

**VILLAGE OF QUOGUE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
WEDNESDAY APRIL 26, 2023
3:00 P.M.**

Pursuant to §103-a of the New York State Public Officer’s Law and Local Law No. 3 of 2022, this public hearing of the Zoning Board of Appeals was held as a hybrid meeting in a combination of both in-person and videoconference (i.e. ZOOM).

Members present in person: Chairperson Pamela Chepiga, Bruce Peiffer, Brendan Ryan

Member Absent: Ed Tolley

Members present by teleconference: Geoff Judge, Alternate George Sard

Others present in person: Village Building Inspector William Nowak, Village Attorney Wayne Bruyn, Deputy Village Clerk Denise Michalowski, Kittric Motz, Susanna Hermann, Joseph Deppe, Michael & Susan Luyckx, Michael Luyckx, Jr.

Others present by teleconference: Aaron Slonim

1) Ms. Chepiga opened the meeting with a roll call, and asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the March 29, 2023 meeting. Ms. Chepiga set the date of the next meeting to Wednesday, May 31, 2023 at 3pm.

MR. PEIFFER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MARCH 29, 2023 MEETING. MR. RYAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

2) The first matter on the agenda was the holdover application of **JAMES & MARJORIE KUHN - 180 DUNE ROAD [SCTM# 902-16-2-11]** for: variances from the provisions of (1) §196-47A(2) in order to permit the construction of a two-story addition onto an existing two-story dwelling with the height at an elevation of 43’ where 38.2’ is required; and (2) all other necessary relief, on a 80,569 sq.ft. parcel of land located on the southerly side of Dune Road in the A-1 Residence District.

Susanna Hermann and Joseph Deppe of En-Consultants were present for the applicants. Ms. Hermann explained that a new survey has been ordered and that a revised site plan has been submitted showing the project shifted landward of the Coastal Erosion line. Ms. Hermann further noted that they intend to stay under both the 50% cost and 25% footprint increase for FEMA requirements. Ms. Hermann asked the Board if they thought that the height variance would be granted so that they could go forward with drawings for the project. Ms. Chepiga said

the Board would need to see a complete package first to ensure that FEMA requirements have been met.

MR. RYAN MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THIS MATTER TO THE NEXT MEETING. MR. PEIFFER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

3) The next matter on the agenda was the holdover application of **182 DUNE ROAD, LLC (AARON SLONIM) – 182 DUNE ROAD [SCTM# 902-16-2-12]** for: variances from the provisions of (1) §196-47A in order to permit a 6” roof deck with an additional 36” railings on a dwelling under construction at a height of 37’1.5” where 34’ is permitted; and (2) all other necessary relief on a 64,300 sq.ft. parcel of land located on the southerly side of Dune Road, approximately 3,050’ west of the Village boundary line in the A-1 Residence District.

Ms. Chepiga noted that the record had been closed on this application and the Board has a written decision. Ms. Chepiga asked for a motion to approve the decision.

MR. PEIFFER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE WRITTEN DECISION. MR. RYAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

3) The last matter on the agenda was the application of **MICHAEL & SUSAN LUYCKX – 17 WILLOW LANE [SCTM# 902-7-2-40]** for variances from the provisions of (1) §196-3D and §196-7B in order to permit the reconstruction with modifications and additions of a nonconforming single family dwelling with attached garage, screened porch and brick patio on a parcel with three dwellings; (2) §196-47 and §196-48 to permit the reconstruction of the dwelling with a height at elevation 33.88’ where the maximum height permitted is at elevation 23.25’ in the required front and rear yards; (3) §196-12B (Table of Dimensional Regulations) to permit the reconstruction of the dwelling with the existing attached garage to remain with a front yard/street setback of 19.7’ where 60’ is required; (4) §196-12B (Table of Dimensional Regulations) to permit the reconstruction of the dwelling with the existing attached garage to remain with a rear yard setback of 38.8’ where 70’ is required; (5) §196-12B (Table of Dimensional Regulations) to permit the reconstruction of the attached screened porch with a rear yard setback of 34.2’ where 70’ is required; (6) §196-12B (Table of Dimensional Regulations) to permit the reconstruction of an attached at-grade brick patio with rear yard setback of 18.1’ where 25’ is required; (7) §196-12B (Table of Dimensional Regulations) to permit lot coverage of 22.04% where 20.00% is required; and (8) all other necessary relief as set forth on the plans and surveys on a nonconforming 15,295 sq.ft. parcel of land located on the westerly side of Willow Lane, approximately 200’ north of Main Street in the A-3 Residence District.

Attorney Kittrich Motz was present on behalf of the applicants. Ms. Motz noted that the requested additional information regarding the size, bedroom count and rental history has been submitted. Ms. Motz said that the lot coverage had been recalculated on the last survey submitted, and has been determined to be 23.34%, where the previous survey showed the calculation to be 22.04%. Ms. Motz added that the applicants would be increasing the lot coverage variance request to 23.34%. Ms. Motz said that she believes that the patio is the cause of the lot coverage overage,

and the survey from 1997 showed the lot coverage to be calculated at 20.5%. Ms. Chepiga said this lot coverage request would make this non-conforming property even more non-conforming. Ms. Motz said this is a small lot and they need some area for a grill and table and chairs. Mr. Peiffer said that he thought there was options available to reduce the current lot coverage. Mr. Ryan said that with a re-build the lot coverage should be able to be in conformity or at least closer to the 20% requirement than 23.34%. Ms. Chepiga said that this application would have to be re-noticed at the higher lot coverage request, but the Board would like to see the lot coverage come closer to the conforming percentage. Ms. Motz asked if this matter could be adjourned to the next meeting. Ms. Chepiga asked for a motion to adjourn to the next meeting.

MR. PEIFFER MADE A MOTION TO ADJOURN THIS MATTER TO THE NEXT MEETING. MR. RYAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED.

There being no more business the meeting was adjourned.