

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

INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF FREEPORT  
ZONING BOARD

MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
46 North Ocean Avenue  
Freeport, NY 11520

June 20, 2024  
6:00 p.m.

M E M B E R S :

ROSA RHODEN	CHAIRPERSON
JENNIFER L. CAREY	DEPUTY CHAIR
BEN JACKSON	MEMBER

\* \* \*

REMY WATTS	SECRETARY
JENNIFER UNGAR	DEPUTY VILLAGE ATTORNEY
SCOTT BRAUN	BUILDING DEPARTMENT

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

-----EXHIBITS-----

BOARD'S FOR I.D. PAGE

1	Affidavit of Publication	5
2	Affidavit of Posting	5

APPLICATION 2024-7

BOARD'S FOR I.D. PAGE

1	Affidavit of Mailing	7
2	Affidavit of Mailing	7

\* \* \* \*

APPLICANT'S FOR I.D.

A	Radius Map	8
---	------------	---

\* \* \* \*

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

June 20, 2024

3

-----I N D E X-----

APPLICATION#	ADDRESS	PAGE
2024-7	16 Archer Street	6-30

1  
2 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Good evening  
3 everyone. I'd like to open up the Zoning  
4 Board of Appeals meeting for June 20th. If  
5 everyone could please join me for the Pledge  
6 of Allegiance.

7 (Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

8 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Can I please  
9 have a motion to enter into executive session  
10 to consult with counsel, please.

11 MEMBER JACKSON: So moved.

12 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Second.

13 THE SECRETARY: All in favor.

14 MEMBER JACKSON: Aye.

15 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Aye.

16 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Aye.

17 THE SECRETARY: Any opposed?

18 (No response was heard.)

19 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: We're going to  
20 be back at 6:30.

21 (WHEREUPON, the Board entered into  
22 executive session from 6:09 p.m. to  
23 6:39 p.m., after which the following  
24 transpired:)

25 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Good evening

1  
2 everyone. Can you please join me for the  
3 Pledge of Allegiance?

4 (Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

5 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Can I please  
6 have a motion to accept the previous meeting  
7 minutes.

8 MEMBER JACKSON: So moved.

9 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Second.

10 THE SECRETARY: All in favor.

11 MEMBER JACKSON: Aye.

12 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Aye.

13 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Aye.

14 THE SECRETARY: Any opposed?

15 (No response was heard.)

16 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Do we have any  
17 Affidavits of Publication and Posting that  
18 need to be entered into the record as  
19 exhibits this evening?

20 THE SECRETARY: I have one Affidavit  
21 of Publication and one Affidavit of Posting  
22 to be entered into the record as exhibits for  
23 this public hearing.

24 (WHEREUPON, the above-referred to  
25 documents were marked as Board's Exhibits 1

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

and 2, for identification, as of this date.)

CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Do we have any requests for adjournment this evening?

THE SECRETARY: Madam Chair, there are no requests for adjournment for this evening, but we have a request to extend a previously granted variance.

CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Can I have a motion?

MEMBER JACKSON: So moved.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: I'll second that.

THE SECRETARY: All in favor.

MEMBER JACKSON: Aye.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Aye.

THE SECRETARY: Any opposed?

(No response was heard.)

THE SECRETARY: Application 2024-7, 16 Archer Street, Residence A, Section 62, Block 48, Lot 4. Jose Gutierrez. Proposed new 4,020 square foot two-story, two-family residence to existing vacant lot. Variances: Village Ordinance 210-6A, 210-37 Permitted

1  
2 uses, 210-31 Building height, sky exposure  
3 plane.

4 I have one Affidavit of Mailing from  
5 the May 16th public hearing and one Affidavit  
6 of Mailing from tonight's public hearing to  
7 be entered into the record as Board's  
8 Exhibits 1 and 2 for this individual  
9 application.

10 (WHEREUPON, the above-referred to  
11 documents were marked as Board's Exhibits 1  
12 and 2, for identification, as of this date.)

13 L U I S R O D R I G U E Z,  
14 having been first duly sworn by a Notary  
15 Public of the State of New York, was  
16 examined and testified as follows:

17 COURT REPORTER: Please state your  
18 name and address for the record.

19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Luis Rodriguez. 92  
20 Atlantic Avenue, Freeport, New York 11520.

21 Good evening, ladies and gentlemen of  
22 the Board. Nice seeing you guys. We're here  
23 presenting a case for 16 Archer Street. It  
24 was, at one time, a legal five-family home  
25 that has been demolished. The proposal is to

1  
2 build a legal two-family home. I know we're  
3 here tonight for the two-family status  
4 because in Freeport, logically, there's no  
5 two-family being built. We're also here for  
6 sky exposure plane. We have some  
7 documentation that we would like to submit as  
8 exhibits to the Village.

9 (WHEREUPON, the above-referred to  
10 document was marked as Applicant's Exhibit A,  
11 for identification, as of this date.)

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: So there are  
13 approximately -- there should be 10 of these  
14 that are going to be utilized instead of 11  
15 because Number 3 that you see there is the  
16 housing project that is right next to this,  
17 that abuts this property. I'd like to point  
18 out that the majority of the properties that  
19 sit in this neighborhood are legal two-family  
20 houses. We didn't stretch it out across  
21 Bedell Street and Raynor Street because there  
22 is an overabundance. We would have filled  
23 this sheet up with probably at least 50  
24 two-family homes.

25 I'd like to point out two properties

1  
2 that sit on this, which is 97 Raynor Street  
3 in Freeport. 97 Raynor Street was a project  
4 that the Village approved back in 2012, I  
5 believe. There were two homes on this  
6 property and they were knocked down and a  
7 legal two-family house was built.

8 I'd also like to point out project  
9 Number 1, which is 52 North Bergen Place,  
10 which was a legal three-family that was  
11 knocked down and then was rebuilt.

12 We can continue on to project --  
13 these are existing homes. Project Number 4,  
14 which is 32 Franklin Square is a legal  
15 two-family, 32 Archer Street, 228 Archer  
16 Street is a legal two. 24 Archer Street is a  
17 legal two. The subject property, 16 Archer  
18 Street which was at one point, again, a legal  
19 five. Number 9, which is 31 Archer Street is  
20 another legal two, and 322 South Main Street  
21 which is on the corner which is also a legal  
22 two-family home.

23 Specifically, those two projects,  
24 which was 52 North Bergen was a knockdown and  
25 it was rebuilt. And again, Project Number 2,

1  
2 which was two single-family houses on one lot  
3 that were knocked down and a legal two-family  
4 house was built on that project.

5 As far as the sky exposure plane is  
6 concerned, we're allowed three feet on the  
7 front of the house. This plan calls for 4.8.  
8 So, we're exceeding 1.8 feet, as far as the  
9 sky exposure plane is concerned. So, that's  
10 one of the variances that we require to build  
11 this home.

12 One of the things that the owner and  
13 the architect did on this project -- as you  
14 know, the side yard setbacks, minimum on each  
15 side is ten feet and five feet. They tried  
16 the borrow a little and they made it 10.8 on  
17 one side and seven feet on the other. In  
18 essence, they could have extended the  
19 property over another two feet, but they're  
20 trying to meet the requirements, trying to  
21 fit within the Village Code. So, one of the  
22 things that they tried to do was to do that.

23 This property is pretty unique,  
24 because the front of the house is Archer  
25 Street and behind it is Franklin Square. So,

1  
2 this house hits on both blocks. The front  
3 hits Archer and the back of the house hits  
4 Franklin Square.

5 They're only asking for one driveway  
6 to put all the cars in for the legal  
7 two-family. So, I just wanted to point that  
8 out, to see if that fits within the  
9 parameters of what it is that the Village  
10 requires in order to build.

11 MEMBER JACKSON: I have a question  
12 for you. On your exhibit here, only two of  
13 them have been approved by the Board. The  
14 remainder were pre-existing nonconforming.

15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, the other ones  
16 are legal two-families that are in the area.  
17 Again, we could have filled this page up with  
18 probably, easily, 50 houses. It would have  
19 been overkill of legal two-families  
20 nonconforming.

21 MEMBER JACKSON: But they are also  
22 pre-existing.

23 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Correct. Correct.  
24 Number 2 was a -- it became conforming  
25 because it was something that was built

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

outside of the scope of what the Village actually requires, and so is Number 1.

CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: I'm sorry, I have a question regarding these two homes. Were they vacant lots, were the houses knocked down completely and rebuilt on?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Or were they existing homes that were refurbished?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, they were completely knocked down and rebuilt.

MEMBER JACKSON: Were they owner occupied?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: They were not. As a matter of fact, Project Number 2 was sold after it was built.

MEMBER JACKSON: The ownership is JJ Brothers; is that correct?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, JJ Brothers.

MEMBER JACKSON: A development company of some sort.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, he's just a spec builder. He's building the home to keep it, he's not selling it. It's the purpose of

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

building the house is to make housing.

MEMBER JACKSON: If you don't mind me asking, what did they pay for the property?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: \$585,000.

MEMBER JACKSON: Since it has two different frontages, have you thought about subdividing and putting a house front and back?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm going to ask him now. They have not given it any thought.

MEMBER JACKSON: Have they given thought to any other alternatives, besides a two-family?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: That's the only alternative right now that they have.

MEMBER JACKSON: That's the only alternative --

MR. RODRIGUEZ: That they explored at this point. Ironically, I did mention that when we were in here talking about it. I saw that. The only concern would be the rear yards, as far as the houses are concerned. I don't think that they have enough square footage, as far as giving them rear yards.

1  
2 They have a total of 8,226 square feet, as  
3 far as the lot. It would have to be 50 by  
4 100. So, we we're missing -- we would be  
5 missing the total footprint of the  
6 construction by about 1,774 square feet.  
7 Divide that by two, then it would be whatever  
8 the number is.

9 MEMBER JACKSON: As spec builders,  
10 have they built in Freeport before?

11 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, they have done  
12 building in Valley Stream in the past.

13 MEMBER JACKSON: Were they with aware  
14 they would need a variance?

15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I don't think they  
16 were aware when they bought the house. I'm  
17 going to be corrected, if I'm wrong.

18 So, a lot of people that went to see  
19 this house, I could tell you from experience,  
20 it was marketed as a five-family house and,  
21 unfortunately, the house was in shambles and  
22 it needed to be either completely knocked  
23 down or gutted to the point that it would  
24 have to be on the studs and reframe the whole  
25 existing house. They weren't going to be

1  
2 able to get a five-family permit either way.  
3 So, the other alternative would have been to  
4 logically knock down the house. To be quite  
5 honest with you, I think it would cost them  
6 more money to refurbish the house then to  
7 build a brand new house.

8 MEMBER JACKSON: And it would require  
9 zoning anyway.

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Correct.

11 MEMBER JACKSON: At one point, did  
12 they realize that they needed a two-family  
13 variance, prior to getting the house?

14 MS. UNGAR: If I may. If he is going  
15 to be speaking a lot, he should probably be  
16 sworn in. So, if he's going to give you  
17 answers to questions, he should be sworn in  
18 as well.

19 MR. RODRIGUEZ: So from what I gather  
20 now, they got the approval for the demo  
21 permit. As they were knocking the house  
22 down, that's when they realized that they  
23 needed to get a variance. Maybe they plowed  
24 too deep into the house already and they were  
25 like, oh wait. That has transpired for

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

myself in the past.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: What year was the house that was just demolished, what year was it built about, sir?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I mean, I could get you that information.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: It looks to me, while you're looking that up, Archer Street for some reason -- some of these numbers are hard to see. You have three, you have five, six, seven and eight, and all of them on Archer Street seem to have been two-family home already existing, as previously brought up by everybody. It seems like they are kind of clustered together in a way that would be logical to add another one. So, I don't know.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: And to continue on --

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Can you look up the date of when they were built, clustered together? I thought the other houses were single-family. These were brought to our attention. I'm trying to get my mind around them.

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

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Would you like the one on 16 Archer specifically?

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Yes. They look like older homes.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: The majority of those houses are older.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: I mean, if we're going to keep density, clustering it together might be --

MR. RODRIGUEZ: This house was built in 1910. 16 Archer. Which other one would you like?

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Tell me what 32 is and maybe even 24.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: 32 is a 1929.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: What about 24. Last one. Just to get a rough idea.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. 24 is 1907.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Apparently, the only house that is not a two-family is that series is the one in the middle which is right next to yours.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yes.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: When was that

1  
2 built? I don't know the number. It seems  
3 like that was maybe built later on. It just  
4 seems weird. Everything else is a two-family  
5 house on that entire block.

6 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I would say probably  
7 '18 or '20. Give me one second. There's a  
8 lot of two-families. On Bedell, as you turn  
9 that corner, there has to be probably, if  
10 there's 20 houses, I could probably pick up  
11 at least 15 two-families in that 20.

12 So 20 Archer is the house right next  
13 door, and that 1 was built in 1910.

14 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Thanks for that.

15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You're welcome. You  
16 bring up a valid point. There's so many  
17 two-family houses there, one after the other.  
18 And they're on the same side of the street  
19 too. If we go onto Raynor as well. I know  
20 Raynor very, very well. On Raynor Street,  
21 and that's the pocket between South Main  
22 Street and Bedell. I could probably pull  
23 them up right now too.

24 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: I'm very  
25 familiar with that. You don't have to pull

1  
2 it up. I'm just saying I see on this map the  
3 south side of the street. You can see mostly  
4 like Archer Street are one- or two-family  
5 homes. It's just strange, because all of  
6 those houses are two-family houses except for  
7 Freeport Housing Authority which is  
8 multi-family.

9 MEMBER JACKSON: They may not have  
10 been built as two-family houses.

11 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Right. They  
12 might have been converted over the years.

13 MS. UNGAR: Also just the case of use  
14 variances, the character or the neighborhood  
15 is not one of the primary factors. I should  
16 say not the only factor to be considered.

17 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: I don't know if  
18 you realize that -- I think if she read back  
19 the testimony you said the house was -- the  
20 first thing you said it was a five-bedroom.

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, five-family.

22 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: You said  
23 something like that. I was going to say  
24 something at the time. Maybe I misheard it,  
25 if it's on the record.

1  
2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: It's actually public  
3 record that they actually marketed the  
4 property that way, which is not the fault of  
5 the Town, it's we have to do our own research  
6 prior to.

7 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Buyer beware.

8 MEMBER JACKSON: As you know, that's  
9 how it works.

10 MR. RODRIGUEZ: It's a shame that's  
11 the way it works, yes. Even if you want to  
12 restore.

13 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Besides the fact  
14 that you have an issue with the two-family  
15 issues, the sky exposure plane. Isn't there  
16 a way to make the building a little more you  
17 said you have 10.8 feet on one side. So,  
18 there was no way to make it, since you have a  
19 long lot and stretch it out and make it  
20 longer and maybe not go so high?

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: I mean, what they're  
22 trying to do is trying to mirror the house on  
23 the second floor and the first floor, as far  
24 as three bedrooms up, three bedrooms down,  
25 living room, kitchen. Where there's a will

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

there's a way.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Are they going to have cathedral ceiling? I'm not sure.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm going to have the architect come up and I'll ask him the question, after he gets sworn in.

CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: I have one more question for you. What is the intention of the basement?

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Before the architect?

MEMBER JACKSON: Does he need an interpreter?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, his hearing.

M I G U E L R A M I R E Z,  
having been first duly sworn by a Notary Public of the State of New York, was examined and testified as follows:

COURT REPORTER: Please state your name and address for the record.

MR. RAMIREZ: Miguel Ramirez.  
Address is 33 Lamont Place in West Babylon, New York 11704.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: The question you had?

1  
2 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: What was the  
3 intention of the basement.

4 MR. RODRIGUEZ: It is storage.

5 MR. RAMIREZ: Not habitable. Just  
6 for storage.

7 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: My follow up  
8 question was, could he have made the building  
9 less wide to have the sky exposure plane  
10 drop? If you didn't have cathedral ceilings,  
11 I'm not sure why you have a sky exposure  
12 plane. Maybe I should rephrase my question.  
13 Am I asking it the wrong way?

14 MR. RODRIGUEZ: You asked the right  
15 way. There are no cathedral ceilings on the  
16 second floor.

17 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: There are?

18 MR. RAMIREZ: No.

19 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Is there an  
20 attic?

21 MR. RAMIREZ: Yes attic.

22 MR. RODRIGUEZ: And the attic, the  
23 purpose of the attic so going to put the  
24 blower for the A/C unit on the second floor  
25 and put a blower in the basement for the

1  
2 first floor. So, they will put the combi  
3 unit with the coil, hot water coil, one for  
4 the first floor and one for the second floor  
5 and laundry down there too.

6 MEMBER JACKSON: Laundry in the  
7 basement?

8 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Laundry for the first  
9 floor in the basement. That's what's on the  
10 plan. And it also calls for it on page 1.

11 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: So the laundry  
12 will be only for the first floor? You are  
13 not having it available for the second floor  
14 residents?

15 MR. RODRIGUEZ: There's nowhere to  
16 put it on the second floor.

17 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: I'm saying, is  
18 there a reason the second floor wouldn't use  
19 it?

20 MR. RODRIGUEZ: So yes, the whole  
21 goal -- I just spoke to the owner -- is that  
22 both tenants would have access to go to the  
23 basement. That's the purpose of the exterior  
24 entrance to the basement, it's on the back of  
25 the house, for them to be able to go down

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

there to do laundry. They have a balcony too on the back of the house. There is a balcony on the second floor. It has nothing to do with what it is that we're talking about.

MEMBER JACKSON: What is the intended rent charge for each unit?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: What I was asking him beforehand was that each unit would probably be \$4,000 each.

MEMBER JACKSON: Do you know what they are estimating building would be?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: He has three estimates. He is getting the numbers down to figure it out.

MS. UNGAR: Again, if they are giving you information, they should be sworn in.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: I'm going to have to translate for them.

J O S E G U T I E R R E Z,  
having been first duly sworn by a Notary Public of the State of New York, was examined and testified as follows:

COURT REPORTER: Please state your name and address for the record.

1  
2 MR. GUTIERREZ: Jose Gutierrez. 124  
3 Bismark Avenue, Valley Stream, New York  
4 11580.

5 MR. RODRIGUEZ: Builders grade. He's  
6 telling me that it's about \$450,000 to build  
7 the house. Meaning, they're not putting any  
8 granite countertops. Everything is going to  
9 be no frills, no thrills in the house.

10 MEMBER JACKSON: Do you know what the  
11 taxes would be; have you looked at that?

12 MR. RODRIGUEZ: More or less on the  
13 vicinity -- that we spoke about before you  
14 guys came in. In the vicinity of \$16,000,  
15 \$17,000.

16 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: A quick thing,  
17 because I looked it up. I thought the house  
18 was sold at \$425,000. Am I correct? You  
19 said \$550,000, \$580,000. I want to confirm  
20 that.

21 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No, it is \$424,000 he  
22 paid.

23 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: That it sold  
24 for.

25 MR. RODRIGUEZ: \$424,000. He bought

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

it cash. He didn't get a mortgage.

CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: So it's not \$550,00. Somebody said \$580,000.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: We have him here.

CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: \$425,000.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: \$424,000.

MEMBER JACKSON: He's an investor. He doesn't plan on living there, correct?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Correct. He didn't get a mortgage, so I think he could fluctuate, as far as numbers are concerned, if he does get the rentals. I'm sure he can get those rentals. It would be a beneficial property for him.

So, also doesn't plan on getting a mortgage also on the property. So, he's going to be paying for everything outright. He has a pretty reputable business. I asked him now. He's able to pay for everything, all the construction. So, we won't have issues like grand opening/grand closing. It won't be a blight in the Village.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: On the other side of that coin, it's not a financial

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

hardship for him.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: There is none. He would be able to build the house.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: If he builds a one-family house, would he have a financial hardship?

MR. RODRIGUEZ: The goal would not be a one-family house. It wouldn't be a benefit to him.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: I understand that. Also we have to weigh the benefit of the Village versus a personal benefit. The identification -- obviously they're not grandfathered in. That's why we make a decision based on whether he's adversely effected or not.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Correct.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: If it's a self-created hardship. That's what we're trying to determine.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Correct. Correct.

CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Thank you.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Would you like to add anything else?

1  
2 MR. RODRIGUEZ: No. Thank you for  
3 the testimony. We hope to hear from you  
4 soon. We appreciate it. Have a great  
5 summer. Stay cool.

6 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Do we have  
7 anyone else who would like to speak for or  
8 against this application this evening?

9 (No response was heard.)

10 MS. UNGAR: There are no speakers.

11 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Can I please  
12 have a motion to close to further evidence  
13 and testimony and reserve decision.

14 MEMBER JACKSON: So moved.

15 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Second.

16 THE SECRETARY: All in favor.

17 MEMBER JACKSON: Aye.

18 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Aye.

19 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Aye.

20 THE SECRETARY: Any opposed?

21 (No response was heard.)

22 CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Thank you.  
23 Can I get a motion to go into  
24 executive session.

25 DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: So moved.

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

June 20, 2024

29

MEMBER JACKSON: Second.

THE SECRETARY: All in favor.

MEMBER JACKSON: Aye.

DEPUTY CHAIR CAREY: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON RHODEN: Aye.

THE SECRETARY: Any opposed?

(No response was heard.)

(Time Ended 7:12 p.m.)

\* \* \* \*

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

June 20, 2024

30

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, BETHANNE MENNONNA, a Notary Public within and for the State of New York do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings, as taken stenographically by myself to the best of my ability, at the time and place aforementioned.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 27th day of June, 2024.

  
BETHANNE MENNONNA