERMAN: Looks like the
16 windows are just under the eaves.

17 MR. YANG: Yes.

18 MEMBER ACKERMAN: Here it looks like
19 it's over.

20 MR. YANG: Right, it was, like,
21 encroaching to the eave.

22 MEMBER FALLICK: And what would be the
23 additional height you would need to meet this?

24 MR. YANG: 3 foot.

25 MEMBER FALLICK: Another 3 foot on top

1 of the 2 foot 7 that was approved?

2 MR. YANG: Yes.

3 MR. DEALBUQUERQUE: No, it's not. It's
4 just 1 foot 6, it's not 3 feet.

5 MEMBER GOODWIN: It's an additional
6 1.42.

7 MEMBER FALLICK: Oh, it's an
8 additional, oh, okay.

9 MEMBER GOODWIN: Total over the limit.

10 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Right, 4 feet.

11 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: It's under 5 feet
12 they are asking for total.

13 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Between 4 and 5 feet.

14 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: And they did change
15 from the original approved on the first floor,
16 they went from 9 foot 6 to 10 feet. So I told
17 them to add just a little bit more, just to --

18 CHAIRMAN MILNER: That difference is
19 not before us, we are looking at the overall
20 height.

21 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: Right.

22 So the first floor now it's half of the
23 6 inches, so they've added another 3 inches
24 because they went from 9 foot 6 to 10 foot on
25 the first floor, and now they have a plate

1 height of 8 feet on the second floor.

2 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Application for the
3 variance is not anything with the interior
4 height, it's for the roof line.

5 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: Yes.

6 MEMBER FALLICK: In order to get to
7 that height, that's how you do it.

8 MEMBER GOODWIN: It's composed of those
9 two changes?

10 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN MILNER: I am trying to -- we
12 don't approve the interior height.

13 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: Of course.

14 CHAIRMAN MILNER: It's the overall
15 height for our purposes over here.

16 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Anybody have any
18 other questions on the Board?

19 (Whereupon, there was no response.)

20 CHAIRMAN MILNER: I understand there is
21 some people from the Planning Board that might
22 want to be heard?

23 Alan, please, identify yourself if you
24 would.

25 MR. MINDEL: Alan Mindel, 89 Meadow

1 Woods Road, Lake Success.

2 Thank you very much for indulging us
3 for a few minutes of your time, we very much
4 appreciate and respect the work that the BZA
5 does.

6 And we understand how this was
7 presented probably did not really make a very
8 clear case of what exactly we are looking at.

9 Having studied it at Architectural
10 Review, I really appreciate the opportunity as
11 to why we are all here.

12 In over 20 years on the Planning Board,
13 this is my first time coming to the BZA. I
14 think its got more to do with how this was
15 really explained as opposed to anything else,
16 so please give me a minute to try to explain
17 this.

18 The existing home now, there is a 9
19 foot elevation change between the average curb
20 height and where construction will begin on the
21 home. A typical home in this zone has to the
22 mid point of the ridge 30 feet to work with,
23 but that comes from the average curb height.
24 Because of the topography of this property,
25 this property is starting minus 9 at 21 feet to

1 the mid point of the ridge to have a two-story
2 home and to have an appropriate amount of roof
3 so that something doesn't look squished down
4 you need to come here.

5 The applicant wants to limit what they
6 ask for. They believe that the more they ask,
7 the more trouble they will have in getting
8 their approvals. But in looking at the design
9 of the home, by doing that, they've hurt the
10 architectural design of the house in certain
11 ways.

12 When we got the previous plan, not the
13 one you are looking at but the one that Stefan
14 has over there, as pointed out, to the top of
15 the sill plate on the second floor with a 9
16 foot height for the first floor, which is low
17 these days, is 6 foot 1. Now, they could have
18 achieved an 8 foot ceiling, but only by
19 vaulting the ceiling and only at certain points
20 would it be 8 foot. At the wall, the actual
21 ceiling height that they would have would have
22 been 6 foot 1, which is crazy.

23 And so we could have asked him to do
24 this or that, nothing we could ask them was
25 going to fix this problem, because they simply

1 did not ask for enough relief from this Board.
2 And even with the relief that they ask today,
3 with all respect, there's multiple aspects
4 that's going to make this home look appropriate
5 to its neighbors. And there is a certain scale
6 that each home has for a certain amount of
7 height on your first floor and you have a
8 certain amount of height on your second floor,
9 and a certain amount of roof.

10 The existing home that's there, way
11 back when must have gotten zoning relief of
12 over 9 feet, not because they built some
13 extravagant crazy home, but in order to
14 maintain the heights of each of these portions
15 so that it would look architecturally
16 appropriate. Having a 6 foot 1 sill plate with
17 a little window underneath would never look
18 right. So then they came back and now they are
19 asking you for another, how much, 2 feet?

20 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: 1 foot 4.

21 MR. MINDEL: Which is still too little
22 to make it look right. They actually need a
23 little more. Not that they can't build the
24 house to code, but in order for it to look
25 architecturally appropriate they need a little

1 bit more height to get there. They need it for
2 that second floor to have that 8 foot in the
3 sill, and they need it also because just like
4 we passed the law here in the Village against
5 mansard roofs, because people were using the
6 roof to hide their floor of the house, it's not
7 just that, but we've heard complaints and seen
8 where in order for a house to look normal,
9 where there was one on Meadow Woods Road that
10 people complained about, the pitch of the roof
11 was too short. The more height you give
12 them -- it won't make the rest of the house
13 bigger, but the more height they will get to
14 the top of the ridge, the more height they get,
15 the more normal the roof is going to look.

16 So they need a minimum of 3 more feet
17 just to get a normal second floor and a little
18 bit of roof. And, frankly, if they had the
19 same one as before, it would make the house
20 look best, that's completely up to your
21 discretion.

22 And I appreciate your time to hear
23 this.

24 CHAIRMAN MILNER: If I hear you
25 correctly, are you saying that we should really

1 not be approving the current application for
2 the additional 1.7?

3 MR. MINDEL: I would ask you to give
4 them a little more.

5 CHAIRMAN MILNER: What in your opinion
6 is appropriate?

7 MR. MINDEL: Right now they are
8 approved for 2 foot 7, I would ask you to give
9 them a minimum of 6, and to get the best
10 looking house would be 9. It's up to you. But
11 they need at least 6 feet to make it all look
12 normal, typical, like a regular house. That's
13 all we are trying to get.

14 And I think the way they've explained
15 it to you, they've done you no favors as to why
16 they need it or what they need.

17 MEMBER FALLICK: So this rendering then
18 is inaccurate in your opinion?

19 MR. MINDEL: It's not inaccurate.

20 MEMBER FALLICK: It will be changed,
21 you are saying the roof would be higher?

22 MR. MINDEL: I'm telling you that
23 that's what they are submitting to you today,
24 accurate for their application for an
25 additional 1 foot 43, and now they figured out

1 a way to get 8 foot to the sill plate, right.
2 As you look at that house as he drew it, they
3 are honest people and have submitted to you
4 exactly honest things. If you look at the roof
5 you will see it's compressed a bit.

6 MEMBER FALLICK: I understand that.

7 MR. MINDEL: And they tried to break it
8 down. The more height you give them --

9 MEMBER FALLICK: Understood.

10 MR. MINDEL: -- the more normal that
11 roof is going to look, the better the house is
12 going to look and, frankly, the smaller it's
13 going to look. Because when you have a high
14 wall with a short roof it looks more imposing
15 and commercial. If you have more of that roof
16 you get a better look.

17 CHAIRMAN MILNER: What I'm looking at
18 the windows on the second floor, seem to be
19 just about abutting the roof.

20 MR. MINDEL: That's because they
21 squeezed themselves crazy.

22 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Look, I very much
23 appreciate the homeowner and their architect
24 trying to work within our code, we really
25 appreciate that.

1 MR. MINDEL: They are trying super
2 hard.

3 CHAIRMAN MILNER: I also feel, and I
4 really appreciate the input of the Planning
5 Board, because our goal is not to restrict
6 people but to let them have their dream home,
7 provided there is nobody out there complaining,
8 and, in fact, people are in favor of the
9 additional height. I wish we could have heard
10 that at the very beginning of the application
11 process.

12 MR. MINDEL: Absolutely.

13 CHAIRMAN MILNER: So we can
14 entertain -- we can't entertain? Just work on
15 the application.

16 MS. CURTO: Yeah, they can work on it,
17 but you can't approve something that hasn't
18 been noticed for that.

19 MEMBER FALLICK: Exactly.

20 MS. CURTO: Can we do an executive
21 session?

22 MR. BONNIE: Yes.

23 MS. CURTO: Let's do an executive
24 session.

25 CHAIRMAN MILNER: I make a motion we go

1 into executive session.

2 Second?

3 MEMBER FALLICK: Second.

4 MS. CURTO: Wait.

5 TRUSTEE FARKAS: Does Elliot want to
6 speak too?

7 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Elliot you want to
8 speak?

9 MR. BROWER: Sure.

10 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Please identify
11 yourself.

12 MR. BROWER: Elliot Brower, 58
13 Westminster Road, Lake Success.

14 I think my esteemed colleague made a
15 slight mistake. The existing plans that came
16 to us only had 8 foot downstairs, not 9 foot.

17 So it's unheard of these days for
18 anybody, especially these people who wanted a
19 higher ceiling, to have 8 foot of ceiling
20 height on the first floor. People go and try
21 and get 10 foot 6 these days.

22 Even this new house that we just
23 approved last month, they have 12 foot
24 downstairs, it's a different zoning
25 application, it's a different area, it's over

1 on Lake Road, but 8 foot is just ridiculous
2 these days.

3 Furthermore, the 6 foot 1 upstairs only
4 came to us after the fact. We looked at the
5 outside of the house, we didn't like it, and
6 then we realized it was only 6 foot 1 to the
7 plate height. I don't think the client
8 realized it either.

9 Having said that, it's 6 foot 1
10 structurally. So when you add a layer of
11 sheetrock and finished floor, you have
12 basically less than 6 foot starting point.
13 Yes, you could trade up, people do it all the
14 time, but based on the design of the house with
15 the windows compressed it's just not going to
16 work. They don't even have room to put molding
17 around a window at that point. The window is
18 so forced up.

19 MR. MINDEL: On the outside either.

20 MR. BROWER: So we feel they need at
21 least another foot downstairs to come to 9
22 foot, which is a pretty nice height, and then
23 another -- at least another foot, 18 inches
24 upstairs. And then as Alan said, I am not
25 going to disagree with him at all, to get the

1 proper roof line they are going to need 3 feet.

2 Obviously I've lived here for 20 years,
3 you can't see the house. We are always
4 concerned with how the neighbors view new
5 houses, the only neighbor is somebody golfing
6 on whatever hole this is here.

7 MR. MINDEL: They won't see it. It's
8 going to look like a nice normal house as
9 opposed to missing a roof.

10 MR. BONNIE: Mr. Chairman, we have a
11 letter from the one neighbor who can see the
12 house.

13 You got copies of it, right?

14 CHAIRMAN MILNER: In favor.

15 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: Just to be clear
16 though, the initial -- what they were approved
17 last time, the ceiling height on the first
18 floor was 9 foot 6, not 9 foot 8, not 8 foot.

19 MR. BROWER: We were told it was 8
20 foot.

21 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: No, it's 9 foot 6
22 on the first floor and there was a 6 foot 1
23 plate height on the second floor.

24 MEMBER FALLICK: 8 foot ceiling height.
25 I am just saying -- nothing, I will withhold

1 what I was going to say.

2 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Just for point of
3 clarification, we sit and we don't make
4 architectural decisions.

5 MR. MINDEL: Oh, I get it. And you
6 don't make the applications, you approve or
7 don't approve.

8 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Somebody is proposing
9 a home that exceeds our maximum --

10 MR. MINDEL: Because of the curb height
11 problem.

12 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Stefan very helpfully
13 worked with the homeowner's architect to come
14 up with something with a minimal amount. Had
15 someone presented --

16 MR. MINDEL: I think this is an unusual
17 situation for this architect and they are not
18 used to the condition. And so we are just
19 trying to just help the resident achieve the
20 home that everyone is going to want to see.

21 CHAIRMAN MILNER: I appreciate that.

22 So I think I will renew my motion to go
23 into executive session so we can have a
24 discussion amongst ourselves and see what we
25 can do, if anything, this evening or in the

1 future to help the homeowner.

2 MR. MINDEL: Let's see what we can do.

3 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Welcome to stay.

4 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

5 CHAIRMAN MILNER: I'll make a motion to
6 come out of executive session.

7 MS. CURTO: All in favor?

8 (Chorus of ayes.)

9 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Back on the record.
10 Anybody in the audience have anything
11 further to say, any questions, comments?

12 (Whereupon, there was no response.)

13 CHAIRMAN MILNER: No. Okay.

14 I am going to basically ask the
15 homeowner to follow me.

16 We are prepared to consider your
17 application this evening, we are prepared to
18 continue the hearing to give you additional
19 time to resubmit plans to perhaps modify the
20 height in accordance with what I heard the
21 Planning Board representatives were suggesting,
22 it's totally up to you.

23 MR. BROWER: Do you mind if I explain?

24 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Be my guest.

25 Off the record please.

1 (Whereupon, a discussion was held off
2 the record.)

3 MS. CURTO: Let's go back on the
4 record.

5 Stefan is going to explain exactly what
6 is on the plan and what they could do.

7 So the first floor right now is at a 10
8 foot ceiling?

9 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: First floor -- the
10 house is maxed out as they are. So if they
11 were to get additional height it would just
12 be --

13 MR. MINDEL: Exterior.

14 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: -- the roof line,
15 that's it.

16 Right now we got 10 foot on the first
17 floor -- 10 foot plate height on the first
18 floor, 8 foot plate height on the second floor,
19 and the attic is almost 9 feet in height.

20 MR. BROWER: The roof is compressed,
21 right? That was the only place they could make
22 up a difference.

23 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: The roof has a
24 minimum of 6 on 12 pitch.

25 MR. MINDEL: It meets the code.

1 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: It meets the code.

2 And the other thing they can do is on
3 the rear side of the house, they can do a
4 reverse brick shelf, and they can probably gain
5 almost a foot.

6 MR. BROWER: On the back of the house?

7 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: Because the grade
8 changes from the front to the back, yeah.

9 MR. BROWER: So that means at some
10 point there would be a step in the house?

11 MR. BONNIE: No.

12 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: No.

13 MR. BONNIE: Step in the foundation.
14 Instead of putting the floor joists on top of
15 the foundation, you do a step in the
16 foundation, you extend the foundation up a foot
17 so that the ground comes into the foundation
18 and yet the wood joists are a foot lower, they
19 are protected.

20 MR. BROWER: So that's something -- is
21 there a basement in this house?

22 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: Yes.

23 MR. BONNIE: It's something that's done
24 all the time.

25 MR. BROWER: Basement would just

1 suffer.

2 MR. BONNIE: No.

3 MR. MINDEL: Go down a foot, doesn't
4 matter. It's a trick to pick up a foot.

5 MR. BROWER: How compressed is the roof
6 right now?

7 MR. BONNIE: It's not.

8 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: It meets the
9 minimum 6 on 12 pitch.

10 MR. BONNIE: It's not compressed at
11 all, and the windows aren't compressed.

12 MR. BROWER: This is all going to work.

13 MR. MINDEL: It will work the way you
14 submit it. They'll make it work.

15 MR. BROWER: So 10 foot downstairs.

16 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: 10 foot on the
17 first floor, 8 foot on the second floor.

18 MEMBER FALLICK: It's per this
19 sectional, Elliot.

20 MR. BROWER: We haven't seen it.

21 MEMBER FALLICK: They submitted it on
22 Friday.

23 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: Do you want to see?

24 MR. MINDEL: Talk to this guy behind
25 me, like, tomorrow.

1 MR. BROWER: The guy behind me.

2 MR. MINDEL: I just know, you know,
3 what you are talking about.

4 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: Gain in the back.

5 MR. MINDEL: It will work. They are
6 going to approve something that will work.
7 Sounds great. We got one of these.

8 MEMBER GOODWIN: I understood that.

9 MR. MINDEL: So it's up to you if you'd
10 like to vote for it, they would be thrilled to
11 get the application.

12 CHAIRMAN MILNER: We need the applicant
13 to tell me that.

14 MR. MINDEL: She just did, she went
15 like this.

16 MS. CURTO: State your name.

17 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Please identify
18 yourself to the court reporter, your name,
19 where you live.

20 MS. XIE: Yeah, I am the owner of the
21 property, 335 Old Lakeville Road in the Village
22 of Lake Success, and I am Lisa Xie, last name
23 is Xie.

24 Yeah, we are happy to listen your
25 approval for our today's design, because before

1 we just have this modest requesting, the
2 variance of the building height increased like
3 almost 2 feet, yeah, and you approve of that.
4 And also the Planning Board member told me
5 also, good for them, so we would like to, yeah,
6 we agree with your agreement, yeah, and that's
7 it.

8 MS. CURTO: Thank you. Thank you very
9 much.

10 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Just to restate, you
11 are asking us to please vote on the application
12 as currently submitted to the Board of Zoning
13 and Appeals?

14 MEMBER FALLICK: This letter.

15 MS. XIE: Okay.

16 MS. CURTO: Which you submitted to the
17 Board today, is what you want them to consider,
18 correct?

19 MS. XIE: Yes.

20 MS. CURTO: Thank you.

21 Is there anybody else here that wants
22 to speak on this application?

23 Yes, go ahead.

24 MS. SMITH: My name is Denise Smith, I
25 live at 3 Jeffrey Lane, Lake Success, and my

1 husband is not here with me today, he's
2 traveling.

3 We just wanted to say that we approve,
4 we are in support of whatever they can get.

5 CHAIRMAN MILNER: And you live where?

6 MS. SMITH: On 3 Jeffrey Lane, around
7 the corner from them, two houses away.

8 CHAIRMAN MILNER: So you will see the
9 house?

10 MS. SMITH: Yes, we will see the house,
11 I mean through the trees, but yes.

12 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Thank you so much.

13 MS. CURTO: Thank you very much.

14 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Any further comments
15 from the Board?

16 (Whereupon, there was no response.)

17 CHAIRMAN MILNER: I am going to make a
18 motion that we approve the application
19 submitted, this is Case 2025-0067C, a request
20 by the homeowners of 335 Old Lakeville Road,
21 for a variance addition just under 2 feet if I
22 am not mistaken.

23 MEMBER FALLICK: No.

24 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Well, the total
25 variance, we've already given them one

1 variance, they are asking for an additional
2 variance of approximately 2 feet.

3 MR. DeALBUQUERQUE: Yes, total 34.5.

4 CHAIRMAN MILNER: 34.5.

5 Jeff?

6 MEMBER GOODWIN: Approve.

7 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Stephen?

8 MEMBER LEVINE: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN MILNER: David?

10 MEMBER FALLICK: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Andrew?

12 MEMBER ACKERMAN: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN MILNER: You got five yeses.

14 Welcome to the neighborhood. Thank you
15 so much.

16 MR. MINDEL: Thank you very much.

17 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Very much appreciate
18 our Planning Board. I do appreciate, you know,
19 them working with everybody.

20 Any further business before the Board?

21 MS. CURTO: Yes. I have a couple of
22 things.

23 CHAIRMAN MILNER: Make a motion to
24 adjourn the Public Hearing.

25 Second?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MEMBER FALLICK: Second.

CHAIRMAN MILNER: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

(Whereupon, the Zoning Board of Appeals hearing stood adjourned.)

CERTIFIED TO BE A TRUE AND ACCURATE TRANSCRIPT OF THE ORIGINAL STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES TAKEN OF THIS PROCEEDING.

Mary Kate Waldron

MARY KATE WALDRON
COURT REPORTER