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## 1. ZBA Narrative

34 Wayne Ave.
Suffern, NY 10901
(845) 357-0830
email: greenwellpls@aol.com

# Jay A. Greenwell, PLS, LLC 

 Land Surveying and Land PlanningVillage of Upper Nyack<br>Project Goose (11 Tompkins Court) Site Plan - ZBA Narrative

June 2022

We are pleased to submit this application to the Zoning Board of Appeals. The subject site is shown as Tax Lot 60.14-1-12.7 ("Lot 7") on the Town of Clarkstown tax maps and consists of 36,108 square feet of dry land ${ }^{1}$ in the R-30 zone (requiring 30,000 sf lots), bounded on the west side by Tompkins Court (part of an average density subdivision) and on the easterly side by the Hudson River. The property is developed with an existing two-story frame dwelling and garage facing Tompkins Court, and an elevated pool 13-15 feet above grade at the river's edge. Entry into the house from either the front door or garage is at the upper level of the house. The house and site are served by all required utilities, including underground electric, telephone, and cable. Municipal sewage is provided with use of an ejector pump.

The westerly side (front) of the property is relatively flat with a grade of $2.9 \%$ consisting of a front yard and a driveway. Northern and southern side yards provide access from the upper level to the lower level with an average grade of approximately $23 \%$. These side yards are relatively small at approximately 2,700 square feet. The areas from the back of the house down to the river include a pool deck, lawn areas, flagstone patios and walkways, and stairwells. Most of this area has been graded flat. Within this area, some additional steep slopes exist comprising 2,500 square feet at grades ranging from $15 \%$ to over $40 \%$. Total steep slopes (>15\% grade) on the Lot represent $14 \%$ of total dry land area. It is further observed that many of the steep slopes on the Lot were disturbed at the creation of the Lot and subdivision (i.e. the steep slopes are neither original to the landscape nor of historical significance).

The existing house is in habitable condition despite the need for meaningful site work to enhance and improve the aesthetics, safety, and environmental attributes. The applicant purchased this house fully intending to reposition the property to meet their needs and desires, within the context of the Village of Upper Nyack's Comprehensive Plan of 2021 and in harmony with the interests of adjoining residents. The front of the property is only perceptible to its neighbors as the property is located at the bottom of Tompkins Court, a private road. The design and plans for this Project were presented to all homeowners in an HOA meeting on April 4, 2022. As recorded in the meeting minutes, no issues were raised - See Exhibit A. In discussion with the HOA, unanimous enthusiasm for the project included appreciated investment in the neighborhood, desire to meaningfully improve existing and deteriorating conditions, and enhancements to property value. In accordance with the property's HOA Declaration of Covenants, Restrictions, Easements, Charges and Liens, Article VII on Architectural Control provides that if the Board "fails to approve or disapprove such design and location within sixty (60) days after said plans and
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specifications have been submitted to it, approval will not be required and this Article will be deemed to have been fully complied with - See Exhibit B. As of the date of this submission, eighty-three (83) days have lapsed without additional comment.

The rear of the property abuts the Hudson River. As such, the only character impacts would be to passing boaters and from the other side of the river, 2.5 miles away. Regardless, the objective of any plans would only be enhancing as previously mentioned.

Key elements of the repositioning include:

1. Installation of an automated gate
2. Driveway replacement with permeable pavers
3. A new roof, generally consistent with the existing roof aesthetics
4. Recladding of the front and side elevations with updated and modernized materials
5. Softening of dwelling color (currently white) to better blend into the landscape
6. Increased dwelling size but done in a manner that meaningfully mitigates increases in lot coverage
7. Use of more glass to better soften the contrast with the environment
8. Installation of an infinity pool
9. Improved landscaping
10. Site erosion remediation through use of rain gardens and retaining walls

## Zoning Summary

As required by $\S 10.5 .17$ of Local Law \#5 of 2022, a comprehensive table of bulk requirements can be found on the Site Plan Section 7a. A summary of the Project's compliance with applicable General Bulk Regulations is found below for Zone Area R-30. As referenced in the Narrative, lots in the Rose Subdivision are subject to the bulk regulations and net lot area depicted on the plat at the time the subdivision was created.

| Bulk Regulation | Existing | Proposed | Comment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Structural setbacks | Full compliance | Full compliance | Pool deck moves inward from rear lot line |
| 2. Building height (35 feet) | 31.0 feet | 33.5 feet | Maximum height increased by 2.5 feet; average height significantly less than that |
| 3. Development Coverage (1) (25.0\%) | 32.4\%, Impervious <br> 32.4\%, Total | 24.2\%, Impervious <br> 36.2\%, Total | - Replace non-permeable driveway with a NYSDEC compliant permeable surface; ~3,000 square feet improved <br> - Removal of one of the pool deck staircases |
| 4. Building Coverage (1) (12.0\%) | 9.1\% | 17.9\%, <br> 11.1\% excluding below pool deck | - 76\% of Building Coverage at grade <br> - $23 \%$ of Building Coverage entirely subterranean beneath the existing pool deck, i.e. no incremental visible expansion |
| 5. FAR (1) (0.20) | 0.13 | 0.22, <br> 0.18 , at ground level | - $18 \%$ of FAR in Basement, below existing pool infrastructure |

(1) Variance required.
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| Bulk Regulation | Existing | Proposed | Comment |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6. Steep Slope | NA | Full Site <br> Improvement Plan <br> Disturbance (1) | • $14 \%$ of net lot area subject to steep <br> slopes |
|  |  |  | • Plans to improve nearly all steep <br> slopes |
|  |  |  | Dramatic improvement to ground <br> stability and drainage |

(1) Variance required.

As noted, certain elements of this plan will require zoning variances:

- Development Coverage: The property is existing nonconforming. Total existing Development Coverage is $32.4 \%$, all of which is Impervious Surface Coverage, vs. $25.0 \%$ allowable per zoning code. Improvements to the Lot will remove a lot of this impervious hardscape and reduce Impervious Surface Coverage to $24.2 \%$. Most of this reduction will come from the driveway utilizing the latest permeable paver technology that would meet or exceed NYSDEC standards. Including all porous surfaces despite meeting NYSDEC standards, total proposed Development Coverage increases 3.8 points to $36.2 \%$. We believe this variance meets the required criteria for a bulk variance.
- Undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties: No undesirable changes. (i) the development plan was shared with the HOA and it was unanimously supported. (ii) Any changes that would impact neighborhood or nearby properties are from the front of the property. (a) Installation of an automated gate should not adversely impact anyone and consideration has already been made to allow for continued street circulation, including expected turnarounds in-driveway; (b) Color change of house softens and blends the property into the environment relative to the existing white infrastructure; (c) Driveway is being replaced with attractive permeable pavers in place of non permeable pavers; (d) No views are adversely impacted as the shape and height of the roof is largely unchanged. The garage height is being elevated by 2.5 feet but it is currently the lowest roof point and finished elevation is well below that allowed by code.
- Benefit sought can be achieved by some method: No. Changes to the design and programming proposed would likely be less advantageous to all constituents and stakeholders.
- Substantial: Not substantial. (i) Impervious coverage decreases from $32.4 \%$ to $24.4 \%$. (ii) Most of the increase from $32.4 \%$ to $36.2 \%$ is from permeable surfaces and installation of retaining walls and terraces which greatly improves existing erosion concerns and dramatically enhances property and area aesthetics. (iii) Increases in Development Coverage are imperceptible to neighbors or nearby properties.
- Adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district: No adverse impact. Quite the contrary. The improvements substantially improve the physical and environmental conditions of the property, neighborhood, and surrounding area. Key benefits include replacement of substantial impervious hardscape with permeable surfaces and pavers and creation of attractive retaining walls to address drainage and erosion concerns. Additionally, the eastern retaining wall, which currently supports the pool deck, is being shortened and brought inland by two feet.
- Self created difficulty: Not self-created. The property was acquired with a high degree of hardscape nonconformity and a substantial drainage and erosion problem with adverse health, safety, and environmental implications.
- Building Coverage: Applicant has gone to great lengths to contain expansion areas to alreadyimproved locations. Notably, the newly improved area under the pool deck does not increase Development Coverage while increasing Building Coverage. The proposed expansion plan thoughtfully takes advantage of the existing slope to virtually hide the vast majority of incremental Building Coverage. Seventy-seven percent (77\%) of the increase in Building Coverage is contained below the pool deck, most of which is entirely subterranean and without windows. As previously mentioned, the size of this existing infrastructure (pool deck) is shortened. While proposed Building Coverage increases from $13.8 \%$ to $17.9 \%$, it is notable that 6.8 points of Building Coverage is below the pool deck, a Development Coverage that currently exists. Exclusive of the area below the pool deck, Building Coverage is only $11.1 \%$. We believe this variance meets the required criteria for a bulk variance.
- Undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties: No impact to the neighborhood or nearby properties. (i) any building coverage changes are in the rear of the property and not visible to neighbors or neighboring properties. (ii) Building Coverage changes in the rear of the property are mostly beneath existing infrastructure and subterranean.
- Benefit sought can be achieved by some method: No. The benefits of this design can only be achieved as proposed. While a different design could be implemented, it would require a full redesign with associated soft costs, but more importantly it would be more detrimental to the environment, less attractive, and result in meaningfully more aboveground and visible bulk.
- Substantial: Not substantial in that the vast majority of the proposed incremental building coverage does not create additional perceptible or practical bulk. Most of the incremental Building Coverage is being reclaimed from areas and infrastructure under the existing pool deck. This project seeks to simply reclaim this space, which is currently encompassed by stark white walls, with a muted grey and glass façade which will blend substantially better into the existing environment. Substantial time, soft costs, and willingness to incur significant incremental development costs has been considered in adherence to the project's development tenets: (i) substantially improve the overall design aesthetic of the dwelling, (ii) improve environmental and safety conditions of the property, (iii) beautify the landscape, and (iv) limit incremental development coverage. It is also worthy to note that the mathematical magnitude of this variance is such because of the decision to build out beneath the existing pool deck. In doing so, additional space is required to build a tunnel from the main house to this basement area and building out as a single level, as opposed to two or three stories (as is customary in this HOA), magnifies the adversity of this calculation relative to the bulk allowance.
- Adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district: No adverse effect. The increases in Building Coverage are entirely over existing Development Coverage.
- Self created difficulty: Yes to the extent that Applicant has chosen to embark on a property improvement program. No to the extent that the existing Building was inefficiently sized and not ideally developed relative to the lot on which it exists. Effecting the proposed changes will help ensure that the asset remains appropriately positioned relative to its comparable group.
- FAR: Aesthetics and structural development under the pool require more floor area than otherwise necessary building above ground. We believe seeking a variance would be preferable to all interested parties. Proposed FAR 0.22 vs 0.20 allowable per zoning code. It is notable that 0.4 of this FAR is below the pool deck. Exclusive of the area beneath the pool deck the FAR is only 0.18 . We believe this variance meets the required criteria for a bulk variance.
- Undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties: No impact to the neighborhood or nearby properties. Similar to the rationale for Building Coverage variance, (i) additional FAR is located in the rear of the property and not visible to neighbors or neighboring properties. (ii) most of the incremental FAR and all of the excess FAR is beneath existing infrastructure and furthermore, most of it is subterranean.
- Benefit sought can be achieved by some method: No. Achieving the expansion sought above ground, even if FAR was limited to 0.20 , would have a substantially greater effect on the perceived and practical bulk as some would be added to the Western elevation which is visible to the HOA.
- Substantial: Not substantial. The existing house was underbuilt. As such, most of the FAR expansion is within zoning allowances.
- Adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district: No adverse effect. As stated above, all of the expansion is over or under existing infrastructure.
- Self created difficulty: Similar to Building Coverage, yes to the extent that Applicant has chosen to improve the property. However, in doing so the self-created difficulty will provide a betterment to the neighborhood and community through increased tax assessments, property value association, and additional comparables for the Upper Nyack Tax Assessor all without creating additional burden on the resources currently provided to the community. The variance required is not self-created to the extent that the property was underdeveloped and not adequately maintained prior to purchase. The reality is that to address the existing property deficiencies a more pervasive approach is required to have the end be justified by the means. The project, and its scope, was discussed with members of the Planning Board prior to (i) acquiring the property and (ii) knowledge that the new zoning ordinance included FAR as a new element of the bulk table.
- Steep Slope Disturbance: We believe this variance meets the required criteria for a bulk variance.
- Undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties: No. In addition to the positive effects of these efforts, it is notable that the areas being disturbed (i) do not have any houses or roads in front of them, (ii) are not the cliffs typified by many other Upper Nyack lots on the Hudson River, (iii) are directly in front of the Hudson River the land and land underwater area for which is privately owned by the Applicant - See footnote 1. It should be noted that the slopes existing at the property today are not the original slopes. In connection with the creation of the subdivision, Lot and residence in 2006, the original slopes were modified / disturbed. Further modification of these slopes has no impact to any natural or historical significance of the area.
- Benefit sought can be achieved by some method: No. Some of the steep slope disturbance directly addresses drainage and erosion issues that cannot be adequately achieved without a similar significant effort. Some of the disturbance pertains to construction
equipment access. Applicant intends to evaluate delivery of equipment and materials via the Hudson River but at this point feasibility and practicality has not been ascertained.
- Substantial: Not substantial. Steep slopes do not comprise a large area (~5,200 square feet), nor are they a significant component of net lot area (less than 15\% of total). Given the steep slope area is so small and the requirement to get construction equipment to the site, we have indicated $100 \%$ disturbance but it is our hope that we will not require the entirety of the variance requested.
- Adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district: No. Proposed efforts will improve the safety, aesthetics, and preservation of the environment. The Applicant intends to restore, plant and/or terrace sections of its property that are eroding or subject to significant drainage issues. Terraces, and their supporting retaining walls in compliance with code, are to be added in the rear of the property.
- Self created difficulty: No. Drainage and erosion have been a persistent and pervasive issue with the property since before the Applicant has owned it. Failure to rectify existing conditions will lead to further deterioration and could cause a health, safety, and environment concern. Furthermore, in connection with discussion of this plan with members of the Planning Board before the property was acquired, it was requested by those members that Applicant deliver a "comprehensive landscaping proposal" when requesting formal approval for this project.

The Applicant has invested significantly in the research, support, and creation of this Plan and has gone to extensive lengths to minimize its development impact and support local objectives. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

HUDSON SHORES HOA MEETING
MINUTES APRIL 4, 2022

Meeting was called to order at 7:38 pm.

Those present were: [Owner 1], Adam Budgor, [Owner 2], [Owner 3], [Owner 4], [Owner 5] and Donna Licata (JL Management \& Realty LLC).

## Motions:

- Motion passed to accept minutes of July 7, 2021
- Motion passed to accept proposed budget (should LS figure need to be adjusted, a revised budget will be presented.


## Discussions:

- Pavement: Blacktop committee formed and will set up appointment with paving company to discuss repair vs. replacement. Date TBD on either Wednesday or Friday after 5 pm or weekend. Committee members are: Adam B., [Owner 1], [Owner 5]., and [Owner 4]
- Mailboxes: Each homeowner will submit their mailbox selection via email to all homeowners for approval by April 21. Installation on all mailboxes target date is May 7.
- Pump Station: Adam B. stated he would like to add plantings as part of beautification around the pump.
- Landscaping: [Owner 5] will speak to Sergio and Salizar (sp?) to obtain pricing to landscape easement areas. Adam B. to cleanout brush and provide plantings around mechanicals.

- Financials were Presented.
- Adam B. spoke to homeowners regarding his proposed renovations on his home. Architectural drawings were presented. No issues were raised.


## Elections:

- [Owner 3] nominated Adam Budgor for a position on the board. Nomination was accepted and approved by all homeowners.
- Election of officers: Adam Budgor, President (term ends 6/2025); [Owner 1], Secretary/Treasurer (term ends 6/2024) and [Owner 3], Vice President (term ends 6/2023).

[^1]
## ZBA Narrative, Exhibit B


#### Abstract

ARTICLE VII. ARCHITECTURAL CONTROL No building, fence, wall or other structure, or change or alteration to the exterior of the Homes or in the landscaping shall be commenced, erected or maintained upon The Properties, nor shall any exterior addition to, or change or alteration thereto, be made until the plans and specifications showing the nature, kind, shape, height, materials, color and locations of the same shall have been submitted to and approved in writing as to harmony of external design and location in relation to surrounding structures and topography by the Board of Directors of the Association or by an architectural committee composed of three or more representatives appointed by the Board. In the event said Board, or its designated committee fails to approve or disapprove such design and location within sixty (60) days after said plans and specifications have been submitted to it, approval will not be required and this Article will be deemed to have been fully complied with. The provisions of this Paragraph shall not apply to Developer. As set forth in Article VIII, Section 7(d) of the Association By-Laws, a two thirds majority of a quorum of the Board of Directors or architectural committee shall be required for approval of any addition, change or alteration. Notwithstanding the foregoing, work requiring a building permit and certificate of occupancy is subject to the approval of the Village of Upper Nyack and a Home Owner is required to secure all such necessary approvals and permits before any work commences.
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## APPLICATION TO THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Date 04/28/22 REV. $5 / 12 / 22$
Appeal No:

Applicant's Name Soraya Scroggins \& Adam Budgor
Applicant's Phone No. 212-233-2225

Attorney's Name Donald Brenner, PE, LLB
Attorney's Address 4 Independence Ave., Tappan, NY 10983
Attorney's Phone No. 845-359-2210

Name of Property Owner Soraya Scroggins \& Adam Budgor
Name of Contract Purchaser $\qquad$ NA

To the Zoning Board of Appeals, Village Hall, Upper Nyack, NY 10960
I/We Soraya Scroggins \& Adam Budgor of 11 Tomkins Court
(Name of Applicant) (Street and Number)

Upper Nyack , NY $\qquad$ hereby appeal to the
(Municipality) (State)

Zoning Board of Appeals from the decision of the Building Inspector on Violation Number $\qquad$ or on application for Building Permit number $\qquad$ dated $\qquad$ whereby the

Building Inspector did deny:
$め$ A Building Permit
( ) Non-Conforming use
( ) A Certificate for Occupancy and / or Use
( ) Other $\qquad$

## APPLICATION TO THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

1. Location of the property 11 Tompkins Ct., Upper Nyack

County Tax ID Number $\frac{60.14-1-12.7}{\text { Zoning District } \frac{R-30}{\text { At Terminus of Tomkins Court }}} \begin{aligned} & \text { At or near the following intersections or main streets: }\end{aligned}$ At Ter
2. Provision(s) of the Zoning Ordinance appealed:

3. Previous Appeal: A previous appeal ( ), has, or $X$ has not been made with respect to this property.

NA Such appeal(s) was/were in the form of
( ) An appeal from a Violation Notice No. $\qquad$ dated $\qquad$
( ) A request for a Variance and was made in Appeal No. $\qquad$ , dated $\qquad$
Appeal No. $\qquad$ , dated $\qquad$
( ) Other
4. Appeal is made hereforth for:
( ) An Interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance or Map
( ) Appeal from Decision of Village Official or Officer $\qquad$
$\qquad$
(name)
( ) A Use Variance to the Zoning Ordinance
$\propto$ An Area Variance to the Zoning Ordinance
Reason for Appeal. Complete all relevant information in the following section or sections pertaining to appeal checked above. Please note that at the time of the Zoning Board of Appeals hearing you will be able to supplement any of the following information by written or oral evidence. It would be advisable to be prepared at the time of the hearing to present written documentation of your application statements to substantiate all financial figures supplied and any other necessary material relevant to the request.

## APPLICATION TO THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Complete only the applicable sections as indicated by appeal request.

INTERPRETATION OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE OR MAP:

## APPLICATION TO THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

## ISE VARIANCE Article V, §17:4, B.

Stat how strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would cause unnecessary hardship. (Note: Proof of hareship to be provided must be related to the property and not the individual owner.)
$\qquad$

1. The applican must demonstrate a substantial lack of return by competent financia evidence:
a. The amount paid for the entire parcel is
b. The date of purch se of the property is
$\qquad$
c. The present value of he entire property is $\qquad$
d. The value of the parcel that is the subject of this application is (als explain how value is determined) NA
e. The monthly expenses attributed maintenance of the poperty are $\qquad$ .
$f$. The amount of taxation on the property is $\qquad$ .
g. The current income from the land in issue is $\qquad$ .
h. The amount of mortgages and other encumerances on the property is (date, monthly payments, balance due, interest rate, etc.) $\qquad$
$\qquad$
2. This property cannot be used by any currently permitted uss because:

3. The alleged hardship relati g to the property in question is unique, and does not apply to the general conditions of he neighborhood in that $\qquad$
4. The requested us variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character ol the neighborhood in

5. The all ged hardship has not been self created in that $\qquad$
6. Gther factors V / we wish the Board to consider in this case are

APPLICATION TO THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

AREA VARIANCE Article V, §17:4, C.
State how applicable zoning regulations would cause practical difficulty. (Note: Proof of practical difficulty should be related to the property and not to the individual. For example, practical difficulty could be the inability to make reasonable use of the land due to the size, shape, grade or contour.)
NEW ZONING CODE ADOPTED IMPLEMENTS SCOPE RESTLIETIONS : FLOOR AREA REQUIREMENTS THAT DID NOT PREVIOUSLY EXIST, CREATNG A PRICNCRL DIFFiCULTY.

1. Will an undesirable change be produced in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties be created by the granting of this variance? Explain. NO. THE AESNAENC UPGRADES TO DWELLING : GROUNDS WILL ENITANCE THE AREA.
2. Can the benefit sought by the applicant be achieved by some method, feasible by the applicant to pursue, other than an area variance? Explain. No.

DESIRED IMPROVEMENTS CANNOT BE REALIZED WITHOUT TIE VAR lANCES.
3. Is the requested area variance substantial in relation to the zoning code? Explain. NO. ALntaclyit The percentage of slope dismusance is $1000 \%$, The total men is MINIMAL. DEVELOPMENT COVERAGE AND BUILDING COVERAGE VARIANCES
4. Will the proposed variance have an adverse effect on the physical or environmental conditions of the neighborhood or district? Explain. NO. THE COVEXAGE AND FAR VAMINNCES WILL IFIVE NO iminer. THE PROPOSED GCADING WILL STABILIZE EXISTING SlopE ANEAS DTAT ARE ENDOING.
5. Is the alleged difficulty self created? Explain. NO. APPLICINT PURCITASKD THO HOUSE IN THE FALL OF $2 O L$ PRIOR TO NEW ZONING. ADOPTION.
6. Is the requested variance the minimum variance necessary to relieve the practical difficulty? Explain. Yes. tit expansion/renovation cannot be achieves without RELIEF SOUGHT.

## APPLICATION TO THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

## AREA VARIANCE (con't)

7. Would a significant economic hardship result if this variance were not granted? Explain.

YES. APPLICANT PURCITASEA THE WITH THE INTENTION OF EXPANSION PRIOR TO NEW ZONING REqUCADONS IND IAVE SPENT A CONSIDERABLE I MOUNT OF MONEY ON ENGINEERING, ARcintectural, Ind Landscaping plans.
8. Given that governmental facilities and services are available to this property, will the granting of this variance effect the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood or district? Explain.
$\qquad$ NEIGHBOCITOOD EXCEPT IN A POSITIVE MANNER
9. If this variance is granted, will the effect of the increased population density produced on available governmental facilities, services, and schools be small or great? Explain.
$\qquad$
10. Other factors the applicant may wish the Board to consider:

SEE Amacied varantive.

## APPLICATION TO THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

## ALL APPLICANTS MUST ATTEST TO THE FOLLOWING:

Subject to the provisions of the General Municipal Law, Article 18, §809, applicant must state the name, address, nature, and extent of the interest of any State, County, or Village of Upper Nyack Officer or employee.

## NONE

## STATE OF NEW YORK . )

) $\mathrm{SS}:$
COUNTY OF ROCKLAND )

Sworn to this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 20 $\qquad$

Applicant's Signature $\qquad$
(Notary Public)

## AFFIDAVIT OF OWNERSHIP


in the State of NEW YOKC $\qquad$ that he/she is the owner of all that certain lot, piece or parcel of land situated, lying and being in the Village of Upper Nyack aforesaid, and that he/she hereby authorizes on their behalf, and that the statements of fact contained in said application are true.
STATE OF NEW YORK )
New York) Ss:
COUNTY OF ROCKEAND )


APPEAL NO. $\qquad$

## Notice to Building lraspector of Appeal to Zoning Board of Appeals

In the matter of the petition of:
Name ADAM BUDGOR \& SORAYA SCROGGINS
Address 11 TOMPKINS COURT
UPPER NYACK, NY 10960
County No: 60.14-1-12.7

Building Inspector
Village of Upper Nyack
County of Rockland, N.Y.

Attention of Mr. Roy Wanamaker, Building Inspector.

Dear Sir:
SORAYA SCROGGINS \&
This is to give notice that ADAM BUDGOR has/have appealed to the Zoning Board of Appeals of the Village of Upper Nyack, County of Rockland, N.Y., from your decision order dated construction, maintenance, or use of a disapproving/approving (strike one) application for alteration, AN EXPANSION/RENOVATION OF AN EXISTING DWELLING.

The grounds on which this appeal is based are as follows:
STRICT APPLICATION OF THE ZONING CODE WOULD CREATE A HARDSHIP.

Yours truly,


Dated 5/12/2022
Note: To be made out in duplicate, original to be served on Building Inspector, duplicate filed with appeal.

## 3. Building Permit Application

Resubmitted to Planning Board May 16, 2022

# VILLAGE OF UPPER NYACK <br> 328 NORTH BROADWAY <br> UPPER NYACK, NY 10960 

INCORPORATED 1872
Tel. 845-358-0084 FAX. 845-358-0741
www.uppernyack-ny.us

BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION FOR

## EXTERIOR RENOVATION/NEW CONSTRUCTION

## SHEDS OVER 120 SF / DECKS OVER 200 SF

## IN GROUND POOLS

Application is hereby made for a Building Permit in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance of the Incorporated Village of Upper Nyack.

Submit the following:

- 2 copies of this application
- 1 copy of deed
- 1 copy of survey in current homeowner's name
- 11 copies of signed and sealed site plan, and submission of plans in pdf format
- 6 copies of elevations and construction plans with details
- 1 copy of Architectural Review Board Finish Schedule
- 1 copy of REScheck Inspection Checklist and Compliance Report for NYS
- 11 copies of signed and sealed landscape plan, if applicable
- General Municipal Law Application, if applicable
- Environmental Assessment Form, if applicable

Further information may be required by the Office of the Building Inspector, as provided by the Zoning Ordinance of the Incorporated Village of Upper Nyack, if such is considered necessary for approval of this application.

## Owner(s) Soraya Scroggins and Adam Budgor

Address: 11 Tompkins Court, Upper Nyack, NY 10960
Phone \# 212-233-2225
Email Address: abudgor@gmail.com; sorayams@gmail.com
Property Address to which permit pertains: Same as above

## PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING

Proposed work: Residential renovation of existing dwelling
with site landscaping and pool renovation
Total valuation of work: $\$ 2,000,000$
County Tax ID Number of Property: ${ }^{60.14-1-12.7}$
Zoning District $\mathrm{R}-30$
Zoning: Single Family $\qquad$ Two Family $\qquad$ Other (specify) $\qquad$
Sewage disposal: Public sewers $X$ Septic system $\qquad$
Distance to nearest stream, river, or waterway Adjacent to Hudson River
Engineer: Brian Brooker Assoc. Phone \# 845-357-4411
Address: 76 Lafayette Ave., Suffern, NY 10901
Architect: Barnes Coy Architects Phone \# 631-537-3555
Address: PO Box 763, Bridgehampton, NY 11932

## Contractor Information

General Contractor Not known at this time
Address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$
Mechanical Contractor / Plumber Not known at this time Address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$
HVAC Contractor Not known at this time
Address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$

Electrician
Not known at this time
Address: $\qquad$
Phone: $\qquad$

# OFFICE OF THE BUILDING INSPECTOR INCORPORATED VILLAGE OF UPPER NYACK PROPERTY OWNER CERTIFICATION 

Inc. Village of Upper Nyack
County of Rockland
State of New York
Property Owner: Adam Budgor and Soraya Scroggins
Certifies that he/she resides at
11 Tompkins Court, Upper Nyack, NY
and that he/she is the owner of all that certain lot, parcel of land and/or building located at

## 11 Tompkins Court, Upper Nyack, NY

and proposed construction will be performed in accordance with the New York State Building Code; in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance of the Incorporated Village of Upper Nyack; and in accordance with plans and specifications submitted herewith.

Signature
Date

## STATEMENT BELOW ONLY TO BE FILLED OUT IN THE EVENT THIS

 APPLICATION IS MADE BY PERSON OTHER THAN OWNER OF PROPERTYInc. Village of Upper Nyack
County of Rockland
State of New York
Agent Name:
 N.IIiamo 10 being duly sworn deposes and says:
That is the owner of the land that is the subject of this permit. The deponent is duly authorized to make this application by said owner.
That the proposed work is authorized by said owner.
Agent Signature:


Sworn to before me this


2022
(Notary Public)

## APPLICATION REVIEW FORM

## PART

Name of Municipality VILLAGE of UpPER NYGCK Date $4 / 25 / 22$ Please check all that apply:


Project Name: STTE PLAA - PROAECT GOOSE

## Tax Map Designation:

| Section 60.14 | Block | $\operatorname{Lot}(s) 12.7$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Section | Block | $\operatorname{Lot}(s)$ |



Project Description: (If additional space required, please attach a narrative summary.)

PLAN MPMAUALS; SEE ATTACHED NARRATVE.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## APPLICATION REVIEW FORM

## If subdivision:

1) Is any variance from the subdivision pegulations required? $\qquad$
2) Is any open space being offered? If so, what amount? $\qquad$
3) Is this a standard or average density subdivision?

If sitte plan:

1) Existing square footage $\qquad$
2) Total square footage
3) Number of dwelling units $\qquad$ 1
If special permit, list special permit use and what the property will be used for.
$\qquad$

## Environmental Constraints:

Are there slopes greater tham 25\%? If yes, please indicate the amount and show the gross and net area. YES - SHOWN IN SIFE PLAN

* Are there streamas on the site? If yes, please provide the names. No

Are there wetlamdls on the site? If yes, please provide the names and type. No

* adjacent to htuson river

Project History: Has this project ever been reviewed before? No
If so, provide a narrative, including the list case number, name, date, and the board(s) you appeared before, and the status of any previous approvals.


List tax map section, block \& lot numbers for all other abutting properties in the same ownership as this project.

## NA

## APPLICATION REVIEW FORM



## General Municipal Law Review:

This property is within 500 feet of:
(Check all that apply)
If ANY TTEM IS CHECKED, A REVIEW MUST BE DONE BY THE ROCKLAND COUNTY COMMISSIONER OF Planning under the State General Municipal Law, Sections $239 \mathrm{~L}, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{~N}$, and Ni.

|  | State or County Road |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Long Path | State or County Park |  |
| $X$ | Municipal Boundary | County Stream |

List names) of facility checked above. HWOSN RIVER -TOWN of
CLARESTOWN
Referral Agencies: (Please make sure that the appropriate agencies as needed received copies of your application and plans for their review.)
RC Highway Department $\qquad$ RC Division of Environmental Resources RC Drainage Agency NYS Dept. of Transportation NYS Thruway Authority
 RC Dept. of Health

Adjacent Municipality $\qquad$
$\qquad$ NYS Dept. of Environmental Conservation
$\qquad$ Other MYS DIV $\square$ Palisades Interstate Park Comm.
$\square$ DIV. COAStal RESOURCES
**All applicants must send copies of their applications and plans to:
Orange and Rockland, Regional manager, 75 West Route 59, Spring Valley, NY 10997.

## APPLICATION REVIEW FORM

## PART II

## Application before the Zoning Board of Appeals

Application, petition or request is hereby submitted for:
$\boxed{\square}$ Variance from the requirement of $\operatorname{section} \frac{6.7 .1 .1,6.7 .1 .2,6.7 .1 .3}{4.4 .2, \text { ROW } 4,606.11}$ (FAR)

$\square$ Review of an administrative decision of the Building Inspector;
$\square$ An order to issue a Certificate of Occupancy;
$\square$ An order to issue a Building Permit;
$\square$ An interpretation of the Zoning Ordinance or Map;
(1) Certification of an existing non-conforming structure or use;Other (explain)

To permit construction, maintenance or use of


If an area variance is required, please fill out below:

This application seeks a variance from the provisions of Article (SCE below) , Section (s) - - Specifically, the applicant seeks a _ (SEE BELOW)
(side yard, lot area, height, etc.) of (SEE bELOW) (feet, height, floor area ratio, etc.)

1. dismiabance to slopes (allenteqories)
2. MAX, flooR ALEA KADO
3. Max, BLDG. COVEXAGE
4. Max. Development Coverage
5. Existing Conditions Survey

September 28, 2021


28 | 11 Tompkins Court: 4. Existing Conditions Survey

## 5. Tax Map



## 6. Deed

# BARGAIN AND SALE DEED WITH COVENANT AGAINST GRANTOR'S ACTS (INDIVIDUAL OR CORPORATION) <br> FORM 8002 (short version), FORM 8007 (long version) 

CAUTION: THIS AGREEMENT SHOULD BE PREPARED BY AN ATTORNEY AND REVIEWED BY ATTORNEYS FOR SELLER AND PURCHASER BEFORE SIGNING.
THIS INDENTURE, made the $3^{5}$ day of November, 2021

## BETWEEN

## DELTA EAST HOLDINGS, LLC,

with an address of 11 Tompkins Court, Upper Nyack, New York 10960, party of the first part, and
SORAYA SCROGGINS and ADAM BUDGOR, wite i husband residing at 30 West Street, Apt. 26E, New York, New York 10004, party of the second part;

WITNESSETH, that the party of the first part, in consideration of One Dollar and No Cents ( $\$ 1.00$ ), lawful money of the United States, paid by the party of the second part, does hereby grant and release unto the party of the second part, the heirs or successors and assigns of the party of the second part forever;
$A L L$ that certain plot, piece or parcel of land, with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the, Village of Upper Nyack, Town of Clarkstown, County of Rockland and State of New York, and more particularly described as follows:

## SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE "A"

TOGETHER with all right, title and interest, if any, of the party of the first part in and to any streets and roads abutting the above described premises to the center lines thereof,

TOGETHER with the appurtenances and all the estate and rights of the party of the first part in and to said premises,

BEING and intended to be the same premises conveyed to Delta East Holdings, LLC, by Deed from Susan Frazier, on April 21, 2017, and recorded in the Office of the Rockland County Clerk on May 3, 2017 under Instrument No. 2017-00014530.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the premises herein granted unto the party of the second part, the heirs or successors and assigns of the party of the second part forever.

AND the party of the first part, covenants that the party of the first part has not done or suffered anything whereby the said premises have been encumbered in any way whatever, except as aforesaid.

AND the party of the first part, in compliance with Section 13 of the Lien Law, covenants that the party of the first part will receive the consideration for this conveyance and will hold the right to receive such consideration as a trust fund to be applied first for the purpose of paying the cost of the improvement and will apply the same first to the payment of the cost of the improvement before using any part of the total of the same for any other purpose.

MEISTER ABSTRACT CORP<br>as Agent for<br>Stewart Title Insurance Company<br>OWNER'S POLICY<br>SCHEDULE A DESCRIPTION

ALL that certain plot, piece or parcel of land with the buildings and improvements thereon erected, situate, lying and being in the Village of Upper Nyack, Town of Clarkstown, County of Rockland and State of New York and being shown and designated as Lot 7 on a certain map entitled, "Rose Subdivision, Village of Upper Nyack, Rockland County, New York" and filed in the Rockland County Clerk's Office on July 9, 1999 in Book 120 of Maps at Page 11 as Map No. 7279.

FOR INFORMATION ONLY:
Premises known as and by 11 Tompkins Court, Nyack, New York;
Being Section: 60.14, Block: 1, Lot: 12.7; Tax Map of the Village of Upper Nyack, County of Rockland, State of New York.

The word "party" shall be construed as if it read "parties" whenever the sense of this indenture so requires.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the party of the first part has duly executed this deed the day and year first above written.


DELTA EAST HOLDINGS, LLC BY Paige Koudijs

## IN PRESENCE OF:



Street Address: 11 Tompkins Court Nyack, New York 10960

Return By Mail To:
Peter Klose, Esq.
99 Main Street, Suite 206
Nyack, New York 10960

## Bargain and Sale Deed dated November 3, 2021



7. Site

7a. Site Plan

DRAWINGS PREPARED FOR

## PROJECT GOOSE SITE PLAN

## VILLAGE OF UPPER NYACK

## ROCKLAND COUNTY, NEW YORK

## OWNER:

ADAM BUDGOR \& SORAYA SCROGGINS
11 TOMPKINS COURT
UPPER NYACK NY 10960

## APPLICANT:

ADAM BUDGOR \& SORAYA SCROGGINS
11 TOMPKINS COURT
UPPER NYACK NY 10960

## SITE ENGINEER:

brooker engineering p.l.l.c.
74 LAFAYETTE AVENUE, SUITE 501
SUFFERN, NEW YORK 10901
(845) 357-4411

## LAND SURVEYOR:

JAY A. GREENWELL, PLS, LLC
34 WAYNE AVE, NND. FLOOR
34 WAYNE AVE, 2ND.
SUFFERN, NY 10901
SUFFERN, NY 10901

## ARCHITECT:

ARNES COY ARCHITECTS
1936 MONTAUK HIGHWAY
po box 763
RIDGEHAMPTON, NY 11932
(631) 537-3555

## ATTORNEY:

DONALD BRENNER, P.E., LL.B.
4 INDEPENDENCE AVENUE
TAPPAN, NY 10983
PHONE: (845) 359-2210

## LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT:

AGUARDIA DESIGN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT
38 scuttle hole road
WATER MILL, NY 119
(631)-726-1478


DRAWNG LST:


Notes:








Figure 5.41 Profile of a typical rain garden

$\frac{\text { RAIN GARDEN DETAIL }}{\text { N.T.S. }}$


## 7b. Existing Development Coverage



7c. Proposed Development Coverage


44 | 11 Tompkins Court: 7. Site

7d. Proposed Building Coverage


7e. Proposed FAR




7f. Existing Slope Map
Dated April 18, 2022
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8. Architecture Plan








[^2]


9. Landscape Plan



10. Current Dwelling and Landscape Photos

10a. Rose Subdivision from the Hudson River


10b. Existing Dwelling Aesthetics
Western view, front
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Southeastern view, rear
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Northeastern view, rear
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[^3]10c. Existing Unmaintained Landscape and Drainage Issues


Erosion area on Hudson River
~1,300 sq. ft. - >40\% slope


Drainage issue, southern side
~1,100 sq. ft. - 15 to 24\% slope


Drainage issue, northern side ~800 sq. ft. - 15 to 40\% slope
11. Dwelling and Landscape Renderings

Western view, front
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Southeastern view, rear


Northeastern view, rear


76 | 11 Tompkins Court: 11. Dwelling and Landscape Renderings


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Lot 7 area is comprised of 36,108 square feet of Dry Land and 61,522 square feet of Land Underwater. Lot 7 is a part of an average density subdivision as filed 7/9/1999 on Map 7279, Book 120 Page 11. The subdivision includes a conveyance of the lands underwater via a Letters Patent dated July 23, 1873, recorded in Book 42 of Patents at page 297 which conveyed the 6.099-acre parcel of land (as well as others) to Mr. Voorhis. The Office of General Services has affirmed that the New York State has no interest in the lands under water and that they were legally and appropriately conveyed for the purposes of commerce or the beneficial enjoyment to the landowner.

[^1]:    Meeting was adjourned 9:17 pm.

[^2]:    
     $==$
    
    

    BARNES
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