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$$
\text { Proceedings - } 356 \text { Roselle Avenue }
$$ CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Good evening, everybody. The first case on the calendar tonight has been assigned Case Number 2 of 2024. It's the case of Joshua and Gila Jedwab, the applicant, of a parcel known as 356 Roselle Avenue and designated as Section 39/Block 120/Lot 35 in a R1 zone. The applicant proposes to maintain an in-ground pool. The applicant seeks variances from Cedarhurst Code Section 265-125, Location Restricted.

This Board has determined that the application is a Type II Action pursuant to Section 617.3 of the New York State Department of Environmental Control Regulations and does not require an Environmental Impact Statement. The village attorney will now read a statement into the record.

MS. WRUBEL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, for the record, we have been provided with proof of the mailing and publication in the local newspaper of record, of all notices of this hearing as required by law. Accordingly, jurisdiction has been

Proceedings - 356 Roselle Avenue obtained over all necessary parties, and this Board has jurisdiction to hear this appeal. Pursuant to New York State General Municipal Law Section 809, on November 9, 2024, a non-collusion affidavit has been duly executed by the applicant, Andrew S. Braum PE, wherein he stated that there are no other persons or entities involved in this application that are employed by or connected to the Village of Cedarhurst, its officers, or employees, which would in any way constitute a conflict under the law. Pursuant to an agreement between the Village of Cedarhurst and Nassau County Planning Commission, the Nassau County Planning Commission has been given notice of this application and recommended that the village of Cedarhurst take action as it deems appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Will the owner or its representative please step forward. Please state your name. MR. BRAUM: Andrew Braum, B-R-A-U-M.
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1924 Bellmore Avenue, Bellmore, New York
11710.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Who are you in relation to the case?

MR. BRAUM: I am an engineer.
Good evening, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Andrew Braum. I am an engineer, and $I$ am representing Mr. Jedwab and his family this evening.

As the chairman mentioned, we are seeking your approval to maintain an existing swimming pool that was recently installed. The proposed plan that $I$ created for the homeowner met and exceeded all of the local requirements, both zoning and Building Code. And when a final survey was done, it came to everyone's attention that the pool was installed too close to the rear property line. Ten feet is what's required in the rear, and at one point in the pool it's 7.9 feet.

So Mr. Jedwab hired a licensed and installed contractor who, from the best of our knowledge, measured off of an existing fence that was not on the property line, not getting

Proceedings - 356 Roselle Avenue
the pool staked or contacting me or figuring out where the exact property line is. If you notice, the as-built survey, which is provided on the left-hand side or the north side, the pool does meet the 10 feet, 10.1. That happened -- if you look on the right-hand side, it is 7.9 feet, and that's the reason we are here in front of you. If you measure to the fence, you get that 10 feet.

So essentially this was not done intentionally. It was not a trick to deceive this board and seek your approval after. The homeowner is here tonight if the Board has any questions for him, but essentially we are seeking your approval to maintain and leave this swimming pool that was partially installed, not meeting the rear setback requirement.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Is that fence still in the same place, or has the fence moved also?

MR. BRAUM: So the fence is currently in
that location. However, it's not -- does not meet the building code requirement for a fence

Proceedings - 356 Roselle Avenue
which must be on the subject property and in control by that subject homeowner. So the new plans that we provided to your Building Department show a proposed fence being installed on the property line or on Mr. Jedwab's property, which would make it in conformance with the building code.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Gotcha. Thank you.
Do you have any questions? Any questions? Okay. Thank you. You can sit down. Anybody in the audience would like to speak in favor of or against this application? Okay. I will make a motion to accept this testimony that this was an honest mistake, and due to the fact that it's an existing condition, there is no complaints from the neighbors, I make a motion to approve the previous variance. MR. SHTEIERMAN: I second the motion. MR. CLARK: Approved. MR. BLEIBERG: Approved. MS. EDELMAN: Approved. CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: So approved. MR. BRAUM: Thank you. Have a good evening.
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Proceedings - 570 Peninsula Boulevard Associates LLC
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Go straight to the
next case.
The second case on the calendar tonight
has been assigned Case Number 7 of 2023 and is
the application of 570 Peninsula Boulevard,
the applicant of a parcel known as 566-570
Peninsula and designated as Section 39/Block
$277 /$ Lots 17-A, 126, 127, 131-B in an R1 zone.
The applicant proposes to construct a
one-story medical building with onsite
parking.
The applicant came before this Board on
March 23, 2023 to seek variances from
Cedarhurst Code Sections 265-33, permitted
use, and 265-40.A and B, front yards. At such
time the Board continued the hearing so the
applicant could present before the Town of
Hempstead where the majority of this project
sits. The site plan was modified due to the
comments of the neighbors at the Cedarhurst
variance. The Town of Hempstead granted the
applicant's requests on a hearing held on
November 29, 2023 with a decision date of
December 6, 2023 .
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The village attorney will now read a statement into the record.

MS. WRUBEL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board, for the record, we have been provided with proof of the mailing and publication in the local newspaper of record, of all notices of this hearing as required by law. Accordingly, jurisdiction has been obtained over all necessary parties, and this Board has jurisdiction to hear this appeal. Pursuant to New York State General Municipal Law Section 809, on January 5, 2023, a non-collusion affidavit has been duly executed by the applicant, David E. Samai, wherein he stated that there are no other persons or entities involved in this application that are employed by or connected to the Village of Cedarhurst, its officers, or employees, which would in any way constitute a conflict under the law.

Pursuant to an agreement between the Village of Cedarhurst and Nassau County Planning Commission, the Nassau County Planning Commission has been given notice of Proceedings - 570 Peninsula Boulevard Associates LLC this application and recommended that the village of Cedarhurst take action as it deems appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Board.
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: The applicant or its representative, please step forward.

MR. BROWNE: Hello, good evening, chairman, members. Christian Browne, McLaughlin \& Stern, 1122 Franklin Avenue, Garden City for the applicant.

Mr. Chairman, as you noted in your brief comments before, this case has already been before this Board. It was presented back in March. At that time there was some comments made, some modifications were ultimately made to the site plan, and now we are back. Then we went to the Town of Hempstead because as has been noted, the vast majority of this property line lies within the jurisdiction of the town. There is only about a 10-foot strip that is within the jurisdiction of this village that runs along the Peninsula Boulevard frontage.

So after we presented, this Board asked
Proceedings - 570 Peninsula Boulevard Associates LLC us to take care of obtaining the necessary variances from the town before the village board, you know, would continue proceeding. So we have done that. The town granted unanimously -- Town of Hempstead Board of Appeals granted unanimously all of the requested variances back in December of 2023. And we are now back before you hoping to complete the process.

As again noted, there is only about a 10-foot strip of this site, which is within the village's jurisdiction. It's entirely along the Peninsula Boulevard frontage, and what is proposed, there is 9 parking spaces and a portion of the office building which comes -- which runs along Branch Boulevard and comes out to the corner at Peninsula Boulevard. So there is a section of the one-story office building that is within your jurisdiction. The zoning that applies -CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: The southeast corner, correct?

MR. BROWNE: That's correct. The zoning that applies here is residential zoning, which
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I guess is just, you know, sort of an accident
of the code that the residential zone which is
generally around this area encroaches to the
village border. But as you all know and has
been repeatedly discussed here, this has
always been a commercial site. It's been a
long-time dilapidated commercial business
site, and now we are proposing to put this
one-story medical office building on it.
After the comments from the neighbors,
the site plan was modified so that there
wouldn't be any ingress or egress out onto
Oakland Avenue $I$ believe that is, and we do
have more than enough parking. We actually
slightly exceed the parking requirements so we
did not require a parking variance from the
town in terms of the number of spaces, and in
fact, the town actually thought we had too
many spots, but we told them the village had
expressed a preference for as much parking as
possible, so we stuck with the site plan as
presented to you. Otherwise, all the
variances at the town, in my opinion, were
also minor and technical and they were

Proceedings - 570 Peninsula Boulevard Associates LLC approved. And so if you see fit to approve your portion to allow us to have this parking in just this chunk of the building that's in Cedarhurst, the project can proceed and the site will be improved accordingly.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Your variance for permitted use which we said is residential now, what is the -- there was a setback I believe, right? The second variance was a setback.

MR. BROWNE: I have to check. It's a front yard setback because we come to the lot line, and again this is -- the setbacks are dictated by the residential zoning, so it's intended for a house, but as you know, this building, you know, it's situated in such a way running along Branch Boulevard as to allow maximum, you know, use of the lot for parking and it's very modest. It's a one-story building.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Mr. Yarnell, the lot line, the lot line rule for commercial -- is there a setback?

MR. YARNELL: Yes. Yes. I will get
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that to you. I want to see what section on
that, but I will get that.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Can you just describe the ingress and egress?

MR. BROWNE: Sure. There would be a curb cut on Peninsula. Located off the corner. You could see it's sort of just adjacent to the building. You come in and you would have access to two-way traffic to go the length of the lot. Parallel to Branch and you would also be able to exit out onto Branch Boulevard through what was formally Third Street.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Because the drawing doesn't show --

MR. SHTEIERMAN: It's on the easement. MR. BROWNE: I stand corrected. Everything will come in through Third Street. CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Perfect. Thank you. MR. YARNELL: Chairman, if this property was in the general business zone, the front yard setback would require a 5 -foot setback. CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: So it's a variance for that? It's a variance for that?
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MR. YARNELL: It's an R1 zone, so if you
use the R1 intended like counselor said, it
would really be --
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: But even if it's
commercial, they would have to seek a variance
also for the 5.
MR. BROWNE: Yes.
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Is that your case?
MR. BROWNE: So that's the case unless
you have further questions.
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Anybody in the Board
have any questions?
MR. SHTEIERMAN: What's your proposed
setback?
MR. BROWNE: It goes to the lot line on
out to the corner.
MR. SHTEIERMAN: Because it's not drawn
on the lot line.
MR. FLAUM: It's a skew. Good evening,
members of the Board. Shmuel Flaum, 194
Wanser Avenue, Inwood, New York 11096 . The
property is not a perfect 90 degrees at the
corner but it's a skew, but the building is
straight so it tapers as it goes towards the
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corner.

MR. SHTEIERMAN: That's on Branch?
MR. FLAUM: Correct. It's at the property line furthest away from Peninsula, and then because the property line tapers because it's not a straight road, its distance is $I$ would say a foot and a half, maybe a little bit more, 2 feet from the property line.

MR. SHTEIERMAN: Understood. I am asking about the facade on Peninsula Boulevard. Is that on the property line, or is there a setback there?

MR. FLAUM: No. It says there 1-foot-6. I have it on my $T-101$ sheet. Do you see it?

MR. SHTEIERMAN: No.
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: It's not on the site plan.

MR. SHTEIERMAN: It's not on our drawings. So 1-foot-6.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Anybody in the audience would like to speak in favor or against the application? Please state your name and address.
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MR. SOKOLOW: Good evening, members of the Board. My name is Mark Sokolow, S-O-K-O-L-O-W. I live at 624 Oakland Avenue, which is like right behind this lot. I am also speaking this evening for Mrs. Kuritzky who is also adjacent. She lives on Branch. She is the first direct neighbor right off on the other side of what's called Third Street on this plan. She is in Florida.

So I understand the limited nature of this hearing this evening, and $I$ am not objecting conceptually to this use of the building. But a couple of issues that we had, and $I$ do appreciate and the neighbors appreciate that we changed -- applicant changed the egress and ingress off of Oakland onto Branch, which was good.

The issues that we have are a couple. One, the garbage is designated to be like right at the edge or as close to Mrs. Kuritzky's property as possible. She is very concerned about that, the dumpsters being right there next to her property. And I am not sure exactly where to place them -- that's
Proceedings - 570 Peninsula Boulevard Associates LLC really on the applicant -- but maybe somewhere on Peninsula or right behind the building close to Peninsula would be more appropriate. The other issue we have is that they put the egress and ingress solely on Branch on what was Third Street, which is right -- happens to be opposite the HALB school which generates a lot of traffic in the morning and in the afternoon and you have all these cars coming in and out over there. Both of these problems could have been solved if the applicant might have been a little bit more receptive to another suggestion.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Can $I$ interrupt for a second? That's not even on our radar. We are not -- this is not -- that was approved by the Town of Hempstead so we can't -- I mean, we could listen, but that part of the property -and Wayne, correct me if $I$ am wrong -- is not in our jurisdiction and we are not even hearing that part of the case tonight. MR. YARNELL: Correct. CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: I hope you brought it up with the Town of Hempstead.
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MR. SOKOLOW: We tried, yes. Counsel mentioned it's always been a commercial property on Peninsula, and again, I don't know why this building has been situated the way it is on Branch. What would be more logical and consistent with the way the neighborhood has been for over 40 years since we lived here is that the building would have been placed on Peninsula where all the current commercial buildings are. That would be within your jurisdiction and that then --

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: But again, that's not the case before us today. That's not the application.

MR. SOKOLOW: Well, then $I$ would ask respectfully --

MR. SHTEIERMAN: Wayne, it's only 10
feet that are in our jurisdiction? So if they are located on Peninsula, they would need a much larger variance from Cedarhurst.

MR. SOKOLOW: But you have commercial property.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Unfortunately, this is not the jurisdiction for that right now.
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MR. SOKOLOW: We have all these
properties that have been that way for 40
years. I am just saying that gratuitously.
It would solve the garbage issue, it would
solve the ingress/egress issue.
The only other thing $I$ would mention
that we brought up before, $I$ don't see it on
the plans. Maybe it's going to be there, to
establish an appropriate buffer of trees, tall
trees, bushes, or fencing.
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Where?

MR. SOKOLOW: Well, it would be number one adjacent to Mrs. Kuritzky's property where Third Street is where you have the ingress or egress.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Is she adjacent or there is a street between her and the property?

MR. SOKOLOW: It's a street that's been abandoned.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: But it's not being used.

MR. SOKOLOW: What we should like to see is some buffer or bushes because you have all
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these cars going in and out.
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: You have to be
careful. There is safety issues, so I am not
going to rule on that. Wayne, does this go
for Design?
MR. YARNELL: If $I$ can say, I think
really the only -- when he is talking about in
reference to bushes $I$ think under your
jurisdiction it really could only be in the
10-foot portion that you guys have
jurisdiction. Any planned plantings, fencing,
trees that fall on the Town of Hempstead's
jurisdiction would be their purview, not
Cedarhurst, so really the only place where
bushes in that 10 -foot buffer area would be
would be at the corner of Oakland and
Peninsula, and it's probably in the site line
triangle.
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Is the whole front
strip ours?
MR. YARNELL: Yes.
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: From Branch to
Oakland?
MR. YARNELL: Yes.
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CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Okay, gotcha.
MR. SOKOLOW: I am talking about trees,
wherever you have the parking, and you have
the parking which is right in my backyard
essentially.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: But again, you are not in the village of Cedarhurst. We can't dictate what goes on in the Town of Hempstead. I can't.

MR. SOKOLOW: Okay. Well, then I think that's --

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
MR. SOKOLOW: Well, thank you very much.
MR. BROWNE: This did come up at the town. Third Street, it was formerly a street. It's now been -- it's basically a driveway. There is a neighbor who lives on the other side of it.

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: The north side?
MR. BROWNE: The north side on Branch. The doctor as part of his plan is going to put new fencing, clean up that area, there will be some plantings there to make the office look
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nice. The dumpster -- just for your
knowledge, the Town of Hempstead insists that
these businesses show, quote, unquote,
dumpsters. None of them ever has it. It's
the Town insists you show something. This
isn't a restaurant. Obviously they are not
going to be putting out smelly waste or
anything like that so there won't be any
garbage near the neighbor.
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Where is the entrance
to the building?
MR. FLAUM: It's on the south side on
Peninsula.
MR. SHTEIERMAN: From the parking lot.
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: On the corner of --
MR. FLAUM: There is a private entrance
for personnel on the north side but the main
entrance --
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: -- is on Peninsula.
MR. BROWNE: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Anybody else have
anything? We will take a three-minute break.
(Recess taken.)
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: We had a private
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session in order to discuss an issue with
counsel. Before we take a vote, I would like
to know if there is any members of the Board
that have any comments or any proposals, any
modifications?
MR. SHTEIERMAN: I just want to clarify
the existing building is set back 14.7 feet.
Right? You are proposing -- Mr. Flaum?
MR. BROWNE: The answer is yes.
MR. FLAUM: Yes.
MR. SHTEIERMAN: Okay. I propose that
we provide the minimum required setback as
would be required in a commercial zone of 5
feet even though this is an $R 1$ which requires
a 25-foot setback. We are not asking for
them, but $I$ propose in the spirit of the
character of the neighborhood 5-foot front
yard just along Peninsula, which means you
have to set back the building another 3 and a
half feet. It's not really a question. It's
just what $I$ propose to the Board.
MR. FLAUM: I think it's doable.
MR. BROWNE: But that does not affect
the parking spots?

CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Correct. Just the building itself.

So the motion in front of us right now is to approve the variance as -- approve the variance with a modification requiring the building be set back on the Peninsula Boulevard side 5 feet from the property line. Take a vote to approve the variance as modified.

MR. BLEIBERG: Approved as modified.
MR. SHTEIERMAN: Approved as modified.
MR. CLARK: Approved as modified.
MS. EDELMAN: Approved as modified.
CHAIRMAN KRENGEL: Approved as modified. (Time noted: 7:32 p.m.)

I, YAFFA KAPLAN, a Notary Public within and for the State of New York, do hereby certify that the foregoing record of proceedings is a full and correct transcript of the stenographic notes taken by me therein.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 4 th day of March, 2024 .

| 1 | 8 | B |  | $\text { corner }[8]-5: 18,5: 22 \text {, }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1-foot-6 [2] - 10:15, } \\ & \text { 10:21 } \end{aligned}$ | 809 [1]-3:13 | backyard ${ }_{[1]}$ - 16:5 <br> behind [2] - 11:5, 12:3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 12:22, 13:14 } \\ \text { Case }[1]-2: 5 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 15:17, } 17: 16 \\ \text { correct }[7]-5: 23, \end{gathered}$ |
| 10 [1] - 13:18 | 9 | between [2]-3:22, | Cedarhurst [11] - 1:7, | 5:24, 10:4, 12:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10-foot }[4]-4: 21, \\ & 5: 12,15: 11,15: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $9_{\text {[1] - 5:15 }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:18 } \\ & \text { bit [2] }-10: 9,12: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 8,2: 15,2: 21,3: 19, \\ & 3: 23,4: 3,7: 5,13: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12: 23,19: 2,20: 10 \\ \text { corrected }[1]-8: 18 \end{gathered}$ |
| $11096{ }_{[1]}-9: 22$ | 90[1]-9:23 | Bldg [1] - 1:20 | 15:15, 16:8 | counsel [2]-13:2, |
| 1122 [1]-4:10 |  | BLEIBERG [2]-1:15, | certify [1]-20:9 | 18:3 |
| 126[1]-2:9 | A | 19:11 | Chairman [4]-1:14, | counselor [1] - 9:3 |
| 127 [1]-2:9 |  | BLVD [1] - 1:4 | 3:4, 4:5, 4:12 | COUNTY [1] - 20:5 |
| 131-B [1] - 2:9 | abandoned ${ }_{[1]}-14: 21$ | Blvd [1]-1:5 | chairman [2]-4:9, | County [2] - 3:23, 3:24 |
| 14.7 [1] - 18:8 | able [1] - 8:12 | board [1] - 5:4 | 8:21 | couple [2]-11:14, |
| 17-A [1]-2:9 | access [1] - 8:10 | Board [17] - 1:15, | CHAIRMAN ${ }_{\text {[35] }}-2: 2$, | 11:19 |
| 194 [1] - 9:21 | accident $[1]-6: 2$ <br> accordingly [2] - 3:9, | 1:16, 1:17, 1:18, $2: 13,2: 17,3: 5,3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 6,5: 22,7: 7,7: 22, \\ & 8: 4,8: 15,8: 20,8: 24, \end{aligned}$ | curb [1]-8:7 <br> current $[1]-13$ : |
| 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 7: 6 \\ & \text { action }[1]-4: 3 \end{aligned}$ | $4: 5,4: 14,4: 25,5: 6,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9: 5,9: 9,9: 12,10: 18, \\ & 10: 22,12: 15,12: 24, \end{aligned}$ | cut [1]-8:7 |
| $2[1]$ - 10:9 | address [1] - 10:25 | 18:4, 18:22 | 13:13, 13:24, 14:12, | D |
| 200[1]-1:7 | adjacent [4]-8:9, | border ${ }_{[1]}-6: 5$ | 14:17, 14:22, 15:3, |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2023[6]-2: 5,2: 14, \\ & 2: 24,2: 25,3: 13,5: 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 7,14: 14,14: 17 \\ & \text { affect }[1]-18: 24 \end{aligned}$ | Boulevard [9] - 2:6, 4:24, 5:14, 5:17 | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 20,15: 23,16: 2, \\ & 16: 7,16: 13,16: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { date }_{[1]}-2: 24 \\ & \text { DAVID }_{[1]}-1: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2024[2]-1:10, 20:14 | affidavit [1] - 3:14 | 5:19, 7:18, 8:13, | 17:11, 17:16, 17:20, | David [1] - 3:15 |
| $22[1]-1: 10$ | afternoon [1]-12:10 | 10:13, 19:8 | 17:22, 17:25, 19:2, | December [2]-2:25, |
| 23 [1]-2:14 | agreement [1] - 3:22 | Branch [11]-5:17, | 19:15 | 5:8 |
| 25-foot [1] - 18:16 | allow [2]-7:3, 7:18 | 7:18, 8:11, 8:12, | changed [2]-11:16, | decision [1]-2:24 |
| 265-33 [1]-2:15 | answer ${ }_{[1]}$ - 18:10 | 10:3, 11:7, 11:18, | 11:17 | deems [1]-4:3 |
| 265-40.A [1]-2:16 | appeal [1] - 3:11 | 12:6, 13:6, 15:23, | character ${ }_{[1]}$ - 18:18 | degrees [1]-9:23 |
| 277/Lots [1] - 2:9 | Appeals [1] - 5:7 | 16:22 | check [1]-7:12 | Dept [1] - 1:20 |
| 29 [1]-2:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { applicant }[11]-1: 5, \\ & 2: 7,2: 10,2: 13,2: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { break }_{[1]}-17: 23 \\ & \text { brief }_{[1]}-4: 12 \end{aligned}$ | Christian [1]-4:9 chunk [1]-7:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { describe }_{[1]}-8: 4 \\ & \text { Design }_{[1]}-15: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3 | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 15,4: 6,4: 11 \\ & 11: 16,12: 2,12: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { brought }[2]-12: 24, \\ & 14: 8 \end{aligned}$ | City [1] - 4:11 <br> clarify [1] - 18:7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { designated [2] - 2:8, } \\ & 11: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3 [1] - 18:20 | applicant's [1]-2:23 | BROWNE [13] - 4:8, | CLARK [2]-1:16, | dictate [1] - 16:9 |
| 39/Block [1] - 2:8 | APPLICATION ${ }_{[1]}$ - $1: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 24,7: 12,8: 6,8: 18, \\ & 9: 8,9: 10,9: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:13 } \\ & \text { clean [1] }-16: 24 \end{aligned}$ | dictated [1]-7:15 dilapidated [1]-6:8 |
| 4 | application [5]-2:6, 3:18, 4:2, 10:24, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:16, 16:22, 17:21, } \\ & 18: 10,18: 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { close }[2]-11: 21,12: 4 \\ & \text { code }[1]-6: 3 \end{aligned}$ | direct ${ }_{[1]}$ - 11:8 <br> discuss [1] - 18:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 40 [2]-13:8, 14:3 } \\ & \text { 4th [1] }-20: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 13:15 <br> applies [2]-5:21, 5:25 | Browne [1] - 4:9 buffer [3] - 14:10, $14 \cdot 25,15 \cdot 16$ | Code [1]-2:15 collusion [1] - 3:14 coming ${ }_{[1]}-12: 10$ | discussed [1] - 6:6 <br> Discussion [1]-16:14 |
| 5 | 11:16 |  | comments [5]-2:21, | distance [1] - 10:7 doable [1] - 18:23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5[4]-3: 13,9: 7,18: 14, \\ & 19: 8 \end{aligned}$ | appropriate [3] - 4:4, $12: 4,14: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 16,5: 20,6: 10,7: 4, \\ & 7: 17,7: 21,8: 9,9: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4:13, 4:15, 6:11, } \\ & 18: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { doctor }{ }_{[1]}-16: 23 \\ & \text { done }{ }_{[1]}-5: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 5-foot [2] - | approve [4]-7:2, | 11:14, 12:3, 13:5, | commercial [8]-6:7, | drawing [1] -8:15 |
| $566-570[2]-1: 5,2: 7$ | approved $[7]-7: 2$, | $13: 9,17: 12,18: 8$, $18: 20,19: 3,19: 7$ | 6:8, 7:23, 9:6, 13:3, 13:10, 13:22, 18:14 | drawings $[1]$ - 10:21 |
| 570 [2]-1:4, 2:6 | 12:17, 19:11, 19:12, | buildings [1] - 13:11 | Commission [2] - | drawn [1]-9:18 driveway $[1]-16: 18$ |
| 6 | 19:13, 19:14, 19:15 area $[3]-6: 4,15: 16$, | bushes [4]-14:11, <br> 14:25, 15:9, 15:16 | complete [1] - 5:10 | due [1] - 2:20 <br> duly [1]-3:14 |
|  |  | business [2] - 6:8, 8:22 | conceptually [1] - 11:13 | dumpster [1] - 17:2 |
| $624_{[1]}-11: 4$ | assigned ${ }_{[1]}-2: 5$ ASSOCIATES [1] | businesses [1] - 17:4 | concerned [1] - 11:23 $^{\text {che }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dumpsters [2] - 11:23, } \\ & \text { 17:5 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 7 | attorney [1] - 3:2 <br> Attorney ${ }_{[1]}$ - 1:19 | C | conflict [1] - 3:21 <br> connected ${ }^{[1]}$ - 3:18 | E |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7[1]-2: 5 \\ & 7: 06[1]-1: 11 \\ & 7: 32[1]-19: 16 \end{aligned}$ | audience [1] - 10:23 <br> Avenue [5] - 1:7, 4:10, <br> 6:14, 9:22, 11:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { calendar }[1]-2: 4^{\text {care }_{[1]}-5: 2} \\ & \text { careful }_{[1]}-15: 4 \\ & \text { cars }_{[2]}-12: 10,15: 2 \end{aligned}$ | consistent [1]-13:7 <br> constitute [1] - 3:20 <br> construct $\left.{ }_{[1]}\right]-2: 10$ <br> continue [1]-5:4 <br> continued [1] - 2:17 | ```easement [1] - 8:17 EDELMAN[2]-1:17, 19:14 edge [1] - 11:21``` |


| egress $[5]-6: 13,8: 5$, |
| :--- |
| $11: 17,12: 6,14: 16$ |
| employed $[1]-3: 18$ |
| employees $[1]-3: 20$ |
| encroaches $[1]-6: 4$ |
| entirely $[1]-5: 13$ |
| entities $[1]-3: 17$ |
| entrance $[3]-17: 11$, |
| $17: 17,17: 19$ |
| essentially $[1]-16: 6$ |
| establish $[1]-14: 10$ |
| evening $[5]-4: 8$, |
| $9: 20,11: 2,11: 6$, |
| $11: 12$ |
| exactly $[1]-11: 25$ |
| exceed $[1]-6: 16$ |
| executed $[1]-3: 15$ |
| existing $[1]-18: 8$ |
| exit $[1]-8: 12$ |
| expressed $[1]-6: 21$ |

F
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15:12, 16:24
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Flaum [2]-9:21, 18:9
Florida [1] - 11:10
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| $\mathbf{G}$ |
| :--- |
| garbage $[3]-11: 20$, |
| 14:5, 17:10 |
| Garden $[1]-4: 11$ |


| ```General [1] - 3:12 general [1]-8:22 generally [1] - 6:4 generates [1]-12:8 given [1] - 3:25 gotcha[1]-16:2 granted [3]-2:22, 5:5, 5:7 gratuitously [1] - 14:4 guess [1]-6:2 guys[1]-15:11``` |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| H |  |
|  | ```HALB [1] - 12:8 half \([2]\) - 10:8, 18:21 hand [1]-20:14 hear [1]-3:11 hearing [5] - 2:17, 2:23, 3:8, 11:12, 12:22 held [1] - \(2: 23\) hello \({ }_{[1]}-4: 8\) Hempstead [8]-2:19, 2:22, 4:18, 5:6, 12:18, 12:25, 16:9, 17:3 Hempstead's [1] - 15:13 hereby [1] - 20:9 hereunto [1]-20:13 hope [1] - 12:24 hoping [1] - 5:9 house [1]-7:16``` |


| $\boldsymbol{I}$ |
| :---: |
| improved $[1]-7: 6$ |
| $\mathbf{I N}_{[2]}-1: 3,20: 13$ |
| ingress $[5]-6: 13,8: 5$, |
| $11: 17,12: 6,14: 15$ |
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Inwood [1] - 9:22
issue $[4]-12: 5,14: 5$,
14:6, 18:2
issues [3]-11:14,
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2:6, 2:8, 4:23, 5:14, $5: 18,8: 7,10: 5$, 10:12, 12:3, 12:4, 13:4, 13:10, 13:20, 15:18, 17:14, 17:20, 18:19, 19:7
perfect [2]-8:20, 9:23 permitted [2]-2:15, 7:8
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place [2]-11:25, 15:15
placed [1] - 13:9
plan $[7]$-2:20, 4:17,
6:12, 6:22, 10:19,
11:10, 16:23
planned [1]-15:12
Planning [2]-3:24, 3:25
plans [1]-14:9
plantings [2]-15:12, 16:25
portion [3]-5:16, 7:3, 15:11
possible [2]-6:22, 11:22
preference ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6:21
present [1]-2:18
presented [3]-4:14, 4:25, 6:23
private [2]-17:17, 17:25
problems [1]-12:11
proceed [1] - 7:5
proceeding ${ }_{[1]}-5: 4$
proceedings $[1]$ -
20:10
process [1]-5:10
project ${ }_{[2]}-2: 19,7: 5$
proof [1]-3:6
properties [1]-14:3
property [15]-4:20,
8:21, 9:23, 10:5, 10:6, 10:9, 10:13, 11:22, 11:24, 12:19, 13:4, 13:23, 14:14, 14:19, 19:8
proposals [1] - 18:5
propose [3]-18:12, 18:17, 18:22
proposed [2]-5:15, 9:14
proposes [1]-2:10
proposing [2]-6:9, 18:9
provide [1]-18:13
provided [1] - 3:6
Public [1]-20:7
publication [1] - 3:7
pursuant ${ }_{[1]}-3: 12$
Pursuant [1]-3:22
purview [1]-15:14
put $[3]-6: 9,12: 5$, 16:23
putting [1] - 17:8

| $\mathbf{Q}$ |
| :--- |
| QUEENS $_{[1]}-20: 5$ |
| questions $[2]-9: 11$, |
| 9:13 |
| quote $[1]-17: 4$ |

$\frac{\mathbf{R}}{\mathbf{R 1}}$

R1 [4]-2:9, 9:2, 9:3, 18:15
RACHEL [1]-1:19
radar [1]-12:16
read [1]-3:2
really $[6]-9: 4,12: 2$,
15:8, 15:10, 15:15,
18:21
receptive ${ }_{[1]}$ - 12:13
recess [1] - 17:24
recommended [1] 4:2
record [6] - 3:3, 3:5,
3:7, 16:13, 16:14, 20:9
reference [1] - 15:9
repeatedly $[1]$ - 6:6
representative ${ }_{[1]}$ 4:7
requested [1] - $5: 8$
requests [1]-2:23
require [2]-6:17, 8:23
required $[3]-3: 8$,
18:13, 18:14
requirements [1] -
6:16
requires [1] - 18:15
requiring ${ }_{[1]}-19: 6$
residential [4]-5:25,
6:3, 7:8, 7:15
respectfully ${ }_{[1]}$ -
13:17
restaurant [1]-17:7
road [1]-10:7
rule [2] - 7:23, 15:5

| running ${ }_{[1]}-7: 18$ runs [2]-4:23, 5:17 | sort [2] - 6:2, 8:8 <br> south [1] - 17:13 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 14:11, } 15: 13,16: 3 \\ \text { triangle }[1]-15: 19 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | spaces [2] - 5:15, 6:18 | two [1] - 8 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { S-O-K-O-L-O-W }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \\ & \text { 11:4 } \end{aligned}$ | spirit [1] - 18:17 <br> spots [2]-6:20, 18:25 | U |
| ```Samai [1]-3:15 school [1] - 12:8 second [3]-2:4, 7:10, 12:16 section [2]-5:19, 8:2 Section [2] - 2:8, 3:13 Sections [1]-2:15 see [6] - 7:2, 8:2, 8:8, 10:16, 14:8, 14:24 seek [2] - 2:14, 9:6 session [1] - 18:2 set \([4]-18: 8,18: 20\), 19:7, 20:14``` | stand ${ }_{[1]}-8: 18$ <br> state [1] - 10:24 <br> STATE ${ }_{[1]}-20: 3$ <br> State [2]-3:12, 20:8 <br> statement ${ }_{[1]}$ - 3:3 <br> stenographic [1] - $20: 11$ <br> step [1]-4:7 <br> Stern [1]-4:10 <br> story [4]-2:11, 5:20, $6: 10,7: 20$ <br> straight $[3]-2: 2,9: 25$, 10:7 | ```ultimately [1] - 4:16 unanimously [2] - 5:6, 5:7 under [2] - 3:21, 15:9 understood [1] - 10:11 unfortunately [1] - 13:24 unless[1] - 9:10 unquote [1]-17:4 up [4]-12:25, 14:8, 16:16, 16:24``` |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { setback }[10]-7: 9, \\ 7: 11,7: 13,7: 24, \end{gathered}$ | Street $[6]-8: 14,8: 19$, $11: 9,12: 7,14: 15$, | V |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:23, 9:15, 10:14, } \\ & \text { 18:13, 18:16 } \\ & \text { setbacks }[1]-7: 14 \\ & \text { sheet }[1]-10: 16 \\ & \text { SHIFRA }_{[1]}-1: 17 \\ & \text { Shmuel }_{[1]}-9: 21 \\ & \text { show }[3]-8: 16,17: 4, \\ & 17: 6 \end{aligned}$ | ```16:17 street[3]-14:18, 14:20, 16:17 strip [3]-4:21, 5:12, 15:21 stuck [1]-6:22 suggestion [1] - 12:14 Supt [1] - 1:20``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { VARIANCE }_{[1]}-1: 2 \\ \text { variance }[11]-2: 22, \\ 6: 17,7: 7,7: 10,8: 24, \\ 8: 25,9: 6,13: 21, \\ \text { 19:5, 19:6, 19:9 } \\ \text { variances }[4]-2: 14, \\ 5: 3,5: 8,6: 24 \\ \text { vast }[1]-4: 19 \end{gathered}$ |
| SHTEIERMAN ${ }^{[13]}$ - <br> 1:18, 8:17, 9:14, 9:18, 10:3, 10:11, 10:17, 10:20, 13:18, 17:15, 18:7, 18:12, 19:12 | T <br> T-101 $[1]-10: 16$ <br> tall $[1]-14: 10$ <br> tapers $[2]-9: 25,10: 6$ | ```Village [3]-1:19, 3:19, 3:23 village [7]-3:2, 4:3, 4:23, 5:3, 6:5, 6:20, 16:8 village's [1] - 5:13``` |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { side }[7]-11: 9,16: 20 \\ & \text { 16:21, 16:22, 17:13, } \\ & \text { 17:18, 19:8 } \end{aligned}$ | technical ${ }_{[1]}-6: 25$ <br> terms ${ }_{[1]}-6: 18$ <br> THE [1]-1:3 | $\frac{\text { vote [2] - 18:3, 19:9 }}{\text { W }}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { site [10]-2:20, 4:17, } \\ & 5: 12,6: 7,6: 9,6: 12, \\ & 6: 22,7: 6,10: 18, \\ & 15: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { therein }[1]-20: 12 \\ & \text { Third }[6]-8: 13,8: 19, \\ & 11: 9,12: 7,14: 15, \\ & 16: 17 \end{aligned}$ | Wanser [1] - 9:22 <br> waste [1]-17:8 <br> WAYNE [1] - 1:20 |
| sits [1]-2:20 <br> situated [2] - 7:17, 13:5 <br> skew [2]-9:20, 9:24 <br> slightly [1] -6:16 <br> smelly [1] - 17:8 | three [1]-17:23 <br> three-minute [1] - 17:23 <br> today ${ }_{[1]}-13: 14$ <br> tonight [2]-2:4, 12:22 <br> towards [1]-9:25 | Wayne [3]-12:20, <br> 13:18, 15:5 <br> wherein [1]-3:16 <br> WHEREOF ${ }_{[1]}-20: 13$ <br> whole [1]-15:20 <br> WITNESS ${ }_{[1]}-20: 13$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SOKOLOW }[111]- \\ & \text { 11:2, 13:2, 13:16, } \\ & \text { 13:22, 14:2, 14:13, } \\ & \text { 14:20, 14:24, 16:3, } \\ & \text { 16:11, 16:15 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Town }[10]-2: 18,2: 22, \\ & 4: 18,5: 6,12: 18 \\ & 12: 25,15: 13,16: 9 \\ & 17: 3,17: 6 \end{aligned}$ | WRUBEL[2] - 1:19, $3: 4$ $\mathbf{Y}$ |
| Sokolow [1] - 11:3 <br> solely [1]-12:6 <br> solve [2]-14:5, 14:6 <br> solved [1] - 12:12 <br> somewhere [1] - 12:2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { town }[7]-4: 21,5: 3, \\ & 5: 5,6: 18,6: 19,6: 24, \\ & 16: 17 \\ & \text { traffic }[2]-8: 10,12: 9 \\ & \text { transcript }[1]-20: 11 \\ & \text { trees }[4]-14: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { YAFFA }[2]^{-20: 7,} \\ & \text { 20:18 } \\ & \text { yard }[3]-7: 13,8: 23, \\ & 18: 19 \\ & \text { yards }[1]-2: 16 \end{aligned}$ |


| YARNELL $[8]-1: 20$, |
| :--- |
| $7: 25,8: 21,9: 2$, |
| $12: 23,15: 7,15: 22$, |
| 15:25 |
| yarnell $[1]-7: 22$ |
| years $[2]-13: 8,14: 4$ |
| YORK $_{[1]}-20: 3$ |
| York $[4]-1: 8,3: 12$, |
| 9:22, 20:8 |
| $\mathbf{Z}$ |

zone [5] - 2:9, 6:3,
8:22, 9:2, 18:14
ZONING [1]-1:2
zoning [4]-5:21,
5:24, 5:25, 7:15

