6:30 P.M. **Workshop**

**Salute The Flag**

**Role Call**

**New Business**

1. **#2889 CDJT DEVELOPMENT MULTI-FAMILY**
   124 Jefferson Street, use variance to convert an existing 6-unit senior housing development to multi-family residential including workforce housing; seeking relief from the permitted uses in the Urban Residential-2 District.

   Documents: 2889 CDJTTOWNHOUSES_APP_REDACTED.PDF, 2889 CDJTTOWNHOUSES_AMILLERCORR4-25-16_REDACTED.PDF

2. **#2886 HOLTBY PROPERTY**
   35 Bensonhurst Avenue, area variance to create a single-family residential lot; seeking relief from the minimum lot size and minimum average lot width requirements in the Urban Residential – 2 District.

   Documents: 2886 HOLTBYRESIDENCE_APPLICATION_REDACTED.PDF

3. **#2888 SARATOGA AUTO REPAIR SIGN**
   254 Washington Street, area variance for a freestanding sign; seeking relief from the maximum height requirement for such sign in the Transect – 5 District.

   Documents: 2888 SARATOGAAUTOREPAIRSIGN_APP_REDACTED.PDF

**Old Business**

1. ~~**#2882 BEYER SUBDIVISION**~~
   ~~199 West Circular Street, area variance to provide for a two-lot residential subdivision; seeking relief from the minimum lot area requirement in the Urban Residential – 2 District.~~

   ~~Documents: 2882 BEYERSUBDIVISION_APPLICATION_REDACTED.PDF, 2882 BEYERSUBDIVISION_BUILDINSPECTDENIAL.PDF, 2882 BEYERSUBDIVISION_REQADVISOPINPB.PDF~~

2. **#2689.1 REJUVENATION HOMES MODIFICATION**
   30 Lafayette Street, area variance modification for constructed changes to a new single-family residence and detached garage; seeking additional relief from the minimum rear yard and minimum distance between principal and accessory buildings in the Urban Residential – 2 District.

   Documents: 2689.1 REJUVENATIONHOMESMOD_APP_REDACTED.PDF, 2689.1 REJUVENATIONHOMES_BUILDINSPECTDENIAL.PDF, 2689.1 REJUVENATIONHOMES_ADDTLINFORECVD4-20-16.PDF

3. **#2883 ASHTON GARAGE**
   149 Grand Avenue, area variance to construct a detached garage; seeking relief from the maximum accessory building coverage requirement in the Urban Residential – 3 District.

   Documents: 2883 ASHTONGARAGE_APPLICATION_REDACTED.PDF

4. **#2884 TRUECUTZ BARBER SHOP**
   44 Jefferson Street, use variance to permit a barber shop; seeking relief from the permitted uses in the Urban Residential – 2 District.

   Documents: 2884 TRUECUTZ_APPLICATION_REDACTED.PDF, 2884 TRUECUTZ_ADDINFO.PDF, 2884 TRUECUTZ_IMAGESRECVD4-21-16.PDF

5. **#2885 CARR RESIDENTIAL ADDITION**
   13 Oakland Drive, area variance to construct additions to an existing single-family residence; seeking relief from the minimum front yard setback (Oakland Dr.), minimum front yard setback (Lawrence St.) and maximum principal building coverage in the Urban Residential – 1 District.

   Documents: 2885 CARRRESIDENCEADDITIONS_APPLICATION_REDACTED.PDF

6. **#2880 ARMER/DESORBO RESIDENCE**
   117 Middle Avenue, area variance for additions to an existing single-family residence; seeking relief from the minimum side yard setback and minimum rear yard setback requirements in the Urban Residential – 3 District.

   Documents: 2880 ARMERDESORBORESIDENCEADD_APP_REDACTED.PDF, 2880 ARMERDESORBORESIDENCEADD_CORRBLACK_REDACTED.PDF, 2880 ARMERDESORBORESIDENCEADD_REVISEDMAP4-11-16.PDF

**Adjourned Items**

~~1. **#2887 DOWNTON WALK APPEAL**~~
   ~~27 Jumel Place, interpretation of determination of the Zoning and Building Inspector for proposed construction of seven single-family residences (condominiums) in the Urban Residential – 3 District.~~

   ~~Documents: 2887 ANWHOLDINGSINTERPRETATION_APP_REDACTED.PDF~~

2. **#2856.1 MOORE HALL**
   ~~28 Union Avenue/35 White Street, area variance for proposed demolition of an existing dormitory building and construction of 26 dwelling units in an Urban Residential – 4 District~~.

   Documents: 2856.1 MOOREHALL2_APPLICATION_REDACTED.PDF

**#2856 MOORE HALL**
~~28 Union Avenue/35 White Street, area variance to convert the existing building to a 53-unit apartment building; seeking relief from the minimum lot size and minimum parking requirement in the Urban Residential – 4 District.~~

**#2759.1 ANW HOLDINGS RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**
~~27 Jumel Place, area variance to demolish existing structure and construct seven single-family residences (condominiums); seeking relief from the maximum principal building coverage, minimum front and rear yard setbacks, maximum number of principal structures on one lot and maximum height for a residential fence requirements in the Urban Residential – 3 District~~.

Documents: 2759.1 ANWHOLDINGCONDOS_APP_REDACTED.PDF, 2759.1 ANWHOLDINGSCONDOS_NEIGHBORCORRREVCD2-21-16_REDACTED.PDF, 2759.1 ANWHOLDINGS_BUILDINSPECTDENIAL.PDF, 2759.1 ANWHOLDINGSCONDOS_CORRSBREWTON_RECVD2-29-16_REDACTED.PDF, 2759.1 ANWHOLDINGSCONDOS_CORRSCOHEN_RECVD3-2-16_REDACTED.PDF, 2759.1 ANWHOLDINGSCONDOS_AERIALVIEW_RECVD3-1-16.PDF, 2759.1 ANWHOLDINGSCONDOS_PRESENTATION2-22-16.PDF, 2759.1

ANWHOLDINGSCONDOS_CORRMPETER_RECVD3-1-16_REDACTED.PDF, 2759.1
ANWHOLDINGSCONDOS_CORRJVALETTA_RECVD3-9-16_REDACTED.PDF, 2759.1
ANWHOLDINGSCONDOS_CORRBMCTAGUE_REVD3-9-16_REDACTED.PDF, 2759.1
ANWHOLDINGCONDOS_POWERPOINT3-14-16.PDF, 2759.1
ANWHOLDINGSCONDOS_NEIGHBORCORRREVCD3-11--3-13-16_REDACTED.PDF,
13-109MV (CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS-ANW JUMEL DOWNTON WALK.PDF,
2759.1 ANWHOLDINGSCONDOS_ADDTLCORRASOF3-29-16.PDF, 2759.1
ANWHOLDINGSCONDOS_ADDTLCORRASOF4-18-16_REDACTED.PDF

**Other Business**

1. **APPROVAL OF DRAFT MEETING MINUTES**
   MAR. 21

2. **NEXT ZONING BOARD MEETING:**
   MAY 9, 2016

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

City Hall – 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
Tel: 518-587-3550 fax: 518-580-9480

[FOR OFFICE USE]

_____ (Application #)

_____ (Date received)

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | CDJT Development, LLC | | |
| Address | Pine West Plaza 2, Wash Ave. Ext<br>Albany, NY 12205 | | |
| Phone | 518-438-3521 / | / | / |
| Email | [redacted] | | |

* An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.

Applicant's interest in the premises: ☑ Owner ☐ Lessee ☐ Under option to lease or purchase

PROPERTY INFORMATION

1. Property Address/Location: 124 jefferson st Tax Parcel No.: 178 . 36 - 3 - 21
(*for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37*)

2. Date acquired by current owner: 2110 3. Zoning District when purchased: _____

4. Present use of property: 6 townhomes 5. Current Zoning District: _____

6. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property?
☐ Yes (when? _____ For what? _____)
☑ No

7. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☐ Historic District ☐ Architectural Review District
☐ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?

8. Brief description of proposed action:
repurpose public benefit from senior to workforce

9. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☑ No

10. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☑ Yes ☐ No

11. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☐ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☑ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☐ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

FEES: Make checks payable to the "Commissioner of Finance". Fees are cumulative and required for each request below.

| | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Interpretation | $ 400 |
| ☑ Use variance | $1,000 |
| ☐ Area variance | |
| -Residential use/property: | $ 150 |
| -Non-residential use/property: | $ 500 |
| ☐ Extensions: | $ 150 |

**INTERPRETATION – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

1. Identify the section(s) of the Zoning Ordinance for which you are seeking an interpretation:

Section(s) _____

2. How do you request that this section be interpreted? _____

_____

_____

_____

3. If interpretation is denied, do you wish to request alternative zoning relief? ☐Yes ☐No

4. If the answer to #3 is "yes," what alternative relief do you request? ☐ Use Variance ☐ Area Variance

**EXTENSION OF A VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

1. Date original variance was granted: _____ 2. Type of variance granted? ☐ Use ☐ Area

3. Date original variance expired: _____

5. Explain why the extension is necessary. Why wasn't the original timeframe sufficient?

_____

_____

_____

_____

When requesting an extension of time for an existing variance, the applicant must prove that the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted have not changed. Specifically demonstrate that there have been no significant changes on the site, in the neighborhood, or within the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted:

_____

_____

_____

**USE VARIANCE** – **PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

A use variance is requested to permit the following:
2 market rate units and 4 workforce units

For the Zoning Board to grant a request for a use variance, an applicant must prove that the zoning regulations create an unnecessary hardship in relation to that property. In seeking a use variance, New York State law requires an applicant to prove all four of the following "tests".

1. That the applicant cannot realize a reasonable financial return on initial investment for any currently permitted use on the property. "Dollars & cents" proof must be submitted as evidence. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return for the following reasons:
   7 years of marketing to seniors and not a single offer

   A. Submit the following financial evidence relating to this property (attach additional evidence as needed):

   1) Date of purchase: 2010 Purchase amount: $377,000

   2) Indicate dates and costs of any improvements made to property after purchase:

| Date | Improvement | Cost |
|---|---|---|
| 2010 | 6 townhomes | $1,800,000 |
| | | |
| | | |

   3) Annual maintenance expenses: $20,000 4) Annual taxes: $12,000

   5) Annual income generated from property: $10,000

   6) City assessed value: $492,000 Equalization rate: 80% Estimated Market Value: $615,000

   7) Appraised Value: $na Appraiser: _____ Date: _____

   Appraisal Assumptions: _____

B. Has property been listed for sale with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS)? ☑ Yes ☐ No If "yes", for how long? 7 years

1) Original listing date(s): 2010 Original listing price: $ 325,000

If listing price was reduced, describe when and to what extent:
$299,000 in 2011

2) Has the property been advertised in the newspapers or other publications? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If yes, describe frequency and name of publications:
all senior outlets 55+ Living Guide

3) Has the property had a "For Sale" sign posted on it? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If yes, list dates when sign was posted:
since 2010

4) How many times has the property been shown and with what results?
multiple times with no offers

2. That the financial hardship relating to this property is unique and does not apply to a substantial portion of the neighborhood. Difficulties shared with numerous other properties in the same neighborhood or district would not satisfy this requirement. This previously identified financial hardship is unique for the following reasons:
seniors do no want this type of housing which is twpo story 2 and 3 bedroom with full basement and attached garage.

3. That the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Changes that will alter the character of a neighborhood or district would be at odds with the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance. The requested variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood for the following reasons:

   already completed for 7 years

4. That the alleged hardship has not been self-created. An applicant (whether the property owner or one acting on behalf of the property owner) cannot claim "unnecessary hardship" if that hardship was created by the applicant, or if the applicant acquired the property knowing (or was in a position to know) the conditions for which the applicant is seeking relief. The hardship has not been self-created for the following reasons:

   seniors do not want this type of housing

**AREA VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

The applicant requests relief from the following Zoning Ordinance article(s) _____

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Other: _____

_____

To grant an area variance, the ZBA must balance the benefits to the applicant and the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and community, taking into consideration the following:

1. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by other feasible means. Identify what alternatives to the variance have been explored (alternative designs, attempts to purchase land, etc.) and why they are not feasible.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Whether granting the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. Granting the variance will not create a detriment to nearby properties or an undesirable change in the neighborhood character for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Whether the variance is substantial. The requested variance is not substantial for the following reasons:

4. Whether the variance will have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district. The requested variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood or district for the following reasons:

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created (although this does not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance). Explain whether the alleged difficulty was or was not self-created:

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☐ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.

_____ Date:_____
(applicant signature)

_____ Date:_____
(applicant signature)

If applicant is not the currently the owner of the property, the current owner must also sign.

Owner Signature: _____ Date:_____

Owner Signature: _____ Date:_____

# ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND/OR BUILDING

APPLICANT: _____ TAX PARCEL NO.: _____._____ - _____ - _____

PROPERTY ADDRESS: _____ ZONING DISTRICT: _____

This applicant has applied to use the identified property within the City of Saratoga Springs for the following:

_____

_____

_____

This application is hereby denied upon the grounds that such use of the property would violate the City Zoning Ordinance article(s)

_____. As such, the following relief would be required to proceed:

☐ Extension of existing variance ☐ Interpretation

☐ Use Variance to permit the following: _____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Area Variance seeking the following relief:

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Other: _____

_____

Note: _____

☐ Advisory Opinion required from Saratoga County Planning Board

_____ _____

ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DATE

Revised 12/2015

AS FEATURED IN: **55+ Living Guide** 55PlusLivingGuide.com

# Saratoga Six

Condominium Rentals / $1,495* per Month
124 Jefferson Street, Saratoga Springs
*Option to Purchase

2 Floor Plans
1,400 Square Feet
2 Bedrooms
2.5 Baths
HOA Included

For more information contact:
Danielle Warrington at 518-698-9955 (cell)

## DOWNSIZE TO UPSCALE SOPHISTICATION AND STYLE.

New construction, luxury 55+ condominiums within walking distance to Broadway and historic Saratoga Race Course. A six unit building with two floor plans to choose from. Attached garage, small front porch and back patios overlooking common backyard areas for total outdoor enjoyment.

# *Short Environmental Assessment Form*
## *Part 1 - Project Information*

### Instructions for Completing

**Part 1 - Project Information. The applicant or project sponsor is responsible for the completion of Part 1.** Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification. Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information.

Complete all items in Part 1. You may also provide any additional information which you believe will be needed by or useful to the lead agency; attach additional pages as necessary to supplement any item.

**Part 1 - Project and Sponsor Information**

124 jefferson st. cdjt development/charles touhey

Name of Action or Project:
saratoga springs ny use variance

Project Location (describe, and attach a location map):
124 jefferson st saragoga springs ny

Brief Description of Proposed Action:
change public benefit from senior designation to workforce designation

| Name of Applicant or Sponsor: | Telephone: 518 438 3521 |
|---|---|
| cdjt development/charles touhey | E-Mail: [redacted] |

Address:
pine west plaza bldg 2 washington ave ext

| City/PO: | State: | Zip Code: |
|---|---|---|
| albany | ny | 12205 |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Does the proposed action only involve the legislative adoption of a plan, local law, ordinance, administrative rule, or regulation? If Yes, attach a narrative description of the intent of the proposed action and the environmental resources that may be affected in the municipality and proceed to Part 2. If no, continue to question 2. | ☑ | ☐ |
| 2. Does the proposed action require a permit, approval or funding from any other governmental Agency? If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit or approval: | ☑ | ☐ |

3.a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action? .43 acres
b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed? .43 acres
c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor? .43 acres

4. Check all land uses that occur on, adjoining and near the proposed action.
☑ Urban ☐ Rural (non-agriculture) ☐ Industrial ☐ Commercial ☐ Residential (suburban)
☐ Forest ☐ Agriculture ☐ Aquatic ☐ Other (specify): _____
☐ Parkland

| | NO | YES | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5. Is the proposed action, | | | |
| a. A permitted use under the zoning regulations? | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan? | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 6. Is the proposed action consistent with the predominant character of the existing built or natural landscape? | NO ☐ | YES ☑ | |
| 7. Is the site of the proposed action located in, or does it adjoin, a state listed Critical Environmental Area? If Yes, identify: _____ | NO ☑ | YES ☐ | |
| 8. a. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels? | ☑ | ☐ | |
| b. Are public transportation service(s) available at or near the site of the proposed action? | ☐ | ☑ | |
| c. Are any pedestrian accommodations or bicycle routes available on or near site of the proposed action? | ☐ | ☑ | |
| 9. Does the proposed action meet or exceed the state energy code requirements? If the proposed action will exceed requirements, describe design features and technologies: _____ | NO ☐ | YES ☑ | |
| 10. Will the proposed action connect to an existing public/private water supply? If No, describe method for providing potable water: _____ | ☐ | ☑ | |
| 11. Will the proposed action connect to existing wastewater utilities? If No, describe method for providing wastewater treatment: _____ | ☐ | ☑ | |
| 12. a. Does the site contain a structure that is listed on either the State or National Register of Historic Places? | ☑ | ☐ | |
| b. Is the proposed action located in an archeological sensitive area? | ☑ | ☐ | |
| 13. a. Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency? | ☑ | ☐ | |
| b. Would the proposed action physically alter, or encroach into, any existing wetland or waterbody? If Yes, identify the wetland or waterbody and extent of alterations in square feet or acres: _____ | ☑ | ☐ | |
| 14. Identify the typical habitat types that occur on, or are likely to be found on the project site. Check all that apply: ☐ Shoreline ☐ Forest ☐ Agricultural/grasslands ☐ Early mid-successional ☐ Wetland ☒ Urban ☐ Suburban | | | |
| 15. Does the site of the proposed action contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered? | ☑ | ☐ | |
| 16. Is the project site located in the 100 year flood plain? | ☑ | ☐ | |
| 17. Will the proposed action create storm water discharge, either from point or non-point sources? If Yes, a. Will storm water discharges flow to adjacent properties? ☑ NO ☐ YES | ☑ | ☐ | |
| b. Will storm water discharges be directed to established conveyance systems (runoff and storm drains)? If Yes, briefly describe: ☑ NO ☐ YES _____ | | | |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 18. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that result in the impoundment of water or other liquids (e.g. retention pond, waste lagoon, dam)?<br>If Yes, explain purpose and size: | ✓ | |
| 19. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the location of an active or closed solid waste management facility?<br>If Yes, describe: | ✓ | |
| 20. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the subject of remediation (ongoing or completed) for hazardous waste?<br>If Yes, describe: | ✓ | |

**I AFFIRM THAT THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE IS TRUE AND ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE**

Applicant/sponsor name: CDST Development Date: 3/28/16

Signature: [illegible]

PRINT FORM

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

City Hall - 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
Tel: 518-587-3550 fax: 518-580-9480

[FOR OFFICE USE]

_____ (Application #)

_____ (Date received)

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | CDJT Development, LLC/Charles Touhey | | |
| Address | Pine West Plaza 2, Wash Ave. Ext<br>Albany, NY 12205 | | |
| Phone | 518-438-3521 / | / | / |
| Email | [redacted] | | |

* An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.

Applicant's interest in the premises: ☑ Owner ☐ Lessee ☐ Under option to lease or purchase

PROPERTY INFORMATION

1. Property Address/Location: 124 jefferson st Tax Parcel No.: 178 . 36 - 3 - 21
(*for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37*)

2. Date acquired by current owner: 2110 3. Zoning District when purchased: UR 7

4. Present use of property: 6 townhomes 5. Current Zoning District: UR 7

6. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property?
☐ Yes (when? _____ For what? _____)
☑ No

7. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☐ Historic District ☐ Architectural Review District
☐ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?

8. Brief description of proposed action:
Repurpose the original public benefit, (which was required by the 4 unit density bonus received) from Senior housing to Workforce housing, wherein buyers must have a maximum income not to exceed 80 to 120% of Saratoga AMI (Area Median Income)

9. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☑ No

10. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☑ Yes ☐ No

11. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☐ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☑ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☐ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

FEES: Make checks payable to the "Commissioner of Finance". Fees are cumulative and required for each request below.

| | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Interpretation | $ 400 |
| ☑ Use variance | $1,000 |
| ☐ Area variance | |
| -Residential use/property: | $ 150 |
| -Non-residential use/property: | $ 500 |
| ☐ Extensions: | $ 150 |

**INTERPRETATION – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

1. Identify the section(s) of the Zoning Ordinance for which you are seeking an interpretation:

Section(s) na

2. How do you request that this section be interpreted?

na

3. If interpretation is denied, do you wish to request alternative zoning relief? ☐Yes ☐No

4. If the answer to #3 is "yes," what alternative relief do you request? ☐ Use Variance ☐ Area Variance

**EXTENSION OF A VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

1. Date original variance was granted: _____ 2. Type of variance granted? ☐ Use ☐ Area

3. Date original variance expired: _____

5. Explain why the extension is necessary. Why wasn't the original timeframe sufficient?

When requesting an extension of time for an existing variance, the applicant must prove that the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted have not changed. Specifically demonstrate that there have been no significant changes on the site, in the neighborhood, or within the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted:

**USE VARIANCE** – **PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

A use variance is requested to permit the following:
Allow the sale of 2 market rate units, and 4 workforce units to persons whose income does not exceed 80-120% of the Saratoga County AMI ( Area Median Income)

For the Zoning Board to grant a request for a use variance, an applicant must prove that the zoning regulations create an unnecessary hardship in relation to that property. In seeking a use variance, New York State law requires an applicant to prove all four of the following "tests".

1. That the applicant cannot realize a reasonable financial return on initial investment for any currently permitted use on the property. "Dollars & cents" proof must be submitted as evidence. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return for the following reasons:

   In 2110, six senior units were completed and marketing began. Each townhome consisted of 2 or 3 bedrooms, 2 story, full basements and attached garage. Price was $325,000. From the outset, buyers were available in the 30 to 40 year old range, with none over the 55 age as required by the project approvals. The price was then lowered to $299,000 (actual builder cost) and subsequently to $250,000 to determine if price was indeed the factor. It clearly was not. For 7 years and 3 realtors, we still have no buyers over 55.

A. Submit the following financial evidence relating to this property (attach additional evidence as needed):

1) Date of purchase: 2010 Purchase amount: $377,000

2) Indicate dates and costs of any improvements made to property after purchase:

| Date | Improvement | Cost |
|---|---|---|
| 2010 | 6 townhomes | $1,800,000 |
| | | |
| | | |

3) Annual maintenance expenses: $20,000 4) Annual taxes: $12,000

5) Annual income generated from property: $10,000

6) City assessed value: $492,000 Equalization rate: 80% Estimated Market Value: $615,000

7) Appraised Value: $na Appraiser: _____ Date: _____

Appraisal Assumptions: _____

B. Has property been listed for sale with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS)? ☑ Yes ☐ No If "yes", for how long? 7 years

1) Original listing date(s): 2010 Original listing price: $ 325,000

If listing price was reduced, describe when and to what extent:
From $325,000 to299,000 to $250,000 in 2011 as well as "Rent With Option To Buy"

2) Has the property been advertised in the newspapers or other publications? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If yes, describe frequency and name of publications:
all senior outlets including 55+ Living Guide for 7 years.

3) Has the property had a "For Sale" sign posted on it? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If yes, list dates when sign was posted:
since 2010

4) How many times has the property been shown and with what results?
multiple times weekends, open houses, with no offers over 7 years.

2. That the financial hardship relating to this property is unique and does not apply to a substantial portion of the neighborhood. Difficulties shared with numerous other properties in the same neighborhood or district would not satisfy this requirement. This previously identified financial hardship is unique for the following reasons:

After 7 years of marketing, price reductions and 3 realtors, it is clear that while persons in the age bracket of 30 t0 40 will purchase these homes, seniors will not.

3. That the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Changes that will alter the character of a neighborhood or district would be at odds with the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance. The requested variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood for the following reasons:

Project was approved and constructed in accordance with all plans and specifications 7 years ago and has impacted the neighborhood favorably in it's appearance and style. (see attached brochure)

4. That the alleged hardship has not been self-created. An applicant (whether the property owner or one acting on behalf of the property owner) cannot claim "unnecessary hardship" if that hardship was created by the applicant, or if the applicant acquired the property knowing (or was in a position to know) the conditions for which the applicant is seeking relief. The hardship has not been self-created for the following reasons:

Applicant entered into project fully expecting seniors to purchase the homes in full accordance and compliance with density bonus granted by the city for such housing. Applicant accepts that an equivalent public benefit must be required to change use. Therefore, applicant is proposing to repurpose public benefit to workforce housing wherein buyers income must not exceed 80 to120% of AMI for Saratoga

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☒ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.

_____ Date: 3-25-16
(applicant signature)

_____ Date: _____
(applicant signature)

If applicant is not the currently the owner of the property, the current owner must also sign.

Owner Signature: _____ Date: _____

Owner Signature: _____ Date: _____

**Attachments**

and supporting materials.

# 124 Jefferson St. – Project History

Background- In 2010, the project was approved for 6 units of senior housing (2 units allowed, plus 4 units (density bonus). Marketing began immediately with age restriction originally at 60, subsequently changed to 55 by the city. However, customers who were willing to purchase were always 30 to 40 years of age.

Unit Design – Two and Three Bedroom, Two story, and full basement with attached garage.

Pricing – $325,000 in 2010 subsequently reduced to $299,000 in 2011 and briefly to $250,000 that year.

Marketing - (Utilized three realtors) ( Roohan ,Hunt ,Pro Realty of New York) with specialized outreach to seniors through flyers and visits to all Saratoga Senior centers. In addition, targeted advertising in "55 + Living Guide". (Attached)

2016 Situation- After 7 years of marketing, it is clear that there is a market for these homes in the 30 to 40 year age range. We are proposing to repurpose the Public Benefit derived from the 4 unit density bonus to "Workforce Housing"

Workforce Housing - would restrict buyers to a maximum of 80 to 120% of the Area Median Income (AMI) for Saratoga County, thus providing affordable housing opportunities for the city, which it sorely needs.

# 124 Jefferson St

## Marketing Efforts 2010-2016

**2010**

#1 Hunt Realty

-20 open houses

-Flyers

-Advertising

-Senior Outreach Centers

-MLS

-Numerous appointments

**2011**

Hunt Realty

-20 open houses

-Flyers

-Advertising

-Senior Outreach Centers

-MLS

-Numerous appointments

**2012**

#2 Roohan Realty

-20 open houses

-Flyers

-Advertising

-Senior Outreach Centers

-MLS

-Numerous appointments

**2013**

Pro Realty of New York

**Hired on-site sales person Cost: $20,000**

**Offered "Rent with option to buy"**

-20 open houses

-Flyers

-Advertising

-Senior Outreach Centers

-MLS

-Numerous appointments

**2014**

#3 Pro Realty of New York

Hired on-site sales person Cost: $20,000

-20 open houses

-Flyers

-Advertising

-Senior Outreach Centers

-MLS

-Numerous appointments

**2015**

Pro Realty of New York

Hired on-site sales person Cost: $20,000

-20 open houses

-Flyers

-Advertising

-Senior Outreach Centers

-MLS

-Numerous appointments

**2016**

Same Marketing as previous 6 years.

AS FEATURED IN: **55+ Living Guide** 55PlusLivingGuide.com

2 Floor Plans

1,400 Square Feet

2 Bedrooms

2.5 Baths

HOA Included

# Saratoga Six

Condominium Rentals / $1,495* per Month
124 Jefferson Street, Saratoga Springs
*Option to Purchase

For more information contact:
Danielle Warrington at 518-698-9955 (cell)

## DOWNSIZE TO UPSCALE SOPHISTICATION AND STYLE.

New construction, luxury 55+ condominiums within walking distance to Broadway and historic Saratoga Race Course. A six unit building with two floor plans to choose from. Attached garage, small front porch and back patios overlooking common backyard areas for total outdoor enjoyment.

**To whom it may concern:**

I (Danielle Warrington) started working with Charles Touhey and property managing 124 Jefferson St. about 4 years ago. Seeming I work for a successful local builder and broker Cecil Provost, and being a realtor myself, we figured this would really help us sell these units. During this time I have set forth several different marketing avenues for 55+ senior living. We have advertised in Saratoga Living, a local magazine, 55 plus living guide, local papers, printed marketing brochures at the Y ,the race track, local business, as well as social media and that's just to name a few. I have spent years showing these units to 55+ seniors week after week just to continue to get the same result. I've done several open house events in hopes to attract seniors. 55+ seniors have no interests in buying these units due to the floor design and layout. They do not want to purchase their final home with 2 sets of stairs and no Bedroom on first floor, and no handicap access. We have rented a few units to 55+ seniors, and as a show of good faith brought every lease and photo id to Brad Birge so he knew we were doing the right thing. All Tenants at this time are moved out due to the reasons I listed above or they have purchased a place with the amenities they need, 1st. floor living.

Also during this time I couldn't even begin to count the number of sales,and rent with option, we have turned away due to the age restriction. What I have seen is that it's the 30+ middle age class that want to buy these condos. We have exhausted every idea, marketing strategy, to get these sold and it's just not happening. We have been honest and worked diligently in this process with just no success!

124 Jefferson Street units 1-6
List of potential sales, rentals lost due to age restriction:

**1.Showing,** from glens falls area, owned a home looking to downsize age 46 years old, pre approved, owns a business. Age restriction only reason for not purchasing, Jan 2013.

**2.Showing,** from Saratoga young professional, age 35 works for a marketing firm in town. Age restriction only reason for not renting or purchasing. March 2013

**3.Showing,** from Albany area, works at Albany Med, age 27, looking to buy 1st time. Pre Approval letter, age restriction can not rent or sell. Bought a condo in malta. April 2013

**4.Showing,** age 32, from Latham area wanted to move to Saratoga, I sold him a house in Stillwater as the age restriction only reason I could not rent or sell to him. June 2013.

**5.Showing,** from burnt hills, age 45 looking to downsize wanted a townhome or condo. Age restriction only reason sale lost. Bought in ballston spa. June 2013

**6. Showing,** from Morgan Stanley, lives in NYC age 37. Looking for summer townhome in saratoga. Age restriction only reason for loss of sale. A track goer for reason loved location. July 2013.

**7.Showing,** from Albany area wanting to move to Saratoga, 1st time home buyer. Pre-approved age 35. Bought house in Albany due to age restriction. Aug 2013

**8. Showing,** from Albany area, age 45 looking to downsize, second home. Wants to move to Saratoga Area. pre- approval. Age restriction the issue. Nov. 2013

**9. Showing,** from Saratoga, age 33, first time home buyer. Age restriction reason for not purchasing. Dec 2013

**10. Showing,** from Queensbury, 36 first time homebuyer, pre-approved, loved property, lack of age requirement. Bought a home in Queensbury. Feb 2014

**11. Showing,** from Saratoga, 2nd home, downsizing. Age 43 unsure of statis if purchased. Age was the issue. April 2014

**12. Showing,** from Watervliet, age 39. 1st time home buyer. Wanted to move to Saratoga. Wanted to buy, age was the issue. Bought a home in malta area.June 2014.

**13. Showing,** age 29, 1st time home buyer, works at GE. Loved the townhomes. Age restriction the issue. Bought a home in ballston spa with her husband.June 2014.

**14. Showing,**, age 34 moving here from NYC. Wanted to put in an offer, age again and bought a townhouse in Clifton Park. July 2014

**15. Showing**, from NJ. wanted to purchase for summer home. Lost deal due to age restriction. Aug 2014.

**16. Showing,** 30. Works at Navy base in Saratoga. 1st time home buyer. Age restriction only reason for no offer submitted. Oct. 2014.

**17. Showing,** 45 looking for second home in Saratoga. Lives in NH. Wanted a summer townhome in town. Decided to build due to age restriction. Dec. 2014

**18. Showing,** Married early 40's. Were looking for a second home. Built in still water a Townhome. Age was reason for loss of sale. March 2015.

**19. Showing,** 42 2nd home, looking to downsize. from Saratoga Area, loss sale to age. Moved to Ballston Spa. April 2015.

**20. Showing,** 1st time home buyer. from Saratoga. Age reason for loss of sale. bought in ballston spa. June 2015.

**21. Showing,** 43, second home. downsizing. moved from latham to saratoga, not sure where tho. Age was loss of sale. July 2015.

**22. Showing,** age 31,from saratoga. works at globalfoundries. loss of sale due to age. relocated to Vermont for job.Aug. 2015

**23. Showing,** age 33, from saratoga area works at local business, loss of sale due to age.

**Every month 1 open house since 2013-2016, no sales due to age restriction!**

This is just some of the contacts that I kept record of. There were also several agents in Saratoga that brought clients to show, age the number one reason for loss of sale. Second reason 55+ does not want to buy due to design layout being 2 story, the concern is in a fews years from now the stairs being a huge issue. Just wanted to give you an idea of the hardship we have dealt with on this project. Thank you Brad for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Danielle
I'm reachable at [redacted], if there is any further questions.

## ZBA App. No. 2889 - CDJT Development Townhouses - Amiee Miller Corr

**From :** Lindsey Gonzalez <lindsey.gonzalez@saratoga-springs.org> Mon, Apr 25, 2016 10:48 AM

**Subject :** ZBA App. No. 2889 - CDJT Development Townhouses - Amiee Miller Corr 1 attachment

**To :** Adam McNeill [redacted]>, Gary Hasbrouck [redacted], kaplankeith [redacted] Skip Carlson [redacted]>, Bil[redacted] helickezba [redacted]>, shsteer[redacted]

**Cc :** Susan Barden <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>

Board Members,

This morning I received a call from a concerned citizen who received a neighbor notification for the above referenced project. She reflected that she was unable to access internet at this time to provide her own statement, so I am summarizing her concerns below:

Aimee Miller
121 Madison St
Re: 124 Jefferson St Use Variance Request

Was comfortable with said property being utilized for senior housing, but NOT for workforce housing. Does not want another Jefferson Terrace in the neighborhood, and feels there is not enough senior housing in Saratoga. Disagrees with any further expansion as there is already a lack of greenspace in the neighborhood.

**Lindsey A. Gonzalez, M.P.A.**

**Land Use Board Coordinator**
**Office of Planning and Economic Development**
**City of Saratoga Springs**
474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
(E) lindsey.gonzalez@saratoga-springs.org
(O) 518.587.3550 x 2533

**LAG elec sig.jpg**
7 KB

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

City Hall – 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
Tel: 518-587-3550 fax: 518-580-9480

[FOR OFFICE USE]

_____ (Application #)

_____ (Date received)

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Rejuvenation Homes, Inc | Constance & Martin Holtby | |
| Address | 203 Lake Avenue<br>Saratoga Springs, NY 12866 | 33 Bensonhurst Avenue<br>Saratoga Springs, NY 12866 | |
| Phone | 518-886-8622 / | / | / |
| Email | [redacted] | | |

* An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.

Applicant's interest in the premises: ☐ Owner ☐ Lessee ☑ Under option to lease or purchase

PROPERTY INFORMATION

1. Property Address/Location: 35 Bensonhurst Avenue Tax Parcel No.: 165 . 57 - 1 - 29 (*for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37*)

2. Date acquired by current owner: 3/1/84 3. Zoning District when purchased: UR 2

4. Present use of property: Vacant Land 5. Current Zoning District: UR 2

6. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property?
   ☐ Yes (when? _____ For what? _____)
   ☑ No

7. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☐ Historic District ☐ Architectural Review District
   ☐ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?

8. Brief description of proposed action:
Construction of a new single family home

9. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☑ No

10. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☐ Yes ☑ No

11. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☐ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☐ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☑ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

**AREA VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

The applicant requests relief from the following Zoning Ordinance article(s) 2.3

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| Minimum Lot Square Feet | 6600 | 5400 |
| Minimum Average Width | 60 ft | 45ft |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Other:

To grant an area variance, the ZBA must balance the benefits to the applicant and the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and community, taking into consideration the following:

1. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by other feasible means. Identify what alternatives to the variance have been explored (alternative designs, attempts to purchase land, etc.) and why they are not feasible.

   The current lot size can not be expanded due to fact that there is an existing building located to the south that is currently located at the minimum setback for it's lot. The lot located to the north is already below the minimum width for the zoning district and narrowing this lot to enhance the width of the subject lot would only further exaggerate it's non-compliance. The lot located to the west is below the minimum area for the zoning district and shortening this lot to enhance the subject lot would only further exaggerate it's non-compliance.

2. Whether granting the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. Granting the variance will not create a detriment to nearby properties or an undesirable change in the neighborhood character for the following reasons:

   The new single family home that is being proposed will fit within the setback and lot coverage zoning requirements and would be in character with other new homes that have been built on the street. There are other lots located on the same street that have less square footage than the subject lot and have recently had, or current have, new construction of single family homes. Both 12 Bensonhurst, (ID 165.57-1-6) and the property directly adjacent to it, (165.57-1-67), have only 5000 sq/ft compared to the 5400 sq/ft of the subject lot. The subject lot is also in character with the lots immediately surrounding it, all of which are similar in width and square footage.

3. Whether the variance is substantial. The requested variance is not substantial for the following reasons:

The variance is not substantial because the subject lot is currently similar in both width and square footage to all of the immediate surrounding lots. Although the subject lot's width is 15' short of the zoning requirement, it is only 5' less than the neighboring lots to the north and west, and 10' less than the neighboring lot to the south. Also, although the subject lot is 1200 square feet smaller than the zoning requirement, it is only 600 square feet smaller than the lots located to the north and west.

4. Whether the variance will have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district. The requested variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood or district for the following reasons:

The variance will not have any adverse environmental effects due to the fact that any proposed new home would need to meet other requirements of the zoning regulation. This would ensure adequate area on the subject lot for water drainage and roof runoff. There are easily accessible water, sewer and gas lines already in the immediate area.

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created (although this does not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance). Explain whether the alleged difficulty was or was not self-created:

The alleged difficulty was self-created in so far that a new home is desired for the lot. The lot is currently vacant land and the construction of a new single family home will require the necessary variance(s).

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☒ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.

_____ Date: 3/14/2016
(applicant signature)

_____ Date: _____
(applicant signature)

If applicant is not the currently the owner of the property, the current owner must also sign.

Owner Signature: Martin Hartsby Date: 3/15/16

Owner Signature: Christine Hartsby Date: 3/15/16




# Site Plan

**Lot Dimensions:**
**45' x 120' = 5400 sq/ft**

**Proposed Structure:**
**24' x 67' = 1608 sq/ft**

**Lot Coverage: 1608 sq/ft = 29%**
**Allowed Coverage: 30%**
**45' x 120' = 5400 sq/ft**
**30% x 5400 = 1620 sq/ft**

**South / Side Setback: 12'6"**
**Minimum: 12'**

**North / Side Setback: 8'6"**
**Minimum: 8'**

**East / Front Setback: 12'**
**Minimum: 10'**

**South / Rear Setback: 41'**
**Minimum: 25'**

**Permeable: 300 sq/ft + 1608 sq/ft**
**= 1908 sq/ft = 36%**
**= 74% Permeable**
**Minimum: 25%**

**East Elevation**

**West Elevation**



# North Elevation



# South Elevation

**Subject Lot: "35" Bensonhurst Avenue**

**Immediate Lot to North: 33 Bensonhurst Avenue**

**Immediate Lot to South:  Division Street**

**View of Bensonhurst Avenue Proceeding North**

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

City Hall - 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
Tel: 518-587-3550 fax: 518-580-9480

[FOR OFFICE USE]

_____ (Application #)

_____ (Date received)

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Byron Wilhoite | William DiCenzo | N/A |
| Address | [redacted] | [redacted] | |
| Phone | [redacted] / | [redacted] | / |
| Email | [redacted] | [redacted] | |

* An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.

Applicant's interest in the premises: ☐ Owner ☑ Lessee ☐ Under option to lease or purchase

PROPERTY INFORMATION

1. Property Address/Location: 254 Washington Street Tax Parcel No.: 165 . 18 - 1 - 9
(*for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37*)

2. Date acquired by current owner: 1975 3. Zoning District when purchased: T5

4. Present use of property: Commercial 5. Current Zoning District: T5

6. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property?
☐ Yes (when? _____ For what? _____)
☑ No

7. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☐ Historic District ☑ Architectural Review District
☑ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?

8. Brief description of proposed action:
Replace the face of an existing freestanding sign on the property. I will be using an existing frame and post to update sign with new business name.

9. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☑ No

10. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☐ Yes ☑ No

11. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☐ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☐ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☑ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

FEES: Make checks payable to the "Commissioner of Finance". Fees are cumulative and required for each request below.

| | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Interpretation | $ 400 |
| ☐ Use variance | $1,000 |
| ☑ Area variance | |
| -Residential use/property: | $ 150 |
| -Non-residential use/property: | $ 500 |
| ☐ Extensions: | $ 150 |

**INTERPRETATION** – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

1. Identify the section(s) of the Zoning Ordinance for which you are seeking an interpretation:

Section(s) _____

2. How do you request that this section be interpreted? _____

_____

_____

_____

3. If interpretation is denied, do you wish to request alternative zoning relief? ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. If the answer to #3 is "yes," what alternative relief do you request? ☐ Use Variance ☐ Area Variance

**EXTENSION OF A VARIANCE** – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

1. Date original variance was granted: _____ 2. Type of variance granted? ☐ Use ☐ Area

3. Date original variance expired: _____

5. Explain why the extension is necessary. Why wasn't the original timeframe sufficient?

_____

_____

_____

_____

When requesting an extension of time for an existing variance, the applicant must prove that the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted have not changed. Specifically demonstrate that there have been no significant changes on the site, in the neighborhood, or within the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

**USE VARIANCE** – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

A use variance is requested to permit the following: _____

_____

_____

For the Zoning Board to grant a request for a use variance, an applicant must prove that the zoning regulations create an unnecessary hardship in relation to that property. In seeking a use variance, New York State law requires an applicant to prove all four of the following "tests".

1. That the applicant cannot realize a reasonable financial return on initial investment for any currently permitted use on the property. "Dollars & cents" proof must be submitted as evidence. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

A. Submit the following financial evidence relating to this property (attach additional evidence as needed):

1) Date of purchase: _____ Purchase amount: $_____

2) Indicate dates and costs of any improvements made to property after purchase:

| Date | Improvement | Cost |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3) Annual maintenance expenses: $_____ 4) Annual taxes: $_____

5) Annual income generated from property: $_____

6) City assessed value: $_____ Equalization rate:_____ Estimated Market Value: $_____

7) Appraised Value: $_____ Appraiser: _____Date: _____

Appraisal Assumptions:_____

B. Has property been listed for sale with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS)? ☐Yes ☐No If "yes", for how long? _____

1) Original listing date(s):_____ Original listing price: $_____

If listing price was reduced, describe when and to what extent: _____

_____

2) Has the property been advertised in the newspapers or other publications? ☐Yes ☐No

If yes, describe frequency and name of publications: _____

_____

3) Has the property had a "For Sale" sign posted on it? ☐Yes ☐No

If yes, list dates when sign was posted: _____

_____

4) How many times has the property been shown and with what results? _____

_____

_____

2. That the financial hardship relating to this property is unique and does not apply to a substantial portion of the neighborhood. Difficulties shared with numerous other properties in the same neighborhood or district would not satisfy this requirement. This previously identified financial hardship is unique for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. That the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Changes that will alter the character of a neighborhood or district would be at odds with the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance. The requested variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood for the following reasons:

4. That the alleged hardship has not been self-created. An applicant (whether the property owner or one acting on behalf of the property owner) cannot claim "unnecessary hardship" if that hardship was created by the applicant, or if the applicant acquired the property knowing (or was in a position to know) the conditions for which the applicant is seeking relief. The hardship has not been self-created for the following reasons:

**AREA VARIANCE** – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

The applicant requests relief from the following Zoning Ordinance article(s) 6.1.5.3

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| Sign Height | 12' | 15' |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Other: _____

To grant an area variance, the ZBA must balance the benefits to the applicant and the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and community, taking into consideration the following:

1. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by other feasible means. Identify what alternatives to the variance have been explored (alternative designs, attempts to purchase land, etc.) and why they are not feasible.

   There is an existing sign on the property from the previous business owner with the exact same height being requested in this application. Alternatives are not feasible due to the expense of creating a new post and sign. It is more cost effective to insert a new sign face into the existing frame and post. Also, the current sign is installed at the base of a slight decline in the ground so the additional height in the post is necessary for the sign to be visible from the road.

2. Whether granting the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. Granting the variance will not create a detriment to nearby properties or an undesirable change in the neighborhood character for the following reasons:

   Granting the variance will not produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties since I will be using a post and frame that has been on the property for many years. I will just be inserting a new sign face into the existing frame/post so it is in keeping with current character of the neighborhood and it will also be an improvement to the existing sign.

3. Whether the variance is substantial. The requested variance is not substantial for the following reasons:

   The requested variance is not substantial due to the fact that I am not requesting a change from the height and dimensions of the current sign on the property.

4. Whether the variance will have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district. The requested variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood or district for the following reasons:

   I will be inserting a new sign face into an existing frame and post on the property.

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created (although this does not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance). Explain whether the alleged difficulty was or was not self-created:

   The alleged difficulty was self created because I am electing to keep the existing post and frame on the property since this is the most cost effective method for a new sign. The height of the sign helps make the sign more visible from the road since the sign sits at the base of a slight decline in the ground making it below the street level.

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☑ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.

Brian Hall Date: 3-26-16
(applicant signature)

_____ Date: _____
(applicant signature)

If applicant is not the currently the owner of the property, the current owner must also sign.

Owner Signature: William DiCenzo Date: 3-26-16

Owner Signature: _____ Date: _____

# ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND/OR BUILDING

APPLICANT: _____ TAX PARCEL NO.: _____.____ - _____ - ____

PROPERTY ADDRESS: _____ ZONING DISTRICT: _____

This applicant has applied to use the identified property within the City of Saratoga Springs for the following:

_____

_____

_____

This application is hereby denied upon the grounds that such use of the property would violate the City Zoning Ordinance article(s)

_____. As such, the following relief would be required to proceed:

☐ Extension of existing variance ☐ Interpretation

☐ Use Variance to permit the following: _____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Area Variance seeking the following relief:

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Other: _____

_____

Note: _____

☐ Advisory Opinion required from Saratoga County Planning Board

_____ _____

ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DATE

Revised 12/2015


30 feet from the street to sign
sign location
80.34 feet to edge of property line
110 feet from property line to sign
47 feet from sign to building
1997
Imagery Date: 7/15/2015 43°04'44.16" N 73°48'25.80" W elev 336 ft

AMERICAN
TRANSMISSION CENTE

SPEED
LIMIT
30

Capitol
DISTRICT SUPPLY
Kitchens | Baths | Plumbing | Heating
252

Capitol
DISTRICT SUPPLY
Kitchens | Baths | Plumbing | Heating
252

SPEED
LIMIT
30

Washington St
Exit Street View
N
68.5" wide
41.5" high
SARATOGA
AUTO
REPAIR
5 ft
Report a problem
© 2016 Google
© 2016 Google
Google earth

SARATOGA

# AUTO REPAIR

4 feet high

5 feet wide

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

CITY HALL - 474 BROADWAY
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NEW YORK 12866
TEL: 518-587-3550 FAX: 518-580-9480
WWW.SARATOGA-SPRINGS.ORG

[FOR OFFICE USE]

(Application #)

(Date received)

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Donald Jeffrey Beyer | | |
| Address | [redacted] | | |
| | | | |
| Tel./Fax | [redacted] | / | / |
| Email | [redacted] | | |

* An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.
Applicant's interest in the premises: ☒ Owner ☐ Lessee ☐ Under option to lease or purchase

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

Property Address (No. & St.) 199 West Circular Street Side of St. (north, east, etc.) North

Tax Parcel No.: 165 . 73 - 2 - 46 *(for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37)* Tax District: ☐ Inside ☐ Outside

1. Date acquired by current owner: July 2008 2. Zoning District when purchased: UR-2
3. Present use of property: Rental 4. Current Zoning District: UR-2
5. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property? ☒ Yes (when? 9/27/2010 for what? subdivision) ☐ No
6. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☐ Historic District ☐ Architectural Review District ☐ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?
7. Brief description of proposed action: relief from minimum area requirements
8. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☒ No
9. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☐ Yes ☒ No
10. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☐ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☐ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☑ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

FEES: Make checks payable to the "Commissioner of Finance" and attach to top of original application. Fees are cumulative and required for each request below.

| | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Interpretation | $ 400 |
| ☐ Use variance | $1,000 |
| ☑ Area variance | |
| -Residential use/property: | $ 150 |
| -Non-residential use/property: | $ 500 |
| ☐ Extensions: | $ 150 |

## INTERPRETATION – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

1. Identify the section(s) of the Zoning Ordinance for which you are seeking an interpretation:

Section(s) _____

2. How do you request that this section be interpreted? _____

_____

_____

_____

3. If interpretation is denied, do you wish to request alternative zoning relief? ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. If the answer to #3 is "yes," what alternative relief do you request? ☐ Use Variance ☐ Area Variance

## EXTENSION OF A VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

1. Date original variance was granted: _____ 2. Type of variance granted? ☐ Use ☐ Area

3. Date original variance expired: _____ 4. Length of extension requested: _____

5. Explain why the extension is necessary. Why wasn't the original timeframe sufficient?: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

When requesting an extension of time for an existing variance, the applicant must prove that the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted have not changed. Specifically demonstrate that there have been no significant changes on the site, in the neighborhood, or within the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted:

_____

## AREA VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

The applicant requests relief from the following Zoning Ordinance article(s) _____.

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| Creation of a 5,700 sqft lot with existing single-family residence and creation of a conforming 6,600 sqft lot with a new single-family residance | 12,300 sqft | 5,700 sqft and 6,600 sqft |

Other: _____

To grant an area variance, the ZBA must balance the benefits to the applicant and the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and community, taking into consideration the following:

1. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by other feasible means. Identify what alternatives to the variance have been explored (alternative designs, attempts to purchase land, etc.) and why they are not feasible.

Proposed addition to existing residence was not cost effective. Costs would exceed value of residence.

2. Whether granting the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. Granting the variance will not create a detriment to nearby properties or an undesirable change in the neighborhood character for the following reasons:

The neighborhood is diverse with regard to lot size. Some lots are a preexisting nonconforming regarding minimum lotsize and some exceed minimum lotsize. The neighborhood is also diverse regarding existing use. Some lots have preexisting nonconforming two family and a commercial use also exists.

3. Whether the variance is substantial. The requested variance is not substantial for the following reasons:

900 sqft smaller (5,700 sqft) than the required (6,600 sqft)

4. Whether the variance will have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district. The requested variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood or district for the following reasons:

The lot is clear of trees or wetland and would not adversely impact surrounding landscape. An ally also boarders the West side of the lot.

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created (although this does not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance). Explain whether the alleged difficulty was or was not self-created:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

In accord with Article 240-14.4A(1)(b)(6) of the Zoning Ordinance, "any request for an area variance, which shall effect a change in density, shall be applied for and considered as a use variance and decided under criteria for the same". A request that involves any of the following relief will require an application for a use variance and will be decided under the use variance criteria:

(1) Dimensional relief from minimum lot size requirements that would allow additional permitted units and/or uses
(2) Relief from on site parking requirements
(3) Reduction in land area requirements for multi-family units

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☐ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.

_____
(applicant signature)

_____
(applicant signature)

Sworn to before me this date:

Date: 1/23/16

_____
*Notary Public*

*Revised: January 2011*

02 12 2016

02 12 2016

DEAD
END
02 12 2016

DEAD
END
02 12 2016

02 12 2016

AHEAD
02 12 2016

02 12 2016

AHEAD
15
02 12 2016

02 12 2016

D
D
02 12 2016







## Site Map
(Not to Scale)

ZONING INFORMATION AND VARIANCES REQUIRED:

PARENT PARCEL TAX MAP NO. = 165.73-2-46

LOT 1

ZONE = UR-2 (URBAN RESIDENTIAL 2)

MINIMUM LOT SIZE = 6,600 SQ. FT.
PROPOSED LOT SIZE = 5,700± SQ. FT.
LOT SIZE VARIANCE REQUIRED = 900 SQ. FT. RELIEF

REQUIRED MEAN LOT WIDTH = 60'
PROPOSED MEAN LOT WIDTH = 69.52'

MAXIMUM PERCENT OF LOT TO BE OCCUPIED BY PRINCIPAL BUILDING = 30%
PROPOSED PERCENT OF LOT TO BE OCCUPIED = 1,380± SQ. FT. = 24.2%

MAXIMUM PERCENT OF LOT TO BE OCCUPIED BY ACCESSORY BUILDING = 10%
PROPOSED PERCENT OF LOT TO BE OCCUPIED = 316± SQ. FT. = 5.5%

MINIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK (PRINCIPAL BUILDING) = AVERAGE OF EXISTING STRUCTURES ON NEIGHBORING LOTS PER ARTICLE XII, §240-12.3
6.8' (TAX PARCEL 47) + 0.6' (TAX PARCEL 51) / 2 = 3.7' FRONT YARD SETBACK
EXISTING FRONT YARD SETBACK (SMALLEST) = 5.6'

MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACK (PRINCIPAL BUILDING) = 8' ONE SIDE, 20' TOTAL
PROPOSED SIDE YARD SETBACK (SMALLEST) = 24.3'

MINIMUM DISTANCE BETWEEN PRINCIPAL AND ACCESSORY BUILDING = 5'
PROPOSED DISTANCE BETWEEN PRINCIPAL AND ACCESSORY BUILDING = 11.8'

MINIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK (ACCESSORY) = 10'
PROPOSED FRONT YARD SETBACK (ACCESSORY) = 42'±

MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACK (ACCESSORY) = 5'
PROPOSED SIDE YARD SETBACK (ACCESSORY) = 5.0'

MINIMUM PERCENT OF LOT TO BE PERMEABLE = 25%
PROPOSED PERCENT OF LOT TO BE PERMEABLE = 62.6%

LOT 2

LOT 2, AS PROPOSED, WILL BE FULLY COMPLIANT WITH CURRENT ZONING.

MINIMUM LOT SIZE = 6,600 SQ. FT.

REQUIRED MEAN LOT WIDTH = 60'

MAXIMUM PERCENT OF LOT TO BE OCCUPIED BY PRINCIPAL BUILDING = 30%

MINIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK (PRINCIPAL BUILDING) = AVERAGE OF EXISTING STRUCTURES ON NEIGHBORING LOTS PER ARTICLE XII,
6.8' (TAX PARCEL 47) + 5.9' (PROPOSED LOT 1) / 2 = 6.4 FRONT YARD SETBACK

FRONT YARD SETBACK FROM BRIGHTON WAY TO BE 10'

MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACK (PRINCIPAL BUILDING) = 8' ONE SIDE, 20' TOTAL

MINIMUM PERCENT OF LOT TO BE PERMEABLE = 25%

DEED REFERENCE:

1.) CONVEYANCE FROM JAMES M. ROGALSKI AND SUSANA L. DANCY TO DONALD JEFFREY BEYER BY DEED DATED JULY 17, 2008, AND RECORDED IN THE SARATOGA COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE ON AUGUST 1, 2008 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 2008026795.

MAP REFERENCE:

1.) MAP ENTITLED "SURVEY OF LANDS OF WALLACE ALLERDICE, KEITH POTTER AND ANTHONY R. PENNELL," DATED SEPTEMBER 21, 1994, AS LAST REVISED ON SEPTEMBER 29, 1995, AND PREPARED BY PAUL F. TOMMELL, L.S., P.C.

NOTES:

1.) THIS MAP WAS PREPARED WITHOUT THE BENEFIT OF AN ABSTRACT OF TITLE OR AN UP TO DATE TITLE REPORT AND IS THEREFORE SUBJECT TO ANY STATEMENT OF FACTS SHOWN THEREON.

2.) THIS MAP WAS PREPARED FROM AN ACTUAL FIELD SURVEY MADE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE EXISTING CODE OF PRACTICE ADOPTED BY THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYORS.

3.) ALL OFFSETS SHOWN BETWEEN STRUCTURES AND PROPERTY LINES ARE TO ROOF OVERHANGS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

4.) ALL CONTOURS SHOWN HEREON ARE REFERENCED TO THE NATIONAL GEODETIC VERTICAL DATUM OF 1929 (NGVD29).

RECORD OF WORK:

1.) GENERAL REVISIONS ON APRIL 7, 2010.

COPYRIGHT © 2010
TOMMELL & ASSOCIATES
UNAUTHORIZED ALTERATION OR ADDITION TO THIS DOCUMENT IS VIOLATION OF SECTION 7209, SUBDIVISION 2, OF NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION LAW.

APPLICANT:

DONALD JEFFREY BEYER
199 West Circular Street
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

# Subdivision of Lands of DONALD JEFFREY BEYER

STATE OF NEW YORK
RUBY J. HESS
LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR
50630
L.S. LIC. NO. 50,630

TOMMELL & ASSOCIATES
2 GILBERT ROAD
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY 12866
PH: (518) 587-3149 FAX: (518) 587-7251

SCALE:
1" = 10'

CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS (ID)
SARATOGA COUNTY, NEW YORK
MARCH 26, 2010

MAP NO.: 20100072

# *Short Environmental Assessment Form*
## *Part 1 - Project Information*

## Instructions for Completing

**Part 1 - Project Information. The applicant or project sponsor is responsible for the completion of Part 1.** Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification. Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information.

Complete all items in Part 1. You may also provide any additional information which you believe will be needed by or useful to the lead agency; attach additional pages as necessary to supplement any item.

**Part 1 - Project and Sponsor Information**

Creation of a Legal sized lot and a substandard sized lot via an area variance. I am the owner.

Name of Action or Project:

Proposed sub division of 19 West Circular to create a legal size building lot.

Project Location (describe, and attach a location map):

199 West Circular Street ( proposed lot is vacant situation adjacent to house on corner of Hyde Street)

Brief Description of Proposed Action:

| Name of Applicant or Sponsor: | Telepho[redacted] |
|---|---|
| Donald Jeffrey Beyer | E-Mail: [redacted] |

Address:

[redacted]

| City/PO: | State: | Zip Code: |
|---|---|---|
| Saratoga Springs | NY | 12866 |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Does the proposed action only involve the legislative adoption of a plan, local law, ordinance, administrative rule, or regulation? If Yes, attach a narrative description of the intent of the proposed action and the environmental resources that may be affected in the municipality and proceed to Part 2. If no, continue to question 2. | ☑ | ☐ |
| 2. Does the proposed action require a permit, approval or funding from any other governmental Agency? If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit or approval: | ☑ | ☐ |

3.a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action? .1 acres
b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed? .1 acres
c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor? .1 acres

4. Check all land uses that occur on, adjoining and near the proposed action.

☐ Urban ☐ Rural (non-agriculture) ☐ Industrial ☑ Commercial ☑ Residential (suburban)
☐ Forest ☐ Agriculture ☐ Aquatic ☐ Other (specify): _____
☐ Parkland

| | NO | YES | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5. Is the proposed action, | | | |
| a. A permitted use under the zoning regulations? | ☐ | ✔ | ☐ |
| b. Consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan? | ☐ | ✔ | ☐ |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 6. Is the proposed action consistent with the predominant character of the existing built or natural landscape? | ☐ | ✔ |
| 7. Is the site of the proposed action located in, or does it adjoin, a state listed Critical Environmental Area? If Yes, identify: _____ | ✔ | ☐ |
| 8. a. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels? | ✔ | ☐ |
| b. Are public transportation service(s) available at or near the site of the proposed action? | ✔ | ☐ |
| c. Are any pedestrian accommodations or bicycle routes available on or near site of the proposed action? | ☐ | ✔ |
| 9. Does the proposed action meet or exceed the state energy code requirements? If the proposed action will exceed requirements, describe design features and technologies: _____ | ✔ | ☐ |
| 10. Will the proposed action connect to an existing public/private water supply? If No, describe method for providing potable water: _____ | ☐ | ✔ |
| 11. Will the proposed action connect to existing wastewater utilities? If No, describe method for providing wastewater treatment: _____ | ☐ | ✔ |
| 12. a. Does the site contain a structure that is listed on either the State or National Register of Historic Places? | ✔ | ☐ |
| b. Is the proposed action located in an archeological sensitive area? | ✔ | ☐ |
| 13. a. Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency? | ✔ | ☐ |
| b. Would the proposed action physically alter, or encroach into, any existing wetland or waterbody? If Yes, identify the wetland or waterbody and extent of alterations in square feet or acres: _____ | ✔ | ☐ |

14. Identify the typical habitat types that occur on, or are likely to be found on the project site. Check all that apply:
☐ Shoreline ☐ Forest ☐ Agricultural/grasslands ☐ Early mid-successional
☐ Wetland ☐ Urban ☐ Suburban

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 15. Does the site of the proposed action contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered? | ✔ | ☐ |
| 16. Is the project site located in the 100 year flood plain? | ✔ | ☐ |
| 17. Will the proposed action create storm water discharge, either from point or non-point sources? If Yes, a. Will storm water discharges flow to adjacent properties? ☐ NO ☐ YES | ✔ | ☐ |
| b. Will storm water discharges be directed to established conveyance systems (runoff and storm drains)? If Yes, briefly describe: ☐ NO ☐ YES _____ | | |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 18. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that result in the impoundment of water or other liquids (e.g. retention pond, waste lagoon, dam)?<br>If Yes, explain purpose and size: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 19. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the location of an active or closed solid waste management facility?<br>If Yes, describe: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 20. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the subject of remediation (ongoing or completed) for hazardous waste?<br>If Yes, describe: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |

**I AFFIRM THAT THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE IS TRUE AND ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE**

Applicant/sponsor name: Donald Jeffrey Beyer Date: 4/14/2016

Signature: _____

.




| Parcel | dimensions | sqft | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 37 | 100x82 | 8200 | single family |
| 38 | 75x50 | 3750 | single family |
| 44 | 50x75 | 3750 | two family |
| 45 | 50x82 | 4100 | potential two family |
| 46 | 150x82 | 12,300 | proposed variance lot |
| proposed | 80x82 | 6,600 | (proposed single lot) |
| proposed | 70x82 | 5,740 | (proposed existing single family) |

| Parcel | dimensions | sqft | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 47 | 150x130 | 19,500 | Allergice Rental |
| 48 | 150x50 | 7500 | single family |
| 49 | 150x50 | 7500 | single family |




| Parcel | dimensions | sqft | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 50x150 | 7500 | two family? |
| 4 | 68x150 | 10,200 | two family? |
| 5.22 | 170x75 | 12,750 | single family |
| 5.21 | 170x75 | 12,750 | single family |
| 5.11 | 170x141.5 | 24,055 | single family |
| 5.13 | 170x90 | 15,300 | multi family? |
| 26 | 170x85 | 14,450 | multi family? |
| 24 | 150x80 | 12,000 | multi family? |

# ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND/OR BUILDING

APPLICANT: DONALD JEFFREY BEYER

TAX PARCEL NO.: 165.73-2-46

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 199 WEST CIRCULAR STREET
ZONING DISTRICT: URBAN RESIDENTIAL – 2

This applicant has applied to use the identified property within the City of Saratoga Springs for the following:

Proposed two-lot subdivision with maintenance of existing home on one of the new lots.

This application is hereby denied upon the grounds that such use of the property would violate the City Zoning Ordinance article(s):

240-2.3 Table 3. As such, the following relief would be required to proceed:

☐ Extension of existing variance ☐ Interpretation

☐ Use Variance to permit the following: _____

☒ Area Variance seeking the following relief:

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| Minimum lot size: lot 1 | 6,600 sq. ft. | 5,700 sq. ft. |

Note: _____

☐ Advisory Opinion required from Saratoga County Planning Board

ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR

3/18/16
DATE

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

CITY HALL - 474 BROADWAY
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NEW YORK 12866
PH) 518-587-3550 FX) 518-580-9480
WWW.SARATOGA-SPRINGS.ORG



Bill Moore, *Chair*
Keith B. Kaplan, *Vice Chair*
Adam McNeill, *Secretary*
Gary Hasbrouck
George "Skip" Carlson
James Helicke
Susan Steer
Cheryl Grey, alternate
Oksana Ludd, alternate


March 22, 2016

Mark Torpey, Chair
Planning Board
City Hall - 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

Re: Recommendation request for Beyer Subdivision – 199 West Circular Street

Dear Mark,

On March 21, 2016 the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) heard the following application:

> **#2882 BEYER SUBDIVISION**, 199 West Circular Street, area variance to provide for a two-lot residential subdivision; seeking relief from the minimum lot area requirement in the Urban Residential – 2 District.

Per 8.4.6 of the City's Zoning Ordinance, "If a proposed subdivision plat contains one or more lots that do not comply with this Chapter and, therefore, require an area variance; the ZBA shall request that the Planning Board provide a written recommendation concerning the proposed variance.

Thank you for your consideration of this request and we look forward to your input.

Respectfully yours,

Bill Moore, Chair
Zoning Board of Appeals

[FOR OFFICE USE]

_____ (Application #)

_____ (Date received)

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

City Hall - 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
Tel: 518-587-3550 fax: 518-580-9480

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Darren and Colleen Grassi | | Todd Levinson |
| Address | [redacted] | | 203 Lake Avenue<br>Saratoga Springs, NY 12866 |
| Phone | / | / | / |
| Email | | | [redacted] |

* An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.

Applicant's interest in the premises: ☒ Owner ☐ Lessee ☐ Under option to lease or purchase

PROPERTY INFORMATION

1. Property Address/Location: 30 Lafayette St, Saratoga Springs Tax Parcel No.: 165 . 68 - 1 - 73
(*for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37*)

2. Date acquired by current owner: 4/10/2015 3. Zoning District when purchased: UR2

4. Present use of property: Residential 5. Current Zoning District: UR2

6. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property?
☒ Yes (when? _____ For what? Area Variance)
☒ No

7. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☒ Historic District ☐ Architectural Review District
☐ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?

8. Brief description of proposed action:
New rear setback and distance from accessory building variances to correspond to as-built survey. Please see attached letter for full description.

9. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☒ No

10. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☒ Yes ☐ No

11. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☐ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☐ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☒ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☑ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.

C grassi _____ Date: 3-1-16
(applicant signature)

_____ Date: 3-1-16
(applicant signature)

If applicant is not the currently the owner of the property, the current owner must also sign.

Owner Signature: _____ Date: _____

Owner Signature: _____ Date: _____

REJUVENATION HOMES INC.
BRINGING HOMES TO LIFE

518-886-8622
INFO@REJUVENATIONHOMES.COM

February 29, 2016

RE: 30 Lafayette St. Area Variance

Hello,

My name is Todd Levinson, owner of Rejuvenation Homes, Inc., the company that built the home located at 30 LaFayette Street in Saratoga Springs, NY. The following letter is an accompanying document related to a Zoning Board of Appeals application. The application is to address discrepancies between variances that were previously granted and the as-built final survey. The purpose of this letter is to explain the reason behind these discrepancies.

When the initial variances were applied for, the building lot was assumed to be a rectangle and the existing structure located upon it was assumed to be perpendicular to the fronting street, LaFayette Street. Area use variances were applied for based on these assumptions, as well as the dimensions of the new addition and accessory building that had been approved by the Design Review Commission. A third point of reference was taken from the portion of the existing structure that was to remain and become part of the new home. This reference was also an assumption based on the architects best estimation of where the old and new foundations could be joined.

The final survey has revealed that although the new addition was built to the exact dimensions that were originally approved, the lot is actually in the shape of a rhombus, rather than a rectangle, and both it and the home are not perfectly perpendicular to the fronting street. The fact that the house is actually on an angle has made the Southeast rear corner protrude futher towards the rear of the lot than was assumed for the intial variance application. Also, the estimate of where the new addition was to join together with the existing structure was off slightly as well. This too has caused the home to grow in length towards the rear of the lot.

This growth has caused the original estimate for the separation between the accessory and principal buildings to decrease by one foot, as the porch and it's corresponding overhang has been forced to a different spot than originally planned.

The new homeowners, and I as their agent, are requesting new relief from both the rear setback and distance between principal and accessory buildings requirements, to better represent the as-built final survey.

Thank you for any and all help in this matter,

Todd Levinson

Owner, Rejuvenation Homes, Inc.

Initial Site Map Submitted for Original Application




Site Map

Scale: $\frac{3}{32}$" = 1'

Original House To Remain

New Addition To Be Added After Removal of Existing Structure

Final "As-Built" Survey



# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

CITY HALL - 474 BROADWAY
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NEW YORK 12866
PH) 518-587-3550 FX) 518-580-9480
WWW.SARATOGA-SPRINGS.ORG



BILL MOORE
CHAIR
KEITH B. KAPLAN
VICE CHAIR
ADAM MCNEILL
SECRETARY
GARY HASBROUCK
GEORGE "SKIP" CARLSON
SHIRLEY POPPEL
OKSANA LUDD


*IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF*
Rejuvenation Homes Inc.
203 Lake Ave
Saratoga Springs NY 12866
Application #2689

from the determination of the Building Inspector involving the premises at 26 and 30 Lafayette St, in the City of Saratoga Springs, New York being tax parcel numbers 165.68-1-29 and 165.68-1-30 in the Inside District, on the Assessment Map of said City.

The appellant having applied for an area variance under the Zoning Ordinance of said City, as amended to permit the demolition of one existing building and a portion of a second existing building and the renovation and construction of an addition to a single-family residence, and construction of a detached garage in a UR-4 District and public notice having been duly given of a hearing on said application held on the 11th day of March and the 20th day of May 2013. The Board notes that there is a second, related application regarding tax parcel 165.68-1-30, noted above, also referring to the demolition of the structure on that property as well as the structure on an adjacent property.

In consideration of the balance between benefit to the applicant with detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community, I move that the following area variance for the following amount of relief:

| TYPE OF REQUIREMENT | DISTRICT DIMENSIONAL REQUIREMENT | PROPOSED | RELIEF REQUESTED |
|---|---|---|---|
| MINIMUM MEAN LOT WIDTH | 100' | 65' | 35' OR 35% |
| MINIMUM SIDE YARD SETBACK | 20' | 7' | 13' OR 65% |
| TOTAL SIDE YARD SETBACK | 45' | 37' | 8' OR 17.8% |
| MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACK | 25' | 22' 8" | 2' 4" OR 9.3% |
| MINIMUM SEPARATION PRINCIPAL AND ACCESSORY BUILDINGS | 10' | 6' | 4' OR 40% |
| MAXIMUM PRINCIPAL BUILDING COVERAGE | 25% | 26.2% | 1.2%, OR 4.8% RELIEF |

As per the submitted plans or lesser dimensions, be approved for the following reasons:

1. The applicant has demonstrated this benefit cannot be achieved by other means feasible to the applicant. Per the materials submitted by the applicant to the Design Review Commission on April 11, 2013, a variety of alternatives in addition to the current proposal, encompassing the variances requested here and on the related application, were considered including rehabilitation of all three existing structures, demolition of all three and replacement with three new ones, and rehabilitation of two structures and removing one. While the first of these options-a rehabilitation of the three structures-would result in maintaining pre-existing nonconformities and therefore may have resulted in the fewest variances to be submitted to this Board, the Board finds that that option

would actually result in a greater number of dimensional nonconformities and therefore be less compliant with district requirements than the current proposal. By reducing the number of structures and enlarging the lot sizes as it is proposed here, the properties become closer to meeting the district requirements. Additionally, there were fire safety and building code issues, as well as cost considerations that made rehabilitation infeasible. Furthermore, on lot width and side setback, as noted by the applicant, there is no adjacent property that could be purchased that could provide greater lot width and room for more side setback.

2. The applicant has demonstrated that granting this variance will not create an undesirable change in neighborhood character or detriment to nearby properties. While the buildings proposed for partial and complete demolition are obviously of an advanced age and are listed as contributing structures, they are in an advanced state of disrepair. Furthermore, as noted by the applicant, the replacement of those buildings in a style consistent with the neighborhood, subject to review by the Desgin Review Commission, would be a positive contribution to the neighborhood. Additionally, neighborhood character would be advanced by the off-street parking made possible by the proposed driveway and garage set forth in the proposal, subject to approval by the city Department of Public Works.

3. Several of these variances, particularly the setbacks, are substantial; however, it should be kept in mind that the side setbacks are consistent with the density of the neighborhood, which is immediately proximate to the downtown district. The substantiality of lot width and side setbacks noted in this case exists to an even greater degree in the current configuration. Therefore the board notes that the proposal will result in a decrease in scale of non-conformity with district zoning requirements, compared to what would be required if a substantial overhaul was proposed of the individual properties on lots 26 and 30.

4. These variances will not have significant adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood or district. The proposed amount of permeable surface of 49.5% will more than meet the district requirement of 15%. The board also notes this project includes the removal of a potential fire hazard of a wooden structure in disrepair in very close proximity to another on at lot 24, the subject of the related application referred to above.

5. The alleged difficulty is self-created insofar as the applicant desires to replace and renovate the subject buildings, but this is not necessarily fatal to the application.

Conditions/Notes:
Design Review Commission historic review is required.
The DRC issued a favorable advisory opinion on this proposal on May 15, 2013.
City DPW approval required for curb cut.

Adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 6 (B. Moore, K. Kaplan, G. Hasbrouck, S. Carlson, S. Poppel, O. Ludd)

NAYES: 0

Dated: May 20, 2013

This variance shall expire 18 months following the filing date of such decision unless the necessary building permit has been issued and actual construction begun as per 240-8.5.1.

5-23-13
Date

Chair

I hereby certify the above to be a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Saratoga Springs on the date above mentioned, six members of the Board being present.

# ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND/OR BUILDING

APPLICANT: DARREN AND COLLEEN GRASSI

TAX PARCEL NO.: 165.68-1-73

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 30 LAFAYETTE STREET
ZONING DISTRICT: URBAN RESIDENTIAL – 2

This applicant has applied to use the identified property within the City of Saratoga Springs for the following:

Modification to previous approval for constructed changes to a new single-family residence and detached garage.

This application is hereby denied upon the grounds that such use of the property would violate the City Zoning Ordinance article(s):

240-2.3 Table 3. As such, the following relief would be required to proceed:

☐ Extension of existing variance ☐ Interpretation

☐ Use Variance to permit the following: _____

☒ Area Variance seeking the following relief:

| Dimensional Requirements | From | Previous App. | To |
|---|---|---|---|
| Minimum total side yard setback: | 45 feet | 37 feet | 36.3 feet |
| Minimum rear yard setback: | 25 feet | 22' 8" | 18.3 feet |
| Min. separation principal and accessory: | 10 feet | 6 feet | 5 feet |

Note: _____

☐ Advisory Opinion required from Saratoga County Planning Board

ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR

3/18/16
DATE

REJUVENATION HOMES INC.
BRINGING HOMES TO LIFE

518-886-8622
INFO@REJUVENATIONHOMES.COM

April 18, 2016

ATTN: Susan Barden
Saratoga Springs Zoning Board

REC'D APR 19 2016

RE: 30 Lafayette Street, Saratoga Springs, NY  Zoning Appeal #2689.1

Hello,

My name is Todd Levinson and I am the owner of Rejuvenation Homes. My company was the owner of the property located at 30 Lafayette St when the original applications were filed for this location. We are also the company that was hired by the current owners, Darren and Colleen Grassi, to build the home that is now located at this address.

The current zoning application in front of the board has to do with the final "as-built" survey not matching up to the intial variances that were granted for this property. I met with the board at the March 21st meeting and explained the reasons behind these discrepencies. The board adjourned our portion of the meeting telling us that nothing further was required and that the matter would be resolved at the next meeting and that there would be no reason for me to attend.

However, at the next meeting the board began a new discussion regarding a freestanding gas fireplace that is located in the rear yard. As I was told my attendance was not necessary, I was unaware that this new item was being brought up until being notified by the home owner who had watched the meeting on a webcast the next day. The board was now requesting a new survey to reflect this fireplace.

This fireplace, and all the other stone work that is now finished at the house, was contracted by the homeowner separately from me and my company and was done long after the current application was filed and my portion of the construction was complete. My application to the board only dealt with the addtional variances I required to present the home owner with their certificate of occupancy which the building department is currently withholding until the resolution of this matter.

I have attached with this letter the requested updated survey. However, I would like to request that if the board decides any additional action needs to be taken, that it considers this fireplace a separate issue from my original application and could bring a resolution to the initial matter prior to any extensions or addtional meetings that may be required, as I am no longer involved in the work at the project and would not be involved in any future board requirements relating to the fireplace.

Thank you for your help in this matter,

Todd Levinson
203 Lake Avenue
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866




3.6' to rear

2.1' to side

## Map Legen

- 5/8" stee
- marker fo
- utility pole
- water valv
- overhead
- fence

## Map Refere

1. Maps of Lands June 1, 1840 Clerk's Office
2. "Survey Lands to Roger A. Ki dated Septemb Hawks, L.S.
3. "Lot Line Adjus Inc." dated Au Thompson–Fler the Saratoga ( #M2013171.

## Deed Refere

Darren J. Grassi a
Inst. #2015010766

## Certification

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED
SARATOGA NATIONAL BAN
STEWART TITLE INSURANC

that the map was prepared i for Land Surveyors adopted b Surveyors, Inc. The certificati map is prepared, to the title institution listed on this bound

## Zoning Varia

| TYPE OF REQUIREMENT |
|---|
| MINIMUM MEAN LOT WI |
| MINIMUM SIDE YARD SE |
| TOTAL SIDE YARD SETB |
| MINIMUM REAR YARD S |
| MINIMUM SEPARATION P ACCESSORS BUILDINGS |
| MAXIMUM PRINCIPAL BU |

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

City Hall - 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
Tel: 518-587-3550 fax: 518-580-9480

[FOR OFFICE USE]

_____
(Application #)

REC'D FEB 2 6 2016
(Date received)

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Rober Ashton | | |
| Address | [redacted] | | |
| Phone | | [redacted] | |
| Email | | | |

* An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.

Applicant's interest in the premises: ☒ Owner ☐ Lessee ☐ Under option to lease or purchase

PROPERTY INFORMATION

1. Property Address/Location: 149 Grand Ave Tax Parcel No.: 165 . 66 - 1 - 18
(*for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37*)

2. Date acquired by current owner: July 22, 2015 3. Zoning District when purchased: UR-3

4. Present use of property: Residential 5. Current Zoning District: UR-3

6. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property?
☐ Yes (when? _____ For what? _____)
☒ No

7. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☐ Historic District ☐ Architectural Review District
☐ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?

8. Brief description of proposed action:
Allow the addition of a car port to the approved 1 car garage to allow 2 cars to be protected from the weather. Garage with car port will occupy 11.4% of the lot versus the allowed 10%.

9. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☒ No

10. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☐ Yes ☒ No

11. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☐ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☐ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☒ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

_____

_____

_____

**USE VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

A use variance is requested to permit the following: _____

_____

_____

For the Zoning Board to grant a request for a use variance, an applicant must prove that the zoning regulations create an unnecessary hardship in relation to that property. In seeking a use variance, New York State law requires an applicant to prove all four of the following "tests".

1. That the applicant cannot realize a reasonable financial return on initial investment for any currently permitted use on the property. "Dollars & cents" proof must be submitted as evidence. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

A. Submit the following financial evidence relating to this property (attach additional evidence as needed):

1) Date of purchase: _____ Purchase amount: $_____

2) Indicate dates and costs of any improvements made to property after purchase:

| Date | Improvement | Cost |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3) Annual maintenance expenses: $_____ 4) Annual taxes: $_____

5) Annual income generated from property: $_____

6) City assessed value: $_____ Equalization rate:_____ Estimated Market Value: $_____

7) Appraised Value: $_____ Appraiser: _____Date: _____

Appraisal Assumptions:_____

B. Has property been listed for sale with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS)? ☐Yes ☐No If "yes", for how long? _____

1) Original listing date(s):_____ Original listing price: $_____

If listing price was reduced, describe when and to what extent: _____

_____

2) Has the property been advertised in the newspapers or other publications? ☐Yes ☐No

If yes, describe frequency and name of publications: _____

_____

3) Has the property had a "For Sale" sign posted on it? ☐Yes ☐No

If yes, list dates when sign was posted: _____

_____

4) How many times has the property been shown and with what results? _____

_____

_____

2. That the financial hardship relating to this property is unique and does not apply to a substantial portion of the neighborhood. Difficulties shared with numerous other properties in the same neighborhood or district would not satisfy this requirement. This previously identified financial hardship is unique for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. That the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Changes that will alter the character of a neighborhood or district would be at odds with the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance. The requested variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood for the following reasons:

4. That the alleged hardship has not been self-created. An applicant (whether the property owner or one acting on behalf of the property owner) cannot claim "unnecessary hardship" if that hardship was created by the applicant, or if the applicant acquired the property knowing (or was in a position to know) the conditions for which the applicant is seeking relief. The hardship has not been self-created for the following reasons:

**AREA VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

The applicant requests relief from the following Zoning Ordinance article(s) _____

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| Maximum percent of lot to be occupied by an accessory building | 10% | 11.4% |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Other: _____

To grant an area variance, the ZBA must balance the benefits to the applicant and the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and community, taking into consideration the following:

1. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by other feasible means. Identify what alternatives to the variance have been explored (alternative designs, attempts to purchase land, etc.) and why they are not feasible.
   No additional land available. No other way to protect 2 cars minimally form the weather with minimal visual impacr.

2. Whether granting the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. Granting the variance will not create a detriment to nearby properties or an undesirable change in the neighborhood character for the following reasons:
   The garage design with the carport is compatible with the exisiting house on the lot and surrounding structures. The arport will provide protection for a second car and minimize the visual impact.

3. Whether the variance is substantial. The requested variance is not substantial for the following reasons:
Area of the proposed garage with the carport (including stairs) is 11.4% (747 st ft +/-) versus the 10% of the allowed lot in the Zoning Distirict

4. Whether the variance will have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district. The requested variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood or district for the following reasons:
The carport will not overshadow neighboring structures and is compatible with the exisiting house and neighboring structures. There are no environmental effects.

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created (although this does not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance). Explain whether the alleged difficulty was or was not self-created:
Approval has been granted for the 1 car garage. We own 2 cars and would like to adequately protect the 2nd car from the weather with minimal visual impact

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☑ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.

_____ Date: 2/26/16
(applicant signature)

_____ Date: _____
(applicant signature)

If applicant is not the currently the owner of the property, the current owner must also sign.

Owner Signature: _____ Date: _____

Owner Signature: _____ Date: _____

# ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND/OR BUILDING

APPLICANT: _____ TAX PARCEL NO.: _____.____ - _____ - ____

PROPERTY ADDRESS: _____ ZONING DISTRICT: _____

This applicant has applied to use the identified property within the City of Saratoga Springs for the following:

_____

_____

_____

This application is hereby denied upon the grounds that such use of the property would violate the City Zoning Ordinance article(s)

_____. As such, the following relief would be required to proceed:

☐ Extension of existing variance ☐ Interpretation

☐ Use Variance to permit the following: _____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Area Variance seeking the following relief:

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Other: _____

_____

Note: _____

☐ Advisory Opinion required from Saratoga County Planning Board

_____ _____

ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DATE

Revised 12/2015

# *Short Environmental Assessment Form*
## *Part 1 - Project Information*

REC'D FEB 2 6 2015

**Instructions for Completing**

**Part 1 - Project Information. The applicant or project sponsor is responsible for the completion of Part 1.** Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification. Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information.

Complete all items in Part 1. You may also provide any additional information which you believe will be needed by or useful to the lead agency; attach additional pages as necessary to supplement any item.

**Part 1 - Project and Sponsor Information**
Robert Ashton

Name of Action or Project:
149 Grand Avenue - Garage

Project Location (describe, and attach a location map):
149 Grand Avenue, Saratoga Springs, NY

Brief Description of Proposed Action:
Allow the addition of a car port to the approved i car garage to allow 2 cars to be protected from the weather

| Name of Applicant or Sponsor: | Telephone: [redacted] |
|---|---|
| Robert Ashton | E-Mail: [redacted] |

Address:
[redacted]

| City/PO: | State: | Zip Code: |
|---|---|---|
| Saratoga Srpings | NY | 12866 |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Does the proposed action only involve the legislative adoption of a plan, local law, ordinance, administrative rule, or regulation? If Yes, attach a narrative description of the intent of the proposed action and the environmental resources that may be affected in the municipality and proceed to Part 2. If no, continue to question 2. | ☑ | ☐ |
| 2. Does the proposed action require a permit, approval or funding from any other governmental Agency? If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit or approval: | ☑ | ☐ |

3.a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action? .151 acres
b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed? .017 acres
c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor? .151 acres

4. Check all land uses that occur on, adjoining and near the proposed action.
☑ Urban ☐ Rural (non-agriculture) ☐ Industrial ☑ Commercial ☐ Residential (suburban)
☐ Forest ☐ Agriculture ☐ Aquatic ☐ Other (specify): _____
☐ Parkland

| | NO | YES | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5. Is the proposed action, | | | |
| a. A permitted use under the zoning regulations? | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan? | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 6. Is the proposed action consistent with the predominant character of the existing built or natural landscape? | ☐ | ☑ |
| 7. Is the site of the proposed action located in, or does it adjoin, a state listed Critical Environmental Area? If Yes, identify: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 8. a. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels? | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Are public transportation service(s) available at or near the site of the proposed action? | ☐ | ☑ |
| c. Are any pedestrian accommodations or bicycle routes available on or near site of the proposed action? | ☐ | ☑ |
| 9. Does the proposed action meet or exceed the state energy code requirements? If the proposed action will exceed requirements, describe design features and technologies: _____ | ☐ | ☑ |
| 10. Will the proposed action connect to an existing public/private water supply? If No, describe method for providing potable water: _____ | ☐ | ☑ |
| 11. Will the proposed action connect to existing wastewater utilities? If No, describe method for providing wastewater treatment: _____ | ☐ | ☑ |
| 12. a. Does the site contain a structure that is listed on either the State or National Register of Historic Places? | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Is the proposed action located in an archeological sensitive area? | ☑ | ☐ |
| 13. a. Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency? | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Would the proposed action physically alter, or encroach into, any existing wetland or waterbody? If Yes, identify the wetland or waterbody and extent of alterations in square feet or acres: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |

14. Identify the typical habitat types that occur on, or are likely to be found on the project site. Check all that apply:
☐ Shoreline ☐ Forest ☐ Agricultural/grasslands ☐ Early mid-successional
☐ Wetland ☑ Urban ☐ Suburban

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 15. Does the site of the proposed action contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered? | ☑ | ☐ |
| 16. Is the project site located in the 100 year flood plain? | ☑ | ☐ |
| 17. Will the proposed action create storm water discharge, either from point or non-point sources? If Yes, a. Will storm water discharges flow to adjacent properties? ☐ NO ☐ YES | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Will storm water discharges be directed to established conveyance systems (runoff and storm drains)? If Yes, briefly describe: ☐ NO ☐ YES _____ | | |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 18. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that result in the impoundment of water or other liquids (e.g. retention pond, waste lagoon, dam)?<br>If Yes, explain purpose and size: | ☑ | ☐ |
| 19. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the location of an active or closed solid waste management facility?<br>If Yes, describe: | ☑ | ☐ |
| 20. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the subject of remediation (ongoing or completed) for hazardous waste?<br>If Yes, describe: | ☑ | ☐ |

**I AFFIRM THAT THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE IS TRUE AND ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE**

Applicant/sponsor name: Robert J. Ashton Date: 2/26/16

Signature: Robert J. Ashton

PRINT FORM

TYPICAL ROOF ASSEMBLY:

- 5/8" THICK PLYWOOD ROOF SHEATHING
- 15 LB. FELT PAPER
- 30 YEAR ASPHALT SHINGLES
- ROOF FRAMING PER PLAN

TYPICAL EXTERIOR WALL:

- EXTERIOR FINISHES AS PER ELEVATIONS
- "TYVEK" AIR BARRIER
- 1/2" O.S.B. SHEATHING
- 2 X 6 WALL STUDS @ 16" O.C.
- R-21 FIBERGLASS INSULATION
- 4 MIL. POLY VAPOR BARRIER
- 1/2" G.W.B. INTERIOR FINISH




# SECTION A-A

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




# GARAGE PLAN

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




# FOUNDATION PLAN

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

## LEFT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

## FRONT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




## RIGHT ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

# REAR ELEVATION

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




# SECOND FLOOR FRAMING PLAN

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




## SECOND FLOOR PLAN

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

City Hall - 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
Tel: 518-587-3550 fax: 518-580-9480

[FOR OFFICE USE]

(Application #)

(Date received)

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Casey James Lamont Washington | [redacted] KAVITA KAVITA MANDEEP SIDHU | |
| Address | [redacted] | | |
| Phone | [redacted] / | / | / |
| Email | [redacted] | | |

* An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.

Applicant's interest in the premises: ☒ Owner ☐ Lessee ☑ Under option to lease or purchase

PROPERTY INFORMATION

1. Property Address/Location: 44 Jefferson St. Saratoga Springs Tax Parcel No.: 178.28 - 1 - 38 (for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37)

2. Date acquired by current owner: 7/10/2008 3. Zoning District when purchased: _____

4. Present use of property: Vacant 5. Current Zoning District: UR2

6. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property?
   ☒ Yes (when? 1946 For what? Use variance)
   ☐ No

7. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☐ Historic District ☐ Architectural Review District
   ☐ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?

8. Brief description of proposed action: Turn into a barber shop. Use existing property.

9. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☑ No

10. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☑ Yes ☐ No

11. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☐ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☑ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☐ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

**USE VARIANCE** – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

A use variance is requested to permit the following: A Barber Shop.

For the Zoning Board to grant a request for a use variance, an applicant must prove that the zoning regulations create an unnecessary hardship in relation to that property. In seeking a use variance, New York State law requires an applicant to prove all four of the following "tests".

1. That the applicant cannot realize a reasonable financial return on initial investment for any currently permitted use on the property. "Dollars & cents" proof must be submitted as evidence. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return for the following reasons:

   See Attached

A. Submit the following financial evidence relating to this property (attach additional evidence as needed):

1) Date of purchase: 7/10/2008 Purchase amount: $ 100,000

2) Indicate dates and costs of any improvements made to property after purchase:

| Date | Improvement | Cost |
|---|---|---|
| N/A | — | — |
| N/A | — | — |
| N/A | — | — |

3) Annual maintenance expenses: $ N/A 4) Annual taxes: $ N/A

5) Annual income generated from property: $ 0

6) City assessed value: $ 69,100 Equalization rate: 78% Estimated Market Value: $ 88,589

7) Appraised Value: $ N/A Appraiser: N/A Date: N/A

Appraisal Assumptions: N/A

B. Has property been listed for sale with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS)? ☑ Yes ☐ No If "yes", for how long? 4 years

1) Original listing date(s): _____ Original listing price: $ _____

If listing price was reduced, describe when and to what extent: _____

2) Has the property been advertised in the newspapers or other publications? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, describe frequency and name of publications: _____

3) Has the property had a "For Sale" sign posted on it? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, list dates when sign was posted: _____

4) How many times has the property been shown and with what results? 0, No serious prospects

2. That the financial hardship relating to this property is unique and does not apply to a substantial portion of the neighborhood. Difficulties shared with numerous other properties in the same neighborhood or district would not satisfy this requirement. This previously identified financial hardship is unique for the following reasons:

See Attached

3. That the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Changes that will alter the character of a neighborhood or district would be at odds with the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance. The requested variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood for the following reasons:

See Attached

4. That the alleged hardship has not been self-created. An applicant (whether the property owner or one acting on behalf of the property owner) cannot claim "unnecessary hardship" if that hardship was created by the applicant, or if the applicant acquired the property knowing (or was in a position to know) the conditions for which the applicant is seeking relief. The hardship has not been self-created for the following reasons:

See Attached

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☒ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.

(applicant signature) Date: 3/9/16

(applicant signature) Date: 3/9/16

If applicant is not the currently the owner of the property, the current owner must also sign.

Owner Signature: Kavita Kavita Date: 3-8-16

Owner Signature: Mandeep Singh Date: 3-8-16

BEFORE THE

# BOARD OF APPEALS

OF THE CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL

*of*

BERNARD J. COLLINS

from the determination of the Building Inspector denying application for permit to

erect and operate a grocery store

on Premises No. 44 Jefferson St. in the City of Saratoga Springs, New York, being Lot No. 115, Block No. E, Section 19, on the Assessment Map of the said City.

having hertofore appealed to this Board from a determination of the Building Inspector denying appellant's application for permission to erect and operate a grocery store

on the premises No. 44 Jefferson St. in the City of Saratoga Springs, being Lot. No. 115, Block No. E, Section No. 19 on the Assessment Map of said City, on the ground that the same violates the zoning ordinance of said City in the following particulars, viz.:

The above described premises are in Zone B which is restricted for the use as herein requested

and the appellant having at the same time applied for a variance from the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance of the said city as amended. And due public notice having been duly given of a hearing on said application to be held on the 12th day of June, 19 46 and the applicant having appeared by him-self in support of said application and no one appearing in opposition, and after due consideration it appearing to the satisfaction of this Board that

said appeal can be granted without detriment to the health, safety, morals, convenience or general welfare of the community, and that the use applied for is a reasonable one for the premises involved; that practical difficulties and unnecessary hardships would result in carrying out the strict letter of the ordinance, and that by granting said appeal the spirit of the ordinance will be observed public safety secured and substantial justice done.

NOW, THEREFORE, RESOLVED, that Bernard J. Collins is hereby authorized to erect and operate a grocery store on the premises No. 44 Jefferson St. in the City of Saratoga Springs, New York, being Lot 115, Block E, Section 19, on the Assessment Map of the City of Saratoga Springs.

~~in accordance with plans and specifications therefor to be submitted to and approved by the Building Inspector of the City of Saratoga Springs, New York, conditioned nevertheless~~

~~the said determination of the Building Inspector be and it hereby is in all things affirmed and the appellant's appeal denied.~~

Dated, June 12, 1946

BOARD OF APPEALS OF THE
CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

John J. Carusone
*Chairman*

I HEREBY certify the above to be a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Board of Appeals of the City of Saratoga Springs on the date above mentioned, four members of the Board being present and concurring.

W B Little
*Secretary*

Property: 44 JEFFERSON ST, Saratoga Springs
SBL: 178.28-1-38

Show all Images
View Parcel Documents

| Assessment | |
|---|---|
| Total | $69,100.00 |
| Total Land | $41,200.00 |
| County Taxable (Saratoga) | $69,100.00 |
| Town Taxable | $69,100.00 |
| School Taxable | $69,100.00 |
| Village Taxable | $0.00 |
| Equalization Rate | 78% |
| Full Market Value | $88,589.74 |

| Structure | |
|---|---|
| **Site 1 of 1** | |
| **Building 1 of 1** | |
| **Section 1 of 1** | |
| Boeck # - Description | - |
| Construction Quality | 1 |
| Gross Floor Area | 988 |
| Number of Stories | 1 |
| Story Height | 8 |
| Year Built / Effective Year Built | 1960 / 0 |
| Condition | 2 - Fair |
| Building Perimeter | 136 |
| Basement Perimeter | 80 |
| Basement SQFT | 400 |
| Number of Elevators | 0 |
| Air Conditioning % | 0 |
| Sprinkler % | 0 |

| Property Description | |
|---|---|
| Type | Commerical |
| Use | 484 - 1 use sm bld |
| Ownership Code | - |
| Zoning | UR2 |
| Road Type | - |
| Water Supply | 3 - Comm/public |
| Utilities | 4 - Gas & elec |
| School District | Saratoga Springs Csd - 411500 |
| Neighborhood Code | 15192 |

| Last Property Sale | |
|---|---|
| Sale Date | 7/10/2008 9:40:56 AM |
| Sale Price | $100,000.00 |
| Useable Sale | YES |
| Arms Length | YES |
| Prior Owner Name | Manzueta , William |
| Deed Book | 2008 |
| Deed Page | 24352 |
| Deed Date | 7/11/2008 |

**Improvements**

| Site # | Description | Quantity | Condition | Year Built | SQFT | Dimentions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | FC1 - Shed-machine | 1 | Fair | 1938 | 68 | 0X0 |

**Land**

| Site # | Land Type | Acres | Front | Depth | SQFT | Soil Rating |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 01 - Primary | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Land: 1 Rating: |

**Owner Information**

| Owner Name | Address 1 | Address 2 | City/State/Zip |
|---|---|---|---|
| ***** | 7 King Arthur Ct | | Saratoga Springs NY 12866 |
| ***** | 7 King Arthur Ct | | Saratoga Springs NY 12866 |

REC'D MAR 18 2016

# North East Realty USA

Rohan Chetoora
North East Realty USA
1438 State St,
Schenectady, NY 12304

Cell: [redacted]
Office: (518) 557-8885
Fax: (518) 982 1561
Email: [redacted]
www.nerealtyusa.com

## Fax Cover Sheet

**Date:** 03/17/2016 **Fax #:** [redacted]

**Attention:** Dave **# pages:** 4

**Notes:**

Dave please receive letter and also
2 listing from the MLS

Rohan

THANK YOU
ROHAN CHETOORA

*NOTE: If you did not receive all the pages indicated or any of the pages are unclear or blurry, please contact this office as soon as possible at the above phone number. Also, if this fax was received in error, please notify this office. Thank you.*

Property Type CI - Commercial Industrial Full Agent Report

**Property Type CM - CRMLS Commercial Full Agent Report**

MLS#: 201117221 Area: 311 List Price: $130,000
Status: Expired Map Co: 36DJ54 Orig List Price: $125,000
Spec Mkt Cond: EXC Sale Price:
Address: 44 JEFFERSON ST Zip: 12866
City/Town (taxing entity) Saratoga S
City/Town (Mail Address) Saratoga Springs
Village:
County: Saratoga OLSF: 988.00 OLM: $1,200.0
Locale: LPSF: Offerd Lease Term: 3
Section: 178.28 Block: 1 Lot: 38 APN: 411501 178.28-1-38

Category: Business Opportunities
Zoning: COMM
Road Frontage:

| | TOTAL SQFT | AVAIL SQFT | CEILINGS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Building: | 988 | 988 | |
| Office: | | 0 | |
| Warehouse: | | 0 | |
| Retail: | | 988 | |

Age: 51 Construction:
Condition: Roof:

Use: Business, Retail
Restrictions:
Lot Size:
Elevators: /
Overhead Door: /
Loading Dock: /
Sprinkler: /
RR Siding: /
Parking: 4/Private, Public

Handicap: No
Lot SqFt:
Acres: 0.000
Stories: 1

Remarks: WONDERFUL OPPORTUNITY FOR GROCERY, DELI OR SMALL OFFICE. JUST 2 BLOCKS FROM SARATOGA RACE TRACK. EQUIPMENT INCLUDED IN SALE, PARKING AVAILABLE IN FRONT AND ON STREET. CALL CSS FOR ALL SHOWINGS AT 518 738 0001.

**FINANCING**
Owner Finance: /
Mortgage:
Assessed Value:

Directions: BROADWAY TO RIGHT ON LINCOLN TO RIGHT ON JEFFERSON.

Business Name: Year Established: Docs Available:

**EXPENSES**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Gas/Oil: | $ | / |
| Electric: | $ | / |
| Water/Sewer: | $ | |
| Repairs/Maint | $ | / |
| RE Taxes: | $ | |
| Insurance: | $ | |
| Management: | $ | |

**ANNUAL TAXES**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| General: | $ | / |
| School: | $ | / |
| Village: | $ | / |
| Total: | $ 1,600 | /8 |

Tenant Pays

**UTILITIES**
Heat:
A/C:
Water: MUNI
Sewer: Yes Volts:
Septic: No Amps:
Phase:

LO: North East Realty USA - Office: 518-557-5801
LO Code: 2205A Fax: 518-288-0010 Sign:
LA1: Rohan Chetoora - 518-557-8885ext. 0 List Team:
LA1 Code: 7008 rohan@nerealtyusa.com Owner:
LA2 Owner Phone:
Possession: AT CLOSING
Sub-Ag 2.5 Buy Ag 0 Bkr Ag 2.5 Depository: TRUSTCO

List Date: 4/28/2011 Expire Date: 10/31/2011 Sale Terms:
Pend Date: Status Date: 11/1/2011 Sell Office:
Closed Date: Sell Agent 1:
Days On Market: 187 Sell Agent 2:
Owner Contribution: Sid Rmks & Contribution $:
Virtual Tour URL:

The information in this listing was gathered from third party sources including the seller and public records. CRMLS and its subscribers disclaim any and all representations or warranties as to the accuracy of this information.

Property Type CI - Commercial Industrial Full Agent Report

**Property Type CM - CRMLS Commercial Full Agent Report**



MLS#: 201332709 Area: 311 List Price: $92,000
Status: Expired Map Co: 36dj54 Orig List Price: $99,900
Spec Mkt Cond: EXC Sale Price:
Address: 44 JEFFERSON ST Zip: 12866
City/Town (taxing entity) Saratoga S
City/Town (Mail Address) Saratoga Springs
Village:
County: Saratoga OLSF: OLM:
Locale: LPSF: Offerd Lease Term:
Section: 178.28 Block: 1 Lot: 38 APN: 411501 178.28-1-38

Category: Business Opportunities
Zoning: commercial
Road Frontage:

| | TOTAL SQFT | AVAIL SQFT | CEILINGS |
|---|---|---|---|
| Building: | 988 | 988 | |
| Office: | | 0 | |
| Warehouse: | | 0 | |
| Retail: | | 988 | |

Age: 51 Construction:
Condition: Roof:

Use: Business, Retail
Restrictions:
Lot Size:
Elevators: /
Overhead Door: /
Loading Dock: /
Sprinkler: /
RR Siding: /
Parking: / Street

Handicap: No
Lot SqFt:
Acres: 0.000
Stories:

Remarks: Very good opportunity for corner store/grocery store ,deli or small office space, just minutes away from Saratoga race track equipment included in sale ,parking available in front and on street. Call showingtime for all appointment at 800 746 9464.

**FINANCING**
Owner Finance: /
Mortgage:
Assessed Value:

Directions: Broadway ,right on Lincoln ,right on to Jefferson.

Business Name: Year Established: Docs Available:

**EXPENSES**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Gas/Oil: | $ | / |
| Electric: | $ | / |
| Water/Sewer: | $ | |
| Repairs/Maint | $ | / |
| RE Taxes: | $ | |
| Insurance: | $ | |
| Management: | $ | |

Tenant Pays

**ANNUAL TAXES**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| General: | $ | / |
| School: | $ | / |
| Village: | $ | / |
| Total: | $2,000 | /E |

**UTILITIES**
Heat:
A/C:
Water: muni
Sewer: Yes Volts:
Septic: Yes Amps:
Phase:

LO: North East Realty USA - Office: 518-557-5801
LO Code: 2205A Fax: 518-288-0010 Sign:
LA1: Rohan Chetoora - 518-557-8885ext. 0 List Team:
LA1 Code: 7008 rohan@nerealtyusa.com Owner:
LA2 Owner Phone:
Possession:
Sub-Ag 0 Buy Ag 2.5 Bkr Ag 2.5 Depository: trustco

List Date: 11/11/2013 Expire Date: 5/12/2014 Sale Terms:
Pend Date: Status Date: 5/13/2014 Sell Office:
Closed Date: Sell Agent 1:
Days On Market: 183 Sell Agent 2:
Owner Contribution: Sld Rmks & Contribution $:
Virtual Tour URL:

The information in this listing was gathered from third party sources including the seller and public records. CRMLS and its subscribers disclaim any and all representations or warranties as to the accuracy of this information.

North East Realty USA

1438 State St, Schenectady, NY 12304
Office: (518) 557-5801
Fax: (518) 288-0010
www.nerealtyusa.com

To whom it may Con Sern,

I the undersign broker Rohan Chetoora, North East Realty USA. have listed 44 Jefferson St for a six month period and the property could not be sold, if you have any further question I can be reached at [redacted]

Thank you.

Yours truly.
Rohan Chetoora.

ROHAN CHETOORA
NORTH EAST
REALTY USA

I am lamont washington and i am writing this statement on behalf of myself, casey james, and the Application for a change in use variance we are submitting. I would like to begin by addressing all four criterias or "tests" that are required by the zoning board to be met in order to be approved for a change in use variance. In the following statement i will prove and provide proof of how we have met all criteria and passed all "tests".

1. The applicant cannot realize a reasonable Financial return on initial investment for any currently permitted use on the property. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return for the following reasons: Attached and also submitted with this application for review, is a statement from the current property owner and the previous property owner. In this statement they both Express the impossibility of running and sustaining a profitable convenience store at that property, due to the hardships of having a much more popular and successful convenience store so close in proximity. This competition makes it impossible for anyone to be successful under the currently permitted use of the property. In the same statement, the current property owner also addresses the fact that it is financially unfeasible to turn the building into a residential home. We hired Sukhdev Fingb (owner of a roofing, and construction company in saratoga springs ny) to give a professional opinion on what it would take to make the property suitable for a family residence. He stated that not only will it cost approximately the same if not more than the current appraised value of the property in the first place, but it would also require extension permits, lots of time and labor that in the end would not provide for a reasonable Financial return (his statement is also attached and submitted with this application for review). The previous property owner also expresses his attempts to sell and lease the property, hiring a real estate agent and putting out a For sale sign for over 5 years with no success whatsoever and no serious prospects whatsoever. Lastly the previous property owner expresses his regret when due to the financial loss the business was acquiring he was forced to close the business and leave the property vacant and abandoned, and inturn it being broken into, vandalized and getting somewhat of a negative reputation associated with it. The property owner States that if the change in use variance is not granted he and the other property owners have no other choice but to continue to leave the property vacant and abandoned. I believe that all of the information provided, proves that it is currently impossible to get any reasonable financial return for any currently permitted use on the property.

2. That the financial hardship relating to this property is unique in does not apply to a substantial portion of the neighborhood this previously identified financial hardship is unique for the following reasons: The primary hardships facing the property and the current permitted use is that of competition. Five Points convenience store not only 2 minutes walking distance up the street from the property in question but it is also wildly successful most locals go there and are very loyal customers making it almost impossible to have a successful convenience store so close in proximity. The current owners in the previous owners have tried three times unsuccessfully to do so and they both believe that a large part of their failure is due to the competition from Five Points convenience store. A convenience store closing down 3 times at the same property is proof that the hardship is unique and certainly exists.
3. That the variance, if granted, will not alter the central character of the neighborhood. The requested variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood for the following reasons: For the past few years the property has been vacant, broken into, and vandalized. Not only does this put a burden on to the current owners butt it creates a negative reputation and impact on the entire neighborhood, surrounding area and saratoga springs as a city. What we plan to bring to the property is a professional and respectable establishment. We have no competitors of the same kind within a mile of the property and will help bring more prosperity to the already existing business in the area and they will do the same for us in the form of advertising. Attached and submitted with this application for review are letters of support from not only most properties that are neighboring 44 Jefferson Street but also letters of support from all businesses in close proximity, and a letter of support from the executive director of the Saratoga Springs Housing Authority located directly across the street from the property in question. The Continuous pattern among the supporters we have acquired is that they welcome the change, in fact they promote it! They believe as do I, that a convenience store will never succeed and having a vacant building there is a negative impact on the neighborhood. When there was a convenience store operating out of the build the hours of business were as follows: 9am to 10 p.m. everyday Monday thru Saturday and 10am to 8pm on Sunday. Our planned hours of operation are as follows: 10am to 8pm Tuesday through Saturday and 12am to 5pm on Sunday and Monday. Our hours of operation are considerably less than that of what is already permitted and has been since 1945. We will only have 4 chairs max in operation on any given day and less on slow days, so not only will there be the

same if not less walk in traffic then a convenient store but parking will not be an issue. There are 5 on site parking spots and plenty of on street parking. I myself live directly across the street (10 seconds walking distance from the property) so myself and my employees will be parking at my house and not the property, leaving the parking spots open for customers only. Also being that most of our customer base will come from the local area, most people will be within walking distance and will not require to park on the property, the parking on site will be more than sufficient but if parking on the property is taken there is plenty of on street parking available as i previously stated. As I previously stated there is no competition within a mile of the property so there is no conflict of competition between businesses. There are however 2 salons within close proximity to the property but they both specialize in only cutting female hair where my business will only be attending to the male clientele. If the use variance is granted we will be promoting for each other. Myself and all my employees are licensed barbers we are all professionals at full hot towel face shaves, designs, and all male haircut styles. We intend to create a professional environment where our male clientele can come get pampered, unwind and relax. I myself am a college graduate, with a degree in business marketing. My partner casey james has an associates degree in business management, we both grew up in saratoga springs myself in particular grew up in the Housing Authority located across the street from the property. We grew up poor, worked hard, kept our records clean, went to college, and tried always to conduct ourselves in a professional manner as we will do with our business. As a result we have gained the respect and support of many good people especially in saratoga springs and the surrounding neighborhoods of the property. Fortunately for us not much is required to operate a barber shop, all we need is barber chairs, a couple mirrors, some chairs for a waiting area, a register, a bathroom, a barbershop owner's license and insurance (the employees bring all their own equipment like capes and clippers etc...). We already have all things required! We have already created an llc, we have insurance, we purchased all the equipment, established payroll, and have even cleaned up the property. All that is left is to get approval for the change in use variance and we can start business with no need for extensions permits or any construction. We believe that we can only improve the central character of the neighborhood.

4. <u>That the alleged hardship has not been self-created. The hardship has not been self-created for the following reasons:</u> The competition in form of the Five Points

convenience store has proved to be too great, forcing the convenience store at 44 Jefferson Street Saratoga Springs New York to close down, not once, not twice, but three times within the past 10 years. Even when store took on new Management it was still unsuccessful. The success of another competing convenience store of the same kind, whomes success negatively affects the financial Return of the property in question is not a hardship that is self-created.

Before I wrap this statement up I would like to discuss a little bit of why I know my business will be successful.

1. My employees and i have already established a large and loyal clientele base. Some of our clientele base includes people such as Shawn Francis who is inspiring to run for the New York State Senate. We also have lots of small business owners for clients who wish to help us promote and advertise through their business.We are also planning to arrange an opening ceremony with the mayor where she cuts the ribbon promoting small businesses with media coverage.
2. The location of the property is prime for Barbershop. Like I previously stated in this statement, the closest Barbershop providing Services similar to the services I plan to provide is at least a mile away, the next similar Barbershop is about 3 miles away. Growing up in the Housing Authority I know from experience that is very inconvenient to go so far for a haircut. Many of the males who reside in housing don't have cars or are too young to drive, so it's very hard for them to get the haircuts they need. Also the property is so close to the track the rec center many other neighborhoods and relatively close to downtown Saratoga Springs. If granted the changing use variance I will be tapping into very prominent customer base.
3. Lastly, I will not let myself fail. Growing up a poor minority in the Saratoga Springs housing District, I've always had to work hard to get what I want. Being the oldest of four Brothers, a single mother and living in a poor home in such a great and rich city that is saratoga springs, i knew from a young age that i could not let myself fail. So I have always worked hard mimicking the successful people that I have seen this city produce. Now I am a 26 years old, a college graduate, with a son, and I am so close to finally fulfilling my dreams and providing a better life and example for my family. Getting this change in use variance is all that stands between me and the rest of my life.

So in closing i ask you all to please approve this application. I along with my partner casey james, my family, and all those that believe and support us implore you to make the right decision. We

have quite literally put our entire lives to making this dream a reality and we have met every criteria or "test" that you require to approve an application, now all that is left is for your approval to allow us to bring a great and new successful small business to the amazing city of Saratoga Springs.

Sincerely,

Lamont washington & Casey James

3/11/16

[redacted]

3/11/16

[redacted]

SARATOGA SPRINGS HOUSING AUTHORITY
ONE SOUTH FEDERAL STREET
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NEW YORK 12866
PHONE: (518) 584-6600 FAX: (518) 583-8006

March 9, 2016

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of the Saratoga Springs Housing Authority I am writing to voice my support for Lamont Washington in his efforts to receive a zoning variance so that he can open a barber shop at 44 Jefferson Street, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866. There are not many male barbershops in the area so Lamont would fill a need for boys and men in the area while adding to the city's tax base. Most importantly to me is the fact that Lamont is a former resident of the Terrace Community and he would set a wonderful example for the current residents of what is possible if you go to school and work hard. Lamont graduated from college and is now an entrepreneur in the same community he grew up in. The housing authority would love to help promote Lamont's business venture so I am hopeful that a zoning variance will be passed to allow Lamont to fulfill his dreams.

Respectfully,

Paul J. Feldman
Executive Director

**Executive Director:** Paul Feldman
**Legal Counsel:** Scott Peterson

**Board of Commissioners:** Joanne Foresta - Chairman, Lucile Lucas – Co Chairman, Ann Bullock, Susan Christopher, Joy King, Eric Weller, Olivine Wescott

Reasonable Accommodation Statement: Pursuant to the Fair Housing Act (42U.S.C. 3601-3619), if you are a federally funded assisted housing program applicant or resident with a disability, you may request an exception, change or adjustment to a rule, policy, practice or service that may be necessary to afford you an equal opportunity to participate in the program.

5 March 2016

Saratoga 5 Points Market and Deli
42 Park Place
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
518.584.1000

To Whom it May Concern;

I am writing on behalf of Lamont, and his new business TrueCutz, which is hoping to open it's doors at the old country store on Jefferson Street here in town. I know being a strong presence in the neighborhood is very important, especially since purchasing 5 Points four years ago myself.
Both Lamont and his grandmother had approached me about his business ideas months ago. So I was disappointed to hear he was having some issues getting open. In my four+ years here in the neighborhood ( even having personally moved across the street from the store), I have seen 2 other businesses open and close in that same location.
We are close-knit here at "The Points" and all of our 5 ( soon to be 6) businesses here communicate well with each other and help/refer each other all the time. I am thrilled Lamont reached out to us. The addition of an all male barbershop feels like a great addition to the 5Points community. We are all thrilled he is bringing life back to this somewhat abandoned building that has had its share of bad reputation.
We wish him the best of luck and offer our support. Our customer base (mostly locals) have also voiced their excitement

over this new endeavor. Anything that brings positive energy, beautification, jobs and commerce to our great neighborhood is a plus in my book!
Please know TrueCutz has our endorsement and let us know how we can help him to be successful. We would LOVE to welcome him to "The Hood".

Thank You.
Sincerely,

Maura B Pulver
Owner, Saratoga 5 Points Market and Deli

I Michele Daus owner of Shear Magic Salon. at 41 Park Place in close proximity to 44 jefferson street saratoga springs ny 12866, would like express my support of the change in use variance. I attest that i have no objection to a barbershop in place of a convenient store at that property.

Additional comments:

I think Lamont would be a great addition to the 5 points area. I have been in business almost 6 yrs. True cutz would be a fabulous for Jefferson Street and our area close to the track. We want to stay a close knit business for the 5 point area. Lamont is very professonial & kind I am thrilled for him to revitalize an old building. I wish him luck.

Signed

Michele Daus

I James at [redacted] Madison St. the neighbor of 44 jefferson street saratoga springs ny 12866, would like express my support of the change in use variance. I attest that i have no objection to a barbershop in place of a convenient store at that property.

Additional comments:

After seeing many convenient stores come & go at 44 Jefferson St. over the years, I think a barbershop might have a better chance of staying in business.

I welcome the change.

Signed: James W. Durstewitz

I Frank Scarr at [redacted] Jefferson the neighbor of 44 jefferson street saratoga springs ny 12866, would like express my support of the change in use variance. I attest that i have no objection to a barbershop in place of a convenient store at that property.

Additional comments:

I think having a Barber Shop at this location is a great idea!

Signed:

F Scarr 3/9/16

I Jonathan Lane at [redacted] Jefferson ST the neighbor of 44 jefferson street saratoga springs ny 12866, would like express my support of the change in use variance. I attest that i have no objection to a barbershop in place of a convenient store at that property.

Additional comments:

It will be good for the neiborhood

Signed: Jonathan Lane 3/7/2016

I Ashley owner of Brown Dog Pet Spa at 42 park pl in close proximity to 44 jefferson street saratoga springs ny 12866, would like express my support of the change in use variance. I attest that i have no objection to a barbershop in place of a convenient store at that property.

Additional comments:

Signed

[redacted] JEFFERSON

I BRIAN FINN at _____ the neighbor of 44 jefferson street saratoga springs ny 12866, would like express my support of the change in use variance. I attest that i have no objection to a barbershop in place of a convenient store at that property.

Additional comments:

Signed:

I mary thompson at [redacted] Madison Street the neighbor of 44 jefferson street saratoga springs ny 12866, would like express my support of the change in use variance. I attest that i have no objection to a barbershop in place of a convenient store at that property.

Additional comments:

Signed: [illegible]

I Ann Marie Kenyon at [redacted] Jefferson Street the neighbor of 44 jefferson street saratoga springs ny 12866, would like express my support of the change in use variance. I attest that i have no objection to a barbershop in place of a convenient store at that property.

Additional comments:

Signed: Ann Marie Kenyon 3/7/16

I Molly Luscko at [redacted] Jefferson St. the neighbor of 44 jefferson street saratoga springs ny 12866, would like express my support of the change in use variance. I attest that i have no objection to a barbershop in place of a convenient store at that property.

Additional comments:

Signed: Molly K. Luscko

I am writing this on behalf of Lamont Washington, and Casey James for their application for a change in use variance for the property of, 44 jefferson street saratoga springs NY. I am the current owner of 44 Jefferson street, saratoga springs, NY 12866. I acquired ownership of the property on 7/10/2008 from William Manzueta.

During my 8 years with this property I have tried twice unsuccessfully to run a profitable convenience store. On both attempts I failed miserably, lost lots of money and was forced to shut down leaving the building vacant and abandoned. I believe that a large part of my failure was due to the fact that I had great competition in the form of 5 points, a very popular convenient store just two minutes (walking) up the street from 44 jefferson. I just couldn't keep up with the competition. Speaking with William Manzueta (the previous owner) he expressed that he had the same challenges and the same hardships that i have had with this property. We both agree that with such a prominent and popular establishment that is the 5 points convenient store right up the street it is impossible to have a thriving and profitable convenience store at this location.

It is also unreasonable to turn the property into a residence. The property is meant for commercial use and commercial use only. There is no kitchen, no refrigerator, no stove, no oven, no kitchen sink, and one very small bathroom with no shower. The property is in no way suitable for a family to live in, and the money it would cost to make it suitable for a family to live in would be close to (if not more) than the current appraised value of the building.

Being that I could not operate a successful/ profitable convenience store at that property and I did/do not have the funds, time, or permissions (area variance, extensions, interpretation, etc...) necessary to convert the property into a residence suitable for a family, I regrettably was forced to shut down. This was almost 4 years ago and the building has been vacant and abandoned ever since. I own the Getty gas station on church street so I am very busy, I seldom have time for myself let alone time to maintain the property at 44 Jefferson. So in my absence the building had been broken into, robbed, and vandalized. There were also rumors that a homeless man had been living in the building. All this resulted in the building getting somewhat of a bad reputation, and all but impossible to sell. During the time the building has been vacant I have attempted to sell and lease the property to no avail. I even hired a real estate agent, but anyone interest in the property was quickly dissipated when the they realized how much money, time, work and effort is required to turn the property into a suitable residence. I had not one single prospect interested in

leasing or buying the property for use of a convenience store. I suspect that with all the failures and the immense competition, anyone can tell that a convenient store at that location is unfeasible. All this accompanied by the negative reputation of the building caused me to lose all hope. I had all but given up until Lamont Washington and Casey James approached me interested in converting the property into a barbershop.

After meeting these two, there is no doubt in my mind that they will be wildly successful. It wasn't the fact that this location is absolutely perfect for a barbershop, being so close to a huge housing complex, the rec center, the track and downtown saratoga, and with no competitors within a mile and quite literally, little to no effort or money required to make the building suitable for a barbershop. It wasn't the fact that they have the support of myself, the entire community and every other business in the area. It was however the fact that these two are some of the most determined, professional, hardworking, and committed individuals I have ever met. They have worked so hard to make their dreams a reality. Never giving up when times got hard. They are good people and they deserve this. Now they have come this far, they have done everything they have to do and the last obstacle they need to overcome is getting approved for this change in use variance. So I implore you all to see reason. These boys have met every criteria, all requirements and "tests" necessary to be granted a change in use variance. If the board elects not to approve the change in use variance then the building will remain vacant and abandoned, I have no other alternatives. I endorse and completely support this application, and feel that this will not only be great for these two but be amazing for the entire great city of Saratoga Springs NY.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

Mandeep Sidhu

[redacted]

My name is Sukhdev Fingb, I am owner of a roofing and in construction company here in Saratoga Springs New York. I specialize in residential homes,extensions, roofing and making sure buildings are within code.Casey James and lamont washington contacted me and asked me to come to the property in question and provide them with an estimate of how much time, money, what kind of permits etc...would be necessary to convert the building on 44 Jefferson Street Saratoga Springs New York into a suitable residence. On monday February 29th 2016 i went to said building and immediately knew that this would not be an inexpensive project. The building is 800 square feet and it's meant for commercial use only. If converted to a residence right now it would only be suitable as a studio apartment, even so there would have to be extensions and permits granted by the city to increase the size of the bathroom and add a shower. There's no kitchen, there's no kitchen sink,no stove no, refrigerator, no oven, no cabinets or shelves and not very much room to add any of it. To convert the building into residence suitable for a studio apartment in my professional opinion would cost no less than $80,000 not including labor and will take no less than 1 and a half year to complete. If the building is to be converted into a residence suitable for a family, the roof will be required to be taken off, a second-floor added with another room and a new roof installed. This will take no less the 4 years to complete and cost no less than $250,000 to compete with the addition of many permits to be granted by the city. As as a commercial building and in my professional opinion it would be financially irresponsible and a waste of time to convert the building into a residence. As it is right now, the building is in great shape and within code as a commercial building. It is perfect and

would require no time, permits or money spent on the the building to be converted into a barbershop. If granted the change in use variance today, Lamont and Casey can quite literally move in set up an open doors for business tomorrow.

Sincerely,

3/11/16.

[redacted]


1
2
Parking
10 ft
21 ft
3
25 ft
4
10½ ft
11 ft
11 ft
10½ ft
4 ft
Absolute Front
9 ft
11 ft
5
22 ft
fence
Absolute Back
Fence
43 ft
46 ft
Back
Yard


Back
employee
Break room
Basement
Stairs to Basement
Door
1
2
Stations
Office
Hall way
Door
Door
Bathroom
Couches
Waiting area
Couches
Stations
2
5
1
register
window
Door
[Front]
[Parking]
7
3
4
5

FRESH DELI
MARKET
PIZZA
BEER SODA LOTTO
44

RESH DELI
MARKET
PIZZA
SODA LOTTO
LD SANDWICH
44
LOTTERY
GET CARD
ATM

VISA

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

City Hall - 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
Tel: 518-587-3550 fax: 518-580-9480

[FOR OFFICE USE]

_____ (Application #)

_____ (Date received)

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Donna & David Carr Jr. | Marcia Carr | |
| Address | [redacted] | [redacted] | |
| Phone | [redacted] | / | / |
| Email | [redacted] | | |

* An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.

Applicant's interest in the premises: ☒ Owner ☐ Lessee ☐ Under option to lease or purchase

PROPERTY INFORMATION

1. Property Address/Location: 13 Oakland Drive Tax Parcel No.: 166.10 - 1 - 9 *(for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37)*

2. Date acquired by current owner: 2001 3. Zoning District when purchased: UR-1

4. Present use of property: Vacant Single Family 5. Current Zoning District: UR-1

6. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property?
   ☐ Yes (when? _____ For what? _____)
   ☒ No

7. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☐ Historic District ☐ Architectural Review District
   ☐ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?

8. Brief description of proposed action: The proposal involves constructing small additions to a single family residence that was owned by our deceased aunt.

9. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☒ No

10. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☐ Yes ☒ No

11. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☐ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☐ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☒ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

FEES: Make checks payable to the "Commissioner of Finance". Fees are cumulative and required for each request below.

| | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Interpretation | $ 400 |
| ☐ Use variance | $1,000 |
| ☒ Area variance | |
| -Residential use/property: | $ 150 |
| -Non-residential use/property: | $ 500 |
| ☐ Extensions: | $ 150 |

**INTERPRETATION** – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

1. Identify the section(s) of the Zoning Ordinance for which you are seeking an interpretation:

Section(s) _____

2. How do you request that this section be interpreted? _____

_____

_____

_____

3. If interpretation is denied, do you wish to request alternative zoning relief? ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. If the answer to #3 is "yes," what alternative relief do you request? ☐ Use Variance ☐ Area Variance

**EXTENSION OF A VARIANCE** – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

1. Date original variance was granted: _____ 2. Type of variance granted? ☐ Use ☐ Area

3. Date original variance expired: _____

5. Explain why the extension is necessary. Why wasn't the original timeframe sufficient?

_____

_____

_____

_____

When requesting an extension of time for an existing variance, the applicant must prove that the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted have not changed. Specifically demonstrate that there have been no significant changes on the site, in the neighborhood, or within the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

**USE VARIANCE** – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

A use variance is requested to permit the following: _____

_____

_____

For the Zoning Board to grant a request for a use variance, an applicant must prove that the zoning regulations create an unnecessary hardship in relation to that property. In seeking a use variance, New York State law requires an applicant to prove all four of the following "tests".

1. That the applicant cannot realize a reasonable financial return on initial investment for any currently permitted use on the property. "Dollars & cents" proof must be submitted as evidence. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

A. Submit the following financial evidence relating to this property (attach additional evidence as needed):

1) Date of purchase: _____ Purchase amount: $_____

2) Indicate dates and costs of any improvements made to property after purchase:

| Date | Improvement | Cost |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3) Annual maintenance expenses: $_____ 4) Annual taxes: $_____

5) Annual income generated from property: $_____

6) City assessed value: $_____ Equalization rate:_____ Estimated Market Value: $_____

7) Appraised Value: $_____ Appraiser: _____Date: _____

Appraisal Assumptions:_____

B. Has property been listed for sale with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS)? ☐Yes ☐No If "yes", for how long? _____

1) Original listing date(s):_____ Original listing price: $_____

If listing price was reduced, describe when and to what extent: _____

_____

2) Has the property been advertised in the newspapers or other publications? ☐Yes ☐No

If yes, describe frequency and name of publications: _____

_____

3) Has the property had a "For Sale" sign posted on it? ☐Yes ☐No

If yes, list dates when sign was posted: _____

_____

4) How many times has the property been shown and with what results? _____

_____

_____

2. That the financial hardship relating to this property is unique and does not apply to a substantial portion of the neighborhood. Difficulties shared with numerous other properties in the same neighborhood or district would not satisfy this requirement. This previously identified financial hardship is unique for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. That the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Changes that will alter the character of a neighborhood or district would be at odds with the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance. The requested variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood for the following reasons:

4. That the alleged hardship has not been self-created. An applicant (whether the property owner or one acting on behalf of the property owner) cannot claim "unnecessary hardship" if that hardship was created by the applicant, or if the applicant acquired the property knowing (or was in a position to know) the conditions for which the applicant is seeking relief. The hardship has not been self-created for the following reasons:

**AREA VARIANCE** – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

The applicant requests relief from the following Zoning Ordinance article(s) 2.0/Table 3, Area & Bulk Schedule

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| Minimum Lot Size (existing) | 12,500 sf | 10,080 sf |
| Principal Building Coverage | 20% | 25% |
| Front Yard Setback | 30' | 17', Laurence St. |
| | 30' | 22', Oakland Dr. |
| | | |
| | | |

Other:

To grant an area variance, the ZBA must balance the benefits to the applicant and the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and community, taking into consideration the following:

1. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by other feasible means. Identify what alternatives to the variance have been explored (alternative designs, attempts to purchase land, etc.) and why they are not feasible.

The current living space is approximately 1,100 sf. We investigated placing a second story on the existing footprint but felt it was out of charachter with the existing neighborhood which is mostly one-story ranches. The three neighboring homes are all single story

2. Whether granting the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. Granting the variance will not create a detriment to nearby properties or an undesirable change in the neighborhood character for the following reasons:

The two larger additions are to the rear of the property. The two small additions on the frontages are architectural to provide relief and the larger expansion on the Oakland frontage matches the existing facade.

3. Whether the variance is substantial. The requested variance is not substantial for the following reasons:

The requested variances are not substantial since the existing lot is substandard and the existing house currently sits within the two front yard setbacks.

4. Whether the variance will have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district. The requested variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood or district for the following reasons:

The additions are small enough to keep the house in scale with surrounding structures and we believe the improvements will enhance the neighborhood.

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created (although this does not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance). Explain whether the alleged difficulty was or was not self-created:

The existing lot is substandard in size and the structure sits within the front yard setback on both frontages. However, the requested variance are self created but are desired to make the existing house a little larger.

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☐ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.

(applicant signature) Date: 3/14/16

(applicant signature) Date: 3/14/16

If applicant is not the currently the owner of the property, the current owner must also sign.

Owner Signature: Executor Date: 3/14/16

Owner Signature: _____ Date: _____

# ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND/OR BUILDING

APPLICANT: _____ TAX PARCEL NO.: _____._____ - _____ - _____

PROPERTY ADDRESS: _____ ZONING DISTRICT: _____

This applicant has applied to use the identified property within the City of Saratoga Springs for the following:

_____

_____

_____

This application is hereby denied upon the grounds that such use of the property would violate the City Zoning Ordinance article(s)

_____. As such, the following relief would be required to proceed:

☐ Extension of existing variance ☐ Interpretation

☐ Use Variance to permit the following: _____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Area Variance seeking the following relief:

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Other: _____

_____

Note: _____

☐ Advisory Opinion required from Saratoga County Planning Board

_____ _____

ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DATE

Revised 12/2015

*617.20*
*Appendix B*
*Short Environmental Assessment Form*

## Instructions for Completing

**Part 1 - Project Information. The applicant or project sponsor is responsible for the completion of Part 1.** Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification. Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information.

Complete all items in Part 1. You may also provide any additional information which you believe will be needed by or useful to the lead agency; attach additional pages as necessary to supplement any item.

**Part 1 - Project and Sponsor Information**

Name of Action or Project:
13 Oakland Drive, Proposed Area Variances

Project Location (describe, and attach a location map):
13 Oakland Drive, Saratoga Springs, NY

Brief Description of Proposed Action:
The proposed action involves proposed additions to an existing single family home which requires area variances from the City of Saratoga Springs Zoning Board of Appeals.

| Name of Applicant or Sponsor: | Telephone: [redacted] |
|---|---|
| Donna & David Carr, Jr. | E-Mail: [redacted] |

Address:
[redacted]

| City/PO: | State: | Zip Code: |
|---|---|---|
| [redacted] | [redacted] | [redacted] |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Does the proposed action only involve the legislative adoption of a plan, local law, ordinance, administrative rule, or regulation? If Yes, attach a narrative description of the intent of the proposed action and the environmental resources that may be affected in the municipality and proceed to Part 2. If no, continue to question 2. | ☑ | ☐ |
| 2. Does the proposed action require a permit, approval or funding from any other governmental Agency? If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit or approval: | ☑ | ☐ |

3.a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action? 0.23 acres
b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed? 0.23 acres
c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor? 0.23 acres

4. Check all land uses that occur on, adjoining and near the proposed action.
☐ Urban ☐ Rural (non-agriculture) ☐ Industrial ☐ Commercial ☑ Residential (suburban)
☐ Forest ☐ Agriculture ☐ Aquatic ☐ Other (specify): _____
☐ Parkland



RESET

| | NO | YES | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5. Is the proposed action, | | | |
| a. A permitted use under the zoning regulations? | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan? | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 6. Is the proposed action consistent with the predominant character of the existing built or natural landscape? | ☐ | ☑ |
| 7. Is the site of the proposed action located in, or does it adjoin, a state listed Critical Environmental Area? If Yes, identify: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 8. a. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels? | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Are public transportation service(s) available at or near the site of the proposed action? | ☑ | ☐ |
| c. Are any pedestrian accommodations or bicycle routes available on or near site of the proposed action? | ☑ | ☐ |
| 9. Does the proposed action meet or exceed the state energy code requirements? If the proposed action will exceed requirements, describe design features and technologies: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 10. Will the proposed action connect to an existing public/private water supply? If No, describe method for providing potable water: _____ | ☐ | ☑ |
| 11. Will the proposed action connect to existing wastewater utilities? If No, describe method for providing wastewater treatment: _____ | ☐ | ☑ |
| 12. a. Does the site contain a structure that is listed on either the State or National Register of Historic Places? | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Is the proposed action located in an archeological sensitive area? | ☑ | ☐ |
| 13. a. Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency? | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Would the proposed action physically alter, or encroach into, any existing wetland or waterbody? If Yes, identify the wetland or waterbody and extent of alterations in square feet or acres: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |

14. Identify the typical habitat types that occur on, or are likely to be found on the project site. Check all that apply:
☐ Shoreline ☐ Forest ☐ Agricultural/grasslands ☐ Early mid-successional
☐ Wetland ☐ Urban ☑ Suburban

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 15. Does the site of the proposed action contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered? | ☑ | ☐ |
| 16. Is the project site located in the 100 year flood plain? | ☑ | ☐ |
| 17. Will the proposed action create storm water discharge, either from point or non-point sources? If Yes, a. Will storm water discharges flow to adjacent properties? ☑ NO ☐ YES | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Will storm water discharges be directed to established conveyance systems (runoff and storm drains)? If Yes, briefly describe: ☑ NO ☐ YES _____ | | |



RESET

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 18. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that result in the impoundment of water or other liquids (e.g. retention pond, waste lagoon, dam)?<br>If Yes, explain purpose and size: | ✓ | |
| 19. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the location of an active or closed solid waste management facility?<br>If Yes, describe: | ✓ | |
| 20. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the subject of remediation (ongoing or completed) for hazardous waste?<br>If Yes, describe: | ✓ | |

**I AFFIRM THAT THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE IS TRUE AND ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE**

Applicant/sponsor name: David Carr Jr / Donna Carr Date: 3/14/16

Signature: David Carr Jr Donna Carr

**Part 2 - Impact Assessment. The Lead Agency is responsible for the completion of Part 2.** Answer all of the following questions in Part 2 using the information contained in Part 1 and other materials submitted by the project sponsor or otherwise available to the reviewer. When answering the questions the reviewer should be guided by the concept "Have my responses been reasonable considering the scale and context of the proposed action?"

| | No, or small impact may occur | Moderate to large impact may occur |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Will the proposed action create a material conflict with an adopted land use plan or zoning regulations? | | |
| 2. Will the proposed action result in a change in the use or intensity of use of land? | | |
| 3. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of the existing community? | | |
| 4. Will the proposed action have an impact on the environmental characteristics that caused the establishment of a Critical Environmental Area (CEA)? | | |
| 5. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change in the existing level of traffic or affect existing infrastructure for mass transit, biking or walkway? | | |
| 6. Will the proposed action cause an increase in the use of energy and it fails to incorporate reasonably available energy conservation or renewable energy opportunities? | | |
| 7. Will the proposed action impact existing:<br>a. public / private water supplies? | | |
| b. public / private wastewater treatment utilities? | | |
| 8. Will the proposed action impair the character or quality of important historic, archaeological, architectural or aesthetic resources? | | |
| 9. Will the proposed action result in an adverse change to natural resources (e.g., wetlands, waterbodies, groundwater, air quality, flora and fauna)? | | |



RESET

| | No, or small impact may occur | Moderate to large impact may occur |
|---|---|---|
| 10. Will the proposed action result in an increase in the potential for erosion, flooding or drainage problems? | ☐ | ☐ |
| 11. Will the proposed action create a hazard to environmental resources or human health? | ☐ | ☐ |

**Part 3 - Determination of significance. The Lead Agency is responsible for the completion of Part 3.** For every question in Part 2 that was answered "moderate to large impact may occur", or if there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action may or will not result in a significant adverse environmental impact, please complete Part 3. Part 3 should, in sufficient detail, identify the impact, including any measures or design elements that have been included by the project sponsor to avoid or reduce impacts. Part 3 should also explain how the lead agency determined that the impact may or will not be significant. Each potential impact should be assessed considering its setting, probability of occurring, duration, irreversibility, geographic scope and magnitude. Also consider the potential for short-term, long-term and cumulative impacts.

☐ Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action may result in one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts and an environmental impact statement is required.

☐ Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above, and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action will not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of Lead Agency | Date |
| Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency | Title of Responsible Officer |
| Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency | Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer) |

PRINT



RESET



13 Oakland Dr.



Side Yard, South Side



Rear Yard Looking North

Rear Yard Looking North

Front Yard, Lawrence St.

Oakland Drive Looking North




Home across Oakland Dr.




## Map Legend

- • 5/8" steel rod set with a tag
- ○ marker found, labeled
- ⌀ utility pole
- ——— - - ——— overhead wires
- —/—/—/—/— wood fence
- (LOT 25) Lot number on filed map

## Deed Reference:

Marcia Carr
Bk1541 P391

## Map Reference:

"Lands of Willard J. Grande Excelsior Spring Park" dated November 1, 1955 by John H. Sheehan and filed in the Saratoga County Clerk's Offce as Map BB–2 and Map CC–98.

Unauthorized alteration or addition to a survey map bearing a licensed Land Surveyor's Seal is a violation of Section 7209 subdivision 2 of the New York State Education Law.

Only apparent easements (if any) are shown on this survey. No abstract of title was available.

| DATE | REVISION |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

10 0 10 20
Scale: 1" = 20'

*Map of Lands of*

# Marcia Carr

*Situate at*

## *13 Oakland Drive*

*City of Saratoga Springs, Saratoga County NY*

12 Lake Avenue
Saratoga Springs,
NY, 12866
Tel: 518–587–5665
Fax: 518–587–5772

THOMPSON/FLEMING
LAND SURVEYORS, P.C.

DATE: Feb. 16, 2016
TAX MAP: 166.10–1–9
SURVEYED BY: WMT
JOB NUMBER: S16–105.11

R:\Users\KMK\Drafting Temp\Oakland–Lawrence\Zoning Site Plan.dwg

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

City Hall - 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
Tel: 518-587-3550 fax: 518-580-9480

[FOR OFFICE USE]

_____ (Application #)

_____ (Date received)

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Chris Armer<br>Teri L DeSorbo | | |
| Address | [redacted] | | |
| | [redacted] | | |
| Phone | [redacted] / [redacted] | [redacted] / [redacted] | [redacted] / [redacted] |
| Email | [redacted]n | | |

* An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.

Applicant's interest in the premises: ☑ Owner ☐ Lessee ☐ Under option to lease or purchase

PROPERTY INFORMATION

1. Property Address/Location: 117 Middle Ave Tax Parcel No.: 166 . 45 - 3 - 25
(*for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37*)

2. Date acquired by current owner: 8/22/2014 3. Zoning District when purchased: UR3

4. Present use of property: Single Family Home 5. Current Zoning District: UR3

6. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property?
☐ Yes (when? _____ For what? _____)
☑ No

7. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☐ Historic District ☐ Architectural Review District
☐ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?

8. Brief description of proposed action:
Add second story and a small addition to a single family home that is currently on the property. The existing home is outside of the setback requirements in that the east side of the home has a side setback of 2.8' and 3.1'. We are requesting no change in this setback. The rear of the home (north) currently is between 1.5' and 2.1'. We are proposing a small addition to the west side of the building. This corner of this addition would be 1.4' from the property line as opposed to the current 1.5'.

9. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☑ No

10. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☐ Yes ☑ No

11. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☐ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☐ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☑ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

**AREA VARIANCE** – **PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

The applicant requests relief from the following Zoning Ordinance article(s) _____

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| Side Setback | 4 ft | 2.8 to 3.1' |
| (Existing home currently has side setback proposed) | | |
| Rear Setback | 25' | 1.4' to 2.1' |
| (existing home currently has rear setback of 1.5' to 2.1' - we are proposing an addition that is approx 5' wide and the corner would be 1" closer to property line. | | |

Other: _____

To grant an area variance, the ZBA must balance the benefits to the applicant and the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and community, taking into consideration the following:

1. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by other feasible means. Identify what alternatives to the variance have been explored (alternative designs, attempts to purchase land, etc.) and why they are not feasible.

   I have attempted to contact the property owner to the rear of this property who has an oversized lot. I have sent letters and knocked on the door many times and have had no response from either.
   We have explored other designs to try to make the home a bit larger to fit todays standards. The home is very narrow and we feel the small side addition adds much to using the still small square footage to its best use.

2. Whether granting the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. Granting the variance will not create a detriment to nearby properties or an undesirable change in the neighborhood character for the following reasons:

   The nearby neighborhood has many properties that do not fit the current setback requirements and therefore this property would not stand out as being out of character
   As mentioned , the bordering property to the rear has an oversized lot and the home on that property is very close to the far border leaving a large back yard. The bordering property to the East has a home that is also located at the far border(east) of its lot leaving yard in between the 2 properties therefore the homes would not be abnormally close to each other. The bordering property to the West is a double lot that runs between both Middle Ave and York. The portion of the property that borders our lot on Middle ave is used as a driveway. The proposed addition to our property would still be 18.2' from that property line. There is also an existing garage along the same property line that is 8.1' from the property line.

3. Whether the variance is substantial. The requested variance is not substantial for the following reasons:

The requested variance is not substantial because the only difference between the current setback of the existing structure and the proposed changes is only reduced by 1" on one corner of the home.

4. Whether the variance will have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district. The requested variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood or district for the following reasons:

There are many similar homes in the area that do not fit the current setback requirements and there will be little impact to neighboring properties.

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created (although this does not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance). Explain whether the alleged difficulty was or was not self-created:

This property was purchased knowing that variances would be required but none of the required variances needed are out of character for the surrounding area nor are they substantial.

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☑ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.

C Christopher Armer Digitally signed by C Christopher Armer Date: 2016.02.09 15:26:49 -05'00' Date: 2/9/2016

(applicant signature)

Teri L DeSorbo Digitally signed by Teri L DeSorbo Date: 2016.02.09 15:30:11 -05'00' Date: 2/9/2016

(applicant signature)

If applicant is not the currently the owner of the property, the current owner must also sign.

Owner Signature: _____ Date: _____

Owner Signature: _____ Date: _____

MAP REFERENCES:

1. SARATOGA COUNTY, CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS, TAX MAP NO. 166.45-3-25

# MAP OF SURVEY

OF LANDS OF

## C. CHRISTOPHER ARMER & TERI DeSORBO

CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS, SARATOGA COUNTY, NEW YORK

SCALE: 1" = 10' DATE: OCTOBER 21, 2014

UPDATED NOVEMBER 18, 2015 TO SHOW PROPOSED ADDITION

**LEGEND:**

- ● FOUND IRON MARKER
- O SET IRON ROD WITH CAP
- UTILITY POLE
- —E— POWER LINE
- STONE WALL
- FENCE

ONLY COPIES FROM THE ORIGINAL OF THIS SURVEY MARKED WITH AN ORIGINAL OF THE LAND SURVEYOR'S EMBOSSED SEAL OR INKED STAMP SHALL BE CONSIDERED TO BE VALID TRUE COPIES.

Unauthorized Alteration to this map is a violation of Section 7209, Subdivision 2 of the New York State Education Law.

WILLIAM J. ROURKE, LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR NO. 49098

W. J. ROURKE, ASSOCIATES
Licensed Land Surveyors
299 Reservoir Road
Fort Edward, N.Y. 12828

14-91
JOB NO.

W.J. ROURKE, ASSOCIATES - LICENSED LAND SURVEYORS

299 RESERVOIR ROAD, FORT EDWARD, NEW YORK 12828

117
EXISTING HOME -
117 Middle AVE - Subject
Property

REAR/SIDE OF SUBJECT FROM WEST
(EXISTING HOME.)

Neighbor Driveway to West
From Back Property Line

Looking WEST FROM
117 Middle AVE

Looking East From
117 Middle Ave

Across STREET From 117 Middle

Across STREET From 117 Middle

Google earth

feet 300
meters 90

- SHOWS DENSITY OF AREA.

FRONT LEFT ELEVATION

FRONT RIGHT ELEVATION

REAR LEFT ELEVATION

REAR RIGHT ELEVATION

OPTION 5

PLAN NO:

PAGE
OF

DRAWN BY:

REVISIONS/DATE:

DESIGNED FOR:
CHRIS
ARMER

ADDRESS:
117 MIDDLE AVE
SARATOGA
NEW YORK

DESIGNERS OF FINE HOMES SINCE 1988
WILLIAMS & WILLIAMS DESIGNERS
518-798-HOUSE(4683)

SEAL:
02/12/15

TO THE BEST OF OUR KNOWLEDGE, BELIEF, & PROFESSIONAL JUDGEMENT, THIS PLANS & SPECIFICATIONS ARE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE ZIP OF ABBREVIATED BUILDING CODE OF NEW YORK STATE THE ZIP OF ENERGY CONSERVATION CONSTRUCTION CODE OF NEW YORK STATE

COPYRIGHT © 2012 BY WILLIAMS & WILLIAMS DESIGNERS ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. ALL WILLIAMS & WILLIAMS DESIGNERS PLANS HAVE BEEN REGISTERED WITH THE UNITED STATES COPYRIGHT OFFICE. THE DRAWINGS IN ANY INSTRUMENT OF SERVICE IS NOT TO BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES UNLESS AND UNTIL WRITTEN PERMISSION WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM WILLIAMS & WILLIAMS DESIGNERS. UNAUTHORIZED ALTERATIONS OR ADDITIONS TO THE DRAWINGS IS A VIOLATION OF THE NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION LAW, ARTICLE 145 SECTION 7209. DO NOT SCALE THESE DRAWINGS. THEY MAY NOT BE TO EXACT SCALE. USE ONLY THE DIMENSIONS SHOWN. OWNER AND CONTRACTOR SHALL CONFORM ALL APPLICABLE BUILDING CODES TO ENSURE THAT PLANS AND DETAILS CONFORM TO ALL REQUIREMENTS. THEY SHALL VERIFY ALL DIMENSIONS & CONDITIONS ON THE JOB BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH WORK & NOTIFY WILLIAMS & WILLIAMS DESIGNERS OF ANY DISCREPANCIES BEFORE HERE & PREVENT. WILLIAMS & WILLIAMS DESIGNERS SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY ADDITIONAL COSTS OR STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS RESULTING FROM FAILURE TO FOLLOW THESE PLANS AND DETAILS.

MAP REFERENCES:

1. SARATOGA COUNTY, CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS, TAX MAP NO. 166.45-3-25




# MAP OF SURVEY

OF LANDS OF

## C. CHRISTOPHER ARMER & TERI DeSORBO

CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS, SARATOGA COUNTY, NEW YORK

SCALE: 1" = 10' DATE: OCTOBER 21, 2014

UPDATED NOVEMBER 18, 2015 TO SHOW PROPOSED ADDITION

**LEGEND:**

- ● FOUND IRON MARKER
- O SET IRON ROD WITH CAP
- UTILITY POLE
- —E— POWER LINE
- STONE WALL
- —x—x— FENCE

ONLY COPIES FROM THE ORIGINAL OF THIS SURVEY MARKED WITH AN ORIGINAL OF THE LAND SURVEYOR'S EMBOSSED SEAL OR INKED STAMP SHALL BE CONSIDERED TO BE VALID TRUE COPIES.

Unauthorized Alteration to this map is a violation of Section 7209, Subdivision 2 of the New York State Education Law.

WILLIAM J. ROURKE, LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR NO. 49098

W. J. ROURKE, ASSOCIATES
Licensed Land Surveyors
299 Reservoir Road
Fort Edward, N.Y. 12828

14-91
JOB NO.

W.J. ROURKE, ASSOCIATES – LICENSED LAND SURVEYORS
299 RESERVOIR ROAD, FORT EDWARD, NEW YORK 12828

**Zimbra** **lindsey.gonzalez@saratoga-springs.org**

## Letter of support for 117 Middle Ave. Variance

**From :** Gillian Black [redacted] Mon, Apr 04, 2016 11:35 AM

**Subject :** Letter of support for 117 Middle Ave. Variance

**To :** lindsey gonzalez <lindsey.gonzalez@saratoga-springs.org>

To Whom it May Concern,

We received notice that Chris Armer & Teri DeSorbo have applied for a variance. My wife Kathryn Strassner and I own the double lot property at [redacted] York Ave. Our driveway (and main entrance) is directly adjacent to the western border of 117 Middle Ave. While at first we were concerned that development may encroach on our privacy, after reviewing the proposed plans we fully support this project. The current structure at 117 Middle Ave. is an eyesore. We believe the proposed construction is in the best interest of our neighborhood and the City of Saratoga Springs, as it replaces a derelict structure and will bolster our local property values. Please grant them their variance.

Best Regards,
Gillian Black

[redacted]

[redacted]

MAP REFERENCES:

1. SARATOGA COUNTY, CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS, TAX MAP NO. 166.45-3-25




# MAP OF SURVEY

OF LANDS OF

## C. CHRISTOPHER ARMER & TERI DeSORBO

CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS, SARATOGA COUNTY, NEW YORK

SCALE: 1" = 10' DATE: OCTOBER 21, 2014

UPDATED NOVEMBER 18, 2015 TO SHOW PROPOSED ADDITION
UPDATED APRIL 11, 2016 TO SHOW EAVES

**LEGEND:**

- ● FOUND IRON MARKER
- ○ SET IRON ROD WITH CAP
- UTILITY POLE
- —E— POWER LINE
- ∞∞∞∞ STONE WALL
- —x—x— FENCE

ONLY COPIES FROM THE ORIGINAL OF THIS SURVEY MARKED WITH AN ORIGINAL OF THE LAND SURVEYOR'S EMBOSSED SEAL OR INKED STAMP SHALL BE CONSIDERED TO BE VALID TRUE COPIES.

Unauthorized Alteration to this map is a violation of Section 7209, Subdivision 2 of the New York State Education Law.

WILLIAM J. ROURKE, LICENSED LAND SURVEYOR NO. 49098

W. J. ROURKE, ASSOCIATES
Licensed Land Surveyors
299 Reservoir Road
Fort Edward, N.Y. 12828

14-91
JOB NO.

W.J. ROURKE, ASSOCIATES – LICENSED LAND SURVEYORS
299 RESERVOIR ROAD, FORT EDWARD, NEW YORK 12828

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

City Hall - 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
Tel: 518-587-3550 fax: 518-580-9480

[FOR OFFICE USE]

(Application #)

(Date received)

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | Applicant's ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Samuel Brewton, Gerald & Debra Mattison, Sandra Cohen | ANW Holdings, LLC (contract vendee) | Jonathon B. Tingley, Esq. Tuczinski, Cavalier & Gilchrist, PC |
| Address | [redacted] | 563 North Broadway | 54 State Street, Suite 803 |
| | [redacted] | Saratoga Springs, New York 12866 | Albany, New York 12207 |
| Phone | [redacted] / | [redacted] / | 463-3990 / |
| Email | [redacted] | unknown | [redacted] |

~~*An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.~~
Applicants are persons aggrieved by the February 22, 2016 Determination of the Zoning and Building Inspector concerning the Downton Walk Project.

Applicant's interest in the premises: ~~☒ Owner~~ ~~☒ Lessee~~ ~~☒ Under option to lease or purchase~~
[x] Persons Aggrieved

PROPERTY INFORMATION

1. Property Address/Location: 27 Jumel Place Tax Parcel No.: 166 . 13 - 1 - 50.2
(*for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37*)

2. Date acquired by current owner: Contract Vendee 3. Zoning District when purchased: UR-3

4. Present use of property: Storage 5. Current Zoning District: UR-3

6. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property?
☒ Yes (when? February 22, 2016 (approx) For what? Area Variances)
☐ No

7. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☐ Historic District ☐ Architectural Review District
☒ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?

8. Brief description of proposed action: Project Developer ANW Holdings, Inc. seeks to construct seven-unit condominium project. This Application appeals from the February 22, 2016 Determination of the Zoning and Building Inspector, which determined that no use variance was required.

9. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☐ No Unknown

10. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☐ Yes ☒ No

11. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☒ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☐ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☐ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

FEES: Make checks payable to the "Commissioner of Finance". Fees are cumulative and required for each request below.

| | |
|---|---|
| ☒ Interpretation | $ 400 |
| ☐ Use variance | $1,000 |
| ☐ Area variance | |
| -Residential use/property: | $ 150 |
| -Non-residential use/property: | $ 500 |
| ☐ Extensions: | $ 150 |

**INTERPRETATION** – **PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

1. Identify the section(s) of the Zoning Ordinance for which you are seeking an interpretation:

Section(s) Article 2, Table 1, Section 2.2, Table 2

2. How do you request that this section be interpreted? The UR-3 zoning district does not permit multi-family residential use. The Downton Walk seven-unit condominium project is a multi-family residential use proposed for property located in the UR-3 zoning district. A use variance is required. See attached Letter Memorandum and Exhibits.

3. If interpretation is denied, do you wish to request alternative zoning relief? ☐ Yes ☒ No

4. If the answer to #3 is "yes," what alternative relief do you request? ☐ Use Variance ☐ Area Variance

**EXTENSION OF A VARIANCE** – **PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

1. Date original variance was granted: _____ 2. Type of variance granted? ☐ Use ☐ Area

3. Date original variance expired: _____

5. Explain why the extension is necessary. Why wasn't the original timeframe sufficient?

When requesting an extension of time for an existing variance, the applicant must prove that the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted have not changed. Specifically demonstrate that there have been no significant changes on the site, in the neighborhood, or within the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted:

_____

_____

_____

**USE VARIANCE** – **PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

A use variance is requested to permit the following: _____

_____

_____

For the Zoning Board to grant a request for a use variance, an applicant must prove that the zoning regulations create an unnecessary hardship in relation to that property. In seeking a use variance, New York State law requires an applicant to prove all four of the following "tests".

1. That the applicant cannot realize a reasonable financial return on initial investment for any currently permitted use on the property. "Dollars & cents" proof must be submitted as evidence. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

A. Submit the following financial evidence relating to this property (attach additional evidence as needed):

1) Date of purchase: _____ Purchase amount: $_____

2) Indicate dates and costs of any improvements made to property after purchase:

| Date | Improvement | Cost |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3) Annual maintenance expenses: $_____ 4) Annual taxes: $_____

5) Annual income generated from property: $_____

6) City assessed value: $_____ Equalization rate:_____ Estimated Market Value: $_____

7) Appraised Value: $_____ Appraiser: _____Date: _____

Appraisal Assumptions:_____

B. Has property been listed for sale with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS)? ☐Yes ☐No If "yes", for how long? _____

1) Original listing date(s):_____ Original listing price: $_____

If listing price was reduced, describe when and to what extent: _____

_____

2) Has the property been advertised in the newspapers or other publications? ☐Yes ☐No

If yes, describe frequency and name of publications: _____

_____

3) Has the property had a "For Sale" sign posted on it? ☐Yes ☐No

If yes, list dates when sign was posted: _____

_____

4) How many times has the property been shown and with what results? _____

_____

_____

2. That the financial hardship relating to this property is unique and does not apply to a substantial portion of the neighborhood. Difficulties shared with numerous other properties in the same neighborhood or district would not satisfy this requirement. This previously identified financial hardship is unique for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. That the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Changes that will alter the character of a neighborhood or district would be at odds with the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance. The requested variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood for the following reasons:

4. That the alleged hardship has not been self-created. An applicant (whether the property owner or one acting on behalf of the property owner) cannot claim "unnecessary hardship" if that hardship was created by the applicant, or if the applicant acquired the property knowing (or was in a position to know) the conditions for which the applicant is seeking relief. The hardship has not been self-created for the following reasons:

**AREA VARIANCE** – **PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING** (add additional information as necessary):

The applicant requests relief from the following Zoning Ordinance article(s) _____

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Other: _____

_____

To grant an area variance, the ZBA must balance the benefits to the applicant and the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and community, taking into consideration the following:

1. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by other feasible means. Identify what alternatives to the variance have been explored (alternative designs, attempts to purchase land, etc.) and why they are not feasible.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Whether granting the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. Granting the variance will not create a detriment to nearby properties or an undesirable change in the neighborhood character for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Whether the variance is substantial. The requested variance is not substantial for the following reasons:

4. Whether the variance will have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district. The requested variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood or district for the following reasons:

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created (although this does not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance). Explain whether the alleged difficulty was or was not self-created:

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☑ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, ~~the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of~~ the persons aggreived by the February 22, 2016 Determination concerning the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

~~Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.~~

S/ Samuel Brewton Date: 3/18/2016
(applicant signature)

_____ Date: _____
(applicant signature)

If applicant is not the currently the owner of the property, the current owner must also sign.

Owner Signature: Not Applicable - Applicants Are Persons Aggrieved by February 22, 2016 Determination of Zoning and Building Inspector Date: _____

Owner Signature: _____ Date: _____

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☑ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, ~~the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of~~ the persons aggreived by the February 22, 2016 Determination concerning the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

~~Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.~~

S/ Debra Mattison
(applicant signature)

Date: 3/18/16

(applicant signature)

Date:

If applicant is not the currently the owner of the property, the current owner must also sign.

Owner Signature: Not Applicable - Applicants Are Persons Aggrieved by February 22, 2016 Determination of Zoning and Building Inspector

Date:

Owner Signature:

Date:

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☑ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, ~~the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of~~ the persons aggreived by the February 22, 2016 Determination concerning the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

~~Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.~~

S/ Sandra Cohen
(applicant signature)

Date: 3/18/2016

(applicant signature)

Date:

If applicant is not the currently the owner of the property, the current owner must also sign.

Owner Signature: Not Applicable - Applicants Are Persons Aggrieved by February 22, 2016 Determination of Zoning and Building Inspector

Date:

Owner Signature:

Date:

ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DENIAL
OF APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND/OR BUILDING

*****See Exhibit A for Zoning and Building Inspector Determination*****

APPLICANT: _____ TAX PARCEL NO.: _____.____ - _____ - _____

PROPERTY ADDRESS: _____ ZONING DISTRICT: _____

This applicant has applied to use the identified property within the City of Saratoga Springs for the following:

_____

_____

_____

This application is hereby denied upon the grounds that such use of the property would violate the City Zoning Ordinance article(s)

_____. As such, the following relief would be required to proceed:

☐ Extension of existing variance ☐ Interpretation

☐ Use Variance to permit the following: _____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Area Variance seeking the following relief:

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Other: _____

_____

Note: _____

☐ Advisory Opinion required from Saratoga County Planning Board

_____ _____
ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DATE

*****See Exhibit A for Zoning and Building Inspector Determination*****

Revised 12/2015

# TUCZINSKI, CAVALIER & GILCHRIST, P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

*Albany Office*
54 State Street, Suite 803
Albany, New York 12207
T: (518) 463-3990
F: (518) 426-5067

Jonathon B. Tingley
jtingley@tcglegal.com
(518) 463-3990 ext. 310

*Saratoga Office*
63 Putnam Street, Suite 202
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866
T: (518) 444-0226
F: (518) 426-5067


March 18, 2016

**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

Zoning Board of Appeals
City of Saratoga Springs
City Hall – 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866

**Re: Interpretation Request**
**Appeal from Zoning and Building Inspector Determination, February 22, 2016**
**Tax Parcel No. 166.13-1-50.2**
**Project: ANW Holdings, LLC, 27 Jumel Place**

Dear Zoning Board of Appeals:

We represent Samuel Brewton, Gerald and Debra Mattison, and Sandra Cohen (hereinafter, "***Appellants***") in connection with the above-referenced matter.

Submitted herewith are the following exhibits:

**Exhibit A** February 22, 2016 Determination of the Zoning and Building Inspector

**Exhibit B** Project Application Materials for the Downton Walk Project, 27 Jumel Place, S/B/L 166.13-1-50.2

**Exhibit C** Relevant Excerpts of 2015 Comprehensive Plan

**Exhibit D** Tax Map Showing Proximity of Project Site to Appellants' Properties

The Appellants hereby appeal from the Zoning and Building Inspector Determination dated February 22, 2016 (the "***February 22, 2016 Determination***"), wherein the Zoning and Building Inspector determined that only area variances were required for the seven-unit condominium Downton Walk project (the "***Project***") proposed by ANW Holdings, LLC (the "***Developer***") for 27 Jumel Place (Tax Map Parcel No. 166.13-1-50.2) (the "***Project Site***"). See Exhibit A.

For the reasons that follow, the Project is not a permitted use in the Urban Residential-3 (UR-3) zoning district, and therefore, a use variance is required. The February 22, 2016 Determination finding that no use variance is required for the Project was erroneous and must be reversed.

**1. Mr. Brewton, Mr. and Mrs. Mattison, and Ms. Cohen Have Standing to Prosecute this Appeal and To Seek the Interpretation Requested.**

The Appellants each live at or own property located at [redacted] Lake Avenue are located adjacent to the Project Site. See Exhibit D. As such, Appellants are persons aggrieved by the February 22, 2016 Determination and have standing to appeal therefrom (Matter of Bonded Concrete, Inc. v. Zoning Bd. of Appeals, 268 AD2d 771, 772 [3d Dep't 2000]; Matter of Sun-Brite Car Wash v. Bd. of Zoning & Appeals, 69 NY2d 406, 413 [1987]).

**2. This Appeal Seeking an Interpretation Stays All Proceedings in Furtherance of the February 22, 2016 Determination, Including any Decision on the Currently Pending Area Variance Application for the Downton Walk Project.**

Please be advised that the filing of this appeal automatically stays all proceedings in furtherance of the February 22, 2016 Determination.

The City's Zoning Code purports to only stay "enforcement proceedings relating to any violation under appeal" (Zoning Ordinance, § 8.4.2 (C)). However, N.Y. General City Law § 81-a [6] stays "all proceedings in furtherance of the action appealed from". The City's Zoning Code does not purport to supersede state law in this regard, and even if it did, it would not be effective to render N.Y. General City Law § 81-a [6] inapplicable (see Kamhi v. Town of Yorktown, 74 NY2d 423, 434–35 [1989]; Cohen v. Bd. of Appeals, 100 NY2d 395 [2003]). Therefore, N.Y. General City Law § 81-a [6] applies to stay "all proceedings in furtherance of the [February 22, 2016 Determination]".

The currently pending area variance application before the Board is a proceeding "in furtherance of the [February 22, 2016 Determination]". The review and decision on the area variance application is therefore automatically stayed until this interpretation appeal is decided. No further proceedings may be taken or any decision rendered on the area variance application until this interpretation appeal has been decided.

**3. The Proposed Use of the Lot is Prohibited in the UR-3 Zoning District and a Use Variance is Required.**

The Project proposes a seven-unit condominium on a single lot in the UR-3 zoning district. See Exhibit B at 1, 9, 22, 23, 24.

The Zoning Code provides that the district intent of the UR-3 Zoning District is

> "[t]o conserve, maintain and encourage single family and two-family residential uses" (Zoning Ordinance, Article 2, Table 1).

Multi-family residential uses are not intended for the UR-3 zoning district, unlike other zoning districts, including the UR-4/4A zoning district, the intent of which is "[t]o accommodate a mix of single, two-family, and multi-family residential uses", and the UR-5 zoning district, the intent of which is "[t]o accommodate multi-family residential development at moderately high densities and to encourage a mix of housing types" (Zoning Ordinance, Article 2, Table 1 [emphasis added]).

The Zoning Ordinance thus draws a clear distinction between zoning districts intended to accommodate multi-family residential uses, and those intended to be limited to single family and two-family residential uses. The UR-3 zoning district is not intended for multi-family uses.

The term "use" is defined in the Zoning Ordinance as "[t]he specific use for which land or a building is designed, occupied or maintained" (Zoning Ordinance, Appendix A, at 18). A "use" is a "permitted use" where it is a "use which is or may be lawfully established in a particular district" (Zoning Ordinance, Appendix A, at 19). For the UR-3 zoning district, any use not specifically identified as "permitted" in the Table of Uses is a prohibited use (Zoning Ordinance, § 2.2(E)(1)).

For the UR-3 zoning district, the Table of Uses identifies single-family and two-family residential uses as permitted, but does not identify multi-family residential uses as permitted. The Table of Uses does provide that such multi-family uses are permitted in the UR-4/4-A, UR-5, and NCU-3 zoning districts.

Here, the specific "use" proposed by the Developer for the Project Site is a seven-family residential use. Although the Developer represents that each of the seven homes will be occupied by a single family, seven families will be using a single lot. Therefore, the Developer proposes a multi-family residential use as the "specific use for which the land . . . is designed, occupied or maintained" (Zoning Ordinance, Appendix A, at 18).

There will be seven dwelling units on the Project Site, which the Developer does not intend to subdivide into seven lots. The Developer intends to use the lot as a "condominium," which is defined as a "multi-family dwelling containing individually owned dwelling units, wherein the real property title and ownership are vested in an owner, who has an undivided interest with others in the common usage areas and facilities which serve the development" (Zoning Ordinance, Appendix A, at 7). Multi-family residential uses (condominiums or otherwise) are not permitted in the UR-3 zoning district. In fact, condominiums are only permitted in the T-4, T-5, and T-6 zoning districts (Zoning Ordinance, § 2.2(E)(1); Article 2, Table 2).

Under the 2015 Comprehensive Plan, the Project Site falls within a portion of the Core Residential Neighborhood-1 and Residential Neighborhood-2 designations. With respect to such designations, the 2015 Comprehensive Plan states:

> "***Core Residential Neighborhood-1 (CRN-1), Core Residential Neighborhood-2 (CRN-2), and Core Residential Neighborhood-3 (CRN-3)***
>
> The Core Residential Neighborhood-1, -2, and -3 designations provide a transition from the Downtown Core and Complementary Core to the predominately residential neighborhood areas and represent the historic residential village. These areas are primarily residential in use, with single and two-family homes allowed in all three CRN designations, while multi-family uses are allowed only in the CRN-2 and CRN-3 areas. . . .
>
> . . . .
>
> ***Residential Neighborhood-1 (RN-1) and Residential Neighborhood-2 (RN-2)***
>
> The Residential Neighborhood-1 and Residential Neighborhood-2 designations are characterized by single family residential uses and moderate density two-family. . . ." Exhibit C, at 6–7.

The Project at issue proposes a seven-unit multi-family residential use, and attempts to characterize it as a "single-family" use by separating each unit by a few feet. See Exhibit B at 24. The fact remains, however, that the "use" proposed for the single lot Project Site is a multi-family condominium, a use that is expressly prohibited in the UR-3 zoning district (but permitted elsewhere) and a use that is discouraged for this particular area of the City in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan.

Accordingly, the February 22, 2016 Determination was erroneous in that it failed to require the Developer to secure a use variance to permit the otherwise prohibited multi-family use of the Project Site. The February 22, 2016 Determination must be reversed, and Appellants request that the Zoning Board of Appeals issue an interpretation that the Project is a multi-family use that is prohibited in the UR-3 zoning district in the absence of a use variance.

Importantly, the requested reversal of the February 22, 2016 Determination and interpretation does not equate to disapproval of the Project. It merely enforces the current zoning for the UR-3 zoning district, effectuates the 2015 Comprehensive Plan's intent for this area, and requires the Developer to demonstrate its entitlement to a use variance to permit the Project as currently proposed, or alternatively, to secure subdivision approval to create separate lots so that the use of each lot is either a single-family permitted use or a two-family permitted use.

We thank the Board for its consideration of this appeal.

Very truly yours,

TUCZINSKI, CAVALIER & GILCHRIST, P.C.

By: _____
Jonathon B. Tingley

# EXHIBIT A

# ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND/OR BUILDING

APPLICANT: ANW HOLDINGS, INC. TAX PARCEL NO.: 166.13-1-50.2

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 27 JUMEL PLACE
ZONING DISTRICT: URBAN RESIDENTIAL-3

This applicant has applied to use the identified property within the City of Saratoga Springs for the following:

Proposed construction of a seven-unit condominium project (detached single-family residences).

This application is hereby denied upon the grounds that such use of the property would violate the City Zoning Ordinance article(s)

240-2.3 A., Table 3 and 6.4.5 A. As such, the following relief would be required to proceed:

☐ Extension of existing variance ☐ Interpretation

☐ Use Variance to permit the following: _____

☒ Area Variance seeking the following relief:

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| Max principal building coverage: 7 units combined | 30% | 46% |
| Max principal buildings on one lot: | 1 | 7 |
| Minimum front yard setback: | 10 ft. | 1 ft. |
| Minimum rear yard setback: | 25 ft. | 6 ft. |
| Maximum height residential fence: | 6 ft. | 8 ft. |

☒ Advisory Opinion required from Saratoga County Planning Board

ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR 2/22/16 DATE

# EXHIBIT B

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

CITY HALL - 474 BROADWAY
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NEW YORK 12866
TEL: 518-587-3550 FAX: 518-580-9480
WWW.SARATOGA-SPRINGS.ORG

[FOR OFFICE USE]

(Application #)

(Date received)

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | AWW Holdings Inc. | | |
| Address | 563 North Broadway | | |
| | Saratoga Springs NY 12866 | | |
| Tel./Fax | 587-4413 / 587-0260 | / | / |
| Email | [redacted] | | |

* An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.
Applicant's interest in the premises: ☐ Owner ☐ Lessee ☐ Under option to lease or purchase

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

Property Address (No. & St.) 27 Jumel Place Side of St. (north, east, etc.) North

Tax Parcel No.: 166 . 13 - 50 - 2 *(for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37)* Tax District: ☒ Inside ☐ Outside

1. Date acquired by current owner: Under Contract 2. Zoning District when purchased: UR3

3. Present use of property: Multi Family - Ballet Studio 4. Current Zoning District: UR 3

5. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property? ☒ Yes (when? 10/31/13 for what? ) ☐ No

6. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☐ Historic District ☐ Architectural Review District ☐ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?

7. Brief description of proposed action: Tear down existing building and build seven unit single family condominium project.

8. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☒ No

9. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☐ Yes ☒ No

10. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☐ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☐ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☒ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

Revised 01/05/2011

FEES: Make checks payable to the "Commissioner of Finance" and attach to top of original application. Fees are cumulative and required for each request below.

| | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Interpretation | $ 400 |
| ☐ Use variance | $1,000 |
| ☑ Area variance | |
| -Residential use/property: | $ 150 |
| -Non-residential use/property: | $ 500 |
| ☐ Extensions: | $ 150 |

## INTERPRETATION – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

1. Identify the section(s) of the Zoning Ordinance for which you are seeking an interpretation:

Section(s) _____

2. How do you request that this section be interpreted? _____

3. If interpretation is denied, do you wish to request alternative zoning relief? ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. If the answer to #3 is "yes," what alternative relief do you request? ☐ Use Variance ☐ Area Variance

## EXTENSION OF A VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

1. Date original variance was granted: 5/1/14 2. Type of variance granted? ☐ Use ☑ Area

3. Date original variance expired: 11/1/15 4. Length of extension requested: _____

5. Explain why the extension is necessary. Why wasn't the original timeframe sufficient?: We were unable to close on the property due to it being held up in probate for the last several months. We are anticipating to close within the next few weeks.

When requesting an extension of time for an existing variance, the applicant must prove that the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted have not changed. Specifically demonstrate that there have been no significant changes on the site, in the neighborhood, or within the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted:

Nothing has changed to this area & no new development

on or near this site.

## USE VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

A use variance is requested to permit the following: _____

For the Zoning Board to grant a request for a use variance, an applicant must prove that the zoning regulations create an unnecessary hardship in relation to that property. In seeking a use variance, New York State law requires an applicant to prove all four of the following "tests".

1. That the applicant cannot realize a reasonable financial return on initial investment for any currently permitted use on the property. "Dollars & cents" proof must be submitted as evidence. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return for the following reasons:

A. Submit the following financial evidence relating to this property (attach additional evidence as needed):

1) Date of purchase: _____ Purchase amount: $_____

2) Indicate dates and costs of any improvements made to property after purchase:

| Date | Improvement | Cost |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3) Annual maintenance expenses: $_____ 4) Annual taxes: $_____

5) Annual income generated from property: $_____

6) City assessed value: $_____ Equalization rate:_____ Estimated Market Value: $_____

7) Appraised Value: $_____ Appraiser: _____ Date: _____

Appraisal Assumptions: _____

_____

B. Has property been listed for sale with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS)? ☐ Yes ☐ No If "yes", for how long? _____

1) Original listing date(s):_____ Original listing price: $_____

If listing price was reduced, describe when and to what extent: _____

_____

2) Has the property been advertised in the newspapers or other publications? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, describe frequency and name of publications: _____

_____

3) Has the property had a "For Sale" sign posted on it? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, list dates when sign was posted: _____

_____

4) How many times has the property been shown and with what results? _____

_____

_____

2. That the financial hardship relating to this property is unique and does not apply to a substantial portion of the neighborhood. Difficulties shared with numerous other properties in the same neighborhood or district would not satisfy this requirement. This previously identified financial hardship is unique for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

3. That the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Changes that will alter the character of a neighborhood or district would be at odds with the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance. The requested variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood for the following reasons:

4. That the alleged hardship has not been self-created. An applicant (whether the property owner or one acting on behalf of the property owner) cannot claim "unnecessary hardship" if that hardship was created by the applicant, or if the applicant acquired the property knowing (or was in a position to know) the conditions for which the applicant is seeking relief. The hardship has not been self-created for the following reasons:

## AREA VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

The applicant requests relief from the following Zoning Ordinance article(s) _____.

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To | → To |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fencing (exterior fence only) | 6' | 8' | |
| Lot Coverage | 30% | (Prev. Appr.) 43.5% | 46.0% |
| Front Yard Setback | 10' | (Pre. Appr.) 5' | 1' |

Other: _____

To grant an area variance, the ZBA must balance the benefits to the applicant and the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and community, taking into consideration the following:

1. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by other feasible means. Identify what alternatives to the variance have been explored (alternative designs, attempts to purchase land, etc.) and why they are not feasible.

   Our fencing request is new, asking for the height limit to go from 6 – 8' (exterior fence only). This creates privacy along the perimeter, a benefit to both sides of the fence. What is currently there is dilapidated and run down, hence aesthically a great improvement. Our modified request for front setback of 1' is what currently exists and consistent with surrounding homes. The 5' granted does not allow for our (2) front porches to be placed on the unit. This style entry fits with the street scape. Finally, the area coverage request of 46% is what was originally asked for, and necessary for the option of adding additional back porches on the homes; an opportunity for our clients to enjoy their backyards, since their fronts are quite limited in size. These variance alternatives are reasonable and contiguous with the urban feel of downtown.

2. Whether granting the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. Granting the variance will not create a detriment to nearby properties or an undesirable change in the neighborhood character for the following reasons:

Granting the area variance will enhance the neighborhood by creating privacy, align the two front porches with the neighboring homes, and allow only 2.5% more in area coverage which was originally requested.

3. Whether the variance is substantial. The requested variance is not substantial for the following reasons:

This request is minimal and less than what currently exists on the property. The fence height increase is not substantial and benefits both the current and new homeowners.

4. Whether the variance will have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district. The requested variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood or district for the following reasons:

This is one lot, seven homes, a singular curb cut and permissable use of the land in lieu of its current nonconforming commercial use. Permeability exceeds the minimum, peaking at 35.10%, parking accommodations are onsite and traffic is reduced due to the applicable Urban Residential 3 zone. The lot will be properly cleaned and abated, a favorable influence both physically and environmentally on the neighborhood.

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created (although this does not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance). Explain whether the alleged difficulty was or was not self-created:

The difficulty was created by the need to change a non-conforming structure to a residential economically feasible solution. A win for all involved; neighbors, city, and a proper sustainable usage by City Standards.

In accord with Article 240-14.4A(1)(b)(6) of the Zoning Ordinance, "any request for an area variance, which shall effect a change in density, shall be applied for and considered as a use variance and decided under criteria for the same". A request that involves any of the following relief will require an application for a use variance and will be decided under the use variance criteria:

(1) Dimensional relief from minimum lot size requirements that would allow additional permitted units and/or uses
(2) Relief from on site parking requirements
(3) Reduction in land area requirements for multi-family units

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☒ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.

_____
(applicant signature)

_____
(applicant signature)

Sworn to before me this date:

Date: _____

_____
*Notary Public*

*Revised: January 2011*

Revised 01/05/2011

617.20

Appendix C

State Environmental Quality Review

# SHORT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

## For UNLISTED ACTIONS Only

**PART I - PROJECT INFORMATION (To be completed by Applicant or Project sponsor)**

1. APPLICANT/SPONSOR: ANW Holdings

2. PROJECT NAME:

3. PROJECT LOCATION: 27 Jumel Place

Municipality: Saratoga Springs, NY County: Saratoga

4. PRECISE LOCATION (Street address and road intersections, prominent landmarks, etc., or provide map):

5. PROPOSED ACTION IS: ☒ New ☐ Expansion ☐ Modification/alteration

6. DESCRIBE PROJECT BRIEFLY:

7 Individual Condominiums

7. AMOUNT OF LAND AFFECTED: Initially: _____ (acres) Ultimately: _____ (acres)

8. WILL PROPOSED ACTION COMPLY WITH EXISTING ZONING OR OTHER EXISTING LAND USE RESTRICTIONS?

☒ Yes ☐ No If No, describe briefly

9. WHAT IS PRESENT LAND USE IN VICINITY OF PROJECT?

☒ Residential ☐ Industrial ☐ Commercial ☐ Agriculture ☐ Park/Forest/Open Space ☐ Other

Describe:

10. DOES ACTION INVOLVE A PERMIT APPROVAL, OR FUNDING, NOW OR ULTIMATELY FROM ANY OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY (FEDERAL, STATE OR LOCAL)?

☒ Yes ☐ No If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit/approvals:

Bldg Dept - Saratoga Springs

11. DOES ANY ASPECT OF THE ACTION HAVE A CURRENTLY VALID PERMIT OR APPROVAL?

☐ Yes ☒ No If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit/approvals:

12. AS A RESULT OF PROPOSED ACTION WILL EXISTING PERMIT/APPROVAL REQUIRE MODIFICATION?

☐ Yes ☒ No

I CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE IS TRUE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE

Applicant/sponsor name: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____



Revised 01/05/2011

PART II - IMPACT ASSESSMENT (To be completed by Lead Agency)

A. DOES ACTION EXCEED ANY TYPE I THRESHOLD IN 6 NYCRR, PART 617.4? If yes, coordinate the review process and use the FULL EAF.
☐ Yes ☐ No

B. WILL ACTION RECEIVE COORDINATED REVIEW AS PROVIDED FOR UNLISTED ACTIONS IN 6 NYCRR, PART 617.6? If No, a negative declaration may be superseded by another involved agency.
☐ Yes ☐ No

C. COULD ACTION RESULT IN ANY ADVERSE EFFECTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE FOLLOWING: (Answers may be handwritten, if legible)

C1. Existing air quality, surface or groundwater quality or quantity, noise levels, existing traffic pattern, solid waste production or disposal, potential for erosion, drainage or flooding problems? Explain briefly:

C2. Aesthetic, agricultural, archaeological, historic or other natural or cultural resources; or community or neighborhood character? Explain briefly:

C3. Vegetation or fauna, fish, shellfish or wildlife species, significant habitats, or threatened or endangered species? Explain briefly:

C4. A community's existing plans or goals as officially adopted, or a change in use or intensity of use of land or other natural resources? Explain briefly:

C5. Growth, subsequent development, or related activities likely to be induced by the proposed action? Explain briefly:

C6. Long term, short term, cumulative, or other effects not identified in C1-C5? Explain briefly:

C7. Other impacts (including changes in use of either quantity or type of energy? Explain briefly:

D. WILL THE PROJECT HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS THAT CAUSED THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL AREA (CEA)?
☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, explain briefly:

E. IS THERE, OR IS THERE LIKELY TO BE, CONTROVERSY RELATED TO POTENTIAL ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS?
☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, explain briefly:

PART III - DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE (To be completed by Agency)

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each adverse effect identified above, determine whether it is substantial, large, important or otherwise significant. Each effect should be assessed in connection with its (a) setting (i.e. urban or rural); (b) probability of occurring; (c) duration; (d) irreversibility; (e) geographic scope; and (f) magnitude. If necessary, add attachments or reference supporting materials. Ensure that explanations contain sufficient detail to show that all relevant adverse impacts have been identified and adequately addressed. If question d of part II was checked yes, the determination of significance must evaluate the potential impact of the proposed action on the environmental characteristics of the CEA.

☐ Check this box if you have identified one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts that **MAY** occur. Then proceed directly to the FULL EAF and/or prepare a positive declaration.

☐ Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action **WILL NOT** result in any significant adverse environmental impacts **AND** provide, on attachments as necessary, the reasons supporting this determination.

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of Lead Agency | Date |
| Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency | Title of Responsible Officer |
| Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency | Signature of Preparer (If different from responsible officer) |

Res 1 App


# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

CITY HALL - 474 BROADWAY
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NEW YORK 12866
PH) 518-587-3550 FX) 518-580-9480
WWW.SARATOGA-SPRINGS.ORG



BILL MOORE
*CHAIR*
KEITH B. KAPLAN
*VICE CHAIR*
ADAM MCNEILL
*SECRETARY*
GARY HASBROUCK
GEORGE "SKIP" CARLSON
SHIRLEY POPPEL
OKSANA LUDO



RECEIVED
OCT 31 2013
ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT


IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF
ANW Holdings, Inc. of 564 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

from the Building Inspector's Denial of Application for Land Use and/or Building for the premises at 27 Jumel Place, Saratoga Springs, New York, identified as Tax Parcel No.: 166.13-1-50.2 in the inside district of the City.

The Applicant has applied for an area variance for relief from the current City Zoning Ordinance applicable to the Urban Residential - 3 zoning district to construct a seven unit condominium development seeking relief from the maximum principal buildings permitted on one lot, maximum principal building coverage, the minimum front yard setback requirements for the two units fronting on Jumel Place, and from the minimum rear yard setback requirements for the two units located at the rear of the property, and public notice having been duly given of a hearing on said application on July 9, 2013 and October 28, 2013.

In consideration of the balance between the benefit to the Applicant with the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community, the Board makes the following resolution that the requested area variance for the following relief or such lesser amount, as described in the submitted application, BE APPROVED:

| Type of Requirement | Required | Existing | Proposed | Total Relief Requested |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maximum Principal Buildings on one lot | One (1) | One (1) | Seven (7) | 6 (600)% |
| Maximum Building Coverage | 30% | 49.4% | 43.5% | 13.5% (45%) |
| Minimum Front Yard Setback for the 2 units fronting on Jumel Place | 10 feet | 1 foot | 5 feet | 5 feet (50%) |
| Minimum Rear Yard Setback for the 2 units located at the rear | 25 feet | .7 foot | 6 feet | 19 feet (76%) |

1. The Applicant has demonstrated that this benefit cannot be achieved by other means feasible. This Board has been asked to consider several prior applications to redevelop this property. It is currently used for mixed commercial and residential purposes with a large cement structure, formerly a manufacturing facility, located on the property. The current use is not conducive to a residential neighborhood and the noise and traffic generated by the current use has been an issue of concern for many of the neighbors. The unique nature

of this property and the prior failed attempts to arrive at a use for this property that is acceptable to neighbors, conforming with the neighborhood and economically feasible has demonstrated that the redevelopment of this property raises unusual and distinct issues. Not only has the Applicant explored alternate means to achieve the requested benefit including a smaller number of units which were evaluated and found to be economically unfeasible, but prior applicants have also attempted to use the structure for varied uses, all of which demonstrates that other alternatives have not been shown to be practical or economically feasible. The applicant has demonstrated that redeveloping this property from an unsightly cement structure used for commercial purposes into a seven unit residential condominium development is the best economically feasible use as shown on the proposed site plan for this property.

2. The Applicant has demonstrated that granting these variances will not create an undesirable change in neighborhood character or a detriment to nearby properties. Applicant had shown that removal of the current cement structure and construction of a seven unit condominium will result in a development that substantially conforms with the residential homes in the neighborhood. The Applicant has demonstrated, and several neighbors have testified in support, that this redevelopment will have a very beneficial impact on the neighborhood. The granting of these variances will result in the removal of a varied use (ballet school), unauthorized use (karate school) and prior nonconforming use (manufacturing facility) and result in a conforming use which is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. We note that the City Planning Board issued a favorable advisory opinion identifying that "This site can adequately accommodate development of this scale, and that the overall density proposed is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood." Based on the foregoing, the granting the variances will improve the appearance of the property and will not create an undesirable change in neighborhood character or impact on nearby properties, but rather a desirable and valuable change.

3. The relief requested may be considered substantial, but is mitigated by the fact that the current existing structure is non-conforming and by the fact that the lot, at 34,765.50 square feet, would accommodate either five single-family lots or four two-family buildings for total of eight residences. The requested variance, for seven units, is one less than the permitted 8 residences. In order to develop this property in a manner that is most conducive to current needs of our citizens, creating smaller free standing condominiums is beneficial. The construction of one continuous unit would have eliminated the need for a variance for seven units, but would not have resulted in a project that meets the current needs of some members of the community. The minimum front and rear setback variances are necessary to maximize the available parking and the need for service vehicles to access the property. Due to the non-conformance of the current structure and some of the existing structures in the neighborhood, these variances will not have a substantial impact on the neighborhood and therefore mitigates the substantial nature of the variances.

4. The Applicant has demonstrated that the variance will not have a significant adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood. The Applicant has demonstrated, and several neighbors have testified in support, that this redevelopment will have a significant beneficial physical impact on the neighborhood. Not only will the current commercial use with resulting traffic and noise generated by such use no longer interfere with the quiet residential neighborhood, but the physical change to the property will be a significant improvement to the appearance of the neighborhood. Additionally, the proposed construction will improve the permeability of the lot to 35.1%, in excess of the required 25%.

5. The alleged difficulty may be considered self-created in that the Applicant desires to re-develop this property in a manner that will meet the needs of residents of Saratoga Springs who are looking to down size and still create a development that conforms to the neighborhood as a residential development in an economic

manner, however, this is not necessarily fatal to the application.

Notifications/Approvals/Conditions of Approval:
Prior variances are discontinued.
Saratoga Springs City Planning Board site plan review is required – the Planning Board will address local concerns as identified by the Saratoga County Planning Board.
Saratoga County Planning Board issued a finding of no significant county side or inter community impact.

Adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 6 (B. Moore, K. Kaplan, A. McNeill, G. Hasbrouck, S. Carlson, O. Ludd)

NAYES: 0

Dated: October 28, 2013

This variance shall expire 18 months following the filing date of such decision unless the necessary building permit has been issued and actual construction begun as per 240-8.5.1.

10/30/13
Date

Chair

I hereby certify the above to be a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Saratoga Springs on the date above mentioned, six members of the Board being present.




MAP OF
the Neighborhood of
**MAGNOLIA LANE**
in SARATOGA SPRINGS
Witt Construction
2018

| Lot Coverage | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Residence | Footprint | Roof OH | Coverage |
| #1 | 2,449 | 284 | 2,733 |
| #2 | 1,337 | 179 | 1,516 |
| #3 | 1,472 | 160 | 1,632 |
| #4 | 2,079 | 153 | 2,243 |
| #5 | 2,719 | 225 | 2,917 |
| #6 | 2,343 | 223 | 2,543 |
| #7 | 2,070 | 220 | 2,290 |
| | 14,526 | 1,445 | 13,958 |
| | | | 34,764 |
| | | | 48,051 |

| Permeable/Non Statistics | |
|---|---|
| (A) Size of Development (Sq. Ft.) | 34,764 |

| (B) Non-Permeable Areas (Sq. Ft.) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Road | 3,306 | |
| Driveways | 3,538 | |
| Patios | 1,740 | |
| Living | 5,865 | |
| Porches | 1,656 | |
| Garages | 4,175 | |
| Total Non-Permeable | 21305 | 61.3% |

| (C) Permeable Areas (Sq. Ft.) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Turf Paved | 1,588 | |
| Landscaped | 11,870 | |
| Total Permeable | 13459 | 38.7% |

*Scale of Feet*

1 5 10 25 50 100


REAR
SIDE
SIDE
FRONT




Concept Site Plan




Site Plan with Existing Building

27 Jumel Place
Saratoga Springs NY

Witt Construction
3/10/2014

| | Depth | Width | Area (sq. ft.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lot Size | 231 | 150.5 | 34,765.50 |

| Area | Existing | % of Lot | As Drawn | % of Lot |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principle Building and Overhang | 17,161 | 49.4% | 15,589 | 46.00% |
| Accessory Building | 160 | 0.5% | | |
| Total | | | | 46.00% |
| Driveways/Road | 6,357 | 18.3% | 7,157 | 20.60% |
| Permeable Areas | 11,088 | 31.9% | 12,191 | 35.10% |

| Setbacks | To the overhangs |
|---|---|
| Front | 1 |
| Rear | 6 |
| Right Side | 7 |
| Left Side | 5 |



NO PARKING
24 HRS




Exhibit B, Page 3

Witt Construction

563 N Broadway Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

February 27.2014, 2013

Magnolia Lane

Street Views



Witt Construction

563 N Broadway Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

February 27.2014, 2013

Magnolia Lane

Street Views

Witt Construction 563 N Broadway Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

February 27,2014, 2013

Magnolia Lane

Street Views

# *Short Environmental Assessment Form*
## *Part 1 - Project Information*

### Instructions for Completing

**Part 1 - Project Information. The applicant or project sponsor is responsible for the completion of Part 1.** Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification. Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information.

Complete all items in Part 1. You may also provide any additional information which you believe will be needed by or useful to the lead agency; attach additional pages as necessary to supplement any item.

**Part 1 - Project and Sponsor Information**

Jumel/Downton Walk - Witt Construction, Inc.

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of Action or Project: Downton Walk | |
| Project Location (describe, and attach a location map): 27 Jumel Place | |
| Brief Description of Proposed Action: 7 Individual Family Condominiums | |
| Name of Applicant or Sponsor: John Witt | Telephone: 518-587-4113<br>E-Mail: [redacted] |
| Address: 563 N. Broadway | |
| City/PO: Saratoga Springs | State: NY<br>Zip Code: 12866 |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Does the proposed action only involve the legislative adoption of a plan, local law, ordinance, administrative rule, or regulation?<br>If Yes, attach a narrative description of the intent of the proposed action and the environmental resources that may be affected in the municipality and proceed to Part 2. If no, continue to question 2. | ☑ | ☐ |
| 2. Does the proposed action require a permit, approval or funding from any other governmental Agency?<br>If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit or approval: Building Department | ☐ | ☑ |

3.a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action? .791 acres
b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed? .791 acres
c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor? .791 acres

4. Check all land uses that occur on, adjoining and near the proposed action.

☐ Urban ☐ Rural (non-agriculture) ☐ Industrial ☐ Commercial ☑ Residential (suburban)
☐ Forest ☐ Agriculture ☐ Aquatic ☐ Other (specify): _____
☐ Parkland

| | NO | YES | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5. Is the proposed action, | | | |
| a. A permitted use under the zoning regulations? | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan? | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 6. Is the proposed action consistent with the predominant character of the existing built or natural landscape? | ☐ | ☑ |
| 7. Is the site of the proposed action located in, or does it adjoin, a state listed Critical Environmental Area? If Yes, identify: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 8. a. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels? | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Are public transportation service(s) available at or near the site of the proposed action? | ☐ | ☑ |
| c. Are any pedestrian accommodations or bicycle routes available on or near site of the proposed action? | ☐ | ☑ |
| 9. Does the proposed action meet or exceed the state energy code requirements? If the proposed action will exceed requirements, describe design features and technologies: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 10. Will the proposed action connect to an existing public/private water supply? If No, describe method for providing potable water: _____ Per site plan approval we need to add a new water-main that runs from Jumel up the private drive. | ☐ | ☑ |
| 11. Will the proposed action connect to existing wastewater utilities? If No, describe method for providing wastewater treatment: _____ | ☐ | ☑ |
| 12. a. Does the site contain a structure that is listed on either the State or National Register of Historic Places? | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Is the proposed action located in an archeological sensitive area? | ☑ | ☐ |
| 13. a. Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency? | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Would the proposed action physically alter, or encroach into, any existing wetland or waterbody? If Yes, identify the wetland or waterbody and extent of alterations in square feet or acres: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 14. Identify the typical habitat types that occur on, or are likely to be found on the project site. Check all that apply: ☐ Shoreline ☐ Forest ☐ Agricultural/grasslands ☐ Early mid-successional ☐ Wetland ☐ Urban ☑ Suburban | | |
| 15. Does the site of the proposed action contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered? | ☑ | ☐ |
| 16. Is the project site located in the 100 year flood plain? | ☑ | ☐ |
| 17. Will the proposed action create storm water discharge, either from point or non-point sources? If Yes, a. Will storm water discharges flow to adjacent properties? ☐ NO ☐ YES | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Will storm water discharges be directed to established conveyance systems (runoff and storm drains)? If Yes, briefly describe: ☐ NO ☐ YES | | |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 18. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that result in the impoundment of water or other liquids (e.g. retention pond, waste lagoon, dam)?<br>If Yes, explain purpose and size: | ✓ | |
| 19. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the location of an active or closed solid waste management facility?<br>If Yes, describe: | ✓ | |
| 20. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the subject of remediation (ongoing or completed) for hazardous waste?<br>If Yes, describe:<br>There as been asbestos found on location. We have an asbestos report and working with Cristo Demolition who is licensed and experienced in moving this hazardous waste properly. | | ✓ |

**I AFFIRM THAT THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE IS TRUE AND ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE**

Applicant/sponsor name: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____

PRINT FORM

CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

CITY HALL - 474 BROADWAY
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NEW YORK 12866
PH) 518-587-3550 FX) 518-580-9480
WWW.SARATOGA-SPRINGS.ORG

Bill Moore
Chair
Keith B. Kaplan
Vice Chair
Adam McNeill
Secretary
Gary Hasbrouck
George "Skip" Carlson
Oksana Ludd
James Helicke

Appeal #2759
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF
ANW Holdings, Inc.
564 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

from the Building Inspector's Denial of Application for Land Use and/or Building for the premises at 27 Jumel Place, Saratoga Springs, New York, identified as Tax Parcel No.: 166.13-1-50.2 in the inside district of the City.

The Applicant has applied for modification to Appeal # 2714, a variance granted October 23, 2013, seeking modification of the relief from the maximum principal building coverage and the minimum front yard setback requirements for the two units fronting on Jumel Place, and for additional relief from maximum height of a residential fence, all as provided in the current City Zoning Ordinance applicable to the Urban Residential - 3 zoning district, and public notice having been duly given of a hearing on said application on April 21, 2014 and April 28, 2014.

In consideration of the balance between the benefit to the Applicant with the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community, the Board makes the following resolution that the requested area variance for the following relief or such lesser amount, as described in the submitted application, BE APPROVED:

| Type of Requirement | Required/ Permitted | Previously Approved | Proposed | Total Relief Requested |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maximum Building Coverage | 30% | 43.5% | 46% | 16% (53%) |
| Minimum Front Yard Setback for the 2 units fronting on Jumel Place | 10 feet | 5 foot | 1 feet | 9 feet (90%) |
| Maximum Height residential fence | 6 feet | N/A | 8 feet | 2 feet (33%) |

1. The Applicant has demonstrated that this benefit cannot be achieved by other means feasible. This Board has previously determined in Appeal #2714 that the Applicant has demonstrated that redeveloping this property from an unsightly cement structure used for commercial purposes into a seven unit residential condominium development is the best economically feasible use as shown on the proposed site plan for this property. The modifications to the maximum principal building coverage and the minimum front yard setback requested by Applicant, subject to the conditions provided below, do not change the Board's prior determinations. The request to increase the maximum height of the residential fence is requested to ensure added privacy for the units and for adjacent neighbors. Providing this privacy cannot be achieved by other means due to the limited size of the property.

2. The Applicant has demonstrated that granting the modification to these variances will not create an undesirable change in neighborhood character or a detriment to nearby properties. In granting variance #2714, the Board concluded the granting the variances will improve the appearance of the property and will not create an undesirable change in

neighborhood character or impact on nearby properties, but rather a desirable and valuable change. The modifications do not change this conclusion. Additionally, granting the variance for an increased height in the fence will enhance the character of the neighborhood.

3. The modifications to the relief requested may be considered substantial. However, due to the proximity of the proposed developed structures to the neighbors and to one another, the Board finds the benefit of privacy fencing to offset the adverse impact.

4. The Applicant has demonstrated that the modification of the variances will not have a significant adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood. In the prior Appeal, the Applicant demonstrated and several neighbors testified in support, that this redevelopment will have a significant beneficial physical impact on the neighborhood. The modifications requested in this application do not alter the conclusions reached by this Board in Appeal #2714. Additionally, the request for an increase in the height of the fence does not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood.

5. The alleged difficulty may be considered self-created, however, this is not necessarily fatal to the application.

Notifications/Approvals/Conditions of Approval:
The minimum front yard setback of 5 feet previously approved in Appeal #2714 is modified only to permit front stoops or stairways within the 5 foot setback to the 1 foot setback.

No eight (8) foot fence shall be permitted to be constructed along Jumel Place or extending beyond the front foundation line along Jumel Place.

County Planning Board issued a decision of "No Significant County Impact" on April 17, 2014.

Adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 7 (B. Moore, K. Kaplan, A. McNeill, G. Hasbrouck, S. Carlson O. Ludd and J. Helicke)

NAYES: 0

Dated: April 28, 2014

This variance shall expire 18 months following the filing date of such decision unless the necessary building permit has been issued and actual construction begun as per 240-8.5.1.

5-1-14
Date

Chair

I hereby certify the above to be a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Saratoga Springs on the date above mentioned, seven members of the Board being present.

RECEIVED
MAY 06 2014
ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT

# EXHIBIT C




# City of Saratoga Springs

## 2015 Comprehensive Plan

*Adopted by City Council 6-16-15*

In May 2013, the City Council initiated an update to the City's Comprehensive Plan and associated maps.

On December 18, 2014, following 19 months of much dialogue and discussion including 19 public meetings, four public workshops, a 2-day open house and numerous focus groups, the Saratoga Springs Comprehensive Plan Committee voted to send to the City Council its "final work product" consisting of the November 2014 version of the Draft Comprehensive Plan and a list of 53 possible amendments to this draft.

The City Council discussed this work product and the list of possible amendments over the course of four City Council workshops, occurring on February 24, March 24, March 31, and April 14, 2015. At its last workshop, the City Council confirmed consensus on the desired language to be included in this Plan.

On June 16, 2015, following a SEQRA Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance, the City Council voted 5-0 to adopt this 2015 Comprehensive Plan update.

# Acknowledgements

**Saratoga Springs City Council**
*(Finalized and approved 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update)*

- Joanne D. Yepsen, Mayor
- John P. Franck, Commissioner of Accounts
- Michele Madigan, Commissioner of Finance
- Chris Mathiesen, Commissioner of Public Safety
- Anthony "Skip" Scirocco, Commissioner of Public Works

- Former Mayor Scott Johnson

**Comprehensive Plan Committee**
*(Produced committee "Final Work Product" and provided to City Council.)*

- Geoff Bornemann, Chair (1/14-12/14)
- Clifford Van Wagner, Chair (5/13-1/14)
- Jamin Totino, Vice Chair
- Sonny Bonacio
- Theresa Capozzola
- Devin Dalpos
- Tom Denny
- Casey Holzworth
- James Letts
- Oksana Ludd (Zoning Board of Appeals)
- Steven Rowland (Design Review Commission)
- Todd Shimkus
- Mark Torpey (Planning Board)
- Charles Wait
- Janice White (5/13-4/14)

- This document was prepared with assistance from MJ Engineering & Surveying PC and the staff of the City's Office of Planning and Economic Development.

# FUTURE LAND USE 4.0

If the City is to be successful in preparing for the future, it must have increased flexibility to accommodate the rapidly changing needs of business, commerce, and our residents. In addition, the City must have increased accountability to ensure and enhance the physical, cultural, and social amenities that make Saratoga Springs an attractive and vibrant locale.

Fortunately, Saratoga Springs is currently in a good position to capitalize on its collective strengths and enthusiasm at a time when many other communities cannot. To maintain and improve upon the City's current position, a close look was given to the City's future land uses and the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (Map). The Map sets the direction for future land uses within the City. It illustrates the City's vision by identifying broad categories of land use. The Map is not a zoning map. However, the zoning map must follow the direction set forth in the Comprehensive Plan in accordance with General City Law §28-a. The zoning ordinance is typically the regulatory document that addresses densities, area, bulk, and specific permitted uses.

A key factor in revising the Map for this update is to ensure it reflects the City's vision. The vision for the City remains relatively unchanged from the 2001 Comprehensive Plan and, therefore, the Map will appear very similar. That vision includes the most intense uses and greatest mix of uses at the City's Core (Broadway). The intensity of uses becomes less as one travels away from the Core. The concept of the greenbelt, which was represented by the Conservation Development District (CDD) in the 2001 Comprehensive Plan, is reinforced in this updated Map.

The various land use categories shown on the map represent the intended uses and densities desired or anticipated for the community in the future. There are a number of important points to note about these land use categories:

- The land use categories in the Map are not zoning districts. The land use categories are broader and more general than zoning districts.
- The boundaries for each of the land use categories are intentionally non-precise and are meant to be fluid. The boundaries of the zoning districts are far more specific and detailed.
- The land use categories are general guides to future zoning or other regulations. State law mandates that zoning must be in conformance with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan. This means that the

density within the zoning for a particular area must be equal or less than that what is described within this document. When areas are to be rezoned, the uses and densities permitted within the zoning district must be compatible with the ranges presented in the land use category.

- The land use categories reflect a vision for the City in the future. It may take many years for the proposed changes to occur. The vision is something to aim for and work towards. Since zoning is the primary tool to implement this plan, the zoning for an area may be changed or upgraded several times in an effort to reflect community input.

The following descriptions are offered for the proposed land use category designations. The descriptions are intended to include the purpose or intent of the category, an overview of general uses and a description of the character for each land use category.

***Downtown Core (DC)***

***Downtown Core (DC)***

The Downtown Core designation represents the heart of the City of Saratoga Springs. It includes areas of the highest density commercial, office, civic, and residential uses that support a highly compact and walkable core, as well as multi-modal transportation options. While the Downtown Core serves local uses, it also attracts people regionally and globally as a vibrant commercial center, employment center, entertainment center, and historic and cultural center.

The Downtown Core is characterized by mixed use buildings with architecturally-interesting facades, streetscape design with ample room for street trees, sidewalks, benches, and other amenities that make the streets pedestrian-friendly. The designation also provides for mid to high-rise residential projects and mixed use projects incorporating housing above non-residential uses.

Looking forward, the Downtown Core will continue to be highly urban in character, with a mix of commercial and residential uses, and a balance between dense infill through development and redevelopment and the creation of attractive public spaces such as plazas and pocket parks.

***Complementary Core (CC)***

***Complementary Core (CC)***

The Complementary Core designation consists of areas of commercial uses of moderate to high intensity interspersed with higher density residential uses. This area is intended to be pedestrian-oriented with multi-modal transportation options and is a complementary, yet slightly less dense, extension of the Downtown Core. These areas represent a mix of freestanding offices, commercial uses, or clusters of businesses meeting the day-to-day needs of residents. The character of the Complementary Core areas is reflective of an urban environment with buildings near the street, parking to the rear or side, and streetscape elements such as sidewalks, and ample room for street trees.

The Complementary Core designation offers opportunities for infill and new development that continues to support the Downtown Core. Freestanding commercial structures as well as mixed-use, multi-story buildings with residential uses above the commercial uses would both be appropriate in this designation.

***Community Mixed Use (CMU)***

***Community Mixed Use (CMU)***

The Community Mixed Use designation includes areas of moderate density residential and community-supported commercial uses. These areas are characterized by mixed use neighborhoods that are walkable and connected to adjacent residential neighborhoods. Each area includes a variety of neighborhood-scale businesses and services that meets the needs of the surrounding community.

While the character of each Community Mixed Use areas may vary, all areas are intended to be pedestrian-oriented with an attractive streetscape, along with amenities such as small parks and plazas. In some areas, identity is already well established through architecture and streetscape while in others, identity will be shaped by future planning decisions.

***Core Residential Neighborhood-1 (CRN-1), Core Residential Neighborhood-2 (CRN-2), and Core Residential Neighborhood-3 (CRN-3)***

***Core Residential Neighborhood-1 (CRN-1)***

***Core Residential Neighborhood-2 (CRN-2)***

***Core Residential Neighborhood-3 (CRN-3)***

The Core Residential Neighborhood-1, -2, and -3 designations provide a transition from the Downtown Core and Complementary Core to the predominantly residential neighborhood areas and represent the historic residential village. These areas are primarily residential in use, with single and two-family homes allowed in all three CRN designations, while multi-family uses are allowed only in the CRN-2 and CRN-3 areas. The Core neighborhoods reflect Saratoga's quintessential residential character and charm through unique architecture, historic elements, front porches, sidewalks, and tree-lined streets.

This area is highly walkable, and should be accessible by transit and a range of multi-modal options.

Although the Core Neighborhood is primarily residential in character, existing neighborhood-scale commercial uses may currently exist to complement residential uses.

CRN-1 Note: The maximum density is 10.0 Units/Acre.

CRN-2 Note: The maximum density is 15.0 Units/Acre.

CRN-3 Note: The maximum density is 30.0 Units/Acre.

***Residential Neighborhood -1 (RN-1)***

***Residential Neighborhood- 2 (RN-2)***

***Residential Neighborhood -1 (RN-1) and Residential Neighborhood- 2 (RN-2)***

The Residential Neighborhood-1 and Residential Neighborhood-2 designations are characterized by single family residential uses with moderate density two-family. While a mix of housing types is present, these areas retain the basic character of single-family neighborhoods, such as front and rear yards, driveways, and garages. Small, neighborhood-scale commercial uses may currently exist to complement the residential uses.

RN-1 Note: The maximum density is 3.5 Units/Acre.

RN-2 Note: The maximum density is 7 Units/Acre.

***Conservation Development District (CDD)***

***Conservation Development District (CDD)***

The Conservation Development District designation reflects the "Country" of the City in the Country. This designation allows for low density residential, outdoor recreation, agricultural, and other rural uses utilizing land conservation methods such as clustering. Areas typically include single-family lots and subdivisions, existing planned developments, farms, estates, and natural areas. Commercial activities should be limited to those that support rural and recreational uses and which protect valuable open space, protect natural resources and maintain natural systems. This designation reflects a rural or agrarian character that works to preserve contiguous open spaces, protect natural resources and restore and maintain natural systems, which will all become increasingly important and valuable community resources.

Development in this area shall require a "conservation analysis" and utilize land conservation methods to protect environmentally sensitive areas and features, minimize the development's edge effects and conserve significant open space.

# EXHIBIT D


1
166.13
GRANGER
LAKE
EAST AVENUE
EAST
JUMEL PLACE
Appellants Properties
Project Site
50.2
1019

The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.
People. Purpose. Place.

40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs
NY 12866

p: 518-587-8100
f: 518-587-0180
www.thelagroup.com

# LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

TO: Saratoga Springs Planning Department
City Hall
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

DATE: 3/18/2016 JOB NO.:

RE: Moore Hall

WE ARE SENDING YOU ☑ Attached ☐ Under separate cover via_____the following items

☐ Shop drawings ☐ Prints ☐ Plans ☐ Samples ☐ Specifications
☐ Copy of letter ☐ Change order ☐ _____

| COPIES | DATE | NO. | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | ZBA Application w/ Exhibit A & B |
| 1 | | | SEQRA Long Form |
| 1 | | | OPRHP Archaeological Response Letter |
| 1 | | | DEC Natural Heritage Response Letter |
| 1 | | | La Group Variance Site Plan |
| 1 | | | Balzer & Tuck Architectural Renderings |
| 1 | | | Application Fee |
| | | | |
| | | | Note: We would appreciate that this application be forwarded |
| | | | To the Saratoga County Planning Board as soon as possible |
| | | | for consideration of an advisory opinion at their next meeting |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

THESE ARE TRANSMITTED as checked below:

☑ For approval ☐ Approved as submitted ☐ Resubmit_____copies for approval
☐ For your records ☐ Approved as noted ☐ Submit_____copies for distribution
☐ As requested ☐ Return for corrections ☐ Return _____corrected prints
☐ For review and comments ☐ _____
☐ FOR BIDS DUE _____20_____ ☐ PRINTS RETURNED AFTER LOAN TO US

REMARKS:

cc: SIGNED:_____

If enclosures are not as noted, kindly notify us at once.

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

CITY HALL - 474 BROADWAY
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NEW YORK 12866
TEL: 518-587-3550 FAX: 518-580-9480
WWW.SARATOGA-SPRINGS.ORG

[FOR OFFICE USE]

_____ (Application #)

_____ (Date received)

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | Moore Hall, LLC | 46 Union Avenue, LLC | Michael J. Toohey, Esq. |
| Address | 18 Division Street, Suite 401<br>Saratoga Springs, NY 12866 | 300 South Division Street<br>Buffalo, NY 14204 | P. O. Box 4367<br>Saratoga Springs, NY 12866 |
| Tel./Fax | [redacted] | [redacted] | [redacted] |
| Email | | | |

* An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.
Applicant's interest in the premises: ☐ Owner ☐ Lessee ☒ Under option to lease or purchase

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

Property Address (No. & St.) 28 Union Avenue/35 White Street Side of St. (north, east, etc.) South of Union Avenue/North of White Street

Tax Parcel No.: 165 . 76 - 1 - 32, 33, 40 & 34.13 *(for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37)* Tax District: ☒ Inside ☐ Outside

1. Date acquired by current owner: 5/13/2009 2. Zoning District when purchased: UR-4

3. Present use of property: Vacant Dormitory, Parking lots 4. Current Zoning District: UR-4

5. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property? ☒ Yes (when? 10/23/06 & 11/20/06 for what? Various Area Variances) ☐ No

6. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☒ Historic District ☐ Architectural Review District ☐ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?

7. Brief description of proposed action: Demolition of existing 6 story dormitory building and construction of 26 new residential units . [See attached Narrative/Exhibit A]

8. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☒ No

9. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☐ Yes ☒ No

10. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☒ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☐ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☒ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

FEES: Make checks payable to the "Commissioner of Finance" and attach to top of original application. Fees are cumulative and required for each request below.

| | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Interpretation | $ 400 |
| ☐ Use variance | $1,000 |
| ☒ Area variance | |
| -Residential use/property: | $ 150 |
| -Non-residential use/property: | $ 500 |
| ☐ Extensions: | $ 150 |

## INTERPRETATION – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

1. Identify the section(s) of the Zoning Ordinance for which you are seeking an interpretation:

Section(s) _____

2. How do you request that this section be interpreted? _____

_____

_____

_____

3. If interpretation is denied, do you wish to request alternative zoning relief? ☒ Yes ☐ No

4. If the answer to #3 is "yes," what alternative relief do you request? ☐ Use Variance ☒ Area Variance

## EXTENSION OF A VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

1. Date original variance was granted: _____ 2. Type of variance granted? ☐ Use ☐ Area

3. Date original variance expired: _____ 4. Length of extension requested: _____

5. Explain why the extension is necessary. Why wasn't the original timeframe sufficient?: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

When requesting an extension of time for an existing variance, the applicant must prove that the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted have not changed. Specifically demonstrate that there have been no significant changes on the site, in the neighborhood, or within the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

## USE VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

A use variance is requested to permit the following: _____

_____

_____

For the Zoning Board to grant a request for a use variance, an applicant must prove that the zoning regulations create an unnecessary hardship in relation to that property. In seeking a use variance, New York State law requires an applicant to prove all four of the following "tests".

1. That the applicant cannot realize a reasonable financial return on initial investment for any currently permitted use on the property. "Dollars & cents" proof must be submitted as evidence. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return for the following reasons:

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

A. Submit the following financial evidence relating to this property (attach additional evidence as needed):

1) Date of purchase: _____ Purchase amount: $_____

2) Indicate dates and costs of any improvements made to property after purchase:

| Date | Improvement | Cost |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3) Annual maintenance expenses: $_____ 4) Annual taxes: $_____

5) Annual income generated from property: $_____

6) City assessed value: $_____ Equalization rate:_____ Estimated Market Value: $_____

7) Appraised Value: $_____ Appraiser: _____ Date: _____

Appraisal Assumptions: _____

_____

B. Has property been listed for sale with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS)? ☐ Yes ☐ No If "yes", for how long? _____

1) Original listing date(s):_____ Original listing price: $_____

If listing price was reduced, describe when and to what extent: _____

_____

2) Has the property been advertised in the newspapers or other publications? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, describe frequency and name of publications: _____

_____

3) Has the property had a "For Sale" sign posted on it? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, list dates when sign was posted: _____

_____

4) How many times has the property been shown and with what results? _____

_____

_____

2. That the financial hardship relating to this property is unique and does not apply to a substantial portion of the neighborhood. Difficulties shared with numerous other properties in the same neighborhood or district would not satisfy this requirement. This previously identified financial hardship is unique for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

3. That the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Changes that will alter the character of a neighborhood or district would be at odds with the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance. The requested variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood for the following reasons:

4. That the alleged hardship has not been self-created. An applicant (whether the property owner or one acting on behalf of the property owner) cannot claim "unnecessary hardship" if that hardship was created by the applicant, or if the applicant acquired the property knowing (or was in a position to know) the conditions for which the applicant is seeking relief. The hardship has not been self-created for the following reasons:

## AREA VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

The applicant requests relief from the following Zoning Ordinance article(s) See attached Exhibit C .

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| See Attached Exhibit B | | |

Other:

To grant an area variance, the ZBA must balance the benefits to the applicant and the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and community, taking into consideration the following:

1. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by other feasible means. Identify what alternatives to the variance have been explored (alternative designs, attempts to purchase land, etc.) and why they are not feasible.

   As described in the Narrative two prior plans were fully developed with regard to this site. One involved the adaptive reuse of the existing structure and the other the demolition of th existing structure. This Project attempts to use the concepts that were previously approved to construct condominiums consistent in mass, scale and design with the neighborhood while proposing a use of the land that is economically viable to finance, build and sell. There is no other adjacent land for sale and building two large single structures up to the permitted 70ft would not be consistent with the neighborhood.

2. Whether granting the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. Granting the variance will not create a detriment to nearby properties or an undesirable change in the neighborhood character for the following reasons:

As depicted on the attached plans, elevations and streetscapes, the proposed buildings are consistent with the buildings throughout the neighborhood. Most of the original Skidmore buildings have been converted into multi-family structures. The City of Saratoga Springs has recognized this by modifying the Union Avenue property from Institutional Education Zoning to UR-4 (See October 1990 adopted Zoning Map). The removal of a vacant Moore Hall and construction of those residential units will be to the benefit of the nearby properties and be significantly more consistent with the streetscape of Union Avenue and White Street.

3. Whether the variance is substantial. The requested variance is not substantial for the following reasons:

The reality of this undertaking is that larger numbers of multi-family dwellings are needed to replace the previously approved Moore Hall. The front yard setback for the Union Avenue building is maintained and is at a point that is consistent with the existing structures in close proximity on the south side of Union Avenue. The building on White Street is generally in line with other structures on that side of the street. The placement of the structures on North Lane are also consistent with neighboring improvements. The use of the "build-to line" also allows for structure placement that will allow for the optimum consistency with neighboring structures. Finally, the term "substantial" is not merely a request for a mathematical calculation. It calls on the Board to review "substantiality" in the context of the existing and historic neighborhood. In this case, the requested variances are not "substantial".

4. Whether the variance will have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district. The requested variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood or district for the following reasons:

The use of this Property as proposed is consistent not only with the Zoning Code, but the stated "Intent" for this particular Zone. The placement and size of the structure will be consistent with other historic buildings in this area of the City. There will be no demand or requirement to use on-street parking for the proposed number of units. The granting of this variance will replace, with a permitted use, a structure that is wholly inconsistent with the neighborhood and, as a result, will have a positive effect on the neighborhood.

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created (although this does not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance). Explain whether the alleged difficulty was or was not self-created:

The proposed need for Area Variance, may be self-created, but the adaptive re-use of the legal pre-existing, non-conforming structure, did not appear to be consistent with the wishes of many neighbors. As a result, the construction of an economically viable Project consistent in mass and size with the neighborhood had to be designed. That is what has been done with the proposed utilization of this site. As a result, with the use of some "Area Variances" we have self-created a Project that is consistent with the neighborhood as it actually exists today.

In accord with Article 240-14.4A(1)(b)(6) of the Zoning Ordinance, "any request for an area variance, which shall effect a change in density, shall be applied for and considered as a use variance and decided under criteria for the same". A request that involves any of the following relief will require an application for a use variance and will be decided under the use variance criteria:

(1) Dimensional relief from minimum lot size requirements that would allow additional permitted units and/or uses
(2) Relief from on site parking requirements
(3) Reduction in land area requirements for multi-family units

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☒ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.

Moore Hall, LLC

BY: _____
(applicant signature)

_____
(applicant signature)

Sworn to before me this date:

Date: 3/18/16

*Notary Public*
KEITH M. FERRARA
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 4664215
Qualified in Saratoga County
Commission Expires 5-31-19

## EXHIBIT A

### Narrative

The history of Skidmore College within Saratoga Springs is that of a quality institution of higher education that has transitioned from approximately 1100 students in 1957 and 80 buildings predominately in the Union Avenue section of the City to its present location on North Broadway. As the college grew so did its need for a more centralized dormitory facility and cafeteria. As a result, in approximately 1957 Moore Hall was completed and dedicated. This facility, with associated parking, spreads from the south side of Union Avenue, across North Lane and up to the north border of White Street. The building itself is constructed of steel and concrete and, if properly maintained, will continue to be a viable structure for decades to come.

Moore Hall continued to be used as a remote Skidmore dormitory until the turn of the Century when it was sold to 46 Union Avenue, LLC, which intended to demolish the building and replace it with a very high end condominium project. The Project for this redevelopment of the site proved not to be an economically viable project, and as a result, the building remained vacant.

In 2014-2015, amid the communal request to find a more affordable living option for the workers in Saratoga Springs, a project was presented to convert the existing building into 53 residential units. This application, which continues to be before the municipal land use boards, brought forth the concept of urban "micro apartments" to reduce the individual units' size and thus rental costs. Although the proximity of the structure to the urban core of the City was ideal for eliminating the need for the tenants to own and/or operate a motor vehicle, this application is opposed by many of the neighbors, because of the need for on street parking. As a result, Moore Hall continues to be vacant and looms over this important entrance to the City.

**Project**

There are certain realities that exist with this site. The only reasonable adaptive reuse of Moore Hall is not acceptable to many of the neighbors and the previously approved condominium project was not large enough to absorb the cost associated with the full redevelopment of this real property.

As a result, this Project presents a proposed use of this site that is consistent in mass, scale and design with this location and neighborhood, presents on-site parking in full compliance with the Zoning Code, is economically viable, and will result in the removal of Moore Hall from the street scape.

The four tax parcels that are to be used are all located in the UR-4 Zone. As depicted on the Plans, elevations and maps attached, the integrated Project consists of 22 units on the Union Avenue Parcel consisting of 18 units in the structure predominantly facing Union Avenue and two (2) units each in the two (2) connected building on the north side of North Lane. The parcel extending from White Street on the south to the south side of North Lane will consist of three (3) units structure facing White Street and one unit on the north side of the site adjacent to North

Lane for a total of twenty six (26) total units in the project. As specified above, all buildings in this land owner's association will have on-site parking as required by the Code.

To give the developer minor flexibility with regard to the placement of the structures, we are seeking Area Variances that are based on a "build-to" line and not the specific location of the overhang roof line of any one of the structures.

The structures on the Union Avenue parcel will share a foundation that connected all proposed buildings so that only one principal structure is being constructed on that Parcel. The Parcel on White Street will contain one 3 unit building and a single unit building. Section 2.3 (A)(2) and (3) of the City Zoning Code allows for more than one principal building on a lot in this zone.

Table 1 set out in Section Two of the Zoning Code specifies that the Urban Residential 4 (UR-4) Zone of the City is set up to "accommodate a mix of single family, two family and multi-family uses". That is exactly and specifically what this Project is intended to achieve.

# EXHIBIT B

Union Avenue frontage

| Description | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| Side yard setback (West and East) | One side 20 min (total 45) | 10 (each side) |
| Total side yard setback | 45 | 20 |
| Rear yard setback (North Lane) | 25 | 16 |
| Building Lot coverage | 25% | 52.3% |
| Density per residential unit | 3,000 sf/unit | 1901 sf/unit |

White Street frontage

| Description | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| Side yard setback (West and East) | One side 20 min (total 45) | 10 (each side) |
| Total side yard setback | 45 | 20 |
| Front yard setback (White Street) | 25 | 5 |
| Rear yard setback (North Lane) | 25 | 10 |
| Building Lot coverage | 25% | 39% |

# BUILDING INSPECTOR DENIAL
# OF APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND/OR BUILDING

APPLICANT: _____ TAX PARCEL NO.: _____._____ - _____ - _____

PROPERTY ADDRESS: _____ ZONING DISTRICT: _____

This applicant has applied to use the identified property within the City of Saratoga Springs for the following:

_____

_____

_____

This application is hereby denied upon the grounds that such use of the property would violate the City Zoning Ordinance article(s)

_____. As such, the following relief would be required to proceed:

☐ Extension of existing variance ☐ Interpretation ☐ Hardship Appeal from Architectural/Historic Review

☐ Use Variance to permit the following: _____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Area Variance seeking the following relief:

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Other: _____

_____

☐ Advisory Opinion required from Saratoga County Planning Board

_____ _____

BUILDING INSPECTOR DATE

*Revision date: January 2011*

## Instructions for Completing Part 1

**Part 1 is to be completed by the applicant or project sponsor.** Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification.

Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information; indicate whether missing information does not exist, or is not reasonably available to the sponsor; and, when possible, generally describe work or studies which would be necessary to update or fully develop that information.

Applicants/sponsors must complete all items in Sections A & B. In Sections C, D & E, most items contain an initial question that must be answered either "Yes" or "No". If the answer to the initial question is "Yes", complete the sub-questions that follow. If the answer to the initial question is "No", proceed to the next question. Section F allows the project sponsor to identify and attach any additional information. Section G requires the name and signature of the project sponsor to verify that the information contained in Part 1is accurate and complete.

### A. Project and Sponsor Information.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Name of Action or Project:<br>Moore Hall Redevelopment (46 Union Ave. & 35 White Street) | | |
| Project Location (describe, and attach a general location map):<br>46 Union Avenue and 35 White Street, Saratoga Springs | | |
| Brief Description of Proposed Action (include purpose or need):<br>To re-develop the existing parcels to include 26 residential condominiums. The building on Union Avenue will include 18 units, there are four carriage house/townhouse units with entrances onto North Lane, three row house units front on White Street. | | |
| Name of Applicant/Sponsor:<br>Moore Hall, LLC | Telephone: [redacted]<br>E-Mail: [redacted] | |
| Address: 18 Division Street, Suite 401 | | |
| City/PO: Saratoga Springs | State: NY | Zip Code: 12866 |
| Project Contact (if not same as sponsor; give name and title/role): | Telephone:<br>E-Mail: | |
| Address: | | |
| City/PO: | State: | Zip Code: |
| Property Owner (if not same as sponsor):<br>46 Union Avenue, LLC | Telephone: [redacted]<br>E-Mail: [redacted] | |
| Address:<br>300 South Division Street | | |
| City/PO: Buffalo | State: NY | Zip Code: 14204 |



RESET FORM

**B. Government Approvals**

**B. Government Approvals Funding, or Sponsorship.** ("Funding" includes grants, loans, tax relief, and any other forms of financial assistance.)

| Government Entity | If Yes: Identify Agency and Approval(s) Required | Application Date (Actual or projected) |
|---|---|---|
| a. City Council, Town Board, or Village Board of Trustees ☐Yes☑No | | |
| b. City, Town or Village Planning Board or Commission ☑Yes☐No | Saratoga Springs Planning Board Site Plan Approval | April 2016 |
| c. City Council, Town or Village Zoning Board of Appeals ☑Yes☐No | Saratoga Springs Zoning Board Area Variances | March 2016 |
| d. Other local agencies ☑Yes☐No | Saratoga Springs; Historic Review Approval from Design Review Commission | April 2016 |
| e. County agencies ☑Yes☐No | Saratoga County Planning Board Advisory opinion | March 2016 |
| f. Regional agencies ☐Yes☑No | | |
| g. State agencies ☐Yes☑No | | |
| h. Federal agencies ☐Yes☑No | | |

i. Coastal Resources.

*i.* Is the project site within a Coastal Area, or the waterfront area of a Designated Inland Waterway? ☐Yes☑No

If Yes,

*ii.* Is the project site located in a community with an approved Local Waterfront Revitalization Program? ☐Yes☐No

*iii.* Is the project site within a Coastal Erosion Hazard Area? ☐Yes☐No

**C. Planning and Zoning**

**C.1. Planning and zoning actions.**

Will administrative or legislative adoption, or amendment of a plan, local law, ordinance, rule or regulation be the only approval(s) which must be granted to enable the proposed action to proceed? ☑Yes☐No

- **If Yes,** complete sections C, F and G.
- **If No,** proceed to question C.2 and complete all remaining sections and questions in Part 1

**C.2. Adopted land use plans.**

a. Do any municipally- adopted (city, town, village or county) comprehensive land use plan(s) include the site where the proposed action would be located? ☑Yes☐No

If Yes, does the comprehensive plan include specific recommendations for the site where the proposed action would be located? ☑Yes☐No

b. Is the site of the proposed action within any local or regional special planning district (for example: Greenway Brownfield Opportunity Area (BOA); designated State or Federal heritage area; watershed management plan; or other?) ☐Yes☑No

If Yes, identify the plan(s):

c. Is the proposed action located wholly or partially within an area listed in an adopted municipal open space plan, or an adopted municipal farmland protection plan? ☐Yes☑No

If Yes, identify the plan(s):



RESET FORM

**C.3. Zoning**

a. Is the site of the proposed action located in a municipality with an adopted zoning law or ordinance. ☑ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, what is the zoning classification(s) including any applicable overlay district?
UR-4

b. Is the use permitted or allowed by a special or conditional use permit? ☑ Yes ☐ No

c. Is a zoning change requested as part of the proposed action? ☐ Yes ☑ No
If Yes,
*i.* What is the proposed new zoning for the site? _____

**C.4. Existing community services.**

a. In what school district is the project site located? Saratoga Springs City School District

b. What police or other public protection forces serve the project site?
City of Saratoga Springs

c. Which fire protection and emergency medical services serve the project site?
City of Saratoga Springs

d. What parks serve the project site?
All parks with the City Limits

**D. Project Details**

**D.1. Proposed and Potential Development**

a. What is the general nature of the proposed action (e.g., residential, industrial, commercial, recreational; if mixed, include all components)? Residential

b. a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action? 1.29 acres
b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed? 1.29 acres
c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor? 1.29 acres

c. Is the proposed action an expansion of an existing project or use? ☐ Yes ☑ No
*i.* If Yes, what is the approximate percentage of the proposed expansion and identify the units (e.g., acres, miles, housing units, square feet)? % _____ Units: _____

d. Is the proposed action a subdivision, or does it include a subdivision? ☐ Yes ☑ No
If Yes,
*i.* Purpose or type of subdivision? (e.g., residential, industrial, commercial; if mixed, specify types)
*ii.* Is a cluster/conservation layout proposed? ☐ Yes ☐ No
*iii.* Number of lots proposed? _____
*iv.* Minimum and maximum proposed lot sizes? Minimum _____ Maximum _____

e. Will proposed action be constructed in multiple phases? ☐ Yes ☑ No
*i.* If No, anticipated period of construction: 12 months
*ii.* If Yes:
- Total number of phases anticipated _____
- Anticipated commencement date of phase 1 (including demolition) _____ month _____ year
- Anticipated completion date of final phase _____ month _____ year
- Generally describe connections or relationships among phases, including any contingencies where progress of one phase may determine timing or duration of future phases: _____



RESET FORM

f. Does the project include new residential uses? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, show numbers of units proposed.

| | One Family | Two Family | Three Family | Multiple Family (four or more) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Initial Phase | | | | 26 condominiums |
| At completion of all phases | | | | 26 condominiums |

g. Does the proposed action include new non-residential construction (including expansions)? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If Yes,

*i.* Total number of structures _____

*ii.* Dimensions (in feet) of largest proposed structure: _____ height; _____ width; and _____ length

*iii.* Approximate extent of building space to be heated or cooled: _____ square feet

h. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that will result in the impoundment of any liquids, such as creation of a water supply, reservoir, pond, lake, waste lagoon or other storage? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If Yes,

*i.* Purpose of the impoundment: _____

*ii.* If a water impoundment, the principal source of the water: ☐ Ground water ☐ Surface water streams ☐ Other specify: _____

*iii.* If other than water, identify the type of impounded/contained liquids and their source. _____

*iv.* Approximate size of the proposed impoundment. Volume: _____ million gallons; surface area: _____ acres

*v.* Dimensions of the proposed dam or impounding structure: _____ height; _____ length

*vi.* Construction method/materials for the proposed dam or impounding structure (e.g., earth fill, rock, wood, concrete): _____

**D.2. Project Operations**

a. Does the proposed action include any excavation, mining, or dredging, during construction, operations, or both? (Not including general site preparation, grading or installation of utilities or foundations where all excavated materials will remain onsite) ☑ Yes ☐ No

If Yes:

*i.* What is the purpose of the excavation or dredging? Foundation excavation

*ii.* How much material (including rock, earth, sediments, etc.) is proposed to be removed from the site?

- Volume (specify tons or cubic yards): 25 tons
- Over what duration of time? 6 weeks

*iii.* Describe nature and characteristics of materials to be excavated or dredged, and plans to use, manage or dispose of them.

Concrete foundation from existing building

*iv.* Will there be onsite dewatering or processing of excavated materials? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If yes, describe. _____

*v.* What is the total area to be dredged or excavated? .75 acres

*vi.* What is the maximum area to be worked at any one time? .75 acres

*vii.* What would be the maximum depth of excavation or dredging? 6 feet

*viii.* Will the excavation require blasting? ☐ Yes ☑ No

*ix.* Summarize site reclamation goals and plan:

The excavated foundation will be the site of new structures or parking.

b. Would the proposed action cause or result in alteration of, increase or decrease in size of, or encroachment into any existing wetland, waterbody, shoreline, beach or adjacent area? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If Yes:

*i.* Identify the wetland or waterbody which would be affected (by name, water index number, wetland map number or geographic description): _____



RESET FORM

*ii.* Describe how the proposed action would affect that waterbody or wetland, e.g. excavation, fill, placement of structures, or alteration of channels, banks and shorelines. Indicate extent of activities, alterations and additions in square feet or acres:

*iii.* Will proposed action cause or result in disturbance to bottom sediments? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, describe:

*iv.* Will proposed action cause or result in the destruction or removal of aquatic vegetation? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes:

- acres of aquatic vegetation proposed to be removed
- expected acreage of aquatic vegetation proposed to be removed
- purpose of proposed removal (e.g. beach clearing, invasive species control, boat access):
- proposed method of plant removal:
- if chemical/herbicide treatment will be used, specify product(s):

*v.* Describe any proposed reclamation/mitigation following disturbance:

c. Will the proposed action use, or create a new demand for water? ☑ Yes ☐ No
If Yes: Existing 53 room dormitory and dining hall - approx. 12,000 gal/day

*i.* Total anticipated water usage/demand per day: 6,600 gallons/day

*ii.* Will the proposed action obtain water from an existing public water supply? ☑ Yes ☐ No
If Yes:

- Name of district or service area: Saratoga Springs
- Does the existing public water supply have capacity to serve the proposal? ☑ Yes ☐ No
- Is the project site in the existing district? ☑ Yes ☐ No
- Is expansion of the district needed? ☐ Yes ☑ No
- Do existing lines serve the project site? ☑ Yes ☐ No

*iii.* Will line extension within an existing district be necessary to supply the project? ☐ Yes ☑ No
If Yes:

- Describe extensions or capacity expansions proposed to serve this project:
- Source(s) of supply for the district: Saratoga Springs

*iv.* Is a new water supply district or service area proposed to be formed to serve the project site? ☐ Yes ☑ No
If, Yes:

- Applicant/sponsor for new district:
- Date application submitted or anticipated:
- Proposed source(s) of supply for new district:

*v.* If a public water supply will not be used, describe plans to provide water supply for the project:

*vi.* If water supply will be from wells (public or private), maximum pumping capacity: _____ gallons/minute.

d. Will the proposed action generate liquid wastes? ☑ Yes ☐ No
If Yes: Existing 53 room dormitory and dining hall - approx. 12,000 gal/day

*i.* Total anticipated liquid waste generation per day: 6,600 gallons/day

*ii.* Nature of liquid wastes to be generated (e.g., sanitary wastewater, industrial; if combination, describe all components and approximate volumes or proportions of each):
Sanitary waste

*iii.* Will the proposed action use any existing public wastewater treatment facilities? ☑ Yes ☐ No
If Yes:

- Name of wastewater treatment plant to be used: Saratoga County Sewer District #1
- Name of district: Saratoga County Sewer District #1
- Does the existing wastewater treatment plant have capacity to serve the project? ☑ Yes ☐ No
- Is the project site in the existing district? ☑ Yes ☐ No
- Is expansion of the district needed? ☐ Yes ☑ No



RESET FORM

- Do existing sewer lines serve the project site? ☑Yes ☐No
- Will line extension within an existing district be necessary to serve the project? ☐Yes ☑No

  If Yes:
  - Describe extensions or capacity expansions proposed to serve this project: _____

*iv.* Will a new wastewater (sewage) treatment district be formed to serve the project site? ☐Yes ☑No

If Yes:
- Applicant/sponsor for new district: _____
- Date application submitted or anticipated: _____
- What is the receiving water for the wastewater discharge? _____

*v.* If public facilities will not be used, describe plans to provide wastewater treatment for the project, including specifying proposed receiving water (name and classification if surface discharge, or describe subsurface disposal plans):

_____

*vi.* Describe any plans or designs to capture, recycle or reuse liquid waste: _____

e. Will the proposed action disturb more than one acre and create stormwater runoff, either from new point sources (i.e. ditches, pipes, swales, curbs, gutters or other concentrated flows of stormwater) or non-point source (i.e. sheet flow) during construction or post construction? ☑Yes ☐No

If Yes:

*i.* How much impervious surface will the project create in relation to total size of project parcel?

_____ Square feet or .96 acres (impervious surface) .88 acres existing

_____ Square feet or 1.29 acres (parcel size)

*ii.* Describe types of new point sources. the redevelopment project will have storm pipe connections to existing city storm system. Connections to system exist as part of current development.

*iii.* Where will the stormwater runoff be directed (i.e. on-site stormwater management facility/structures, adjacent properties, groundwater, on-site surface water or off-site surface waters)?

Stormwater runoff will be collected on site for infiltration and detention.

- If to surface waters, identify receiving water bodies or wetlands: _____
- Will stormwater runoff flow to adjacent properties? ☐Yes ☑No

*iv.* Does proposed plan minimize impervious surfaces, use pervious materials or collect and re-use stormwater? ☑Yes ☐No

f. Does the proposed action include, or will it use on-site, one or more sources of air emissions, including fuel combustion, waste incineration, or other processes or operations? ☐Yes ☑No

If Yes, identify:

*i.* Mobile sources during project operations (e.g., heavy equipment, fleet or delivery vehicles)

*ii.* Stationary sources during construction (e.g., power generation, structural heating, batch plant, crushers)

*iii.* Stationary sources during operations (e.g., process emissions, large boilers, electric generation)

g. Will any air emission sources named in D.2.f (above), require a NY State Air Registration, Air Facility Permit, or Federal Clean Air Act Title IV or Title V Permit? ☐Yes ☑No

If Yes:

*i.* Is the project site located in an Air quality non-attainment area? (Area routinely or periodically fails to meet ambient air quality standards for all or some parts of the year) ☐Yes ☐No

*ii.* In addition to emissions as calculated in the application, the project will generate:
- _____Tons/year (short tons) of Carbon Dioxide ($CO_2$)
- _____Tons/year (short tons) of Nitrous Oxide ($N_2O$)
- _____Tons/year (short tons) of Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)
- _____Tons/year (short tons) of Sulfur Hexafluoride ($SF_6$)
- _____Tons/year (short tons) of Carbon Dioxide equivalent of Hydroflourocarbons (HFCs)
- _____Tons/year (short tons) of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs)



RESET FORM

h. Will the proposed action generate or emit methane (including, but not limited to, sewage treatment plants, landfills, composting facilities)? ☐Yes ☑No

If Yes:

*i.* Estimate methane generation in tons/year (metric): _____

*ii.* Describe any methane capture, control or elimination measures included in project design (e.g., combustion to generate heat or electricity, flaring): _____

i. Will the proposed action result in the release of air pollutants from open-air operations or processes, such as quarry or landfill operations? ☐Yes ☑No

If Yes: Describe operations and nature of emissions (e.g., diesel exhaust, rock particulates/dust):

_____

j. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels or generate substantial new demand for transportation facilities or services? ☐Yes ☑No

If Yes:

*i.* When is the peak traffic expected (Check all that apply): ☐ Morning ☐ Evening ☐Weekend ☐ Randomly between hours of _____ to _____.

*ii.* For commercial activities only, projected number of semi-trailer truck trips/day: _____

*iii.* Parking spaces: Existing _____ Proposed _____ Net increase/decrease _____

*iv.* Does the proposed action include any shared use parking? ☐Yes ☐No

*v.* If the proposed action includes any modification of existing roads, creation of new roads or change in existing access, describe:

_____

*vi.* Are public/private transportation service(s) or facilities available within ½ mile of the proposed site? ☐Yes ☐No

*vii* Will the proposed action include access to public transportation or accommodations for use of hybrid, electric or other alternative fueled vehicles? ☐Yes ☐No

*viii.* Will the proposed action include plans for pedestrian or bicycle accommodations for connections to existing pedestrian or bicycle routes? ☐Yes ☐No

k. Will the proposed action (for commercial or industrial projects only) generate new or additional demand for energy? ☑Yes ☐No

If Yes:

*i.* Estimate annual electricity demand during operation of the proposed action: 420,000 kWh

*ii.* Anticipated sources/suppliers of electricity for the project (e.g., on-site combustion, on-site renewable, via grid/local utility, or other): Local grid utility

*iii.* Will the proposed action require a new, or an upgrade to, an existing substation? ☐Yes ☑No

l. Hours of operation. Answer all items which apply.

*i.* During Construction:

- Monday - Friday: 7 am - 9 pm
- Saturday: 7 am - 9 pm
- Sunday: 7 am - 9 pm
- Holidays: _____

*ii.* During Operations:

- Monday - Friday: 24 Hours - residential
- Saturday: 24 Hours - residential
- Sunday: 24 Hours - residential
- Holidays: 24 Hours - residential



RESET FORM

m. Will the proposed action produce noise that will exceed existing ambient noise levels during construction, operation, or both? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If yes:

*i.* Provide details including sources, time of day and duration:

Construction and Demolition Activities

*ii.* Will proposed action remove existing natural barriers that could act as a noise barrier or screen? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Describe: _____

n.. Will the proposed action have outdoor lighting? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If yes:

*i.* Describe source(s), location(s), height of fixture(s), direction/aim, and proximity to nearest occupied structures:

Lighting will be included for building entrances and exits, low level lighting along walks, dark-sky friendly lighting for parking spaces between building.

*ii.* Will proposed action remove existing natural barriers that could act as a light barrier or screen? ☐ Yes ☑ No

Describe: _____

o. Does the proposed action have the potential to produce odors for more than one hour per day? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If Yes, describe possible sources, potential frequency and duration of odor emissions, and proximity to nearest occupied structures: _____

p. Will the proposed action include any bulk storage of petroleum (combined capacity of over 1,100 gallons) or chemical products (185 gallons in above ground storage or an amount in underground storage)? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If Yes:

*i.* Product(s) to be stored _____

*ii.* Volume(s) _____ per unit time _____ (e.g., month, year)

*iii.* Generally describe proposed storage facilities: _____

q. Will the proposed action (commercial, industrial and recreational projects only) use pesticides (i.e., herbicides, insecticides) during construction or operation? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If Yes:

*i.* Describe proposed treatment(s):

_____

*ii.* Will the proposed action use Integrated Pest Management Practices? ☐ Yes ☐ No

r. Will the proposed action (commercial or industrial projects only) involve or require the management or disposal of solid waste (excluding hazardous materials)? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If Yes:

*i.* Describe any solid waste(s) to be generated during construction or operation of the facility:

- Construction: 4 tons per 12 months (unit of time)
- Operation : 1 tons per 1 month (unit of time)

*ii.* Describe any proposals for on-site minimization, recycling or reuse of materials to avoid disposal as solid waste:

- Construction: Cardboard recycling
- Operation: Recycling of all recyclable materials

*iii.* Proposed disposal methods/facilities for solid waste generated on-site:

- Construction: Local Hauler
- Operation: Local Hauler



RESET FORM

s. Does the proposed action include construction or modification of a solid waste management facility? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If Yes:

*i.* Type of management or handling of waste proposed for the site (e.g., recycling or transfer station, composting, landfill, or other disposal activities): _____

*ii.* Anticipated rate of disposal/processing:

- _____ Tons/month, if transfer or other non-combustion/thermal treatment, or
- _____ Tons/hour, if combustion or thermal treatment

*iii.* If landfill, anticipated site life: _____ years

t. Will proposed action at the site involve the commercial generation, treatment, storage, or disposal of hazardous waste? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If Yes:

*i.* Name(s) of all hazardous wastes or constituents to be generated, handled or managed at facility: _____

Diasposal of Friable asbestos before building demolition

*ii.* Generally describe processes or activities involving hazardous wastes or constituents: _____

An abatement contractor removes the identified materials and disposes of them in the proper way. It is a one time handeling of the hazardous material. It is not on going.

*iii.* Specify amount to be handled or generated _____ tons/month **20 tons total**

*iv.* Describe any proposals for on-site minimization, recycling or reuse of hazardous constituents: _____

*v.* Will any hazardous wastes be disposed at an existing offsite hazardous waste facility? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If Yes: provide name and location of facility: _____

Albany Landfill

If No: describe proposed management of any hazardous wastes which will not be sent to a hazardous waste facility:

_____

## E. Site and Setting of Proposed Action

### E.1. Land uses on and surrounding the project site

a. Existing land uses.

*i.* Check all uses that occur on, adjoining and near the project site.

☑ Urban ☐ Industrial ☑ Commercial ☐ Residential (suburban) ☐ Rural (non-farm)

☐ Forest ☐ Agriculture ☐ Aquatic ☑ Other (specify): Multi-family, Educational, Parkland, Mixed use office/residential

*ii.* If mix of uses, generally describe:

_____

b. Land uses and covertypes on the project site.

| Land use or Covertype | Current Acreage | Acreage After Project Completion | Change (Acres +/-) |
|---|---|---|---|
| • Roads, buildings, and other paved or impervious surfaces | .88 | .96 | +.08 |
| • Forested | | | |
| • Meadows, grasslands or brushlands (non-agricultural, including abandoned agricultural) | | | |
| • Agricultural (includes active orchards, field, greenhouse etc.) | | | |
| • Surface water features (lakes, ponds, streams, rivers, etc.) | | | |
| • Wetlands (freshwater or tidal) | | | |
| • Non-vegetated (bare rock, earth or fill) | | | |
| • Other Describe: Lawn | .41 | .33 | -.08 |



RESET FORM

c. Is the project site presently used by members of the community for public recreation? ☐Yes ☑No

*i.* If Yes: explain: _____

d. Are there any facilities serving children, the elderly, people with disabilities (e.g., schools, hospitals, licensed day care centers, or group homes) within 1500 feet of the project site? ☑Yes ☐No

If Yes,

*i.* Identify Facilities:

Empire State College, Katrina Trask Nursery School at Presbyterian Church, Waldorf School,

e. Does the project site contain an existing dam? ☐Yes ☑No

If Yes:

*i.* Dimensions of the dam and impoundment:

- Dam height: _____ feet
- Dam length: _____ feet
- Surface area: _____ acres
- Volume impounded: _____ gallons OR acre-feet

*ii.* Dam's existing hazard classification: _____

*iii.* Provide date and summarize results of last inspection:

_____

f. Has the project site ever been used as a municipal, commercial or industrial solid waste management facility, or does the project site adjoin property which is now, or was at one time, used as a solid waste management facility? ☐Yes ☑No

If Yes:

*i.* Has the facility been formally closed? ☐Yes ☐ No

- If yes, cite sources/documentation: _____

*ii.* Describe the location of the project site relative to the boundaries of the solid waste management facility:

_____

*iii.* Describe any development constraints due to the prior solid waste activities: _____

g. Have hazardous wastes been generated, treated and/or disposed of at the site, or does the project site adjoin property which is now or was at one time used to commercially treat, store and/or dispose of hazardous waste? ☐Yes ☑No

If Yes:

*i.* Describe waste(s) handled and waste management activities, including approximate time when activities occurred:

_____

h. Potential contamination history. Has there been a reported spill at the proposed project site, or have any remedial actions been conducted at or adjacent to the proposed site? ☐Yes ☑ No

If Yes:

*i.* Is any portion of the site listed on the NYSDEC Spills Incidents database or Environmental Site Remediation database? Check all that apply: ☐Yes ☐No

☐ Yes – Spills Incidents database Provide DEC ID number(s): _____

☐ Yes – Environmental Site Remediation database Provide DEC ID number(s): _____

☐ Neither database

*ii.* If site has been subject of RCRA corrective activities, describe control measures: _____

*iii.* Is the project within 2000 feet of any site in the NYSDEC Environmental Site Remediation database? ☐Yes ☐No

If yes, provide DEC ID number(s): _____

*iv.* If yes to (i), (ii) or (iii) above, describe current status of site(s):

_____



RESET FORM

*v.* Is the project site subject to an institutional control limiting property uses? ☐Yes ☐No

- If yes, DEC site ID number: _____
- Describe the type of institutional control (e.g., deed restriction or easement): _____
- Describe any use limitations: _____
- Describe any engineering controls: _____
- Will the project affect the institutional or engineering controls in place? ☐Yes ☐No
- Explain: _____

**E.2. Natural Resources On or Near Project Site**

a. What is the average depth to bedrock on the project site? < 8 feet

b. Are there bedrock outcroppings on the project site? ☐Yes ☑No
If Yes, what proportion of the site is comprised of bedrock outcroppings? _____%

c. Predominant soil type(s) present on project site: WnA Windsor loamy sand 100 %
_____ _____%
_____ _____%

d. What is the average depth to the water table on the project site? Average: < 10 feet

e. Drainage status of project site soils: ☑ Well Drained: 100 % of site
☐ Moderately Well Drained: _____% of site
☐ Poorly Drained _____% of site

f. Approximate proportion of proposed action site with slopes: ☑ 0-10%: 100 % of site
☐ 10-15%: _____% of site
☐ 15% or greater: _____% of site

g. Are there any unique geologic features on the project site? ☐Yes ☑No
If Yes, describe: _____

h. Surface water features.

*i.* Does any portion of the project site contain wetlands or other waterbodies (including streams, rivers, ponds or lakes)? ☐Yes ☑No

*ii.* Do any wetlands or other waterbodies adjoin the project site? ☐Yes ☑No

If Yes to either *i* or *ii*, continue. If No, skip to E.2.i.

*iii.* Are any of the wetlands or waterbodies within or adjoining the project site regulated by any federal, state or local agency? ☐Yes ☐No

*iv.* For each identified regulated wetland and waterbody on the project site, provide the following information:

- Streams: Name _____ Classification _____
- Lakes or Ponds: Name _____ Classification _____
- Wetlands: Name _____ Approximate Size _____
- Wetland No. (if regulated by DEC) _____

*v.* Are any of the above water bodies listed in the most recent compilation of NYS water quality-impaired waterbodies? ☐Yes ☐No

If yes, name of impaired water body/bodies and basis for listing as impaired: _____

i. Is the project site in a designated Floodway? ☐Yes ☑No

j. Is the project site in the 100 year Floodplain? ☐Yes ☑No

k. Is the project site in the 500 year Floodplain? ☐Yes ☑No

l. Is the project site located over, or immediately adjoining, a primary, principal or sole source aquifer? ☐Yes ☑No
If Yes:

*i.* Name of aquifer: _____



RESET FORM

m. Identify the predominant wildlife species that occupy or use the project site:
Multiple bird species
Small rodents
Insects

n. Does the project site contain a designated significant natural community? ☐ Yes ☑ No
If Yes:
*i.* Describe the habitat/community (composition, function, and basis for designation): _____
*ii.* Source(s) of description or evaluation: _____
*iii.* Extent of community/habitat:
- Currently: _____ acres
- Following completion of project as proposed: _____ acres
- Gain or loss (indicate + or -): _____ acres

o. Does project site contain any species of plant or animal that is listed by the federal government or NYS as endangered or threatened, or does it contain any areas identified as habitat for an endangered or threatened species? ☐ Yes ☑ No

p. Does the project site contain any species of plant or animal that is listed by NYS as rare, or as a species of special concern? ☐ Yes ☑ No

q. Is the project site or adjoining area currently used for hunting, trapping, fishing or shell fishing? ☐ Yes ☑ No
If yes, give a brief description of how the proposed action may affect that use: _____

**E.3. Designated Public Resources On or Near Project Site**

a. Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in a designated agricultural district certified pursuant to Agriculture and Markets Law, Article 25-AA, Section 303 and 304? ☐ Yes ☑ No
If Yes, provide county plus district name/number: _____

b. Are agricultural lands consisting of highly productive soils present? ☐ Yes ☑ No
*i.* If Yes: acreage(s) on project site? _____
*ii.* Source(s) of soil rating(s): _____

c. Does the project site contain all or part of, or is it substantially contiguous to, a registered National Natural Landmark? ☐ Yes ☑ No
If Yes:
*i.* Nature of the natural landmark: ☐ Biological Community ☐ Geological Feature
*ii.* Provide brief description of landmark, including values behind designation and approximate size/extent: _____

d. Is the project site located in or does it adjoin a state listed Critical Environmental Area? ☐ Yes ☑ No
If Yes:
*i.* CEA name: _____
*ii.* Basis for designation: _____
*iii.* Designating agency and date: _____



RESET FORM

e. Does the project site contain, or is it substantially contiguous to, a building, archaeological site, or district which is listed on, or has been nominated by the NYS Board of Historic Preservation for inclusion on, the State or National Register of Historic Places? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If Yes:

*i.* Nature of historic/archaeological resource: ☐ Archaeological Site ☑ Historic Building or District

*ii.* Name: Saratoga Springs Downtown District, Union Avenue Historic District

*iii.* Brief description of attributes on which listing is based:

The structure is within the state listed district. (non-contributing structure)

f. Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory? ☑ Yes ☐ No

g. Have additional archaeological or historic site(s) or resources been identified on the project site? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If Yes:

*i.* Describe possible resource(s): _____

*ii.* Basis for identification: _____

h. Is the project site within five miles of any officially designated and publicly accessible federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource? ☑ Yes ☐ No

If Yes:

*i.* Identify resource: All city and state parks within the city limits, Yaddo, NYRA

*ii.* Nature of, or basis for, designation (e.g., established highway overlook, state or local park, state historic trail or scenic byway, etc.): State park, historic gardens, historic race track

*iii.* Distance between project and resource: up to 5 miles.

i. Is the project site located within a designated river corridor under the Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers Program 6 NYCRR 666? ☐ Yes ☑ No

If Yes:

*i.* Identify the name of the river and its designation: _____

*ii.* Is the activity consistent with development restrictions contained in 6NYCRR Part 666? ☐ Yes ☐ No

**F. Additional Information**

Attach any additional information which may be needed to clarify your project.

If you have identified any adverse impacts which could be associated with your proposal, please describe those impacts plus any measures which you propose to avoid or minimize them.

**G. Verification**

I certify that the information provided is true to the best of my knowledge.

Applicant/Sponsor Name Alfio Bonacio Jr. Date 3/18/16

Signature _____ Title member

PRINT FORM



RESET FORM

NEW YORK STATE OF OPPORTUNITY.
Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation

**ANDREW M. CUOMO**
Governor

**ROSE HARVEY**
Commissioner

February 26, 2016

Mr. Michael Hale
The LA Group
40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

Re: DEC
Moore Hall Demolition & New Construction
28 Union Avenue, Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
16PR00001

Dear Mr. Hale:

Thank you for requesting the comments of the Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP).

At your request, OPRHP is providing you with our comments regarding the archaeological component of your project's review. During the review OPRHP considers the proposed project's impacts to previously identified archaeological sites as well as the likelihood of there being unidentified archaeological sites and whether or not the project could impact those archaeological resources.

After reviewing the project and our records we determined that there were no previously identified archaeological sites in the project area and the potential for unidentified archaeological deposits being present was limited due to substantial prior ground disturbance from previous development of the site.

OPRHP has no archaeological concerns with the proposed project. Please continue the consultation process as impacts to buildings and structures are still being evaluated by other staff members.

Sincerely,

Daniel A. Bagrow
Scientist (Archaeology)

**NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION**
**Division of Fish, Wildlife & Marine Resources**
**New York Natural Heritage Program**
625 Broadway, 5th Floor, Albany, New York 12233-4757
**Phone:** (518) 402-8935 • **Fax:** (518) 402-8925
**Website:** www.dec.ny.gov

February 10, 2016

Michael Hale
The LA Group
40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

Re: Moore Hall student residential building, Union Avenue
Town/City: City Of Saratoga Springs. County: Saratoga.

Dear Michael Hale:

In response to your recent request, we have reviewed the New York Natural Heritage Program database with respect to the above project.

We have no records of rare or state-listed animals or plants, or significant natural communities at your site or in its immediate vicinity.

The absence of data does not necessarily mean that rare or state-listed species, significant natural communities, or other significant habitats do not exist on or adjacent to the proposed site. Rather, our files currently do not contain information that indicates their presence. For most sites, comprehensive field surveys have not been conducted. We cannot provide a definitive statement on the presence or absence of all rare or state-listed species or significant natural communities. Depending on the nature of the project and the conditions at the project site, further information from on-site surveys or other resources may be required to fully assess impacts on biological resources.

This response applies only to known occurrences of rare or state-listed animals and plants, significant natural communities, and other significant habitats maintained in the Natural Heritage Database. Your project may require additional review or permits; for information regarding other permits that may be required under state law for regulated areas or activities (e.g., regulated wetlands), please contact the appropriate NYS DEC Regional Office, Division of Environmental Permits, as listed at www.dec.ny.gov/about/39381.html.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Conrad
Information Resources Coordinator
New York Natural Heritage Program




## SITE STATISTICS

TAX MAP PARCELS 165.76–1–32, 165.76–1–33, 165.76–1–34.13, 165.76–1–40

EXISTING ZONING – UR–4

PARCEL SIZE – 1.29 ACRES

## BUILDING VARIANCES

UNION AVENUE

SIDE YARD SETBACK REQUIRED – 20' MINIMUM, 45' TOTAL
PROVIDED – 10', 10' 20' TOTAL

VARIANCE REQUESTED 10' 25'

REAR YARD SETBACK REQUIRED – 25'
PROVIDED – 16' NORTH LANE

VARIANCE REQUESTED 9'

MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE
PRINCIPAL BUILDING REQUIRED – 25%
PROPOSED – 52.39%

VARIANCE REQUESTED 27.39%

DENSITY PER UNIT REQUIRED – 3,000 SF PER UNIT
PROPOSED – 1,901 SF PER UNIT

VARIANCE REQUESTED – 1099 SF PER UNIT

WHITE STREET

SIDE YARD SETBACK REQUIRED – 20' MINIMUM, 45' TOTAL
PROVIDED – 10', 10' 20' TOTAL

VARIANCE REQUESTED 10' 25'

REAR YARD SETBACK REQUIRED – 25'
PROVIDED – 10' NORTH LANE

VARIANCE REQUESTED 15'

MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGE
PRINCIPAL BUILDING REQUIRED – 25%
PROPOSED – 39%

VARIANCE REQUESTED 14%

The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.
People. Purpose. Place.
40 Long Alley
Saratoga Springs
NY 12866
p: 518-587-8100
f: 518-587-0180
www.thelagroup.com

Unauthorized alteration or addition to this document is a violation of Section 7209 of the New York State Education Law.

© the LA Group 2014

*Prepared for:*

Moore Hall, LLC
18 Division Street
Suite 401
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

*Project Title:*

Moore Hall Redevelopment
46 Union Ave and
35 White St.
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

| | |
|---|---|
| Project No.: | 2014096 |
| Design: | |
| Drawn: | Ch'k'd: |
| Date: | Scale: |

| Rev: | Description: | Date: |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

*Drawing Title*

*Drawing No.*

Moore Hall - 2014096

Plotted By: MATT BROBSTON
Save Date: 3/17/2015 10:01 AM
File Name: G:\2014\2014096_Moore_Hall\2014096CADD\VARIANCE-PLAN.dwg

The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.
*People. Purpose. Place.*

balzer + tuck
architecture

Bonacio Construction Inc.

Union Streetscape Image - Existing | UNION AVENUE CONDOMINIUMS

BTA PROJECT NO: 1602

N







The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.
*People. Purpose. Place.*

balzer + tuck architecture

Bonacio Construction Inc.

Union Streetscape Image
BTA PROJECT NO: 1602

UNION AVENUE CONDOMINIUMS
3/10/2016

N

NORTH (UNION AVENUE) ELEVATION

The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.
People. Purpose. Place.

balzer + tuck
architecture

Bonacio Construction Inc.

Mansion Elevation Studies | UNION AVENUE CONDOMINIUMS
BTA PROJECT NO: 1602
02/29/2016

0' 4' 8'

EAST ELEVATION
(WEST SIMILAR)

SOUTH (COURTYARD) ELEVATION

The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.
People. Purpose. Place.

balzer + tuck
architecture

Bonacio Construction Inc.

Mansion Elevation Studies | UNION AVENUE CONDOMINIUMS
BTA PROJECT NO: 1602
02/29/2016

0' 4' 8'

CARRIAGE HOUSE NORTH (COURTYARD) ELEVATION

CARRIAGE HOUSE SOUTH (NORTH LANE) ELEVATION

The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.
*People. Purpose. Place.*

balzer + tuck
architecture

Bonacio Construction Inc.

Carriage House North & South Elevations

BTA PROJECT NO: 1602

UNION AVENUE CONDOMINIUMS

3/8/2016

0' 4' 8'

CARRIAGE HOUSE EAST ELEVATION (SIMILAR AT WEST ELEVATION)

The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.
*People. Purpose. Place.*

balzer + tuck
architecture

Bonacio Construction Inc.

Carriage House East Elevation
BTA PROJECT NO: 1602

UNION AVENUE CONDOMINIUMS
3/8/2016

0' 4' 8'

ROW HOUSE 102 thru 104 - WHITE STREET ELEVATION

ROW HOUSE 102 thru 104 - SIDE ELEVATION

The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.
People. Purpose. Place.

balzer + tuck
architecture

Bonacio Construction Inc.

Row House Elevations
BTA PROJECT NO: 1602

UNION AVENUE CONDOMINIUMS
3/10/2016

The LA GROUP
Landscape Architecture & Engineering P.C.
*People. Purpose. Place.*

balzer + tuck
architecture

Bonacio Construction Inc.

Union Avenue Perspective
BTA PROJECT NO: 1602

UNION AVENUE CONDOMINIUMS

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

CITY HALL - 474 BROADWAY
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NEW YORK 12866
TEL: 518-587-3550 FAX: 518-580-9480
WWW.SARATOGA-SPRINGS.ORG

[FOR OFFICE USE]

(Application #)

(Date received)

## APPLICATION FOR:
## APPEAL TO THE ZONING BOARD FOR AN INTERPRETATION, USE VARIANCE, AREA VARIANCE AND/OR VARIANCE EXTENSION

| | APPLICANT(S)* | OWNER(S) *(If not applicant)* | ATTORNEY/AGENT |
|---|---|---|---|
| Name | ANW Holdings Inc. | | |
| Address | 563 North Broadway | | |
| | Saratoga Springs NY 12866 | | |
| Tel./Fax | 587-4413 / 587-0260 | / | / |
| Email | [redacted] | | |

* An applicant must be the property owner, lessee, or one with an option to lease or purchase the property in question.
Applicant's interest in the premises: ☐ Owner ☐ Lessee ☐ Under option to lease or purchase

## PROPERTY INFORMATION

Property Address (No. & St.) 27 Jumel Place Side of St. (north, east, etc.) North

Tax Parcel No.: 166 . 13 - 50 - 2 *(for example: 165.52 – 4 – 37)* Tax District: ☒ Inside ☐ Outside

1. Date acquired by current owner: Under Contract 2. Zoning District when purchased: UR3

3. Present use of property: Multi Family - Ballet Studio 4. Current Zoning District: UR 3

5. Has a previous ZBA application/appeal been filed for this property? ☒ Yes (when? 10/31/13 for what? ) ☐ No

6. Is property located within (check all that apply)?: ☐ Historic District ☐ Architectural Review District ☐ 500' of a State Park, city boundary, or county/state highway?

7. Brief description of proposed action: Tear down existing building and build seven unit single family condominium project.

8. Is there a written violation for this parcel that is not the subject of this application? ☐ Yes ☒ No

9. Has the work, use or occupancy to which this appeal relates already begun? ☐ Yes ☒ No

10. Identify the type of appeal you are requesting *(check all that apply)*:

☐ INTERPRETATION (p. 2) ☐ VARIANCE EXTENSION (p. 2) ☐ USE VARIANCE (pp. 3-6) ☒ AREA VARIANCE (pp. 6-7)

FEES: Make checks payable to the "Commissioner of Finance" and attach to top of original application. Fees are cumulative and required for each request below.

| | |
|---|---|
| ☐ Interpretation | $ 400 |
| ☐ Use variance | $1,000 |
| ☑ Area variance | |
| -Residential use/property: | $ 150 |
| -Non-residential use/property: | $ 500 |
| ☐ Extensions: | $ 150 |

## INTERPRETATION – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

1. Identify the section(s) of the Zoning Ordinance for which you are seeking an interpretation:

Section(s) _____

2. How do you request that this section be interpreted? _____

3. If interpretation is denied, do you wish to request alternative zoning relief? ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. If the answer to #3 is "yes," what alternative relief do you request? ☐ Use Variance ☐ Area Variance

## EXTENSION OF A VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

1. Date original variance was granted: 5/1/14
2. Type of variance granted? ☐ Use ☑ Area
3. Date original variance expired: 11/1/15
4. Length of extension requested: _____
5. Explain why the extension is necessary. Why wasn't the original timeframe sufficient?: We were unable to close on the property due to it being held up in probate for the last several months. We are anticipating to close within the next few weeks.

When requesting an extension of time for an existing variance, the applicant must prove that the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted have not changed. Specifically demonstrate that there have been no significant changes on the site, in the neighborhood, or within the circumstances upon which the original variance was granted:

Nothing has changed to this area & no new development

On or near this site.

**USE VARIANCE** – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

A use variance is requested to permit the following: _____

For the Zoning Board to grant a request for a use variance, an applicant must prove that the zoning regulations create an unnecessary hardship in relation to that property. In seeking a use variance, New York State law requires an applicant to prove all four of the following "tests".

1. That the applicant cannot realize a reasonable financial return on initial investment for any currently permitted use on the property. "Dollars & cents" proof must be submitted as evidence. The property in question cannot yield a reasonable return for the following reasons:

A. Submit the following financial evidence relating to this property (attach additional evidence as needed):

1) Date of purchase: _____ Purchase amount: $_____

2) Indicate dates and costs of any improvements made to property after purchase:

| Date | Improvement | Cost |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

3) Annual maintenance expenses: $_____ 4) Annual taxes: $_____

5) Annual income generated from property: $_____

6) City assessed value: $_____ Equalization rate:_____ Estimated Market Value: $_____

7) Appraised Value: $_____ Appraiser: _____ Date: _____

Appraisal Assumptions: _____

_____

B. Has property been listed for sale with the Multiple Listing Service (MLS)? ☐ Yes ☐ No If "yes", for how long? _____

1) Original listing date(s):_____ Original listing price: $_____

If listing price was reduced, describe when and to what extent: _____

_____

2) Has the property been advertised in the newspapers or other publications? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, describe frequency and name of publications: _____

_____

3) Has the property had a "For Sale" sign posted on it? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, list dates when sign was posted: _____

_____

4) How many times has the property been shown and with what results? _____

_____

_____

2. That the financial hardship relating to this property is unique and does not apply to a substantial portion of the neighborhood. Difficulties shared with numerous other properties in the same neighborhood or district would not satisfy this requirement. This previously identified financial hardship is unique for the following reasons:

_____

_____

_____

3. That the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Changes that will alter the character of a neighborhood or district would be at odds with the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance. The requested variance will not alter the character of the neighborhood for the following reasons:

4. That the alleged hardship has not been self-created. An applicant (whether the property owner or one acting on behalf of the property owner) cannot claim "unnecessary hardship" if that hardship was created by the applicant, or if the applicant acquired the property knowing (or was in a position to know) the conditions for which the applicant is seeking relief. The hardship has not been self-created for the following reasons:

## AREA VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):

The applicant requests relief from the following Zoning Ordinance article(s) _____.

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To | → To |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fencing (exterior fence only) | 6' | 8' | |
| Lot Coverage | 30% | (Prev. Appr.) 43.5% | 46.0% |
| Front Yard Setback | 10' | (Pre. Appr.) 5' | 1' |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Other: _____

To grant an area variance, the ZBA must balance the benefits to the applicant and the health, safety, and welfare of the neighborhood and community, taking into consideration the following:

1. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by other feasible means. Identify what alternatives to the variance have been explored (alternative designs, attempts to purchase land, etc.) and why they are not feasible.

   Our fencing request is new, asking for the height limit to go from 6 – 8' (exterior fence only). This creates privacy along the perimeter, a benefit to both sides of the fence. What is currently there is dilapidated and run down, hence aesthically a great improvement. Our modified request for front setback of 1' is what currently exists and consistent with surrounding homes. The 5' granted does not allow for our (2) front porches to be placed on the unit. This style entry fits with the street scape. Finally, the area coverage request of 46% is what was originally asked for, and necessary for the option of adding additional back porches on the homes; an opportunity for our clients to enjoy their backyards, since their fronts are quite limited in size. These variance alternatives are reasonable and contiguous with the urban feel of downtown.

2. Whether granting the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties. Granting the variance will not create a detriment to nearby properties or an undesirable change in the neighborhood character for the following reasons:

Granting the area variance will enhance the neighborhood by creating privacy, align the two front porches with the neighboring homes, and allow only 2.5% more in area coverage which was originally requested.

3. Whether the variance is substantial. The requested variance is not substantial for the following reasons:

This request is minimal and less than what currently exists on the property. The fence height increase is not substantial and benefits both the current and new homeowners.

4. Whether the variance will have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district. The requested variance will not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood or district for the following reasons:

This is one lot, seven homes, a singular curb cut and permissable use of the land in lieu of its current nonconforming commercial use. Permeability exceeds the minimum, peaking at 35.10%, parking accommodations are onsite and traffic is reduced due to the applicable Urban Residential 3 zone. The lot will be properly cleaned and abated, a favorable influence both physically and environmentally on the neighborhood.

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created (although this does not necessarily preclude the granting of an area variance). Explain whether the alleged difficulty was or was not self-created:

The difficulty was created by the need to change a non-conforming structure to a residential economically feasible solution. A win for all involved; neighbors, city, and a proper sustainable usage by City Standards.

In accord with Article 240-14.4A(1)(b)(6) of the Zoning Ordinance, "any request for an area variance, which shall effect a change in density, shall be applied for and considered as a use variance and decided under criteria for the same". A request that involves any of the following relief will require an application for a use variance and will be decided under the use variance criteria:

(1) Dimensional relief from minimum lot size requirements that would allow additional permitted units and/or uses
(2) Relief from on site parking requirements
(3) Reduction in land area requirements for multi-family units

## DISCLOSURE

Does any City officer, employee, or family member thereof have a financial interest (as defined by General Municipal Law Section 809) in this application? ☒ No ☐ Yes If "yes", a statement disclosing the name, residence and nature and extent of this interest must be filed with this application.

## APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

I/we, the property owner(s), or purchaser(s)/lessee(s) under contract, of the land in question, hereby request an appearance before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

By the signature(s) attached hereto, I/we certify that the information provided within this application and accompanying documentation is, to the best of my/our knowledge, true and accurate. I/we further understand that intentionally providing false or misleading information is grounds for immediate denial of this application.

Furthermore, I/we hereby authorize the members of the Zoning Board of Appeals and designated City staff to enter the property associated with this application for purposes of conducting any necessary site inspections relating to this appeal.

_____
(applicant signature)

_____
(applicant signature)

Sworn to before me this date:

Date: _____

_____
*Notary Public*

617.20

# Appendix C

## State Environmental Quality Review

# SHORT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM

## For UNLISTED ACTIONS Only

**PART I - PROJECT INFORMATION (To be completed by Applicant or Project sponsor)**

1. APPLICANT/SPONSOR: ANW Holdings

2. PROJECT NAME:

3. PROJECT LOCATION: 27 Helmet Place

Municipality: Saratoga Springs, NY County: Saratoga

4. PRECISE LOCATION (Street address and road intersections, prominent landmarks, etc., or provide map)

5. PROPOSED ACTION IS: ☒ New ☐ Expansion ☐ Modification/alteration

6. DESCRIBE PROJECT BRIEFLY: 7 Individual Condominiums

7. AMOUNT OF LAND AFFECTED: Initially: _____ (acres) Ultimately: _____ (acres)

8. WILL PROPOSED ACTION COMPLY WITH EXISTING ZONING OR OTHER EXISTING LAND USE RESTRICTIONS?
☒ Yes ☐ No If No, describe briefly

9. WHAT IS PRESENT LAND USE IN VICINITY OF PROJECT?
☒ Residential ☐ Industrial ☐ Commercial ☐ Agriculture ☐ Park/Forest/Open Space ☐ Other
Describe:

10. DOES ACTION INVOLVE A PERMIT APPROVAL, OR FUNDING, NOW OR ULTIMATELY FROM ANY OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY (FEDERAL, STATE OR LOCAL)?
☒ Yes ☐ No If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit/approvals: Bldg Dept - Saratoga Springs

11. DOES ANY ASPECT OF THE ACTION HAVE A CURRENTLY VALID PERMIT OR APPROVAL?
☐ Yes ☒ No If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit/approvals:

12. AS A RESULT OF PROPOSED ACTION WILL EXISTING PERMIT/APPROVAL REQUIRE MODIFICATION?
☐ Yes ☒ No

I CERTIFY THAT THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE IS TRUE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE

Applicant/sponsor name: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____

**PART II - IMPACT ASSESSMENT** (To be completed by Lead Agency)

A. DOES ACTION EXCEED ANY TYPE I THRESHOLD IN 6 NYCRR, PART 617.4? If yes, coordinate the review process and use the FULL EAF.
☐ Yes ☐ No

B. WILL ACTION RECEIVE COORDINATED REVIEW AS PROVIDED FOR UNLISTED ACTIONS IN 6 NYCRR, PART 617.6? If No, a negative declaration may be superseded by another involved agency.
☐ Yes ☐ No

C. COULD ACTION RESULT IN **ANY** ADVERSE EFFECTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE FOLLOWING: (Answers may be handwritten, if legible)

C1. Existing air quality, surface or groundwater quality or quantity, noise levels, existing traffic pattern, solid waste production or disposal, potential for erosion, drainage or flooding problems? Explain briefly:

C2. Aesthetic, agricultural, archaeological, historic or other natural or cultural resources; or community or neighborhood character? Explain briefly:

C3. Vegetation or fauna, fish, shellfish or wildlife species, significant habitats, or threatened or endangered species? Explain briefly:

C4. A community's existing plans or goals as officially adopted, or a change in use or intensity of use of land or other natural resources? Explain briefly:

C5. Growth, subsequent development, or related activities likely to be induced by the proposed action? Explain briefly:

C6. Long term, short term, cumulative, or other effects not identified in C1-C5? Explain briefly:

C7. Other impacts (including changes in use of either quantity or type of energy? Explain briefly:

D. WILL THE PROJECT HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS THAT CAUSED THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL AREA (CEA)?
☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, explain briefly:

E. IS THERE, OR IS THERE LIKELY TO BE, CONTROVERSY RELATED TO POTENTIAL ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS?
☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, explain briefly:

**PART III - DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE** (To be completed by Agency)

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each adverse effect identified above, determine whether it is substantial, large, important or otherwise significant. Each effect should be assessed in connection with its (a) setting (i.e. urban or rural); (b) probability of occurring; (c) duration; (d) irreversibility; (e) geographic scope; and (f) magnitude. If necessary, add attachments or reference supporting materials. Ensure that explanations contain sufficient detail to show that all relevant adverse impacts have been identified and adequately addressed. If question d of part ii was checked yes, the determination of significance must evaluate the potential impact of the proposed action on the environmental characteristics of the CEA.

☐ Check this box if you have identified one or more potentially large or significant adverse impacts that **MAY** occur. Then proceed directly to the FULL EAF and/or prepare a positive declaration.

☐ Check this box if you have determined, based on the information and analysis above and any supporting documentation, that the proposed action **WILL NOT** result in any significant adverse environmental impacts **AND** provide, on attachments as necessary, the reasons supporting this determination.

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of Lead Agency | Date |
| Print or Type Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency | Title of Responsible Officer |
| Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency | Signature of Preparer (If different from responsible officer) |

Res + App


# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

CITY HALL - 474 BROADWAY
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NEW YORK 12866
PH) 518-587-3550 FX) 518-580-9480
WWW.SARATOGA-SPRINGS.ORG



BILL MOORE
*CHAIR*
KEITH B. KAPLAN
*VICE CHAIR*
ADAM MCNEILL
*SECRETARY*
GARY HASBROUCK
GEORGE "SKIP" CARLSON
SHIRLEY POPPEL
OKSANA LUDD



RECEIVED
OCT 31 2013
ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT


IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF
ANW Holdings, Inc. of 564 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

from the Building Inspector's Denial of Application for Land Use and/or Building for the premises at 27 Jumel Place, Saratoga Springs, New York, identified as Tax Parcel No.: 166.13-1-50.2 in the inside district of the City.

The Applicant has applied for an area variance for relief from the current City Zoning Ordinance applicable to the Urban Residential - 3 zoning district to construct a seven unit condominium development seeking relief from the maximum principal buildings permitted on one lot, maximum principal building coverage, the minimum front yard setback requirements for the two units fronting on Jumel Place, and from the minimum rear yard setback requirements for the two units located at the rear of the property, and public notice having been duly given of a hearing on said application on July 9, 2013 and October 28, 2013.

In consideration of the balance between the benefit to the Applicant with the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community, the Board makes the following resolution that the requested area variance for the following relief or such lesser amount, as described in the submitted application, BE APPROVED:

| Type of Requirement | Required | Existing | Proposed | Total Relief Requested |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maximum Principal Buildings on one lot | One (1) | One (1) | Seven (7) | 6 (600)% |
| Maximum Building Coverage | 30% | 49.4% | 43.5% | 13.5% (45%) |
| Minimum Front Yard Setback for the 2 units fronting on Jumel Place | 10 feet | 1 foot | 5 feet | 5 feet (50%) |
| Minimum Rear Yard Setback for the 2 units located at the rear | 25 feet | .7 foot | 6 feet | 19 feet (76%) |

1. The Applicant has demonstrated that this benefit cannot be achieved by other means feasible. This Board has been asked to consider several prior applications to redevelop this property. It is currently used for mixed commercial and residential purposes with a large cement structure, formerly a manufacturing facility, located on the property. The current use is not conducive to a residential neighborhood and the noise and traffic generated by the current use has been an issue of concern for many of the neighbors. The unique nature

of this property and the prior failed attempts to arrive at a use for this property that is acceptable to neighbors, conforming with the neighborhood and economically feasible has demonstrated that the redevelopment of this property raises unusual and distinct issues. Not only has the Applicant explored alternate means to achieve the requested benefit including a smaller number of units which were evaluated and found to be economically unfeasible, but prior applicants have also attempted to use the structure for varied uses, all of which demonstrates that other alternatives have not been shown to be practical or economically feasible. The applicant has demonstrated that redeveloping this property from an unsightly cement structure used for commercial purposes into a seven unit residential condominium development is the best economically feasible use as shown on the proposed site plan for this property.

2. The Applicant has demonstrated that granting these variances will not create an undesirable change in neighborhood character or a detriment to nearby properties. Applicant had shown that removal of the current cement structure and construction of a seven unit condominium will result in a development that substantially conforms with the residential homes in the neighborhood. The Applicant has demonstrated, and several neighbors have testified in support, that this redevelopment will have a very beneficial impact on the neighborhood. The granting of these variances will result in the removal of a varied use (ballet school), unauthorized use (karate school) and prior nonconforming use (manufacturing facility) and result in a conforming use which is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. We note that the City Planning Board issued a favorable advisory opinion identifying that "This site can adequately accommodate development of this scale, and that the overall density proposed is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood." Based on the foregoing, the granting the variances will improve the appearance of the property and will not create an undesirable change in neighborhood character or impact on nearby properties, but rather a desirable and valuable change.

3. The relief requested may be considered substantial, but is mitigated by the fact that the current existing structure is non-conforming and by the fact that the lot, at 34,765.50 square feet, would accommodate either five single-family lots or four two-family buildings for total of eight residences. The requested variance, for seven units, is one less than the permitted 8 residences. In order to develop this property in a manner that is most conducive to current needs of our citizens, creating smaller free standing condominiums is beneficial. The construction of one continuous unit would have eliminated the need for a variance for seven units, but would not have resulted in a project that meets the current needs of some members of the community. The minimum front and rear setback variances are necessary to maximize the available parking and the need for service vehicles to access the property. Due to the non-conformance of the current structure and some of the existing structures in the neighborhood, these variances will not have a substantial impact on the neighborhood and therefore mitigates the substantial nature of the variances.

4. The Applicant has demonstrated that the variance will not have a significant adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood. The Applicant has demonstrated, and several neighbors have testified in support, that this redevelopment will have a significant beneficial physical impact on the neighborhood. Not only will the current commercial use with resulting traffic and noise generated by such use no longer interfere with the quiet residential neighborhood, but the physical change to the property will be a significant improvement to the appearance of the neighborhood. Additionally, the proposed construction will improve the permeability of the lot to 35.1%, in excess of the required 25%.

5. The alleged difficulty may be considered self-created in that the Applicant desires to re-develop this property in a manner that will meet the needs of residents of Saratoga Springs who are looking to down size and still create a development that conforms to the neighborhood as a residential development in an economic

manner, however, this is not necessarily fatal to the application.

Notifications/Approvals/Conditions of Approval:
Prior variances are discontinued.
Saratoga Springs City Planning Board site plan review is required – the Planning Board will address local concerns as identified by the Saratoga County Planning Board.
Saratoga County Planning Board issued a finding of no significant county side or inter community impact.

Adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 6 (B. Moore, K. Kaplan, A. McNeill, G. Hasbrouck, S. Carlson, O. Ludd)

NAYES: 0

Dated: October 28, 2013

This variance shall expire 18 months following the filing date of such decision unless the necessary building permit has been issued and actual construction begun as per 240-8.5.1.

10/30/13
Date

Chair

I hereby certify the above to be a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Saratoga Springs on the date above mentioned, six members of the Board being present.

# MAP OF
## the Neighborhood of
# MAGNOLIA LANE
in SARATOGA SPRINGS

by Witt Construction

2013




| Lot Coverage | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Residence | Footprint | Roof OH | Coverage |
| #1 | 2,449 | 284 | 2,733 |
| #2 | 1,357 | 159 | 1,516 |
| #3 | 1,472 | 160 | 1,632 |
| #4 | 2,079 | 159 | 2,238 |
| #5 | 2,759 | 223 | 2,917 |
| #6 | 2,340 | 223 | 2,563 |
| #7 | 2,070 | 220 | 2,290 |
| | 14,526 | 1,413 | 15,939 |
| | | | 34,766 |
| | | | 46.0% |

| Permeability Statistics | | |
|---|---|---|
| Size of Development (Sq. Ft.) | | 34,766 |
| Non-Permeable Areas (Sq. Ft) | | |
| Road | 3,306 | |
| Driveways | 1,338 | |
| Pavers | 1,740 | |
| Living | 5,665 | |
| Porches | 1,656 | |
| Garages | 4,173 | |
| Total Non-Permeable | 21305 | 61.3% |
| Permeable Areas (Sq. Ft) | | |
| Turf Paved | 1,555 | |
| Landscaped | 11,870 | |
| Total Permeable | 13425 | 38.7% |

*Scale of Feet*

1 5 10 25 50 100

REAR




FRONT




Concept Site Plan




Site Plan with Existing Building

27 Jumel Place
Saratoga Springs NY

Witt Construction
3/10/2014

| | Depth | Width | Area (sq. ft.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lot Size | 231 | 150.5 | 34,765.50 |

| Area | Existing | % of Lot | As Drawn | % of Lot |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principle Building and Overhang | 17,161 | 49.4% | 15,589 | 46.00% |
| Accessory Building | 160 | 0.5% | | |
| Total | | | | 46.00% |
| Driveways/Road | 6,357 | 18.3% | 7,157 | 20.60% |
| Permeable Areas | 11,088 | 31.9% | 12,191 | 35.10% |

| Setbacks | To the overhangs |
|---|---|
| Front | 1 |
| Rear | 6 |
| Right Side | 7 |
| Left Side | 5 |



NO PARKING
24 HRS
STARTING
8AM
MON-WED
FRI


Paruck
Blake-Atlantic, R
518-464-
Commercial Se
www.prublakeatla



Witt Construction

563 N Broadway Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

February 27.2014, 2013

Magnolia Lane

Street Views

Witt Construction

563 N Broadway Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

February 27.2014, 2013

Magnolia Lane

Street Views

Witt Construction

563 N Broadway Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

February 27.2014, 2013

Magnolia Lane

Street Views

# *Short Environmental Assessment Form*
## *Part 1 - Project Information*

## Instructions for Completing

**Part 1 - Project Information. The applicant or project sponsor is responsible for the completion of Part 1.** Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification. Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information.

Complete all items in Part 1. You may also provide any additional information which you believe will be needed by or useful to the lead agency; attach additional pages as necessary to supplement any item.

| **Part 1 - Project and Sponsor Information**<br>Jumel/Downton Walk - Witt Construction, Inc. | | |
|---|---|---|
| Name of Action or Project:<br>Downton Walk | | |
| Project Location (describe, and attach a location map):<br>27 Jumel Place | | |
| Brief Description of Proposed Action:<br>7 Individual Family Condominiums | | |
| Name of Applicant or Sponsor:<br>John Witt | Telephone: 518-587-4113<br>E-Mail: [redacted] | |
| Address:<br>563 N. Broadway | | |
| City/PO:<br>Saratoga Springs | State:<br>NY | Zip Code:<br>12866 |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Does the proposed action only involve the legislative adoption of a plan, local law, ordinance, administrative rule, or regulation?<br>If Yes, attach a narrative description of the intent of the proposed action and the environmental resources that may be affected in the municipality and proceed to Part 2. If no, continue to question 2. | ☑ | ☐ |
| 2. Does the proposed action require a permit, approval or funding from any other governmental Agency?<br>If Yes, list agency(s) name and permit or approval:<br>Building Department | ☐ | ☑ |

3.a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action? .791 acres
b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed? .791 acres
c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor? .791 acres

4. Check all land uses that occur on, adjoining and near the proposed action.

☐ Urban ☐ Rural (non-agriculture) ☐ Industrial ☐ Commercial ☑ Residential (suburban)
☐ Forest ☐ Agriculture ☐ Aquatic ☐ Other (specify): _____
☐ Parkland

| | NO | YES | N/A |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5. Is the proposed action, | | | |
| a. A permitted use under the zoning regulations? | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan? | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 6. Is the proposed action consistent with the predominant character of the existing built or natural landscape? | ☐ | ☑ |
| 7. Is the site of the proposed action located in, or does it adjoin, a state listed Critical Environmental Area? If Yes, identify: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 8. a. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels? | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Are public transportation service(s) available at or near the site of the proposed action? | ☐ | ☑ |
| c. Are any pedestrian accommodations or bicycle routes available on or near site of the proposed action? | ☐ | ☑ |
| 9. Does the proposed action meet or exceed the state energy code requirements? If the proposed action will exceed requirements, describe design features and technologies: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 10. Will the proposed action connect to an existing public/private water supply? If No, describe method for providing potable water: _____ Per site plan approval we need to add a new water-main that runs from Jumel up the private drive. | ☐ | ☑ |
| 11. Will the proposed action connect to existing wastewater utilities? If No, describe method for providing wastewater treatment: _____ | ☐ | ☑ |
| 12. a. Does the site contain a structure that is listed on either the State or National Register of Historic Places? | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Is the proposed action located in an archeological sensitive area? | ☑ | ☐ |
| 13. a. Does any portion of the site of the proposed action, or lands adjoining the proposed action, contain wetlands or other waterbodies regulated by a federal, state or local agency? | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Would the proposed action physically alter, or encroach into, any existing wetland or waterbody? If Yes, identify the wetland or waterbody and extent of alterations in square feet or acres: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 15. Does the site of the proposed action contain any species of animal, or associated habitats, listed by the State or Federal government as threatened or endangered? | ☑ | ☐ |
| 16. Is the project site located in the 100 year flood plain? | ☑ | ☐ |
| 17. Will the proposed action create storm water discharge, either from point or non-point sources? If Yes, a. Will storm water discharges flow to adjacent properties? ☐ NO ☐ YES | ☑ | ☐ |
| b. Will storm water discharges be directed to established conveyance systems (runoff and storm drains)? If Yes, briefly describe: ☐ NO ☐ YES _____ | | |

14. Identify the typical habitat types that occur on, or are likely to be found on the project site. Check all that apply:

☐ Shoreline ☐ Forest ☐ Agricultural/grasslands ☐ Early mid-successional

☐ Wetland ☐ Urban ☑ Suburban

| | NO | YES |
|---|---|---|
| 18. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that result in the impoundment of water or other liquids (e.g. retention pond, waste lagoon, dam)?<br>If Yes, explain purpose and size: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 19. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the location of an active or closed solid waste management facility?<br>If Yes, describe: _____ | ☑ | ☐ |
| 20. Has the site of the proposed action or an adjoining property been the subject of remediation (ongoing or completed) for hazardous waste?<br>If Yes, describe: _____<br>There as been asbestos found on location. We have an asbestos report and working with Cristo Demolition who is licensed and experienced in moving this hazardous waste properly. | ☐ | ☑ |

**I AFFIRM THAT THE INFORMATION PROVIDED ABOVE IS TRUE AND ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE**

Applicant/sponsor name: _____ Date: _____

Signature: _____

# CITY OF SARATOGA SPRINGS
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

CITY HALL - 474 BROADWAY
SARATOGA SPRINGS, NEW YORK 12866
PH) 518-587-3550 FX) 518-580-9480
WWW.SARATOGA-SPRINGS.ORG



Bill Moore
Chair
Keith B. Kaplan
Vice Chair
Adam McNeill
Secretary
Gary Hasbrouck
George "Skip" Carlson
Oksana Ludd
James Helicke


Appeal #2759
IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF
ANW Holdings, Inc.
564 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

from the Building Inspector's Denial of Application for Land Use and/or Building for the premises at 27 Jumel Place, Saratoga Springs, New York, identified as Tax Parcel No.: 166.13-1-50.2 in the inside district of the City.

The Applicant has applied for modification to Appeal # 2714, a variance granted October 23, 2013, seeking modification of the relief from the maximum principal building coverage and the minimum front yard setback requirements for the two units fronting on Jumel Place, and for additional relief from maximum height of a residential fence, all as provided in the current City Zoning Ordinance applicable to the Urban Residential - 3 zoning district, and public notice having been duly given of a hearing on said application on April 21, 2014 and April 28, 2014.

In consideration of the balance between the benefit to the Applicant with the detriment to the health, safety and welfare of the community, the Board makes the following resolution that the requested area variance for the following relief or such lesser amount, as described in the submitted application, BE APPROVED:

| Type of Requirement | Required/ Permitted | Previously Approved | Proposed | Total Relief Requested |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Maximum Building Coverage | 30% | 43.5% | 46% | 16% (53%) |
| Minimum Front Yard Setback for the 2 units fronting on Jumel Place | 10 feet | 5 foot | 1 feet | 9 feet (90%) |
| Maximum Height residential fence | 6 feet | N/A | 8 feet | 2 feet (33%) |

1. The Applicant has demonstrated that this benefit cannot be achieved by other means feasible. This Board has previously determined in Appeal #2714 that the Applicant has demonstrated that redeveloping this property from an unsightly cement structure used for commercial purposes into a seven unit residential condominium development is the best economically feasible use as shown on the proposed site plan for this property. The modifications to the maximum principal building coverage and the minimum front yard setback requested by Applicant, subject to the conditions provided below, do not change the Board's prior determinations. The request to increase the maximum height of the residential fence is requested to ensure added privacy for the units and for adjacent neighbors. Providing this privacy cannot be achieved by other means due to the limited size of the property.

2. The Applicant has demonstrated that granting the modification to these variances will not create an undesirable change in neighborhood character or a detriment to nearby properties. In granting variance #2714, the Board concluded the granting the variances will improve the appearance of the property and will not create an undesirable change in

neighborhood character or impact on nearby properties, but rather a desirable and valuable change. The modifications do not change this conclusion. Additionally, granting the variance for an increased height in the fence will enhance the character of the neighborhood.

3. The modifications to the relief requested may be considered substantial. However, due to the proximity of the proposed developed structures to the neighbors and to one another, the Board finds the benefit of privacy fencing to offset the adverse impact.

4. The Applicant has demonstrated that the modification of the variances will not have a significant adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood. In the prior Appeal, the Applicant demonstrated and several neighbors testified in support, that this redevelopment will have a significant beneficial physical impact on the neighborhood. The modifications requested in this application do not alter the conclusions reached by this Board in Appeal #2714. Additionally, the request for an increase in the height of the fence does not have an adverse physical or environmental effect on the neighborhood.

5. The alleged difficulty may be considered self-created, however, this is not necessarily fatal to the application.

Notifications/Approvals/Conditions of Approval:
The minimum front yard setback of 5 feet previously approved in Appeal #2714 is modified only to permit front stoops or stairways within the 5 foot setback to the 1 foot setback.

No eight (8) foot fence shall be permitted to be constructed along Jumel Place or extending beyond the front foundation line along Jumel Place.

County Planning Board issued a decision of "No Significant County Impact" on April 17, 2014.

Adopted by the following vote:

AYES: 7 (B. Moore, K. Kaplan, A. McNeill, G. Hasbrouck, S. Carlson O. Ludd and J. Helicke)

NAYES: 0

Dated: April 28, 2014

This variance shall expire 18 months following the filing date of such decision unless the necessary building permit has been issued and actual construction begun as per 240-8.5.1.

5-1-14
Date

Chair

I hereby certify the above to be a full, true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Saratoga Springs on the date above mentioned, seven members of the Board being present.

RECEIVED
MAY 06 2014
ACCOUNTS DEPARTMENT

**From:** "Tracy Miller" [redacted] >
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Cc:** [redacted]
**Sent:** Sunday, February 21, 2016 10:28:43 PM
**Subject:** ANW Holdings "Downton Walk"

Dear Ms. Barden -

My husband and I live at [redacted] Jumel Place, [redacted] across the street from 27 Jumel Place. We received the notice of public hearing for the above mentioned project. It is unlikely that we will be able to attend the meeting on Monday February 22 in person, but wanted to make a statement for the record.

We are in support of the project. The project is an enormous improvement over the existing structure, and its previous uses.

We understand the request for variance from the front yard setback, and agree it will maintain a similar look to what exists on the street.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Tracy and Johnny Miller

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or taking any other action with respect to the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.

---

# ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR DENIAL
# OF APPLICATION FOR LAND USE AND/OR BUILDING

APPLICANT: ANW HOLDINGS, INC. TAX PARCEL NO.: 166.13-1-50.2

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 27 JUMEL PLACE
ZONING DISTRICT: URBAN RESIDENTIAL-3

This applicant has applied to use the identified property within the City of Saratoga Springs for the following:

Proposed construction of a seven-unit condominium project (detached single-family residences).

This application is hereby denied upon the grounds that such use of the property would violate the City Zoning Ordinance article(s)

240-2.3 A., Table 3 and 6.4.5 A. As such, the following relief would be required to proceed:

☐ Extension of existing variance ☐ Interpretation

☐ Use Variance to permit the following: _____

☒ Area Variance seeking the following relief:

| Dimensional Requirements | From | To |
|---|---|---|
| Max principal building coverage: 7 units combined | 30% | 46% |
| Max principal buildings on one lot: | 1 | 7 |
| Minimum front yard setback: | 10 ft. | 1 ft. |
| Minimum rear yard setback: | 25 ft. | 6 ft. |
| Maximum height residential fence: | 6 ft. | 8 ft. |

☒ Advisory Opinion required from Saratoga County Planning Board

ZONING AND BUILDING INSPECTOR 2/22/16 DATE

February 28, 2016

To: The Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Saratoga Springs, NY

cc: Saratoga Springs City Council, Saratoga Springs Planning and Economic Development Department, gridsaratoga.com, saratogaspringspolitics.com, Saratoga Today, The Saratogian, The Times Union

Re: Illegal Application for "seven single family condominiums,"
and requests for substantial Zoning Variances at
27 Jumel Place, Saratoga Springs, by ANW Holdings, Builder, John Witt

Public Hearing #2 to be held at the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting on March 7, 2016

Fr: Neighbors of Surrounding Properties

On Monday night, March 7th, the Zoning Board will be deciding on a major project on Jumel Place which is illegal and out of character with the neighborhood. The builder, John Witt, is asking for 7 single condominiums which would be selling for up to 1.5 million dollars per unit. Condominiums are not allowed in UR-3 zoning and the lot is zoned for only 5 units. The builder should be required to follow the zoning law. Mr. Witt is also asking for substantial variances as well.

The Zoning Board of Appeals needs to protect the residential neighborhoods on East Avenue, Lake Avenue, Granger St, and Jumel Place, which surround 27 Jumel Place, from this massively overdone and illegal application. This project will negatively impact the value of our homes and the quality of life in our neighborhood. There are far too many legal questions and large variances being sought, which if granted, would make zoning law useless.

First and foremost, the Land Use category of Jumel Place in our city's 2015 Comprehensive Plan is a Core Residential Neighborhood-1 (CRN-1), allowing a maximum density of 10 units/acre. In our city's Zoning Ordinance, Jumel Place is located in an Urban Residential-3 (UR-3) Zoning District, which allows for only single and two-family homes to be built. By law, this particular parcel of land is large enough to allow five single family homes or four two-family homes.

The applicant is requesting to build "seven single family condominiums." Condominiums are not allowed on Jumel Place, as by definition in our Zoning Ordinance, condominiums are multifamily. The city's Zoning Ordinance states the definition of a condominium as follows: "<u>CONDOMINIUM</u>: A multifamily dwelling containing individually owned dwelling units, wherein the real property title and ownership are vested in an owner, who has an undivided interest with others in the common usage areas and facilities which serve the development."

Multifamily structures are not allowed in a Core Residential Neighborhood-1 or a UR-3 Zoning District. The request by the applicant must be called what they are, 7 single family homes. However, only 5 single family units are allowed on this size lot, or 4 two-family units. (Actually only one unit is allowed, as the applicant has not sub-divided the lot.)

The request for seven single family homes is 40% over the density allowed in an UR-3 Zoning District and creates a 40% density bonus for Mr. Witt's $700K to $1.5 million dollar homes. In our city's Zoning Ordinance, a density bonus of this magnitude is only allowed for affordable senior housing. This is not affordable housing.

To allow for the density the applicant is requesting, the city council would have to change the Land Use category of this area in the Comprehensive Plan from a Core Residential Neighborhood-1 (CRN-1), which allows up to 10 units/acre, to a Core Residential Neighborhood-2 (CRN-2), which allows up to 15 units/acre.

Why is the applicant insisting on calling these seven single family homes "seven single family condominiums"?
Is it because the applicant believes he will only have to provide back yards for two of the seven units, as his application shows? Five of the units have no back yards at all. A 25' back yard setback is required for every unit in a UR-3 Zoning District.
Is it so the applicant doesn't have to spend the money to subdivide the lot?
Is it because the applicant thinks he will be allowed more units than the maximum of five single family homes allowed on this lot?
Is it because these $700K to $1.5 million dollars homes may receive a condominium tax break, thereby forcing the far more modest homes in the area to virtually subsidize them?
Is it because of all of these reasons? We simply do not know.

Legally, whether these seven single family homes are called condominiums, or not, they are not allowed on this property site. **Only five single family homes are allowed by law on this property.** Approving this application would be in violation of the city's Comprehensive Plan and its Zoning Ordinance.

**In addition to the <u>applicant requesting two units more than legally allowed</u> on this lot, the applicant also is asking for the <u>following massive variances</u>.**

**Variance 1)** <u>The maximum building coverage allowed</u> on this lot is 30%. The applicant had previously asked for a 43.5% building coverage allowance, or 45% more than what is allowed. He has recently increased this request to 46%, or 53.3% more than what is allowed. Granting either of these requests would be substantial.

**Variance 2)** <u>The rear yard setback required</u> for each unit is 25 feet. The applicant is asking that this requirement be eliminated by 100% for five units, going from the 25 feet required to zero (0) feet. For the remaining two units he is asking for a 76% reduction in the rear yard setback from 25 feet to 6 feet.

**Variance 3)** <u>The front yard setback required</u> for the two front units is 10 feet. The applicant is asking for one (1) foot, a 90% reduction in the front yard setback. The applicant claims that this is so "our (2) front porches [can] be placed on the unit." However, his drawings show that he is not proposing porches, only overhangs.

**Variance 4)** The fence height allowed in this UR-3 residential area is six feet. The applicant is asking for an eight foot fence, a 33% increase in height over what is allowed. Why is this necessary only for this development? Is the applicant trying to exclude the rest of the neighborhood? A fence this high would create an exclusive walled enclave shutting out the existing neighborhood.

**Variance 5)** The applicant is asking for a maximum principal building on one lot to be increased from one to seven, a 600% increase. As mentioned earlier, only five single family units are allowed by law on this property, after the property is subdivided. Why is this property not being subdivided?

This project will negatively impact the value of our homes and the quality of life in our neighborhood.

**There are far too many legal questions and large variances being sought, which if granted, would make zoning law useless.**

This illegal application with its substantial variances needs to be denied by the Saratoga Springs Zoning Board of Appeals at their upcoming meeting on March 7th.

The neighbors would support a more balanced project with 5 single family homes on 30% of the land with more standard setbacks.

For additional information contact: [redacted]

**From: SANDRA COHEN – [redacted] Lake Avenue, Saratoga Springs, NY – [redacted]**

**To: SARATOGA SPRINGS ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**
**SARATOGA SPRINGS CITY COUNCIL**
**SARATOGA COUNTY SUPERVISORS**
**SARATOGA SPRINGS PLANNING DEPARTMENT**
**REGIONAL PRESS & BLOGS**

**Re: APPLICATION FOR CONDOMINIUMS**
**AND REQUESTS FOR ZONING VARIANCES**
**27 JUMEL PLACE, SARATOGA SPRINGS, BY BUILDER – JOHN WITT**

It appears that the Saratoga Springs Zoning Board of Appeals might be in danger of overstepping its purview if they approve Developer John Witt's current request which will effectively change the zoning ordinance regarding the type of housing allowed in a long-existing Jumel Place neighborhood, within a mile of Saratoga Race Course. Witt has requested an area variance, when what he needs is a use variance, because the condominiums he proposes are not legally allowed within the property's UR-3 zoning. According to our zoning laws – which have the stated interest of maintaining a particular harmony within each of the city's different districts – such use variance would need the approval of the City Council, not an end run through the ZBA. But a vote is scheduled for the ZBA meeting on March 7.

Although the City offers ample opportunity to build cluster housing in UR-1 and SR-2 zones (per Article 4, Section 241-13-A of the city code - ecode.360.com), Witt is attempting to cluster seven single-family condominiums on a 0.79-acre UR-3 lot. Current zoning only allows for either one single family residence or one two-family residential structure. In his proposal, the seven owners would each have an undivided interest in the entire property, while they own their individual structures that sit on the commonly-owned land (which is what defines its condominium status). Contrary to claims that condominiumizing the land alone is only a financial move, it is a clear change of use of the land, in that it automatically includes the clustering model which, in addition to being restricted to specific other areas of the City, allows for tighter lot-lines between homes, albeit they must still follow specific setback and open space codes.

In addition to such change of use, he has also asked for setbacks that would be in violation of code even within a clustered community – as crowded as 1-foot from the existing front sidewalk (10 feet is legal) and 6-feet from the rear (25' is legal). Witt is also requesting additional height, approaching three-storeys, on his structures – which would be interruptively noticeable from Lake Avenue (Route 29), one of the main thoroughfares into the City. He also wants permission to erect an 8-foot fence around three sides of the perimeter to enclose/isolate his Downton Walk community, an English-Cotswold-style development, from the rest of the Victorian/American-turn-of-the-century neighborhood, in which some homes have been there since the late 1800s among others from the 1920s.

Saratoga code (Section 241-13-G) states that new clustered housing – which includes condominiums, townhouses, row houses, zero-lot-line homes, and other multiples – are ONLY allowed in UR-1 and SR-2 locations. In order to build them, even in the specified districts, one must first file for a subdivision of the property, which Witt has not done. That would have resulted in permission to build only five single-family homes or four two-family homes on that size property, ***along with the requirement that each structure must adhere to code setbacks from existing property lines and, within the new multiple community, must meet the percentages of open space.***

The percentage of open space of this project, as presented, does not even adhere to cluster code; nor do the requests for relief from setbacks between the cluster structures and existing neighboring properties, including the City-owned sidewalk. Much of the builder's positive comparison on building standards are irrelevant, as they take into consideration the structure currently on the site, which was built before Saratoga had zoning codes.

Neighbors have no issue with Witt as a quality builder. Nor do they have issue with multiple structures on the property, as long as there is adherence to existing codes. Overloading the space and radically cutting setbacks endangers both the new property and the neighboring structures. It also presents quality of life issues for the current residents, including increased noise and the effect of being walled-off from the contiguous neighborhood. As it is currently planned, the project ***will alter the essential character of the neighborhood and will present an adverse physical impact on the community in which it would be situated.*** The concept of allowing condominiums in UR-3 neighborhoods is a slippery slope that would present an even greater threat to the entire City. Such disregard of our zoning codes will open the door to requests and expectations of similar divergent development in other neighborhoods.

###




Witt Construction

563 N Broadway Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

March 1, 2016

Downton Walk

Aerial View

Scale: 1" = 150'

# DOWNTON WALK

WITT CONSTRUCTION, INC.

563 NORTH BROADWAY, SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY 12866

518.587.4113 | WITTCONSTRUCTION.COM

Granger Ave
Jumel Pl




Concept Site Plan

Site Plan with Existing Building

# Proposed Downton Walk

# Examples of drives, paving areas, yards and green space

# Area Variance Criteria

1. Whether granting the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties

2. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by other feasible means. Identify what alternatives to the variance have been explored (alternative designs, attempts to purchase land, etc.) and why they are not feasible

3. Whether the requested area variance is substantial

4. Whether the proposed variance will have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district

5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created

1. Whether granting the variance will produce an undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties

Granting the use and area variance will **<u>not</u>** produce an undesirable change, but rather enhance the neighborhood.

By eliminating a large commercial & multi-family structure that takes up ~50% of the lot and fails to meet the front, side and rear setbacks. Its replacement will be a very attractive single-family condominium project.

2. Whether the benefit sought by the applicant can be achieved by other feasible means. Identify what alternatives to the variance have been explored (alternative designs, attempts to purchase land, etc.) and why they are not feasible

Other feasible means are **<u>not</u>** available:
Alternative designs options are fewer units, smaller units or taller units.

- Fewer units will make the cost of the land for each unit prohibitive. (See following slide)
- Smaller units would be both undesirable and smaller than the surrounding homes. The proposed home sizes are consistent with that of the existing neighborhood.
- Taller units would not be in keeping with the homes in the existing neighborhood

All adjacent land is currently occupied with single family homes.

## Estimated Development Costs

Jumel Place Project

| | |
|---|---|
| Land Purchase | 370,000 |
| 4103 Land Development-Professional Fees | 23,000 |
| 4116 Land Development - Interest | 42,000 |
| 4117 Land Development - Taxes | 20,000 |
| 4132 Land Development - Soil Testing | 11,700 |
| 4140 Land Development - Construction | 60,000 |
| 4141 Land Development - Fill Dirt | 21,000 |
| 4142 Land Development - Demolition & Asbestos Removal | 155,000 |
| 4142 Land Development - Lot Clearing | 10,000 |
| 4145 Land Development - Silt Fencing | 6,000 |
| 4155 Land Development - Electric lines | 24,000 |
| 4183 Land Development - Trees | 12,000 |
| Total | 754,700 |
| | |
| Reasonable Return for Development Risk | 150,700 |
| Total Cost of Land to Be Divided by number of Home Sites | 905,460 |

3. Whether the requested area variance is substantial

The requested variance is **<u>not</u>** substantial due to :

- The new setbacks requested are less than what currently exists with the existing structure.
- The new setbacks are consistent with the setbacks of other single family homes in the neighborhood.
- The percent of lot to be covered is less than the existing multi-use structure.
- The permeable area of the lot will be increased with the new development as compared to the existing development

4. Whether the proposed variance will have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district

The proposed variance will **<u>not</u>** have adverse physical or environmental effects on neighborhood or district.

- The proposed single family development will be contained on the one lot with one curb cut for all vehicle access to the property
- The net permeability of the development will be great than the existing development

## 5. Whether the alleged difficulty was self-created

The difficulty was self-created, **<u>however:</u>**

It was created by the need to change the deteriorating non-conforming multi-family/ mixed-use structure to a use consistent with the existing neighborhood.

- The change will be a win for the neighbors with the replacement of a multi-use / commercial structure with single family homes.
- The change will be a win for the city with additional tax revenues and a higher tax base.

# Lot Statistics

27 Jumel Place
Saratoga Springs NY

Witt Construction
6/12/2013

| | Depth | Width | Area (sq. ft.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lot Size | 231 | 150.5 | 34,765.50 |

| **Area** | Existing | % of Lot | As Drawn | % of Lot |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principle Building | 17,161 | 49.4% | 14,801 | 42.60% |
| Accessory Building | 160 | 0.5% | 344 | 0.98% |
| Misc./ Overhangs | | | | 2.42% |
| Total | | | | 46.00% |
| | | | | |
| Driveways/Road | 6,357 | 18.3% | 7,157 | 20.60% |
| Premeable Areas | 11,088 | 31.9% | 12,191 | 35.10% |

| **Setbacks** | **Foundation (ft)** |
|---|---|
| Front | 0 |
| Rear | 6 |
| Right Side | Meet UR-3 |
| Left Side | Meet UR-3 |

# Existing Building



SARATOGA
CITY BALLET
TENKARA
KARATE

# Neighborhood

NO PARKING
24 HRS

STOP

188


Google - Imagery ©2013 - Terms of Use

# Proposed Downton Walk

# Proposed Downton Walk



# DOWNTON WALK

WITT CONSTRUCTION, INC.

563 NORTH BROADWAY, SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY 12866

518.587.4113 | WITTCONSTRUCTION.COM

**From:** "Max Peter" [redacted] >
**To:** "Kate Maynard" <kate.maynard@saratoga-springs.org>, "Bradley Birge" <bbirge@saratoga-springs.org>, "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>, [redacted] >, [redacted]
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 1, 2016 10:14:03 PM
**Subject:** ZBA area variance at 27 Jumel Place (#2795.1)

March 1, 2016

To: Saratoga Springs Zoning Board of Appeals

RE: #2795.1, ANW Holdings, seeking area variance for 27 Jumel Place

Dear members of the ZBA board,

I appreciated the opportunity to speak to the board during the previous ZBA meeting on Feb 22, and would like to re-iterate my concerns with this area variance request.

In particular, I am concerned about ANW Holding's request for a variance on the minimum rear setback. My understanding is that UR-3 zoning requires a 25' minimum rear setback. My understanding is that ANW Holdings seeks a variance to reduce this to a 6' setback across the entire rear of the property line.

I ask the board to deny this rear setback variance for two reasons.

1. The variance is substantial. I acknowledge that there is a building with an existing variance on the rear setback. However, this existing rear variance is a 1-story structure limited to the northeast corner of the lot. The northwest rear corner is currently open space. ANW's request will substantially increase the existing rear variance. It will extend the variance upwards by at least one full additional story as well as an additional gabled roof. There also appears to be a steeple structure on a rear building. I do not know the exact proposed heights, but I am guessing it increases the rear variance from a 10' height to 30'. It will also extend the rear variance from the northeast half of the lot to the entire rear lot line. This is a significant increase in the mass and scale of the existing rear setback variance.
2. The variance will be a detriment to nearby properties and will produce an undesirable change in the neighborhood. My property is [redacted] Lake Ave, corner to the northwest. If the proposed variance is approved, a 2-story gabled roof building will be only 6' from my backyard, and will overshadow my back yard and invade my family's privacy and be a detriment to our enjoyment of our back yard. Although ANW's rendering appeared to show some foliage along this rear setback, I believe that this 6' setback is likely to be insufficient to plant any trees along the setbacks. I believe that allowing large multi-story dwellings 6' from the rear lot line will in fact be a detriment to my property and will produce an undesirable change in my neighborhood.

I ask the board to consider a compromise, whereby the rear setback is limited to the existing variance on the northeast corner. The northwest corner should be left as open space, reducing the number of proposed buildings from 7 to 6, and allowing open space for the planting of trees and green space.

Thank you for your consideration,

Max Peter

[redacted] Lake Ave

Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or taking any other action with respect to the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.

**Zimbra** **lindsey.gonzalez@saratoga-springs.org**

## #2759.1 ANW HOLDINGS RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

**From :** J Valetta [redacted] Wed, Mar 09, 2016 01:10 PM

**Subject :** #2759.1 ANW HOLDINGS RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

**To :** susan barden <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>

**Cc :** kate maynard <kate.maynard@saratoga-springs.org>, bbrige@saratoga-springs.org, cindy phillips <cindy.phillips@saratoga-springs.org>, lindsey gonzalez <lindsey.gonzalez@saratoga-springs.org>, christina carton <christina.carton@saratoga-springs.org>, joanne yepsen <joanne.yepsen@saratoga-springs.org>, skip scirocco <skip.scirocco@saratoga-springs.org>, christian mathiesen <christian.mathiesen@saratoga-springs.org>, michele madigan <michele.madigan@saratoga-springs.org>

To: The Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Saratoga Springs, NY

cc: Saratoga Springs City Council, Saratoga Springs Planning and Economic Development Department

Re: Application for "seven unit condominium project,"
and requests for substantial Zoning Variances at
27 Jumel Place, Saratoga Springs, by ANW Holdings

We are writing to ask you to deny the zoning appeal from ANW Holdings for variances to build 7 unit condominium project on the property of 27 Jumel Place. We would welcome the development of our adjoining property; however we feel the variances that have been requested are too excessive. In addition, according to the definition of condominium in our city zoning ordinance as a multi-family dwelling, it is not allowed in the UR-3 zoning district.

The Saratoga Springs Zoning Ordinance defines a condominium as follows:

"CONDOMINIUM: A multifamily dwelling containing individually owned dwelling units, wherein the real property title and ownership are vested in an owner, who has an undivided interest with others in the common usage areas and facilities which serve the

development."

A subdivided lot this size, of which this request for a variance is not, in a Core Residential Neighborhood-1 or a UR-3 Zoning District would allow for 5 single family homes or 4 two-family homes.

The Land Use category of Jumel Place in our city's 2015 Comprehensive Plan is a Core Residential Neighborhood-1 (CRN-1), allowing a maximum density of 10 units/acre. In our city's Zoning Ordinance, Jumel Place is located in an Urban Residential-3 (UR-3) Zoning District, which allows for only single and two-family homes to be built. By law, this particular parcel of land is large enough to allow five single family homes or four two-family homes.

The request for seven single family condominiums is 40% over the density allowed in an UR-3 Zoning District and creates a 40% density bonus. In our city's Zoning Ordinance, a density bonus of this magnitude is only allowed for affordable senior housing. This project has not been presented as neither senior nor affordable housing.

To allow for the density the applicant is requesting, the city council would have to change the Land Use category of this area in the Comprehensive Plan from a Core Residential Neighborhood-1 (CRN-1), which allows up to 10 units/acre, to a Core Residential Neighborhood-2 (CRN-2), which allows up to 15 units/acre.

The substantial variances the applicant is asking for include:

1) The maximum building coverage allowed on this lot is 30%. The previous request was for a 43.5% building coverage allowance, or 45% more than what is allowed. The request has been increased to 46%, or 53.3% more than what is allowed.

2) The rear yard setback required for each unit is 25 feet. The applicant is asking that this requirement be eliminated by 100% for five units, going from the 25 feet required to zero (0) feet. For the remaining two units he is asking for a 76% reduction in the rear yard setback from 25 feet to 6 feet.

3) The front yard setback required for the two front units is 10 feet. The applicant is asking for one (1) foot, a 90% reduction in the front yard setback.

4) The fence height allowed in this UR-3 residential area is six feet. The applicant is asking for an eight foot fence, a 33% increase in height over what is allowed.

5) The applicant is asking for a maximum principal building on one lot to be increased from one to seven, a 600% increase.

We hope you will agree that this appeal to the Zoning Board of Appeals by ANW Holdings should be denied at this time.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jane Valetta

John Valetta

[redacted] Jumel Place

---

**From:** "bob mctague" [redacted]
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 9, 2016 11:23:46 AM
**Subject:** John Witts application for variences on Jumel Place

Susan,  I just can not believe this application is even considered.  It is absurd.  Bob McTague, Saratoga Springs

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying,

distribution, or taking any other action with respect to the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.

---

# Approximant Height of Homes

| | Ridge |
|---|---|
| House #1 | 33'-6" |
| House #2 | 27' |
| House #3 | 27' |
| House #4 | 32' |
| House #5 | 30' |
| House #6 | 30' |
| House #7 | 32' |



Fence Concepts:
6'foot fence with 2' lattice.

**From:** "stephanie waring" [redacted]
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Sunday, March 13, 2016 2:06:36 PM
**Subject:** Downton Walk

Dear Ms. Barden,

I've read the Saratogian article on Downton Walk and I have been aware of this project. I'm worried that it is a clever way to get around zoning laws. What is the point of zoning laws if you can get around them so easily? I'm not from this neighborhood. I live in Saratoga. If John Witt is granted what he's asking for then why do we have laws if any developer can come in and develop any way he/she wants in this City? I don't understand how this project was approved the first time and why it is being considered again. Thank you and I appreciate the opportunity to make my feelings known.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Waring

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If

**From:** [redacted]
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Cc:** "Linda" [redacted]
**Sent:** Saturday, March 12, 2016 11:36:51 AM
**Subject:** Fwd: Witt Construction Downton Walk

Ms. Braden -

My wife Linda and I live at [redacted] East Ave. and also own the residence at [redacted] East Ave. As we have previously communicated to Mr. Witt, we are in support of his project and believe it will ultimately improve the neighborhood. Our one concern, also communicated to Mr. Witt, is in regards to the demolition of the current property. Specifically, this property has been (mostly) vacant and in disrepair for several years and we are worried that there may be various 'pests' living in/on the property that may become dislodged during demolition and then relocate throughout the neighborhood. Mr. Witt has assured us that he will take proper measures to ensure this does not happen. We would ask that the city be aware of this concern and stress/ensure remediation measures are taken when granting Zoning approval.

Regards,

Jeff & Linda Anderson
[redacted] East Avenue
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

Ph. [redacted]

- sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Marci Robinson [redacted] >
**Date:** March 11, 2016 at 11:38:09 AM EST
**To:** Marci Robinson [redacted] >
**Subject: Witt Construction Downton Walk**

All,

We are pleased to inform you that we are moving along with our plans for the property on 27 Jumel Place, Saratoga Springs. Due to the lengthy probate process the City approvals we received have expired. We received approval for an extension from the Planning Board last night and we are scheduled to go before the Zoning Board again this month to apply for an extension. Attached is a drawing of the proposed 7 lot single family condominium project. The project will improve the neighborhood by eliminating the existing commercial building and constructing attractive homes which will fit in the neighborhood with similar setbacks to the existing homes on the street. This project is sure to enhance the neighborhood and increase property values.

We hope that you will express your support by sending a brief email to Susan Barden (the planner assigned to the ZBA) susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org. as we go before the City Zoning Board of Appeals for approval on Monday, March 21, 2016 at 7pm. It is important to include your name and physical address on the email. Please send the email to Susan Barden and cc me so that John Witt will have a copy of all letters supporting the project.

Once the extension is approved, we plan to close on the property and move full speed ahead with construction!

Best,
MR

Marci Robinson
Sales Assistant

Witt Construction, Inc.
563 North Broadway
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866
518.587.4113

[image/jpeg:image002.jpg]

**From:** "John Cashin" [redacted] >
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Friday, March 11, 2016 3:09:21 PM
**Subject:** Downton Walk Zoning Variance

Dear Ms. Barden,
I wish to add my voice to those City residents in opposition to the proposed zoning variances necessary to permit the Witt subdivision called Downton Walk. John Witt has repeatedly shown his insensitivity to the needs of the communities where his subdivisions are being developed. His only concern is to maximize the return on his investment in the parcels he purchases. He has wantonly cleared in a designated "no cut" zone in the Town of Greenfield and has proposed clear cutting in a designated "Open Space" in a planned Conservation subdivision in the town of Saratoga. In the furtherance of his plans, he has repeatedly attempted to misconstrue the provisions of the zoning regulations and the explicit provisions of the Comprehensive Plan to achieve his ends.

While he is fully aware of the Zoning requirements in a Urban Residential-3 zone, Witt simply believes that the Zoning laws and the provisions of the City's Comprehensive Plan do not apply to him. Below I have reproduced an excerpt from an well written and researched article by City resident, Sandy Cohen. The article succinctly describes Witt's attempt to manipulate the zoning provisions well beyond their original intent and shows his total disregard to the explicit provisions of the City's Comprehensive Plan. His lack of concern for community character simply knows no bounds.

Please advise the Zoning Board of Appeals to deny this application.
Respectfully,
John Cashin

The most basic of the issues was the **seven condominiums** he is proposing to build. All will be free-standing structures. So, in his mind, they are basically single-family homes. However, the owners will only be buying the walls and the space within them. The land under and around them will be owned by all the homeowners with an undivided interest and managed by a Homeowners Association that they will direct to maintain and care for it – thus the condominium moniker. The ZBA feels that such ownership is not enough to consider the project a "regular" condominium for zoning purposes – because it will "look like" it's made up of single-family homes. This becomes a confusing issue, because, on one hand, the builder is admitting he is building condos, only because of the land-ownership factor; but, on the other hand, he wants special consideration for his request to place more structures on the lot than allowed by law.

Most communities refer to Witt's model as "zero-lot-line" homes and do not "condominiumize" the land. Zero-lot-line homes are considered **cluster housing** and, in Saratoga Springs, are allowable **only** in the Urban Residential-1 (UR-1) and Suburban Residential-2 (UR-2) districts. The codes for those types of communities require the land to be subdivided before it can be approved. Witt has not applied for subdivision, which requires much heavier oversight before approval. The codes addressing cluster housing **require** adherence to proper set-backs to existing properties, although they can be ignored between the homes within land being developed. They also require a strict percentage of the land to be left green. Witt is requesting relief from those setbacks; and has not even made a request for as much relief as he would need, because of the orientation of the homes on the land. And he is not leaving anywhere near as much green land surrounding those homes as required by law. But even those two issues are trumped by the fact that these **are** condos that may NOT be built in a UR-3 district.

If Witt wants to continue to ask for such allowances, especially for condos/multi-family housing in a UR-3 area, we believe it is incumbent on him – by the City's Comprehensive Plan, Charter, and Zoning Codes – to petition the City Council, which we also believe is the **only** group that can make such exception, by changing language in the Comprehensive Plan itself to allow multi-family housing in a Core Residential Neighborhood-1 (CRN-1) category. However, such a drastic change as this would be opposed by most of the more than 10,000 homeowners throughout the residential neighborhoods in our city.

We contend that the Zoning Board of Appeals will be operating outside of its purview, if it approves Witt's application.

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it

**From:** [redacted]
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Cc:** "Marci Robinson" [redacted]
**Sent:** Friday, March 11, 2016 11:24:45 AM
**Subject:** Witt Construction Downton Walk-Jumel Place

Meghan O'Connor
Realty USA-Scott Varley Team
66 Warren St
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

Susan,

I'm writing this email in support of the Downton Walk on 27 Jumel Place. I have several clients that are very interested in building in this neighborhood. The proposed plans and neighborhood concept will only help and increase the value of existing homes. This John Witt project will be a great addition to the city of Saratoga Springs. Please make sure that this email is recorded in favor of the project. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Meghan OConnor

3/14/2016

To: Saratoga Zoning Board of Appeals

Saratoga Council and Planning Board,

First of all I can appreciate the awkward position in which the proposal to develop 27 Jumel Place puts the Zoning Board of Appeals, after having already approved the numerous substantial variances two years ago. Having said that, this also gives the Zoning Board, the neighborhood, and the Saratoga Community at large, another opportunity to take a second look at this proposal and its potential city wide long term effects.

I think we all agree the development of the property into residential use could be an asset to the neighborhood and the City Tax Rolls as well.

**The broader questions, First :** Is this is the right development for this piece of property? John Witt and his construction company are well-known at producing high quality, high end units. By John's own description this would add six million + to the tax rolls. However, a project of this magnitude on this property is requiring numerous (at least 5) and substantial variances (90% and more) relief with major modifications to the zoning regulations in a residential area.

**Second:** There are questions as to this *type* of development in the UR-3 zoning. This kind of development seems to be a first for the City's residential areas…Do we really want to make quasi-single family / condominium a precedent for change for other parts of the City's residential zoning?

One of the criteria that the Zoning Board of Appeals must consider is **"Whether the benefits sought by the applicant can be achieved by any other means".**

Does anybody really believe you need a six million dollar plus project to reasonably and economically develop this site? It seems reasonable that a scaled back project even in the 3 to 4 million dollar range that stays within zoning requirements would be feasible and lucrative. Even at that level it far surpasses the value of any property in the area, perhaps even the Eastside. Understandably a developer wants to maximize their investment; however it should not be the role of the Zoning Board of Appeals to grant variances to ensure increased profitability of the development. A more modest development that remains within the guidelines is in order.

Another criterion the ZBA must consider is **"Whether the variances will produce an undesirable change in the neighborhood or a detriment to nearby properties"**.

An increase of lot coverage over 50% above Zoning restrictions is very significant, especially considering this is one of the largest parcels in the neighborhood. Although none of the public materials available indicate the height of any of the buildings, presumably all are well under the 60 ft zoning limit. Pertaining to the two Jumel Place facing structures however, the graphics indicate 3 stories with copula's which are well above the surrounding 1 to 1 ½ story homes; in addition they rise up 1 foot from the sidewalk. Slightly smaller homes appear to be depicted toward the rear of the property. At such heights privacy to the surrounding neighboring back yards is reduced. The development is also surrounded with a 6 to 8 foot opaque wall separating the older neighboring properties from the new development. All of these would seem to be an undesirable change if not a detriment to the neighborhood. A more modest development that remains within the guidelines would be appropriate.

A third consideration of the ZBA is **"Whether the variance is substantial"**

**All Five** of the variances sought after seem very substantial, ranging from a 50% to 90% relief in the codes. A more modest development that remains within the guidelines is obtainable.

And the last ZBA consideration: **"Was the alleged difficulty self created?"**

The concerns of criteria 1, 2, & 3 can all be resolved with: A more modest development that remains within the guidelines of the zoning.

I urge the Zoning Board of Appeals to deny the zoning variances and to suggest a redesign of the proposed development.

Respectively Submitted,

Gerald Mattison

[redacted]

# SARATOGA COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

**TOM L. LEWIS**
**CHAIRMAN**

**JASON KEMPER**
**DIRECTOR**

March 22, 2016

Susan Barden, Senior Planner
City of Saratoga Springs
City Hall, 474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

**RE: SCPB Referral Review#13-109–Area Variance- ANW Holdings/Witt**
Demolition of existing building to construct a 7-unit condo building needing variances for front yard setbacks, lot coverage and height for exterior fence. Jumel Place, north side & Granger Ave., west side.

Received from the City of Saratoga Springs Zoning Board of Appeals on March 18, 2016.

Reviewed by the Saratoga County Planning Board on March 22, 2016.

**Decision**: No Significant County Wide or Inter Community Impact

**Comment:** We recognize the referral to be submitted because the original variances granted to the appellant on May 1, 2014 have expired without any activity having been undertaken. It is additionally acknowledged that the appellant has presented nothing of great magnitude as new or additional to the variance request made since our last review of the project. In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City of Saratoga Springs Zoning Board of Appeals and the Saratoga County Planning Board (SCPB) the above-noted area variances have been reviewed and deemed to present no impacts or issues of a countywide or intermunicipal nature.

Michael Valentine, Senior Planner
Authorized Agent for Saratoga County

**DISCLAIMER:** Recommendations made by the Saratoga County Planning Board on referrals and subdivisions are based upon the receipt and review of a "full statement of such proposed action" provided directly to SCPB by the municipal referring agency as stated under General Municipal Law section 239. A determination of action is rendered by the SCPB based upon the completeness and accuracy of information presented by its staff. The SCPB cannot be accountable for a decision rendered through incomplete or inaccurate information received as part of the complete statement.

**50 WEST HIGH STREET**
**BALLSTON SPA, NY 12020**

**(518) 884-4705 PHONE**
**(518) 884-4780 FAX**

From: D. Mattison< dgmattison@verizon.net>
Date: March 18, 2016
To: susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org
The Zoning Board of Appeals of the City of Saratoga Springs, NY

Re: Application for "seven single family condominiums,"
and requests for substantial Zoning Variances at
27 Jumel Place, Saratoga Springs, by ANW Holdings, Builder, John Witt
Public Hearing #2 to be held at the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting on March 21, 2016

I am writing this letter prior to the March 21st, 2016 meeting of the Saratoga Springs Zoning Board in regard to the proposed zoning variances being requested by builder John Witt for the property located at 27 Jumel Place in Saratoga Springs, New York. I am hoping that you will forward this to members of The Zoning Board of Appeals of Saratoga Springs.

Mr. Witt is creating an oversized project which is out of character with the existing homes on the street. He is making intrusive variance requests. In his letter to neighbors dated February 11, 2016 he understated the variances requested, (3 rather than 5). Therefore neighbors were given incomplete and deceptive information about the project. His letter asked for:

-Increased lot coverage by 16%
-Decrease minimum front yard setback by 9 feet
-Raise the height of the residential fence by 2 feet

In actuality, there are five variances being requested that include:

1 – The maximum building coverage allowed on this lot is 30%. The previous request was for a 43.5% building coverage allowance, or 45% more than what is allowed. The request has been increased to 46%, or 53.3% more than what is allowed.

2 – The rear yard setback required for each unit is 25 feet. The applicant is asking that this requirement be eliminated by 100% for five units, going from the 25 feet required to zero (0) feet. For the remaining two units he is asking for a 76% reduction in the rear yard setback from 25 feet to 6 feet.

3 – The front yard setback required for the two front units is 10 feet. The applicant is asking for one (1) foot, a 90% reduction in the front yard setback.

4 – The fence height allowed in this UR-3 residential area is six feet. The applicant is asking for an eight foot fence, a 33% increase in height over what is allowed.

5 – The applicant is asking for a maximum principal building on one lot to be increased from one to seven, a 600% increase.

It would be a travesty for the board to disregard the above facts and override zoning ordinances that have been in effect for years. At the very least, a compromise of the extreme variance requests needs to be negotiated.

It is my hope that these substantial variances, as they are proposed, be denied.

Sincerely,
Debra Mattison
206 Lake Avenue

change.org

# Saratoga Neighbors for Zoning Enforcement

Recipient: Saratoga Springs Zoning Board of Appeals and Susan Barden

Letter: Greetings,

Keep Saratoga Springs Neighborhoods Special: Enforce our Zoning codes!

# Comments

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sam Brewton | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-15 | We're not against developing this plot, but we opposed the massive scope of the requested variances, loss of setbacks, and the cramming-in of more buildings than this lot is zoned for. What's the point of zoning if it can be this easily skirted? This lot can be successfully developed, and we'd welcome this same developer if a more reasonable plan were presented. |
| Holly Bates | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga Springs is changing far too quickly and losing the character that made it so beloved. These changes are so often the result of wealthy developers making their way around zoning laws that are there for a reason. Our officials have been elected by the citizens of Saratoga Springs, and as such, they are the people to whom they should listen. |
| jeannine moran | saratoga springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Uphold our zoning laws and do not cave to developers. |
| Kira Cohen | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I grew up in Saratoga Springs and have lived 25 years in the neighborhood that is threatened by this development. I do not want to see my neighborhood put at risk by the casting aside of our city's zoning ordinance. The Saratoga Neighbors for Zoning Enforcement does not oppose new housing in our neighborhood, we simply feel that the scale of this project is beyond necessary and asks for too many variances to the zoning laws of our district. This puts not only our homes at risk, but the new homes as well. It also opens the door for these types of overboard developments to move into other residential neighborhoods throughout town - thus dismantling the core ideology behind our comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance, and disrupting the historical character and dignity of our beautiful town. |
| Margaret Selikoff | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | There is no reason for this type of development in this neighborhood. |
| Kim Fonda | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I am sick and tired of double standards. The Zoning Board is a disgrace and our hopes for good stewardship decline day by day! |
| Janice Pancake | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | If this goes as planned, it will set a precedent in our city that builders can get zoning laws changed and build wherever they want. Seems to me that our city has allowed all kinds of new, unaffordable, condos, etc. and taken the charm away from my hometown... |
| Joann Lorman | Porter Corners, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga is getting to many large buildings. ..let's not lose its charm! |
| Robert Bostick | Arlington, VA | 2016-03-16 | I love the Saratoga of my childhood, my youth and to alter those memories of the alleys, streets and diverse neighborhoods would be sacrilege. |
| John Veitch | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | This is not proper for that neighborhood. Simply out of character. I live next to the old St. John Neumann residence, and that conversion was fine for that building. This is not appropriate for Jumel Place |
| Liam Sheji | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | It's important to preserve our cities history, and replacing our historic buildings is a crime to our lifestyle |
| Marie falls | Lorton, VA | 2016-03-16 | I hate seeing my hometown lose its charm! |
| Steven McCarthy | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Enough is Enough |
| Martha Strohl | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | The Comprehensive Plan and our zoning codes are meant to be observed, not abused. |
| Lillian Spost | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga risks losing the charm that is its reputation. |
| Michael Gent | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Once you open the floodgates,there'll be no stopping them.The town is enough of a mess already. |

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Anthony Smith | Washington, DC | 2016-03-16 | I'm shocked that the lovely tree-lined streets of my hometown would be destroyed by this condo developer.<br><br>Enforce the zoning laws and stop this blight on the community. |
| shawn banner | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Our town is special because far sighted folk created a charter and zoning codes that preserve what is best about Saratoga. Lately, it seems that special dispensation keeps getting given to folks who want to build exactly what those far-sighted zoning laws and city planning decisions were meant to avoid. Growth is good--in fact, growth is great, but not growth that breaks the carefully crafted rules that make Saratoga a pleasure to reside in. Please do not keep giving in to developers' whims at the expense of what makes our fair city both fair and special! |
| Z. Parisi | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | cp |
| Amber Duffney | Keeseville, NY | 2016-03-16 | O remember Saratoga the way it used to be. I have seen neighborhoods destroyed by "improvement", I would hate to see Saratoga to become a city of high rises, and loose it's charm and historic value. |
| Sunshine Stewart | Greenfield Center, NY | 2016-03-16 | Keep Saratoga beautiful!!! |
| Meghan Cherny | Corinth, NY | 2016-03-16 | Bit by bit we are losing our history and our roots, that which makes it all beautiful. Saratoga is beautifully old, we must fight for her. |
| Janice Bellamy | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Too many extreme variances requested. This won't blend in with the neighborhood. The builder is asking the Zoning Board for special treatment. |
| Amy Barakat | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I don't like the direction my hometown has headed since I was a child. Too much commercialization and too much building. |
| patricia rubio | saratoga springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I am concerned about the violation of the City zoning laws the variance would entail. |
| Kathleen Brown | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Wrong plan, wrong place, & more overpriced real estate not needed! |
| bob mctague | saratoga sp, NY | 2016-03-16 | Our neighborhoods are under attack by greedy builders who have no reguard for families that live in the communities. |
| Daniel Schwank | xxxxxxxxxx, NY | 2016-03-16 | I'm against the overdevelopment that's destroying this town |
| Shealyn Heritage | Ballston Spa, NY | 2016-03-16 | I for one may not live I Toga directly but was born at Saratoga hospital lived in the outside towns all my life and have many Saratoga relatives of all era of Saratoga. It sadden my heart thinking about the stories I've heard of old Saratoga, Stories I have from Saratoga In the times before all the condo when we went to see our Saratoga family and The Saratoga now. Why does everything have to be so glamorized. We need some original and not just Original historical. Stop changing zoning laws for these big wig glamizatation. |
| Cindy June | Ballston Spa, NY | 2016-03-16 | Save my hometown from the developers who only see $$$$$$ |
| Lori LeBarron | Gansevoort, NY | 2016-03-16 | There seems to an influx of developers who are presenting proposals that do not adhere to Saratoga Springs zoning laws. This needs to stop! |
| Leslie Brown | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | There is way too much development in Saratoga and we're losing the quietness of the city. Please stop the building. |
| Joan Nellhaus | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | This is wrong in so many ways. Integrity must be maintained. |
| Hillary Takahashi | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Protect our picturesque and wonderful neighborhoods. |
| Mary O'Donnell | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | As a native, I have watched our city change way too much and not for the better in my estimation. This project would set a precedent and continue to ruin the very reason some people moved here. We want to keep our city's character. |

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jay Rogoff | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Approval of Downton Walk, a development entirely out of character with the neighborhood, would send a signal to developers that our zoning regulations are meaningless and can be circumvented at will. |
| Judi Duclos | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I do not like the path that our beautiful city seems to be on!!!!! |
| Penny Jolly | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | This is a residential neighborhood, protected supposedly by our zoning laws. Please observe those laws! Do NOT permit all these special variances. Don't overcrowd our neighborhoods and try to make them into something they are not: a pretentious "Downton Walk" with expensive condos instead of separate one-family homes of modest size. |
| Brucie Rosch | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Developers can make their money elsewhere. It would be one thing if they had a track record of building affordable housing in Saratoga Springs, but They. Do. Not. |
| Tracy Millis | Saratoga Springs, NY, NY | 2016-03-16 | The entire project is foolish. |
| Regina Camilletti | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | This development will scar an otherwise homogenous, established neighborhood of older homes. People are invested in these homes and that neighborhood. Who has the right to step in and on behalf of a builder and his cohort, threaten their investment? If anything goes, how about lets build some stables next to City Hall and put those 7 condos on East, really close to Skidmore. Sure. I would sue you if I could. |
| Jacklyn Clark | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I don't want this in my neighborhood, I've lived on this street for 24 years and to alter the streetscape with gaudy condos would be a disgrace. More importantly if the city government allows this to become reality that would be sinful. Keep within the parameters of the neighborhood, amen!!!!!! |
| Barbara Ungar | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Developers and greed are ruining what makes Saratoga Springs a desirable place to live and visit. |
| Celete Caruso | Saratoga springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I'm signing because the Integrity of each neighborhood within the city needs to be maintained |
| Suzanne kwasniewski | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Too many projects are approved that deviate from zoning ordinances. |
| Richard Hibbert | Burlington, VT | 2016-03-16 | My mother has lived on Jumel Place, in the other block, since 1959. My siblings and I spent part of our formative years in that neighborhood. The house belongs to our family, and we value the character of the neighborhood. That includes the portion of the street for which this project is proposed. I believe that this would be a drastic, and negative, change in the character of this part of the city. |
| Annette Damron | Lecanto, FL | 2016-03-16 | I was born and raised there and don't want to come home to a metropolis. |
| Susan Traylor | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I don't want Saratoga Springs, my beautiful home town to turn into a Clifton Park! |
| Marisa Wade | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga is starting to loose some of it's charm to all of these apartments and condominiums |
| JOHN DUANE | Middle Grove, NY | 2016-03-16 | to keep saratoga saratoga ! |
| Arthur Porter III | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I believe that this is yet another example of the abuse of the zoning variance process to circumvent existing zoning designations and the Comprehensive Plan. |
| Katherine Totten | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Enough is enough |
| Karin Vollkommer | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | This project is too big for the neighborhood. |
| kathleen orefice | westport, CT | 2016-03-16 | I want Saratoga to stay the way it is. It's already changing too much. |

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Amy Syrell | South Glens Falls, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga Springs needs to be a place for all people, not just those with a lot of money. |
| Jill P McMahon | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | The project seems too large for the space available. More shoehorning of big houses out of character with the neighborhood that loom over their neighbors. |
| Frank Capone | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | preserve the residential character |
| Bette Brill | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Just do not change the zoning laws for this or any project in a neighborhood that is not zoned for it.... |
| amejo amyot | saratoga springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I like green space around homes and consistent density in neighborhoods. this is a 1 and 2 family area. |
| Patricia Cornute | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Too many developments already in our town, hard to recognize the charming place it used to be., when the sun can't even shine down on you as you walk down certain streets any more. |
| sue scherer | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Enough with the overgrowth. |
| linda battiste | Schenectady, NY | 2016-03-16 | I grew up in Saratoga and it's beautiful the way it is! |
| Mary Frances Healy | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I have lived here my whole life and don't like the direction we are going |
| MaryAnn Wager | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I have lived in Saratoga my entire life and I am concerned for the future of our beautiful city. It is quickly losing its historical look and feel. |
| Patricia Mathews | Sanford, ME | 2016-03-16 | I strongly believe in preserving the integrity of all cities, but most importantly those cities that represent the history of our country. I lived on Jumel Place until I graduated from college. When I go back to visit family I am often disappointed to see yet another set of new and expensive Town Houses, apartment buildings, hotels, and condos. With each change Saratoga Springs loses a little of its identity. Just take a walk on Jumel Place, and you will clearly see that a development of this type is out of character with the neighborhood. Saratoga, a city I have always been proud to call my hometown, should not lose its charm to moneymaking investments. |
| Deb Garrelts | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I agree that we are being over-run with condominiums and that our neighborhoods need protection |
| Denise Dart | Clifton Park, NY | 2016-03-16 | I'm signing because I am a native Saratogian and the alleged zoning codes worked against my Dad and now we have foreigners coming in and being allowed to build wherever and however big they want just because they have the money. |
| Barbara Claydon | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | inappropriate development of the space for the existing neighborhood in which I happen to live |
| Paul Hibbert | Broken Arrow, OK | 2016-03-16 | My family has property on Jumel place |
| Chris Pringle | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I've lived in saratoga almost all my life and I'm sick of seeing this great little town desecrated by these monstrosities being built with no thought what so ever. The west side of town now looks like a haven for yuppies and has driven out the families that have resided there for years. Downtown hardly looks the same as I remember it as a child. All the once family owned businesses that occupied Broadway are now gone and these corporate goons have bullied their way in forcing the rent to a ridiculous level that only 6 figure a year income families can afford. This use to be a great place to live a place I called home now I don't even recognize the town I grew up in. Enough is enough. |
| Joyce McKnight | Lake Luzerne, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga Springs already has empty developments...the zoning board is either ineffectual or "on the take." |

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ann Diller | Gansevoort, NY | 2016-03-16 | I am appalled at the over-development that has changed our city so that it unaffordable to longtimers, courtesy of boards that are overly generous to devevlopers. |
| Randy Hammond | Porter Corners, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga is heading in the wrong direction |
| helen travis | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | They are destroying Saratoga making hard for families to live homeless rase now its more homeless families working families that can't effored Saratoga price or anywhere els for that matter rent has raise so high everywhere its sad and decrees |
| kayla rynasko | Schenectady, NY | 2016-03-16 | Born and raised in Saratoga. Graduate of Saratoga high. All my family lives here! |
| Kathy Becker | Greenfield Center, NY | 2016-03-16 | I was born and raised in Saratoga Springs. I am so upset by huge changes that have been made in Saratoga. What ever happened to preserving the historical buildings in the city. It looks like the almighty dollar has won out. It is such a shame and so sad. |
| Liz Mark | Gansevoort, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga is being overrun by greedy developers like Bonacio and losing its charm. |
| Charles Kish | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | The character of too many neighborhoods are at stake when projects are granted that require numerous large scale changes to existing zoning. When developers profit concerns trump zoning considerations and justifiable and considered opposition by neighbors to this degree, who's opposition is totally supported by current zoning, the zoning board is not doing it's job. There is zoning for a reason based on long term plans and consideration for the city as a whole. Wholesale variances granted solely for the purpose of developer profit is is a travesty. |
| Nancy Flynn | Buskirk, NY | 2016-03-17 | We have a family home on the other block of Jumel  Place that my mom lives in and believe this will hurt the whole street  and set a bad precedent. |
| Ann Haller | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | This is an inappropriate use if the land. It is not in accordance with the zoning. developers should not be exempt from rules just because they want to maximize their profits.  The city is running out of build-able lots, so the developer is trying to squeeze as much profit as he can out of this lot. |
| renee harder | gansevoort, NY | 2016-03-17 | way to much development now |
| Richard Dunham | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | I do not believe that a previous factory/Dance Studio in a residential neighborhood needs to be re-zoned to accommodate more living space than the current regulations allow.<br>Enough cronieism. Build a house, or two. |
| Kelly Mackison | Gansevoort, NY | 2016-03-17 | I am bored in raided is Saratoga |
| Jodi Stevens | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | I grew up on this area and just can't stand by and watch the integrity of this beautiful, quaint neighborhood be destroyed... |
| Jennifer Kleindienst | Middletown, CT | 2016-03-17 | I grew up near Saratoga and visit often. I would hate to see the city's charm erode with a project like this. |
| Patricia Duval | Portland, OR | 2016-03-17 | To oppose approvals requested for this project. Plan is totally irrelevant to the existing neighborhood. Approving these requests would set a bad precedent and many of Saratoga neighborhoods would be at risk. |
| Gloria Burke | Waterville, ME | 2016-03-17 | This would set a terrible president. |
| Dorene Couch | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | I want to show my support for our local residents and weigh in on matters of development that will have a negative impact on our neighborhoods |

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Wayne T. Senecal | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | I believe the developer's application is a change in use requiring City Council Approval not just Zoning Board of Appeals approval. |
| Jerome Luhn | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | People are entitled to know what development plans are being proposed so that they, and the officials entrusted with authority over zoning decisions, can make informed judgments that affect the character of the place where they live over the long term. Seemingly material omissions in presentation, together with behavior by the developer and relevant board officials, have given neighbors reason to raise questions, such as whose interests enjoy primacy in this proposal? No one wants to wake to rude surprises after the foundations are poured. That's something any developer should understand. |
| Sheila Levo | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | I'm signing because although I am a Saratoga native, I no longer live in the city After my husband died, I sold my house as the upkeep (lawn, snow, etc.) was too much for me. The prices for decent rentals in the city were outrageous. I was forced to look elsewhere and as a consequence, I now live in Ballston. This project, if allowed, would be another example of pricing the the middle class out Saratoga. |
| Melanie Herter | New York City, NY | 2016-03-17 | Trying to keep my neighborhood from illegal property use and major congestion |
| Ina Harney | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | This has to stop in Saratoga, not only in my backyard but this one too. Residents have to pay attention to all of these plans, not only their neighborhoods. Every time the builders manage to get one over on our city government leaders and build these monstrocsities it gives them permission to ruin another neighborhood. |
| Nicholas Rossi | Parrish, FL | 2016-03-17 | I lived in Saratoga 62yrs. I grew up in that part of town & owned a home at 213 East AVE. Allowing this development is wrong |
| James Lestrange | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | Stop putting the interests of the wealthy ahead of long time Saratoga residents. We have enough development already. Too many people moving in making everything more expensive and causing traffic congestion. |
| richard bradley | Ballston Spa, NY | 2016-03-17 | developers are destroying the Saratoga I grew up in. they just need to leave things alone. they are just fine as they are |
| Henry Bovee | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | For my friend |
| Michael Graul | Granby, CO | 2016-03-17 | I would like to see the zoning laws upheld in this single family neighborhood where I grew up. I hope those individuals on the zoning board haven't lost sight of doing what is right. |
| HEATHER STABLES | SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY | 2016-03-18 | This is NOT NYC.... |
| Michael Stoneback | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-18 | developers are ruining the city with maximizing land use with the approval of city boards and their own interpretation of zoning |

**A NOT-SO-LITTLE BIT OF INTERESTING DOWNTON INFO . . .**

On closer inspection of the plans for Downton Walk, I realized that I had picked up **footprint** square footage for the homes from the permeability chart. It is my understanding that, for permeability numbers, one presents the square-foot measurements of the footprint of the home **only**. That means **only the first floor** of a multi-story home.

That is where I got the size figures I posted in my previous letters. That begins to explain why, in the builder's response to my latest missive, the square footage **he** presented had jumped at the high end, to 3,000**+** square feet. **Note the plus sign**. We believe it's there for a reason . . .

If a builder puts the square footage of the footprint on a permeability chart, and it is 2,700 square feet for example, it is likely that the square footage of the entire house -- all floors -- will be much larger than that.

So, using rough figures as an example, because it's impossible to know if the second floor will cover every square foot of what is below it (some homes have slightly smaller second floors – but not usually very much so), one **could** estimate that a home that we thought was 2,700 sq. ft. could really be as large as 4,000 to even 5,400 square feet (the discrepancy being any porches and overhangs included in that 2,700 figure; and the second floor might or might not extend over them.)

This leads us to the permeability chart for Downton Walk . . .

The numbers are not all easy to read, as this is a small side chart, on a plan that has fuzzy type. And, keep in mind, this is supposed to be the **footprint** of the building – including **only** the first floor (overhangs and porches are in other areas of the chart).

The footprints of the seven homes alone add up to 14,526 sq.ft. (builder's numbers).

The builder has already told us that two of the structures are 1,800 sq.ft. – which would probably be those with the 1,357 sq.ft. and 1,472 sq.ft. footprints on his chart. Let's assume they will be exactly 1,800 sq.ft. each. That means that the second floor adds just under 40% to the footprint size.

On the larger ones, he has quoted 2,800 – 3,000+ sq.ft.

To begin at his 2,800-sq.ft. number for the larger homes, you also need to add around 40% to the smallest large home.

So we'll use 40% as a general guide.

(**ALERT**: This is where that plus sign after the 3,000 sq.ft. quote comes in; because a 2,759 sq.ft. home footprint – which is the size of one footprint on his chart – **without** its attached garage that would add almost 600 sq.ft. more -- with only 40% added for a second floor, means there likely will be at least a 3,900 sq.ft. structure [and the overhangs will add an additional 228 sq. ft. and the garage almost 600 sq. ft. more, for a total of approximately 4,700 sq.ft.]. We have no way of knowing if the builder will be including living space over the garage, so we didn't include that in these figures.) Obviously, much more detail is needed from the builder.

The builder has said that the total **footprint** for all seven homes is 14,526 sq. ft. That does NOT include the roof overhangs. In addition, the garages themselves total 4,175 sq.ft. (Again, please keep in mind that, not having seen full architectural plans, we can't tell if there will be any living space built above the garages, so although we are adding in the builder's number, we are not adjusting the garage number with the additional 40 percent.)

The following total is likely on the small side, because we're assuming that the second floor is only 40% the size of the first floor (not very likely); and we're **ignoring** that the plans show windows in four different floors of the buildings. Why would there be windows in a basement, if it is only used for storage? And the window on the top floor is a clue to the possibility of a small attic room as well.

Please keep in mind that the surrounding homes on Jumel Place average about around 1,450 sq.ft., with half of them being somewhat smaller, and one as small as 900 sq. ft**. (This includes the total interior square footage of all floors.)**

Because of the way Downton Walk homes are situated in the plans, and because there is such little room for green space between them, they will mass visually, on Jumel Place, as if they are one giant compound, likely exceeding 25,000 sq. ft. -- including the homes, the (*single-story*) garages, and the porches. (Note: There is also something labeled "Living" that is another 5,665 sq.ft. in the non-permeable section. Because we cannot determine what that is, exactly, it is not included it in the 25,000 estimated sq.ft. size of the "Downton Walk Enclosure".

If this project goes through to completion as currently designed, the only upside we see, in addition to the removal of the existing factory building, might be the possibility of more Hershey bars at Halloween.

###

MORE THAN 25,000 SQUARE FOOT MASS ?
A NOT-SO-LITTLE BIT OF INTERESTING DOWNTON INFO . . .

On closer inspection of the plans for Downton Walk, it appears that there has been some misconception regarding the actual size of the development. If people are visualizing the quoted sizes that have been used in the various articles that have previously been presented, they might be in for a surprise.

It appears that a complex that felt large at the 14,526 sq.ft.-total of first-floor footprints -– which is the only measurement that was written the drawings –- when massed together as complete homes -- will likely produce what, visually, will appear to be an almost contiguous structure well in excess of 25,000 sq.ft.

This writer, for one, previously referred to square-footage for the homes from the builder's permeability chart. However, for permeability numbers, only the square-foot measurements of the first floor of the home are used, regardless of how many stories will be added to that. So the actual structure, once it is built, unless it is single-story construction, will be appreciably larger. And the drawings of Downton Walk indicate homes with two or more floors.

Please note that, to get to the larger figure, we have used 40% as a conservative addition for the second floors of these homes. There is no way of knowing how these homes will really lay out, because Mr. Witt has not provided this important information to the neighbors or community. Many homes in Saratoga are built

almost like boxes, with the first floor and second floor being exactly the same size. In such case, one would simply double the square footage to get the total living area. Others have a more modest upper level. So 40% was our compromise.

And keep in mind that we're ignoring that the plans show windows for four different levels. Why would there be windows in a basement, if it is only used for storage? And the window on the top floor is sometimes a clue to the possibility of a small attic room as well. We also have added nothing for any space that might be built above the garages. So that "in excess of 25,000 sq.ft." could easily become a much larger number. Obviously, more detail is needed from the builder to be complete on this.

But this begins to explain why, in the builder's response to my latest missive, the square footage he presented had jumped at the high end, to 3,000**+** square feet. His plus-sign is quite accurate, because the addition of multiple floors to the home sizes written on that chart makes a huge difference.

For perspective, please keep in mind that the surrounding homes on Jumel Place average about 1,450 sq.ft., in size, with half of them being somewhat smaller, and one as small as 900 sq. ft. (This includes the total interior square footage of both floors on any two-story structures.)

So, visually, five of those average-size Jumel Place homes, if placed on that lot after subdivision to the maximum number of homes allowed there by Code, would create a visual mass of only 12,100 square feet, including relative proportions of Mr. Witt's figures for overhangs, garages, porches, and such -- less than half of what is proposed (and only conservatively approximated) -- and much more in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.

The ZBA should allow Mr. Witt to build what **is** permitted there: five single-family homes or four two-family homes, not "seven single-family condominiums" which are not permitted in an Urban Residential–3 Zoning District.

###

Susan Barden
Zoning Board of Appeals
Saratoga Springs City Hall

17 March, 2016

Ms. Barden & Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals,

I have lived on the 200 block of Lake Avenue for 25 years. The back property line of my home abuts the property of 27 Jumel Place and runs nearly its entire length. I have a great many concerns in regard to the Downton Walk development plan that is proposed for that location.

Our current zoning laws forbid developments of this kind, not only in our Urban Residential-3 classification, but also within the larger Core Residential Neighborhood-1. Multi-family housing is against the codes.

Mr. Witt's proposal that this project is a "single-family condominium" attempts to skirt these codes by tying together two separate types of housing. Either it is a single-family designation, or it is a condominium. To go forward as single-family and fit multiple homes on the lot, he would have to subdivide – for which he has not applied. This would only allow up to five homes on the lot, not seven as proposed. Without subdivision, it goes forward as a condominium, which is forbidden in this district.

In order to accommodate seven homes onto the lot, several variances to the legal property setbacks have been requested. However, these variances are not within an acceptable range. They seek to nullify nearly all space between properties. The legal setback is 25 ft. A variance bringing that space down to 6 ft. is unacceptable. It poses privacy issues, as well as safety issues for not only the existing neighbors, but for those who will be living in these new homes.

Yes, the current building at 27 Jumel sits on top of its property lines. It was built before zoning laws were implemented to protect the character and safety of our neighborhoods. The proximity of the current structure has always been a sore point, but I feel that adding only 6 ft. of space is still not adequate to provide privacy and prevent noise. Especially since the trees that exist along the back will be removed and cannot be replaced, as they would pose a risk to the foundations of these new homes.

I, and my neighbors, do not oppose new housing being brought into our neighborhood. We fully support Mr. Witt's effort to provide residential infill for the city and beautify the street of Jumel Place. However, we feel the scale of this project is over-zealous and out of character - not only for our neighborhood, but with the rest of Saratoga as well. A neighborhood boasting very modest sized homes (averaging 1450 sq.ft.) that are late American victorian/craftsman/turn-of-the-century in design is not the proper place for extremely large English country style homes.

Should the Downton Walk development be approved with the current variance requests, it paves the way for future developments of this scale to move into other neighborhoods throughout town, thus threatening the integrity and historical character of our city.

The neighbors ask that there be negotiation on the scale of the project and the requested variances. We would love to welcome Mr. Witt's talents into our neighborhood. But we desire our zoning laws to be upheld. They were not put in place just to be cast aside on a whim. We ask that you please take our concerns into consideration.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Kira Cohen

signatures_1458277405

| Name | Postal Code | State | Signed On |
|---|---|---|---|
| Chris Mathiesen | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Kristin Brenner | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-15 |
| Catherine Golden | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-15 |
| Olivia Cruz | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-15 |
| Scott Starr | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-15 |
| Bryan N. | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Jane Stevens | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Jeannine Moran | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Carol Schupp Star | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Karen Pettigrew | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Margaret Selikoff | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Kim Fonda | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| kathy shimm | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Ronnie Betor | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Frank Callucci | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| debbie barry | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| isabella warner | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Mary Tipton | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Claire Demarest | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| John Veitch | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Liam Sheji | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Jim Favaloro | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Philip Donnelly | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Jennifer South | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Theresa Boisseau | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Susan DeRossi | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Christine Guarnieri | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Carrie Warner | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Jena Rotheim | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Steven McCarthy | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Martha Strohl | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Cherylle Hudak | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Lillian Spost | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Michael Gent | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Melany Gent | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Rob Wright | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Shawn Banner | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Randi Kish | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Mame Noonan | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Lynn Blasso | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| John Kaufmann | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Deena Smith | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Janice Bellamy | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Lynda goodness | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Martha Ray | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Amy Barakat | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| patricia rubio | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Kathleen Brown | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Pepper Wolfe | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Robert McTague | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Daniel Schwank | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Gordon Ray | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Emma Folkins | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Theresa Capozzola | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Leslie Brown | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Joan Nellhaus | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Gabriel Stinson | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Laura Blunt | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Nancy Wilder | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Hillary Takahashi | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Judith Brenner | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Mary O'Donnell | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Jay Rogoff | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Judi Duclos | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Penny Jolly | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Frank DeRossi | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Brucie Rosch | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Tracy Millis III | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Regina Camilletti | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Jacklyn Clark | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Barbara Ungar | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Celete Caruso | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Suzanne kwasniewski | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Deborah Millis | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Johanna Garrison | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| William Pettigrew | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Robert Lippman | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Peter Lee | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Susan Traylor | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Marisa Wade | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Arthur Porter | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Kathryn Fitzgerald | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Annmarie Palmieri | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| doug lake | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Nanci StJohn | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Katherine Totten | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Robin Kish | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Rhea Demory | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| John Schroeder | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Derek Olsen | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Teri Blasko | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Karin Vollkommer | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| David Lombardo | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Dina Fittipaldi | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Margaret Fittipaldi | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Julio Olvera | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Holly Lawton | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Jill P McMahon | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Stephen Farenell | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Frank Capone | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Bette Brill | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| amejo amyot | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Joy Burke | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Patricia Cornute | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| sue scherer | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| David Morris | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Mary Frances Healy | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Tara Chhabra | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Annette Carman | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| MaryAnn Wager | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Stephanie Ryall | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Lisa Campilango | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Deborah Garrelts | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Joosje Anderson | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Barbara Claydon | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Chris Pringle | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| monica winn | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Tracey Radigan | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Amy Hichman | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Rick Moran | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Kayla Rynasko | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Jeanne Oconnor | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Chuck Lamb | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Charles Kish | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Colleen Downing | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Ann Haller | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Ellen Boyce | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Deanne Marg | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Richard Dunham | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Jodi Stevens | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Louisa Foye | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Karen Thomas | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Joseph Marcuccio | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Vicki Feldman | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Patricia Duval | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Gloria Burke | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Tamara Woolsey | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Dorene Couch | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Ingrid H Stone | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Barbara Proctor | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Sandra Cohen | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-15 |
| Oona Grady | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Roxanne Mead | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Wayne T. Senecal | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Tara Martin | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| EDWARD Jewell | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Jerome Luhn | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Sheila Levo | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| William Yusavage | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Melanie Herter | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Ina Harney | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| James Lestrange | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Loretta Martin | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| LeeAnne Olsen | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Joanne Dwornik | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Alan Edstrom | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Henry Bovee | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Sam Brewton | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-15 |
| Michelle Deyette | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Judy Riester | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Holly Bates | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Ann Sette | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Kira Cohen | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-15 |
| Michelle Deyette | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Judy Riester | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Holly Bates | 12866 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Michele McClure | 12871 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Susan king | 12871 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| doug klein | 12871 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| james brophy | 12877 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Amy Syrell | 12803 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Jarred Butler | 12822 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Meghan Cherny | 12822 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Gary Daluisio | 12831 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Erin Wiggin | 12831 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Llona Hogan | 12831 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Lori LeBarron | 12831 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Davene Jones | 12831 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Diller Ann | 12831 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Liz Mark | 12831 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| renee harder | 12831 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Kelly O'DONNELL -Mackison | 12831 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Sunshine Stewart | 12833 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Darrell Rikert | 12833 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Kathy Becker | 12833 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Joyce McKnight | 12846 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| JOHN DUANE | 12850 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Joann Lorman | 12859 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Randy Hammond | 12859 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Noah Casner | 12865 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Amber Duffney | 12944 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Julie Behrens | 13743 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Ardath Stroman | 14105 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Tracy Maimone | 14445 | New York | 2016-03-16 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Michael Yarinsky | 11205 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Janice Pancake | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Sherry Dapello | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Beverlee Patterson | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Shealyn Heritage | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Cindy June | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Michelle Cameron | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Cathy Hoff | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Beverlee Patterson | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Martha Almgren | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| richard bradley | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Nancy Flynn | 12028 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Thomas Wadsworth | 12043 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Hannah Christopher Christopher | 12065 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Vanessa Saari | 12065 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Denise Dart | 12065 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Eric Gould | 12144 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Michael Taormina | 12188 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| nancy Henry | 12203 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| c frank parisi | 12210 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| linda battiste | 12302 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Michael Yarinsky | 11205 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Janice Pancake | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Sherry Dapello | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Beverlee Patterson | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Shealyn Heritage | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Cindy June | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Michelle Cameron | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Cathy Hoff | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Beverlee Patterson | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Martha Almgren | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| richard bradley | 12020 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Nancy Flynn | 12028 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Thomas Wadsworth | 12043 | New York | 2016-03-17 |
| Hannah Christopher Christopher | 12065 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Vanessa Saari | 12065 | New York | 2016-03-16 |
| Anthony Smith | 20011 | District of Columbia | 2016-03-16 |
| Karen Hefter | 20637 | Maryland | 2016-03-17 |
| Marie falls | 22193 | Virginia | 2016-03-16 |
| Robert Bostick | 22202 | Virginia | 2016-03-16 |
| Alysia Han | 28036 | North Carolina | 2016-03-17 |
| Allison Williford | 28467 | North Carolina | 2016-03-16 |
| Sherry Callahan | 30517 | Georgia | 2016-03-16 |
| John Spinelli | 32724 | Florida | 2016-03-15 |
| Justin Cressey | 33066 | Florida | 2016-03-16 |
| Bethany Cohen | 33433 | Florida | 2016-03-17 |
| Matt schwarz | 33919 | Florida | 2016-03-16 |
| Nicholas Rossi | 34219 | Florida | 2016-03-17 |
| Annette Damron | 34461 | Florida | 2016-03-16 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Paul Hibbert | 74011 | Oklahoma | 2016-03-16 |
| Michael Graul | 80015 | Colorado | 2016-03-17 |
| Rick Leverence | 2144 | Massachusetts | 2016-03-16 |
| Patricia Mathews | 4073 | Maine | 2016-03-16 |
| MaryBeth Hibbert | 5408 | Vermont | 2016-03-16 |
| Richard Hibbert | 5408 | Vermont | 2016-03-16 |
| Jennifer Kleindienst | 6457 | Connecticut | 2016-03-17 |
| Kathleen Ruggles Orefice | 6880 | Connecticut | 2016-03-16 |
| james yellen | 7470 | New Jersey | 2016-03-17 |
| Rick Leverence | 2144 | Massachusetts | 2016-03-16 |
| Patricia Mathews | 4073 | Maine | 2016-03-16 |
| MaryBeth Hibbert | 5408 | Vermont | 2016-03-16 |
| Richard Hibbert | 5408 | Vermont | 2016-03-16 |
| Jennifer Kleindienst | 6457 | Connecticut | 2016-03-17 |
| Kathleen Ruggles Orefice | 6880 | Connecticut | 2016-03-16 |
| james yellen | 7470 | New Jersey | 2016-03-17 |

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS
# of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

Joan Kupprecht, 20 Jumel Place

Larry Britt
Marie Britt 207 Caroline St.

Anne Kearney Prouty 14 Jumel Pl.

Bill Evens 12 Jumel Pl.

Mary Hibbert 11 Jumel Place

(Gabriel Edell) 9 Jumel Pl.

Michael P. Geisi 8 Jumel Pl.

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS
# of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

---

Rachel D'Mello 110 Ludlow St.

Ashleigh Kramer 100 Ludlow St SSNY 12866

[illegible] 100 Ludlow St 12866

[illegible] 415 Maple Ave 12866
683-2913

Alesia Manning 13 Jewel Pl 12866

Elizabeth DiMuzzo 227 Lake Ave
Saratoga Springs NY 12866

[illegible] 227 Lake Ave
Saratoga Springs NY 12866

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS
# of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

---

Karyn Lanatti 209 Lake

Karen Hicks 207 Lakeview

William Max Oswald 174 East Ave

Marie Sanok 179 East Ave

Lisa Morris 8 Linewood Ave I do oppose this development

Joe Fitzgerald 187 East Ave

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS
# of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

---

LITWIN, ERIC 200 LAKE AVE

YUSAVAGE, WILLIAM 177 East Ave

Linda Church 225 Lake Ave, Saratoga Springs NY

Paul Church 225 LAKE AVE SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY 12866

Jim MacNeill 75 Lake Ave S.S. Jim MacNeill

Susie O. Torone 164 East Ave. S.S. 12866

Sharon Ogle 18 Hutchins St 12866

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS
# of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

---

LITWIN, ERIC 200 LAKE AVE

YUSAVAGE, WILLIAM 177 East Ave

Linda Church 225 Lake Ave, Saratoga Springs NY

Paul Church 225 LAKE AVE SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY 12866

Jim MacNeill 75 Lake Ave S.S. Jim MacNeill

Susie O. Torone 164 East Ave. S.S. 12866

Sharon Ogle 18 Hutchins St 12866

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS
# of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

---

Karyn Lanatti 209 Lake

Karen Hicks 207 Lakeview

William Max Oswald 174 East Ave

Marie Sanok 179 East Ave

Lisa Morris 8 Linewood Ave I do oppose this development

Joe Fitzgerald 187 East Ave

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS
# of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

---

Rachel D'Mello 110 Ludlow St.

Ashleigh Kramer 100 Ludlow St SSNY 12866

[illegible] 100 Ludlow St 12866

[illegible] 415 Maple Ave 12866
683-2913

Alesia Manning 13 Jewel Pl 12866

Elizabeth DiMuzzo 227 Lake Ave
Saratoga Springs NY 12866

[illegible] 227 Lake Ave
Saratoga Springs NY 12866

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS
# of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

Joan Kupprecht, 20 Jumel Place

Larry Britt
Marie Britt 207 Caroline St.

Anne Kearney Prouty 14 Jumel Pl.

Bill Evens 12 Jumel Pl.

Mary Hibbert 11 Jumel Place

(Gabriel Edell) 9 Jumel Pl.

Michael P. Geisi 8 Jumel Pl.

WATER UNDER THE BRIDGE . . .

After spending much time with the drawings and plans for Downton Walk, something about the numbers has not felt right. But, this time, it had to do with permeability, the amount of vacant land on a lot that is available to absorb water, such as rain, melting snow, pipe break, swimming pool overflow, etc.

Because we were previously pursuing other issues, we didn't really look at the math in the permeability charts presented on the drawings. A closer examination reveals some inconsistencies and numbers don't seem to add up.

If you want to follow along, we draw your attention to the builder's package presented at the March 7, 2016 meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals. Copies of the documents can still be found online at http://www.saratoga-springs.org/AgendaCenter/ViewFile/Item/379?fileID=1546

We are referring specifically to pages 14 & 17. The numbers on page 14 are very fuzzy, because they are reduced copies of what appears to be a blueprint. So, our figures might not be exact, but we are confident that they are very close. Also, it is our understanding that, to find the permeable area that is left on a lot, one adds the footprints of the homes planned for the land to the other areas designated as non-permeable, because the areas under roof are considered non-permeable.

Witt states on the drawings chart that the **non-permeable area** (listed as the size of the road, driveways, pavers, porches, "living", and garages -- **excluding** the housing footprints) is roughly **21,300** sq.ft. When we add in the home **footprints** total from the other chart – roughly **15,900** sq.ft. – we arrive a grand total of non-permeable surface of **37,200** sq.ft. Yet, the area of the lot itself is only **34,765** sq.ft. So something **must** be wrong, especially when 25% of the land – in this case, **8,691** sq.ft. – must be kept permeable.

At best, perhaps we could remove the "Living" line item in the Non-Permeable Areas part of the chart on page 14. That represents about 5,660 sq.ft. We cannot understand what that is. So we're thinking perhaps it was a mistake? That would **adjust** the designated **Non–Permeable area** to **15,640** sq. ft. Added to the **15,900** sq.ft. of **home footprints**, the **total Non-Permeable** would be reduced to **31,540**. However, the difference of **3,225 sq.ft. (9.28%)** does not meet the City's need for **8,691 sq. ft. (25%)** of permeability.

At a glance, it appears to all work beautifully for him on page 17, **because** he has only cited Roads and Driveways as non-permeable, **neglecting to add in the other non-permeable items on his chart on page 14: specifically pavers, porches, "living", and garages**. If there is a viable reason for this, we would greatly appreciate an explanation. If not, we think the City has an obligation to make certain he's not accidentally taking advantage of more area variances than he is requesting.

We feel quite certain that, should this project proceed, detailed plans with accurate measurements will be forthcoming. But that might be far too late, because it is not impossible that the ZBA will have already cast the die for the Jumel Place "seasonal swimming pool" which -- because of non-permeability of the land -- could periodically replace the street itself.

So we ask the ZBA to stop this process and request accurate accounting of permeability as well as further information on the expected final sizes of the homes being planned, as at least five of the square footages being discussed in the media either match or come close to the sizes that appear as **single-story footprints** on the permeability chart -- while the project elevations call for multiple story structures.

###

**From:** "Kira Lajeunesse" <kira.lajeunesse@gmail.com>
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Sunday, March 20, 2016 4:06:50 PM
**Subject:** Downton Walk Proposal-27 Jumel Place

Ladies and Gentleman of the Zoning Board of Appeals,

There is no reason that Mr. Witt should be granted any variance to the current zoning law of the City of Saratoga Springs. The lot upon which he wishes to build is in a UR3 zone which does not permit the type or size of structure which he seeks permission to erect. The homes surrounding this site are single family residences with no more than 2000 square feet of living space. The structures proposed by Witt simply do not fit in the neighborhood, and clearly will change or alter the character of this neighborhood.

Mr. Witt can build homes that do, in fact, blend with the neighborhood, that do not violate

the zoning law and do not require any variances and still realize a profit..

This seems another example of local builders trying to convince the Zoning Board that in order to make a profit they must be given a variance. There is no hardship that he will suffer if not granted the variance that he seeks.

As an owner of two homes in Saratoga's Historic District (one on Circular Street and one on White Street) and a resident of Saratoga's historic district for over thirty years, I am appalled by the gross changes that have begun to encroach on our neighborhoods.

Please deny the variance for the benefit of the city and the residents who have made Jumel Place their home.

Thank you,
Kira Lajeunesse

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or taking any other action with respect to the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.

**From:** "Laura Giannini" <lauracgiannini@gmail.com>
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Sunday, March 20, 2016 3:12:47 PM
**Subject:** Opposition to proposed 27 Jumel Place development

Ms. Barden,

I'd like to express my objection to the proposed Downton Walk project and the associated variance requests for the 27 Jumel Place property. I live several houses away on Jumel Place, and I strongly feel that the scope of the project is not fitting or appropriate for our neighborhood. Additionally, the proposed density and the number of requested variances are concerning for both this particular property and the precedent that approval may set moving forward. I am not opposed to rejuvenation of this property in general, just the specifics of this particular proposal. I would support a more balanced project in line with

the invaluable character of our neighborhood.

I often walk past this property on my way to East Side Rec with my young son, and I do not want that part of our street to be built up in a fashion so incongruous with the scale, architecture, and lot set-up as the rest of the street.

Thank you for your consideration of the views of the neighbors as you evaluate this decision.

Laura Giannini
19 Jumel Place, Saratoga Springs

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or taking any other action with respect to the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.

---

**From:** bobv40@aol.com
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Sunday, March 20, 2016 11:45:51 AM
**Subject:** Save Saratoga

We agree that the Downtown Walk proposal on Jumel should not go forward.

Lesley and Bob Vogel
238 Caroline Street

**From:** "Reg Lilly" <reg.lilly@gmail.com>
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Saturday, March 19, 2016 1:39:51 PM
**Subject:** 27 Jumel

Hello,
I live at 15 Granger, right around the corner from the propsed condominium. Last I heard, there was a plan to build several McMansions there. I'm definitely opposed to the development that I now read about on the flyer you left on my door.

Sincerely,
Reginald Lilly
15 Granger Ave
Saratoga Springs, NY

**From:** mrlouspal@aol.com
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Saturday, March 19, 2016 10:04:10 AM
**Subject:** PLEASE!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

# STOP THE MADNESS THAT IS GOING ON WITH THE BUILDERS/DEVELOPERS & THE REAL ESTATE BUSINESS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

**From:** "Penny Jolly" <pjolly@skidmore.edu>
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Friday, March 18, 2016 9:25:27 AM
**Subject:** Downto Walk

Dear Ms. Barden,

I wish to urge the ZBA to turn down the request for all the variances so that the builder can build 7 codos in what is clearly a neighborhood of one-family houses on individual plots of land. I live about 3 blocks away from the site and often walk there; Downton Walk simply does not fit in: it's pretentious, crowded, and totally out of character with the neighborhood. That's why we have zoning laws: to maintain certain types of structures in certain parts of the city. Please do NOT waive these zoning restrictions.

Thank you,
Penny Jolly

**********

Dr. Penny Howell Jolly
Professor of Art History
Filene 111
Skidmore College
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

**From:** "Deborah Garrelts" <dgarrelts1@gmail.com>
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Friday, March 18, 2016 7:22:45 AM
**Subject:** downton walk

Ms. Barden and zoning board of appeals,
I am voicing objection to the downton walk project.
the zoning variances and elimination of set backs is an intrusion
on the existing neighborhood.

The "charm" of the condo units does not fit at all in the existing
character of the neighborhood despite Mr. Witt's extensive
reputation. It calls to mind a McMansion that was built on
North Broadway which inspires ridicule for being over the top and pretentious.

The project impacts its immediate neighbors in  a negative way
through loss of trees, loss of light by towering over other structures, and
loss of privacy through reduced or eliminated setbacks.

I urge the zoning board of appeals to reject the project as it is until changes are made
to lessen the negative impacts on neighbors and the neighborhood.

--
Deborah Garrelts

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: **Darlene Murray** <darlenedmurray@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Mar 18, 2016 at 7:13 AM
Subject: The Witt Construction Project called "Downton WalK"
To: bbirge@saratoga-springs.org, maynard@saratoga-springs.org, cindy.phillips@saratoga-springs.org, gonzalez@saratoga-springs.org, Christina.Carton@saratoga-springs.org, susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org
Cc: jwitt@wittconstruction.com, Sam Zucchini <samzucchini@earthlink.net>, Debbie Garrelts <dgarrelts1@gmail.com>, William Yusavage <wyusavag@nycap.rr.com>

Dear Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals

I am writing to express my concerns about the project called "Downton Walk" propossed by John Witt. My husband, William Yusavage and I currently own a two-family home at 177 East Avenue, and I own a a single family home located behind my house at 177-A East Avenue, around the corner from Jumel Place. I pass the lot in question on a daily basis when walking. I have lived in Saratoga Springs since 1991, and have owned four houses in the city, including three in this neighborhood. I have lived on East Avenue for a combined total of 20 years, and I love it because of the neighbors who all look out for one another.

Its a warm and inviting neighborhood of middle-class families, and I know a number of them personally.

First, let me say that I mistakenly signed a letter of support for the project last week when Mr. Witt came to my house on a door-to-door mission to gain support. I was pleased to hear that the stucco building that is currently at the location on Jumel Place would be replaced with housing, however now I am concerned with the style and scope of the project.

My current understanding is that the lot is zoned for five single-family homes or four two-family homes. I understand that Mr. Witt wants to build seven single family homes on this lot. Unfortunately, the project he has put forth does not appear to fit into the neighborhood, becasue of its design and scope. It is my understanding the required setbacks are being violated with this plan. Looking at the rendering, it appears to have a stone facade and an Elizabethan design. Contrast this with the modest wood-framed Victorian homes surrounding the lot on all sides, and it looks completely out-of-place. It certainly appears that there would be no back yards, front yards or even adequate parking spaces on the lot, which is concerning to me as a local resident. It means that these houses would not appeal to families, but rather to retirees or those purchasing a second home, who don't want the trouble of yard upkeep. As second homes these houses may sit empty for much of the year. In addition, I am concerned that the lot may be fenced in at a hight of 8 feet. Nothing says "I don't want to get to know my neighbor" more than an 8 foot high fence! Look around the nighborhood and note that there are almost no high fences separating yards. In fact, our fences are 3 or 4 feet high so that we can chat with our neighbors, and keep an eye on each other's homes, especially during the racing season when burgleries and other crimes spike in our neighborhood.

For these, and many other reasons, I respectfully request that the Zoning Board of Appeals deny Mr. Witt's current propossal and ask him to modify his plans to include no more that five single-family homes, with Victorian style architectural elements, adequate off-street parking, and that no high fences be erected that would wall-off the houses like a gated community.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Darlene D. Murray
177 East Avenue
Saratoga Springs, NY
518-584-7295

**From:** "Gerald Mattison" <dgmattison@verizon.net>
**To:** "joanne yepsen" <joanne.yepsen@saratoga-springs.org>, "michele madigan" <michele.madigan@saratoga-springs.org>, "christian mathiesen" <christian.mathiesen@saratoga-springs.org>, "john frank" <john.frank@saratoga-springs.org>, "skip scirocco" <skip_scirocco@saratoga-springs.org>, "joseph ogden" <joseph.ogden@saratoga-springs.org>, "tim cogan" <tim.cogan@saratoga-springs.org>, "sharon kellner-chille" <sharon.kellner-chille@saratoga-springs.org>, "lynn bachner" <lynn.bachner@saratoga-springs.org>, "eileen finneran" <eileen.finneran@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2016 6:01:01 PM
**Subject:** Jumel Redevelopment Proposal

Dear Mayor Yepsen and the City Council.

I'm sure by now you are aware of the Downton Walk Development proposed for 27 Jumel. Though we all probably agree that the removal of the factory building that presently occupies the property and replacing with residential housing would be the ideal for all involved parties, the present proposal before the Zoning Board of Appeals violates the spirit and intent of the current zoning ordinances. This is not only manifested by the number of variances sought (5) but also by the significant amount of relief requested for each variance. The net result is not just a minor tweak such as to allow a homeowner change a deck, or perhaps enlarge a garage built for buggies to accommodate a vehicle, but rather the variances are being used to subvert the local Zoning. It is important that this ***not*** become a precedent that can be cited for development in other City residential areas!

To be sure I do not blame the developer. It is in the realm of the City Planners and the Zoning Board of Appeals to protect the spirit of the Zoning ordinances yet provide case specific variances that will minimally alter the spirit of the zoning. This is especially important in residential areas. I contend, at least in this case, those we have hired or appointed, have fallen short in carrying out the mission that the residents have entrusted them to perform.

The Zoning Board of Appeals has yet another chance on Monday to review the application and hopefully recommend to the developer a resubmission of a plan that will not subvert the intent of the Zoning Ordinances. I would hope the Mayor and City Council would also agree that the spirit of the zoning should not be compromised and will also express their concerns to the Zoning board of Appeals.

Respectively,

Gerald Mattison,

206 Lake Ave Saratoga

Cell: 518 796 6204

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or taking any other action with respect to the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.

**From:** "Peter Dorsman" <peterdorsman1@msn.com>
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 16, 2016 9:39:20 AM
**Subject:** Downton Walk Development

Susan

I have been following the approval process regarding Downton Walk and wanted to express my support. It is my understanding the Saratoga Springs Planning Board has agreed to an extension of the previously received approval of the development and a similar extension request will be reviewed by the Saratoga Springs Zoning Board.

Before moving to Saratoga Springs in 2014 I lived in Manhattan so I am familiar with housing density. The plans I have seen for Downton Walk are aesthetically appealing and representative of "the art of the possible" when designing residences in an existing neighborhood.

My Saratoga residence (Park Alley North) is in an area that was developed by John Witt. While I did not purchase my home from Witt Construction, I bought the home because I was impressed with the quality of the construction and what Witt Construction was able to create in a relatively small area. I am confident Witt Construction will deliver a similar result with the development of Downton Walk.

Peter Dorsman

**From:** "Kara Conway Love" <kcl@conwaylove.com>
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Cc:** moconnor@realtyusa.com
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 15, 2016 9:50:14 PM
**Subject:** Witt Construction Project - 27 Jumel Place

Dear Ms. Barden- we are in favor of the Witt Construction project on Jumel Place in the City of Saratoga Springs. We recently met with Mr. Witt to learn more about the proposed single family condominium project. We believe that the project will improve the neighborhood by eliminating the existing commercial building and constructing attractive homes which will fit in the neighborhood. The proposed homes will have similar setbacks to the existing homes on the street. This project is sure to enhance the neighborhood and increase property values.

Thank you for your time.

John Love and Kara Conway Love
724 Waldens Pond Rd, Albany, New York 12203
518.573.6016 (Kara cell)

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: jlapook@gmail.com
To: "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
Sent: Sunday, March 20, 2016 8:25:20 PM
Subject: Jumel Place development

I'm writing to express my concern about the proposed Jumel Place development, which would be unacceptably out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood. Not only would the variances requested result in irrevocable harm to what is now a beautiful area, but granting them would set a very dangerous precedent. I ask that the variances be denied, and only a neighborhood-compatible plan approved.
Thank you.
Judith LaPook
38 Horseshoe Drive
Saratoga Springs

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** "Linda Church" <lindarchurch@gmail.com>
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Sunday, March 20, 2016 8:12:10 PM
**Subject:** Jumel Place - Downton Walk

Dear Ms. Barden and members of the zoning board,

I am writing to express my concern about the variances requested by Mr. Witt for the proposed project on Jumel Place. The size and scope of the project is not in scale with the existing neighborhood, and the density for the size of the property is inappropriate for this UR3 zoned area. The current zoning exists for a reason, and if you grant these variances, this will give license to any builder who wishes to do the same. The city is already choking under all the growth, and we are losing the quaint character of what was Saratoga.

Mr. Witt builds beautiful homes. I respectfully ask that he submit a project that is smaller

in size, more fitting to the surrounding homes (most of which are under 2000 square feet), which do not encroach on the neighbors, and one that keeps more green space in our neighborhood. Deny this change in zoning for the good of our city, and the neighbors on Jumel.

Respectfully Submitted,

Linda Reese Church
225 Lake Ave.

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or taking any other action with respect to the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.

**From:** "Tina Morris" <tina.k.morris@gmail.com>
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Sunday, March 20, 2016 6:09:00 PM
**Subject:** "Downton Walk Development"

Susan,
I live very near-by this proposed project and am extremely concerned.

Seven single condominiums could easily be only the beginning of a major change to our small early 20th century neighborhood.

I was born and raised in Los Angeles, CA where set backs and limits on the number of stories have been ignored.  The results are in a word, a "mess"!

If zoning regulations/laws are waived for Mr. Witt then a long line of developers will follow! A precedent should definitely not be set here, no exceptions!

Tina Morris

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or taking any other action with respect to the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.

---

**From:** "Scott Dexter" <sdexter2@icloud.com>
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Sunday, March 27, 2016 12:00:51 PM
**Subject:** 27 Jumel

Ms. Barden,

We own 23 Jumel Place, which has a long shared property border with the proposed property.
The issue of the application for variance for 27 Jumel has only recently come to our attention.

We oppose the variance for the number of proposed properties for the sight.

Furthermore, we particularly opposed the variances for the setback, since buildings would be within 6 feet of our property, as well as the proposed 8 foot fence, if indeed that fence will border the back yard of 23 Jumel.
These variances will adversely impact the enjoyment and aesthetics of our property. In fact, I am sure the zoning codes were designed to protect property owners from precisely such an adverse impact.

Sincerely,
Scott and Martha Dexter

change.org

# Saratoga Neighbors for Zoning Enforcement

Recipient: Saratoga Springs Zoning Board of Appeals and Susan Barden

Letter: Greetings,

Keep Saratoga Springs Neighborhoods Special: Enforce our Zoning codes!

# Comments

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sam Brewton | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-15 | We're not against developing this plot, but we opposed the massive scope of the requested variances, loss of setbacks, and the cramming-in of more buildings than this lot is zoned for. What's the point of zoning if it can be this easily skirted? This lot can be successfully developed, and we'd welcome this same developer if a more reasonable plan were presented. |
| Holly Bates | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga Springs is changing far too quickly and losing the character that made it so beloved. These changes are so often the result of wealthy developers making their way around zoning laws that are there for a reason. Our officials have been elected by the citizens of Saratoga Springs, and as such, they are the people to whom they should listen. |
| jeannine moran | saratoga springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Uphold our zoning laws and do not cave to developers. |
| Kira Cohen | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I grew up in Saratoga Springs and have lived 25 years in the neighborhood that is threatened by this development. I do not want to see my neighborhood put at risk by the casting aside of our city's zoning ordinance. The Saratoga Neighbors for Zoning Enforcement does not oppose new housing in our neighborhood, we simply feel that the scale of this project is beyond necessary and asks for too many variances to the zoning laws of our district. This puts not only our homes at risk, but the new homes as well. It also opens the door for these types of overboard developments to move into other residential neighborhoods throughout town - thus dismantling the core ideology behind our comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance, and disrupting the historical character and dignity of our beautiful town. |
| Margaret Selikoff | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | There is no reason for this type of development in this neighborhood. |
| Kim Fonda | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I am sick and tired of double standards. The Zoning Board is a disgrace and our hopes for good stewardship decline day by day! |
| Janice Pancake | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | If this goes as planned, it will set a precedent in our city that builders can get zoning laws changed and build wherever they want. Seems to me that our city has allowed all kinds of new, unaffordable, condos, etc. and taken the charm away from my hometown... |
| Joann Lorman | Porter Corners, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga is getting to many large buildings. ..let's not lose its charm! |
| Robert Bostick | Arlington, VA | 2016-03-16 | I love the Saratoga of my childhood, my youth and to alter those memories of the alleys, streets and diverse neighborhoods would be sacrilege. |
| John Veitch | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | This is not proper for that neighborhood. Simply out of character. I live next to the old St. John Neumann residence, and that conversion was fine for that building. This is not appropriate for Jumel Place |
| Liam Sheji | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | It's important to preserve our cities history, and replacing our historic buildings is a crime to our lifestyle |
| Marie falls | Lorton, VA | 2016-03-16 | I hate seeing my hometown lose its charm! |
| Steven McCarthy | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Enough is Enough |
| Martha Strohl | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | The Comprehensive Plan and our zoning codes are meant to be observed, not abused. |
| Lillian Spost | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga risks losing the charm that is its reputation. |
| Michael Gent | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Once you open the floodgates,there'll be no stopping them.The town is enough of a mess already. |

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Anthony Smith | Washington, DC | 2016-03-16 | I'm shocked that the lovely tree-lined streets of my hometown would be destroyed by this condo developer.<br><br>Enforce the zoning laws and stop this blight on the community. |
| shawn banner | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Our town is special because far sighted folk created a charter and zoning codes that preserve what is best about Saratoga. Lately, it seems that special dispensation keeps getting given to folks who want to build exactly what those far-sighted zoning laws and city planning decisions were meant to avoid. Growth is good--in fact, growth is great, but not growth that breaks the carefully crafted rules that make Saratoga a pleasure to reside in. Please do not keep giving in to developers' whims at the expense of what makes our fair city both fair and special! |
| Z. Parisi | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | cp |
| Amber Duffney | Keeseville, NY | 2016-03-16 | O remember Saratoga the way it used to be. I have seen neighborhoods destroyed by "improvement", I would hate to see Saratoga to become a city of high rises, and loose it's charm and historic value. |
| Sunshine Stewart | Greenfield Center, NY | 2016-03-16 | Keep Saratoga beautiful!!! |
| Meghan Cherny | Corinth, NY | 2016-03-16 | Bit by bit we are losing our history and our roots, that which makes it all beautiful. Saratoga is beautifully old, we must fight for her. |
| Janice Bellamy | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Too many extreme variances requested. This won't blend in with the neighborhood. The builder is asking the Zoning Board for special treatment. |
| Amy Barakat | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I don't like the direction my hometown has headed since I was a child. Too much commercialization and too much building. |
| patricia rubio | saratoga springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I am concerned about the violation of the City zoning laws the variance would entail. |
| Kathleen Brown | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Wrong plan, wrong place, & more overpriced real estate not needed! |
| bob mctague | saratoga sp, NY | 2016-03-16 | Our neighborhoods are under attack by greedy builders who have no reguard for families that live in the communities. |
| Daniel Schwank | xxxxxxxxxx, NY | 2016-03-16 | I'm against the overdevelopment that's destroying this town |
| Shealyn Heritage | Ballston Spa, NY | 2016-03-16 | I for one may not live I Toga directly but was born at Saratoga hospital lived in the outside towns all my life and have many Saratoga relatives of all era of Saratoga. It sadden my heart thinking about the stories I've heard of old Saratoga, Stories I have from Saratoga In the times before all the condo when we went to see our Saratoga family and The Saratoga now. Why does everything have to be so glamorized. We need some original and not just Original historical. Stop changing zoning laws for these big wig glamizatation. |
| Cindy June | Ballston Spa, NY | 2016-03-16 | Save my hometown from the developers who only see $$$$$$ |
| Lori LeBarron | Gansevoort, NY | 2016-03-16 | There seems to an influx of developers who are presenting proposals that do not adhere to Saratoga Springs zoning laws. This needs to stop! |
| Leslie Brown | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | There is way too much development in Saratoga and we're losing the quietness of the city. Please stop the building. |
| Joan Nellhaus | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | This is wrong in so many ways. Integrity must be maintained. |
| Hillary Takahashi | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Protect our picturesque and wonderful neighborhoods. |
| Mary O'Donnell | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | As a native, I have watched our city change way too much and not for the better in my estimation. This project would set a precedent and continue to ruin the very reason some people moved here. We want to keep our city's character. |

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jay Rogoff | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Approval of Downton Walk, a development entirely out of character with the neighborhood, would send a signal to developers that our zoning regulations are meaningless and can be circumvented at will. |
| Judi Duclos | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I do not like the path that our beautiful city seems to be on!!!!! |
| Penny Jolly | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | This is a residential neighborhood, protected supposedly by our zoning laws. Please observe those laws! Do NOT permit all these special variances. Don't overcrowd our neighborhoods and try to make them into something they are not: a pretentious "Downton Walk" with expensive condos instead of separate one-family homes of modest size. |
| Brucie Rosch | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Developers can make their money elsewhere. It would be one thing if they had a track record of building affordable housing in Saratoga Springs, but They. Do. Not. |
| Tracy Millis | Saratoga Springs, NY, NY | 2016-03-16 | The entire project is foolish. |
| Regina Camilletti | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | This development will scar an otherwise homogenous, established neighborhood of older homes. People are invested in these homes and that neighborhood. Who has the right to step in and on behalf of a builder and his cohort, threaten their investment? If anything goes, how about lets build some stables next to City Hall and put those 7 condos on East, really close to Skidmore. Sure. I would sue you if I could. |
| Jacklyn Clark | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I don't want this in my neighborhood, I've lived on this street for 24 years and to alter the streetscape with gaudy condos would be a disgrace. More importantly if the city government allows this to become reality that would be sinful. Keep within the parameters of the neighborhood, amen!!!!!! |
| Barbara Ungar | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Developers and greed are ruining what makes Saratoga Springs a desirable place to live and visit. |
| Celete Caruso | Saratoga springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I'm signing because the Integrity of each neighborhood within the city needs to be maintained |
| Suzanne kwasniewski | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Too many projects are approved that deviate from zoning ordinances. |
| Richard Hibbert | Burlington, VT | 2016-03-16 | My mother has lived on Jumel Place, in the other block, since 1959. My siblings and I spent part of our formative years in that neighborhood. The house belongs to our family, and we value the character of the neighborhood. That includes the portion of the street for which this project is proposed. I believe that this would be a drastic, and negative, change in the character of this part of the city. |
| Annette Damron | Lecanto, FL | 2016-03-16 | I was born and raised there and don't want to come home to a metropolis. |
| Susan Traylor | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I don't want Saratoga Springs, my beautiful home town to turn into a Clifton Park! |
| Marisa Wade | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga is starting to loose some of it's charm to all of these apartments and condominiums |
| JOHN DUANE | Middle Grove, NY | 2016-03-16 | to keep saratoga saratoga ! |
| Arthur Porter III | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I believe that this is yet another example of the abuse of the zoning variance process to circumvent existing zoning designations and the Comprehensive Plan. |
| Katherine Totten | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Enough is enough |
| Karin Vollkommer | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | This project is too big for the neighborhood. |
| kathleen orefice | westport, CT | 2016-03-16 | I want Saratoga to stay the way it is. It's already changing too much. |

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Amy Syrell | South Glens Falls, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga Springs needs to be a place for all people, not just those with a lot of money. |
| Jill P McMahon | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | The project seems too large for the space available. More shoehorning of big houses out of character with the neighborhood that loom over their neighbors. |
| Frank Capone | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | preserve the residential character |
| Bette Brill | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Just do not change the zoning laws for this or any project in a neighborhood that is not zoned for it.... |
| amejo amyot | saratoga springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I like green space around homes and consistent density in neighborhoods. this is a 1 and 2 family area. |
| Patricia Cornute | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Too many developments already in our town, hard to recognize the charming place it used to be., when the sun can't even shine down on you as you walk down certain streets any more. |
| sue scherer | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | Enough with the overgrowth. |
| linda battiste | Schenectady, NY | 2016-03-16 | I grew up in Saratoga and it's beautiful the way it is! |
| Mary Frances Healy | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I have lived here my whole life and don't like the direction we are going |
| MaryAnn Wager | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I have lived in Saratoga my entire life and I am concerned for the future of our beautiful city. It is quickly losing its historical look and feel. |
| Patricia Mathews | Sanford, ME | 2016-03-16 | I strongly believe in preserving the integrity of all cities, but most importantly those cities that represent the history of our country. I lived on Jumel Place until I graduated from college. When I go back to visit family I am often disappointed to see yet another set of new and expensive Town Houses, apartment buildings, hotels, and condos. With each change Saratoga Springs loses a little of its identity. Just take a walk on Jumel Place, and you will clearly see that a development of this type is out of character with the neighborhood. Saratoga, a city I have always been proud to call my hometown, should not lose its charm to moneymaking investments. |
| Deb Garrelts | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I agree that we are being over-run with condominiums and that our neighborhoods need protection |
| Denise Dart | Clifton Park, NY | 2016-03-16 | I'm signing because I am a native Saratogian and the alleged zoning codes worked against my Dad and now we have foreigners coming in and being allowed to build wherever and however big they want just because they have the money. |
| Barbara Claydon | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | inappropriate development of the space for the existing neighborhood in which I happen to live |
| Paul Hibbert | Broken Arrow, OK | 2016-03-16 | My family has property on Jumel place |
| Chris Pringle | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | I've lived in saratoga almost all my life and I'm sick of seeing this great little town desecrated by these monstrosities being built with no thought what so ever. The west side of town now looks like a haven for yuppies and has driven out the families that have resided there for years. Downtown hardly looks the same as I remember it as a child. All the once family owned businesses that occupied Broadway are now gone and these corporate goons have bullied their way in forcing the rent to a ridiculous level that only 6 figure a year income families can afford. This use to be a great place to live a place I called home now I don't even recognize the town I grew up in. Enough is enough. |
| Joyce McKnight | Lake Luzerne, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga Springs already has empty developments...the zoning board is either ineffectual or "on the take." |

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ann Diller | Gansevoort, NY | 2016-03-16 | I am appalled at the over-development that has changed our city so that it unaffordable to longtimers, courtesy of boards that are overly generous to devevlopers. |
| Randy Hammond | Porter Corners, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga is heading in the wrong direction |
| helen travis | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-16 | They are destroying Saratoga making hard for families to live homeless rase now its more homeless families working families that can't effored Saratoga price or anywhere els for that matter rent has raise so high everywhere its sad and decrees |
| kayla rynasko | Schenectady, NY | 2016-03-16 | Born and raised in Saratoga. Graduate of Saratoga high. All my family lives here! |
| Kathy Becker | Greenfield Center, NY | 2016-03-16 | I was born and raised in Saratoga Springs. I am so upset by huge changes that have been made in Saratoga. What ever happened to preserving the historical buildings in the city. It looks like the almighty dollar has won out. It is such a shame and so sad. |
| Liz Mark | Gansevoort, NY | 2016-03-16 | Saratoga is being overrun by greedy developers like Bonacio and losing its charm. |
| Charles Kish | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | The character of too many neighborhoods are at stake when projects are granted that require numerous large scale changes to existing zoning. When developers profit concerns trump zoning considerations and justifiable and considered opposition by neighbors to this degree, who's opposition is totally supported by current zoning, the zoning board is not doing it's job. There is zoning for a reason based on long term plans and consideration for the city as a whole. Wholesale variances granted solely for the purpose of developer profit is is a travesty. |
| Nancy Flynn | Buskirk, NY | 2016-03-17 | We have a family home on the other block of Jumel  Place that my mom lives in and believe this will hurt the whole street  and set a bad precedent. |
| Ann Haller | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | This is an inappropriate use if the land. It is not in accordance with the zoning. developers should not be exempt from rules just because they want to maximize their profits.  The city is running out of build-able lots, so the developer is trying to squeeze as much profit as he can out of this lot. |
| renee harder | gansevoort, NY | 2016-03-17 | way to much development now |
| Richard Dunham | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | I do not believe that a previous factory/Dance Studio in a residential neighborhood needs to be re-zoned to accommodate more living space than the current regulations allow.<br>Enough cronieism. Build a house, or two. |
| Kelly Mackison | Gansevoort, NY | 2016-03-17 | I am bored in raided is Saratoga |
| Jodi Stevens | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | I grew up on this area and just can't stand by and watch the integrity of this beautiful, quaint neighborhood be destroyed... |
| Jennifer Kleindienst | Middletown, CT | 2016-03-17 | I grew up near Saratoga and visit often. I would hate to see the city's charm erode with a project like this. |
| Patricia Duval | Portland, OR | 2016-03-17 | To oppose approvals requested for this project. Plan is totally irrelevant to the existing neighborhood. Approving these requests would set a bad precedent and many of Saratoga neighborhoods would be at risk. |
| Gloria Burke | Waterville, ME | 2016-03-17 | This would set a terrible president. |
| Dorene Couch | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | I want to show my support for our local residents and weigh in on matters of development that will have a negative impact on our neighborhoods |

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Wayne T. Senecal | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | I believe the developer's application is a change in use requiring City Council Approval not just Zoning Board of Appeals approval. |
| Jerome Luhn | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | People are entitled to know what development plans are being proposed so that they, and the officials entrusted with authority over zoning decisions, can make informed judgments that affect the character of the place where they live over the long term. Seemingly material omissions in presentation, together with behavior by the developer and relevant board officials, have given neighbors reason to raise questions, such as whose interests enjoy primacy in this proposal? No one wants to wake to rude surprises after the foundations are poured. That's something any developer should understand. |
| Sheila Levo | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | I'm signing because although I am a Saratoga native, I no longer live in the city After my husband died, I sold my house as the upkeep (lawn, snow, etc.) was too much for me. The prices for decent rentals in the city were outrageous. I was forced to look elsewhere and as a consequence, I now live in Ballston. This project, if allowed, would be another example of pricing the the middle class out Saratoga. |
| Melanie Herter | New York City, NY | 2016-03-17 | Trying to keep my neighborhood from illegal property use and major congestion |
| Ina Harney | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | This has to stop in Saratoga, not only in my backyard but this one too. Residents have to pay attention to all of these plans, not only their neighborhoods. Every time the builders manage to get one over on our city government leaders and build these monstrocsities it gives them permission to ruin another neighborhood. |
| Nicholas Rossi | Parrish, FL | 2016-03-17 | I lived in Saratoga 62yrs. I grew up in that part of town & owned a home at 213 East AVE. Allowing this development is wrong |
| James Lestrange | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | Stop putting the interests of the wealthy ahead of long time Saratoga residents. We have enough development already. Too many people moving in making everything more expensive and causing traffic congestion. |
| richard bradley | Ballston Spa, NY | 2016-03-17 | developers are destroying the Saratoga I grew up in. they just need to leave things alone. they are just fine as they are |
| Henry Bovee | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-17 | For my friend |
| Michael Graul | Granby, CO | 2016-03-17 | I would like to see the zoning laws upheld in this single family neighborhood where I grew up. I hope those individuals on the zoning board haven't lost sight of doing what is right. |
| HEATHER STABLES | SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY | 2016-03-18 | This is NOT NYC.... |
| Michael Stoneback | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-18 | developers are ruining the city with maximizing land use with the approval of city boards and their own interpretation of zoning |
| Barbara Bovee | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-18 | To preserve Saratoga |
| deborah koransky | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-18 | i am opposed to this Witt project. |
| Maureen Curtin | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-18 | There are an excessive number of substantial variances, which if granted would make our zoning laws useless. |
| Deb Mattison | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-18 | Following the zoning ordinances will create a home more in character with the neighborhood in which we live and work. |
| Tara graul | Lyndhurst, NJ | 2016-03-18 | I oppose this development. Anyone else who truly loves Saratoga Springs and the neighborhood surrounding Jumel Place knows that approving zoning for this project would be inappropriate. I hope that the board does the right thing. |
| Deb Mattison | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-18 | Following the zoning ordinances will create a home more in character with the neighborhood in which we live and work. |

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| Margaret Bradley | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-18 | Again, our "City in the Country" is being challenged. |
| Jamie Barss | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-18 | I grew up in this neighborhood and I can stand the way developers are ruin my home town Saratoga has turn in to a town for the rich and are push the every day people out This was always a family friendly town but not anymore I think this will ruin the charm of the eastside |
| Virginia Ponessa | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-19 | I used to live on Jumel Place and am so sad to see how negatively the town has been changing. |
| Mary-Ellen Callahan | Edgewater, NJ | 2016-03-19 | My family lives in Saratoga Springs and this is a dangerous proposal to all future zoning. There is a greater need for protecting the zoning code than a need for a seven unit development. |
| Reginald Lilly | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-19 | I live around the corner from this project and it would transform the character of the neighborhood in a very negative way. It would have a negative impact as well on property values in the neighborhood. I strongly oppose this project. |
| Connie Crawford | Ballston Spa, NY | 2016-03-19 | I'm sick of all the condos and ugly huge boxy buildings going up in Saratoga, especially the UNAFFORDABLE high rents they charge.... |
| Nancy Toole | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-19 | DOWNTON WALK should NOT be allowed to be built in this neighborhood. And if it is, a bad precedent will have been set. |
| Joyce Dart | saratoga springs, NY | 2016-03-19 | I'm signing because I like having neighborhoods with homes and sidewalks. I don't want big box buildings that block the sun. |
| Dillon Moran | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-19 | The invasiveness of development in Saratoga Springs is more than enough without bending all of the rules put in place to govern it. This project is simply too much |
| Steven Mattison | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | I think it is ridiculous that there are zoning laws in place and a high profile builder can sweep in and have multiple zoning ordinances changed just to get the big buck without regard to the neighbors and neighborhood. |
| Christiana HOLLAND | SARATOGA SPGS, NY | 2016-03-20 | We have enough apartments and condos for now! Let's all take a break |
| M.Thomas Porter | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | This is a terrible precedent to set for the future in old established Saratoga Springs neighborhoods. |
| Linda Church | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | I disagree with the variances being requested. Present something more in line with the area. This is too dense, and too big! |
| Grant Gentner | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | We are losing too much of our charm to building. We also are losing green space. If we lose our Saratoga charm, it will be difficult to come back. |
| Kathleen Bryan | Niskayuna, NY | 2016-03-20 | I've seen too many changes in Saratoga over the last 27 years. It would be nice to keep the neighborhoods family friendly. |
| Robert Vogel | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | I am opposed to the Downtown Walk development project |
| Kim Stevens | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | I live in the neighborhood and I don't want to start the precedent of building large condos among single family homes. |
| Joanie Rupprecht | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | I like the feel of Saratoga w/ old, private houses, I esp. like that feel on JUMEL where I LIVE !!! Please respect the current zoning !!! |
| Peggy Tayler-MacNeill | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | I care about keeping keeping this a family neighborhood without the density discussed in this petition. Imagine if each condo had 4 children? Or more? It is an outrageous expectation for that small property to expect to fit seven condos with any size family. What about sewer and water capacity? |
| James Pollard | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | I object to this development in my neighborhood because it violates current zoning law, seeks variances and exceptions which, if granted, would significantly and negatively impact the density and character my immediate environment, and of the city |

| Name | Location | Date | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| John Boardman | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | The stepped up assault on the zoning ordinances, under the cover of the vaguely worded "Comprehensive Plan", has got to stop. This is the third major project in 6 months (see Moore Hall and the hospital expansion) where developers have attempted to slip projects that would need a major zoning change as simple variances. The ZBA and Planning Board need to see these for what they are and insist development comply with the existing ordinance. The Comprehensive Guide does not overrule the Zoning Ordinance - it's the reverse. |
| James Pollard | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | I object to the project as proposed because it is non-compliant with current zoning regulations, and because it seeks an audacious and unprecedented number of variances, most of which (if granted) would have a severe negative impact to the density and character of my neighborhood and are therefor unacceptable. |
| Lisa Wilcox | Huntsville, AL | 2016-03-20 | I loved the old Saratoga. Too many changes, too fast |
| Laura Giannini | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | Although I support rejuvenation of the property at 27 Jumel Place, I strongly feel that the proposed project is not appropriate for our neighborhood. I down the street from the subject property, and we ask the zoning board to respect the wishes of our family and our neighbors and reject the requested radical variances to the current laws. We feel this project itself is not beneficial to the neighborhood and its invaluable character, and allowing the violation of the zoning laws would set a dangerous precedent moving forward. |
| Russell Pittenger | Saratoga, NY | 2016-03-20 | The variances asked for seen excessive. |
| Chris Bernd | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | The condominum/townhouse growth in Saratoga is out of control, taking away open spaces and I believe zoning laws need to be followed. |
| Albert Mather | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | I'm signing because I do not want our neighborhood to become "mansionized" like the neighborhood from which we moved in Wellesley MA |
| Tina K. Morris | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-20 | The proposed Downton Walk Development is near my home. A large development is not in keeping with the existing small early 20th century homes. I strongly object to waiving zoning regulations which will set a negative precedent for the entire city of Saratoga Springs. |
| Ralph Yusavage | Saratoga Springs, NY | 2016-03-21 | Its not okay to ignore the rules whenever its convenient. The developers will build the charm right out of our city if we let them. |

Thomas and Rachel Uccellini
[redacted] Granger Avenue
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

March 21, 2016

Susan Barden
The Zoning Board of Appeals
City Hall
474 Broadway
Saratoga Springs, NY 12866

Dear Zoning Board of Appeals:

We are writing in favor and to further offer our resounding support for Witt Construction's proposed Downton Walk Project. It goes without saying that Downton's European exterior would be a welcome improvement from the dilapidated, vacant building that exists on Jumel Place today, but, moreover, these variance's have previously been approved and this site plan of single-family condominiums are better suited for the wholly residential neighborhood.

Three years ago, we, too, were up against varying public discourse from both the neighbors and the City of Saratoga Springs. After a year of meetings with the Zoning Board of Appeals, we were approved for a front yard setback of 27.3 feet (91% relief) and rear yard setback of 24 feet (80% relief) from the minimum 30 feet setback requirement. In addition, we also received maximum building coverage of principal building of 11% (55% relief). Given what on paper appears to be a huge concession, the finished product fits perfectly on this city lot and has garnered positive feedback from most of the people that were against the project. One of the most common comments is that the house "looks like it has been on the lot for years." This is a testament to Mr. Witt's ability to uphold the characteristic of the neighborhood, as well as, the city of which he has been a lifelong resident.

It is apparent that our Witt home added both aesthetic beauty and increased surrounding property values. Downton Walk will enhance our neighborhood and add to the continued development and enrichment of the City of Saratoga Springs.

Sincerely,

Thomas and Rachel Uccellini

signatures_1458577853

| Name | City | State | Postal Code | Signed On |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sandra Cohen | Saratoga Springs | New York | | 2016-03-15 |
| Sam Brewton | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-15 |
| Kira Cohen | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-15 |
| John Spinelli | DeLand | Florida | 32724 | 2016-03-15 |
| Kristin Brenner | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-15 |
| Catherine Golden | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-15 |
| Olivia Cruz | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-15 |
| Scott Starr | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-15 |
| Bryan N. | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Gary Daluisio | Gansevoort | New York | 12831 | 2016-03-16 |
| Jane Stevens | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Holly Bates | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Jeannine Moran | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Carol Schupp Star | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Karen Pettigrew | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Margaret Selikoff | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Kim Fonda | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| kathy shimm | saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Ronnie Betor | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Janice Pancake | Ballston Spa | New York | 12020 | 2016-03-16 |
| Frank Callucci | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| debbie barry | Saratoga springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Joann Lorman | Porter Corners | New York | 12859 | 2016-03-16 |
| isabella warner | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Mary Tipton | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Claire Demarest | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Robert Bostick | Arlington | Virginia | 22202 | 2016-03-16 |
| John Veitch | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Liam Sheji | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Jim Favaloro | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Marie falls | Woodbridge | Virginia | 22193 | 2016-03-16 |
| Philip Donnelly | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Jarred Butler | Corinth | New York | 12822 | 2016-03-16 |
| Judy Riester | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Jennifer South | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Theresa Boisseau | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Susan DeRossi | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Christine Guarnieri | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Carrie Warner | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Michael Yarinsky | Brooklyn | New York | 11205 | 2016-03-16 |
| Jena Rotheim | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Steven McCarthy | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Martha Strohl | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Cherylle Hudak | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Lillian Spost | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Michael Gent | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Rick Leverence | Somerville | Massachusetts | 2144 | 2016-03-16 |
| Melany Gent | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anthony Smith | Washington | District of Columbia | 20011 | 2016-03-16 |
| Rob Wright | Saratoga springs ny | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Sherry Dapello | Ballston Spa | New York | 12020 | 2016-03-16 |
| Shawn Banner | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Allison Williford | Calabash | North Carolina | 28467 | 2016-03-16 |
| Julie Behrens | Candor | New York | 13743 | 2016-03-16 |
| c frank parisi | Albany | New York | 12210 | 2016-03-16 |
| Randi Kish | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Justin Cressey | Pompano Beach | Florida | 33066 | 2016-03-16 |
| Mame Noonan | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Eric Gould | Rensselaer | New York | 12144 | 2016-03-16 |
| Hannah Christopher Christopher | Clifton Park | New York | 12065 | 2016-03-16 |
| Amber Duffney | Keeseville | New York | 12944 | 2016-03-16 |
| Sunshine Stewart | Greenfield Center | New York | 12833 | 2016-03-16 |
| Lynn Blasso | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| John Kaufmann | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Deena Smith | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Meghan Cherny | Corinth | New York | 12822 | 2016-03-16 |
| Janice Bellamy | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Lynda goodness | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Martha Ray | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Amy Barakat | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| patricia rubio | saratoga springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Kathleen Brown | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Erin Wiggin | Gansevoort | New York | 12831 | 2016-03-16 |
| Ardath Stroman | Middleport | New York | 14105 | 2016-03-16 |
| Llona Hogan | Gansevoort | New York | 12831 | 2016-03-16 |
| Pepper Wolfe | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Robert McTague | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Daniel Schwank | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Gordon Ray | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Emma Folkins | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Beverlee Patterson | Ballston Spa | New York | 12020 | 2016-03-16 |
| Shealyn Heritage | Ballston Spa | New York | 12020 | 2016-03-16 |
| Vanessa Saari | Clifton Park | New York | 12065 | 2016-03-16 |
| Theresa Capozzola | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Cindy June | Ballston Spa | New York | 12020 | 2016-03-16 |
| Lori LeBarron | Gansevoort | New York | 12831 | 2016-03-16 |
| Leslie Brown | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Joan Nellhaus | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Gabriel Stinson | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Michelle Cameron | Ballston Spa | New York | 12020 | 2016-03-16 |
| Laura Blunt | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Nancy Wilder | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Hillary Takahashi | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Noah Casner | Salem | New York | 12865 | 2016-03-16 |
| Judith Brenner | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Mary O'Donnell | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Jay Rogoff | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Judi Duclos | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Penny Jolly | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Frank DeRossi | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Brucie Rosch | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Tracy Millis III | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Regina Camilletti | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Jacklyn Clark | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Matt schwarz | Fort Myers | Florida | 33919 | 2016-03-16 |
| Barbara Ungar | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Sherry Callahan | Braselton | Georgia | 30517 | 2016-03-16 |
| Celete Caruso | Saratoga springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Suzanne kwasniewski | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Deborah Millis | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| MaryBeth Hibbert | Burlington | Vermont | 5408 | 2016-03-16 |
| Richard Hibbert | Burlington | Vermont | 5408 | 2016-03-16 |
| Ann Sette | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Johanna Garrison | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| William Pettigrew | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Annette Damron | Lecanto | Florida | 34461 | 2016-03-16 |
| Davene Jones | Wilton | New York | 12831 | 2016-03-16 |
| Robert Lippman | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Peter Lee | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Susan Traylor | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Marisa Wade | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| JOHN DUANE | Middle Grove | New York | 12850 | 2016-03-16 |
| Arthur Porter | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Kathryn Fitzgerald | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Annmarie Palmieri | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| doug lake | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Nanci StJohn | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Katherine Totten | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Robin Kish | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Cathy Hoff | Ballston Spa | New York | 12020 | 2016-03-16 |
| Rhea Demory | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| John Schroeder | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Derek Olsen | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Teri Blasko | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Karin Vollkommer | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| David Lombardo | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Kathleen Ruggles Orefice | Westport | Connecticut | 6880 | 2016-03-16 |
| Dina Fittipaldi | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Margaret Fittipaldi | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Tracy Maimone | East Rochester | New York | 14445 | 2016-03-16 |
| Amy Syrell | South Glens Falls | New York | 12803 | 2016-03-16 |
| Julio Olvera | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Holly Lawton | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Jill P McMahon | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Stephen Farenell | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Frank Capone | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bette Brill | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| amejo amyot | saratoga springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Joy Burke | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Patricia Cornute | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| sue scherer | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| nancy Henry | Albany | New York | 12203 | 2016-03-16 |
| David Morris | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| linda battiste | Schenectady | New York | 12302 | 2016-03-16 |
| Mary Frances Healy | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Tara Chhabra | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Annette Carman | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| MaryAnn Wager | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Patricia Mathews | Sanford | Maine | 4073 | 2016-03-16 |
| Stephanie Ryall | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Lisa Campilango | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Deborah Garrelts | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Joosje Anderson | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Denise Dart | Clifton Park | New York | 12065 | 2016-03-16 |
| Barbara Claydon | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Paul Hibbert | Broken Arrow | Oklahoma | 74011 | 2016-03-16 |
| Chris Pringle | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Darrell Rikert | Greenfield Center | New York | 12833 | 2016-03-16 |
| Joyce McKnight | Lake Luzerne | New York | 12846 | 2016-03-16 |
| james brophy | saratoga springs | New York | 12877 | 2016-03-16 |
| Diller Ann | Gansevoort | New York | 12831 | 2016-03-16 |
| monica winn | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Tracey Radigan | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Amy Hichman | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Rick Moran | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Randy Hammond | Porter Corners | New York | 12859 | 2016-03-16 |
| Kayla Rynasko | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Jeanne Oconnor | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Kathy Becker | Greenfield Center | New York | 12833 | 2016-03-16 |
| Chuck Lamb | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Liz Mark | Gansevoort | New York | 12831 | 2016-03-16 |
| Charles Kish | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Colleen Downing | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-16 |
| Nancy Flynn | Buskirk | New York | 12028 | 2016-03-16 |
| Ann Haller | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Beverlee Patterson | Ballston Spa | New York | 12020 | 2016-03-17 |
| Ellen Boyce | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Deanne Marg | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Michele McClure | Schuylerville | New York | 12871 | 2016-03-17 |
| Michelle Deyette | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Thomas Wadsworth | Cobleskill | New York | 12043 | 2016-03-17 |
| renee harder | gansevoort | New York | 12831 | 2016-03-17 |
| Richard Dunham | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Kelly O'DONNELL -Mackison | Gansevoort | New York | 12831 | 2016-03-17 |
| Jodi Stevens | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jennifer Kleindienst | Middletown | Connecticut | 6457 | 2016-03-17 |
| Louisa Foye | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Karen Thomas | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Joseph Marcuccio | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Bethany Cohen | Boca Raton | Florida | 33433 | 2016-03-17 |
| Vicki Feldman | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Patricia Duval | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Gloria Burke | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Karen Hefter | Hughesville | Maryland | 20637 | 2016-03-17 |
| Tamara Woolsey | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Dorene Couch | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Ingrid H Stone | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Barbara Proctor | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Oona Grady | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Alysia Han | Davidson | North Carolina | 28036 | 2016-03-17 |
| Roxanne Mead | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Wayne T. Senecal | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Martha Almgren | Ballston Spa | New York | 12020 | 2016-03-17 |
| Tara Martin | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| EDWARD Jewell | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Susan king | Schuylerville | New York | 12871 | 2016-03-17 |
| Jerome Luhn | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Chris Mathiesen | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Sheila Levo | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| William Yusavage | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Melanie Herter | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Ina Harney | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Nicholas Rossi | Parrish | Florida | 34219 | 2016-03-17 |
| James Lestrange | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| richard bradley | Ballston Spa | New York | 12020 | 2016-03-17 |
| Loretta Martin | Please Select: | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| doug klein | Schuylerville | New York | 12871 | 2016-03-17 |
| Michael Taormina | Waterford | New York | 12188 | 2016-03-17 |
| LeeAnne Olsen | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Joanne Dwornik | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Alan Edstrom | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Henry Bovee | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-17 |
| Michael Graul | Aurora | Colorado | 80015 | 2016-03-17 |
| james yellen | Wayne | New Jersey | 7470 | 2016-03-17 |
| Kelly Winters | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-18 |
| Phyllis Hecker | NY | New York | 12205 | 2016-03-18 |
| Arvilla Morett | CITY | | POSTAL COD | 2016-03-18 |
| Stephanie Waring | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-18 |
| HEATHER STABLES | SARATOGA SPRINGS | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-18 |
| Michael Stoneback | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-18 |
| jessica moore | Gansevoort | New York | 12831 | 2016-03-18 |
| Debra Murphy | CANTON | Georgia | 30114-7795 | 2016-03-18 |
| Barbara Bovee | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-18 |
| Gerald Mattison | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-18 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| deborah koransky | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-18 |
| Judith LaPook | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-18 |
| Elizabeth Fisher | Porter Corners | New York | 12859 | 2016-03-18 |
| Maureen Curtin | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-18 |
| Tara Graul | Lyndhurst | New Jersey | 7071 | 2016-03-18 |
| Deb Mattison | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-18 |
| Margaret Bradley | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-18 |
| Virginia Ponessa | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Richard Snyder | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Deborah Graul | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| jerry hilliker | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Nathaniel Harrington | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Cherae Remillard | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Mary-Ellen Callahan | East Hartford | Connecticut | 6118 | 2016-03-19 |
| Tomarra McCall | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Jessica Glagov | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| gay murrisky | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Reginald Lilly | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Sara Zlotnick | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Connie Crawford | Ballston Spa | New York | 12020 | 2016-03-19 |
| Nancy Toole | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Joy Holcomb | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Joyce Dart | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Dillon Moran | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Kerri Barber | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Colleen Macvean | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| John Clark | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Eleanor Williams | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-19 |
| Saraya Robison | Salem | New York | 12865 | 2016-03-20 |
| Eugene Waters | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Suzanne Kelleher | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Kira Lajeunesse | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Steven Mattison | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Mercer Anderson | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Deborah Reed | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Susan Bernd | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Jeannette Green | Newbury Park | California | 91320 | 2016-03-20 |
| Jan Roth | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Ryan McKenzie | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| William Finlay | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Christy Holland | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Mary Beth Donohoe | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| M.Thomas Porter | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Linda Church | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Grant Gentner | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Kathleen Bryan | Niskayuna | New York | 12309 | 2016-03-20 |
| Robert Vogel | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Kimberly Stevens | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Joanie Rupprecht | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Peggy Tayler-MacNeill | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| John Boardman | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| James Pollard | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Lisa Wilcox | Huntsville | Alabama | 35805 | 2016-03-20 |
| Laura Giannini | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Rachel Morgan | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| James Purdy | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Russ Pittenger | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Anne Trainor | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Betsey Porter | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Cristina Zambuto | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Adam Giannini | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Angela Gardner | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Chris Bernd | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Deborah Fuller | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Lisa Wong | Saratoga springs | New York | 12867 | 2016-03-20 |
| Johnny Martinez | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Albert Mather | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Tina K. Morris | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-20 |
| Carolyn Coogan | Albany | New York | 12203 | 2016-03-21 |
| Meghan Flewwelling | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-21 |
| Sylvia Bloom | Greenwich | New York | 12834 | 2016-03-21 |
| rachid Daoui | GaNSEVOORT | New York | 12831 | 2016-03-21 |
| Kate Brown | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-21 |
| Jane Valetta | Saratoga Springs | New York | 12866 | 2016-03-21 |

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

Joan Kupprecht, [redacted] Jumel Place

Larry Britt

Marie Britt [redacted] Caroline St.

Anne Kearney Prouty [redacted] Jumel Pl.

Bill Evans [redacted] June Pl.

Mary Hibbert [redacted] Jumel Place

(Gabriel Edell) [redacted] Jumel Pl.

Michael P. Geisi [redacted] Jumel Pl.

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS
# of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

---

Rachel D'Mello [redacted] Ludlow St.

Ashleigh Kramer [redacted] Ludlow St SS NY 12866

[redacted] Ludlow St 12866

[redacted] Maple Ave 12866

[redacted]

Alesia Manning [redacted] Sumel Pl 12866

[redacted] Lake Ave

Elizabeth DiMuzzo Saratoga Springs NY 12866

[redacted] Lake Ave

Saratoga Springs NY 12866

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

Karyn Lanetti [redacted] Lake

Karen Hicks [redacted] Lakeview

William Max Oswald [redacted] East Ave

Marie Sanok [redacted] East Ave

Lisa Morris [redacted] Pinewood Ave I do oppose this development

Joe Fitzgerald [redacted] East Ave

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS
# of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

---

LITWIN, ERIC [redacted] LAKE AVE

(SAVAGE) WILLIAM [redacted] East Ave

Linda Church [redacted] Lake Ave, Saratoga Springs NY

Paul Church [redacted] LAKE AVE SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY 12866

Jim MacNeill [redacted] Lake Ave SS. Jim MacNeill

Susie O. Toone [redacted] East Ave. S.S. 12866

[redacted] Hutchins St 12866

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS
# of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

---

LITWIN, ERIC [redacted] LAKE AVE

(USAVAGE) WILLIAM [redacted] East Ave

Linda Church [redacted] Lake Ave, Saratoga Springs NY

Paul Church [redacted] LAKE AVE SARATOGA SPRINGS, NY 12866

Jim MacNeill [redacted] Lake Ave SS. Jim MacNeill

Susie O. Toone [redacted] East Ave. S.S. 12866

[redacted] Hutchins St 12866

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

Karyn Lanetti [redacted] Lake

Karen Hicks [redacted] Lakeview

William Max Oswald [redacted] East Ave

Marie Sanok [redacted] East Ave

Lisa Morris [redacted] Linewood Ave I do oppose this development

Joe Fitzgerald [redacted] East Ave

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS
# of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

---

Rachel D'Mello [redacted] Ludlow St.

Ashleigh Kramer [redacted] Ludlow St SS NY 12866

[redacted] Ludlow St 12866

[redacted] Maple Ave 12866

[redacted]

Alesia Manning [redacted] Sunset Pl 12866

Elizabeth DiMuzzo [redacted] Lake Ave Saratoga Springs NY 12866

[redacted] Lake Ave Saratoga Springs NY 12866

# OUR STANCE AS NEIGHBORS of proposed "Downton Walk":

- We don't oppose Mr. Witt per se, or that he should develop this property.
- But we are concerned about the scale of the variances he is requesting and of the project as currently designed.
- We are concerned that the current design and density of the proposal and the number and size of the proposed homes are out of character with this historic neighborhood.
- We would like a revised more reasonable proposal.

Joan Kupprecht, [redacted] Jumel Place

Larry Britt

Marie Britt [redacted] Caroline St.

Anne Kearney Prouty [redacted] Jumel Pl.

Bill Evans [redacted] June Pl.

Mary Hibbert [redacted] Jumel Place

(Gabriel Edell) [redacted] Jumel Pl.

Michael P. Geary [redacted] Jumel Pl.

**From:** "Kim Stevens" [redacted]
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Monday, March 21, 2016 9:26:22 AM
**Subject:** Condos on Jumel

Susan,
I used to live at [redacted] Jumel and I currently live at [redacted] Circular St., on the corner of Circular and York.

Please do not approve the proposed multi-unit condo unit at 27 Jumel place. It would not be a good precedent to start on the east side. I have seen this pattern in other communities and it really breaks up the neighborhood.

I know we have many single family homes that have been split into 2 -3 apartments, but 7 units, surrounded by small modest homes would not work. The one apartment-only home in the other section of Jumel already creates some stress on that block.

I appreciate the controlled home renovations that have been taking place on York. The upgraded homes fit in with their neighbors. Please keep with this pattern.

Thanks,
Kim Stevens

**From:** "Jim MacNeill" [redacted]
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Monday, March 21, 2016 9:34:27 AM
**Subject:** Downtown Walk ..... John Witt

Good Morning Susan, my wife and I live at [redacted] Lake Ave ..... very close to the proposed sub-division. I am opposed to this project as the size of the houses proposed do not fit with the neighborhood, the total lack of yard and space between the new houses and the neighborhood and the asking price of the new houses. Currently the old factory has no set back to any of its neighbors and the drawings Mr. Witt has passed around seem to carry this forward with the proposed project. All the houses that border this project are very modest at best and this would upset the balance and perhaps lead to further demolition and more upscale housing in the neighborhood.

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or taking any other action with respect to the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.

**From:** "J Rupprecht" [redacted] >
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Monday, March 21, 2016 10:04:46 AM
**Subject:** 27 Jumel Condos

Hi,
I live at [redacted] Jumel Place. Several times per week, I walk to the East Side rec field to use the tennis courts. Please do not approve the multiple zoning variances requested for the proposed condo at 27 Jumel. The spread of condos in the town should not spread into the east side neighborhood.

Thanks,
Joan Rupprecht

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or taking any other action with respect to the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.

**From:** "Bob Mctague" [redacted] >
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Monday, March 21, 2016 10:59:27 AM
**Subject:** Downton Walk

Susan,

Hi my name is Bob McTague and I very much support your efforts to stop greedy developers.

I will be attending the ZBA meeting tonight. I run the face book page SACRAP Chat. We need to support all our neighbors with a watch full eye.

Hope to meet you at the meeting.

Bob McTague
[redacted] nelson Ave
Saratoga Springs
[redacted]

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are

**From:** "jerry luhn" [redacted] >
**To:** "Susan Barden" <Susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Monday, March 21, 2016 1:08:23 PM
**Subject:** Jumel Place project proposal

Dear Ms. Barden,

I am a nearby neighbor to the project area of John Witt's proposal, and wish to register my opposition to the scale and density required by it. I have to say I share the dismay registered by other neighbors in whose judgment this undertaking, however skillfully crafted in the abstract, is simply too much for the neighborhood and, in a word, wrong.

The zoning plan for that area is relatively recent and thoughtful, and could even accommodate the greater part of the proposal being put forward. I urge you to exert your influence and your own best judgment to keep faith with the plan we have for this area, and in so doing to protect the character of the neighborhoods around Jumel Place and elsewhere in town.

Respectfully,
Jerry Luhn
[redacted] Pinewood Avenue

**From:** "AKP Jumel" [redacted] >
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>, "Anne Kearney Proulx" <mdmjumel@yahoo.com>
**Sent:** Monday, March 21, 2016 1:26:22 PM
**Subject:** 27 Jumel Place

Hi Susan - I meant to e-mail you much earlier today, but it slipped my mind. I hope I'm not too late to show my support for all you folks who are up against the proposed development at 27 Jumel. I've lived in my house at [redacted] Jumel since I was 4 years old - I'm in my 60s now and I remember the Tarant Mfg. Company like it was yesterday. The proposed project would be a wonderful addition to our little street. BUT not on the scale that John Witt has proposed. I will be at the 7 pm mtg tonight and will voice my opinion if I'm allowed.

Hope to talk to you there.

Anne Kearney Proulx
[redacted]

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If

**From:** "Richie Ball" [redacted]
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Cc:** [redacted] >
**Sent:** Monday, March 21, 2016 3:19:07 PM
**Subject:** 27 Jumel Downton Walk

Susan,

Good afternoon, I would like to express my support for the Down-Ton Walk project. This will be an enormous improvement to the neighborhood, I'd really like to see this moving forward, since being on hold for some time now. There are more positives than negatives to this wonderful project. I know and trust Witt construction to do the right thing, for us as neighbors, and to the great city of Saratoga Springs.

Thank you, Richard Ball

Also, my property at [redacted] Granger Avenue, border's 150 feet of the existing structure, which is in dire need of demolition. Looking forward to it.
Thank you once again!

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or taking any other action with respect to the contents of this message is

From: "Elizabeth DiNuzzo" [redacted]
To: "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2016 4:07:11 PM
Subject: Jumel Place development

Hi Susan,
As a homeowner on Lake Ave, I am writing to encourage you to deny the existing "Downton Walk" proposal. East Side Saratoga is known for its authenticity and community. A high-end cookie-cutter development does not fit with this neighborhood. The high fence is especially upsetting. The people who might buy these homes have no idea how unwelcome this development will be - and why would we put them in a position of being resented rather than welcomed by their new neighbors? It doesn't make any sense to change the existing zoning. Let him build five single family homes with tasteful architecture and appropriate fencing - he'll still make money, the new homeowners will be welcomed, and the existing neighborhood will retain its unique and historic character.
Best,
Elizabeth DiNuzzo
[redacted]

Sent from my iPhone

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely

**From:** "Marie Sandholdt" [redacted] >
**To:** "Susan Barden" <Susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Monday, March 21, 2016 4:45:50 PM
**Subject:** Downtown walk

We are writing to express concern about the proposed project referred to as "Downtown Walk" located on Jumle Place. John Witt came to our door last week looking for support, he presented the project in a way that made sense. That he was planning on knocking down a old unused building and would like to replace it with some nice homes. This sounded great except Mr. Witt was not forthcoming with the fact that he was looking for exemptions and variances with the code for the area and that he was looking to exceed what was allowed. Because of this I (Mark) signed a paper in support when in fact after seeing off the facts I do not support this project in its current state.
The amount of housing Mr. Witt wants to place on this lot exceeds what it should hold. Looking at the first hand, I have no idea how he would be able to fit everything he wishes, for if he did he would create a distraction in the neighborhood. Multiple structures that would not fit in with the pre-existing homes, as well as creating a problem with parking. Mr. Witt isn't just asking for one exemption, or modification to the code, he is asking for numerous ones which just prove that his plans need to be scalled back because in their current state they do not fit the land or the neighborhood.

I do however believe and would support a project to replace this building that followed the city guidelines and code for our neighborhood. After all the codes were created for a reason, to make sure over croweding did not happen and to preserve the community and

neighborhood. I'm sure when the codes were created much care and thought was put into them.

With these concerns and more I sincerely hope the Zoning Board of Appeals rejects proposal and requests Mr.Witt to modify his plans to fit within the zoning regulations the city has set.

Thank you for your time.

Mark English
Marie Sandholdt
[redacted] East Avenue

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or taking any other action with respect to the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.

---

**From:** "Johnny Miller" [redacted]
**To:** "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 22, 2016 7:47:36 AM
**Subject:** Downton Walk

Susan,

I agree that the density of the project is too high and should comply with the zoning codes currently in place. I live across the street and was denied a variance for expanding my carriage house beyond the allowable lot coverage, therefore I built it according to the allowable size.
I'm for a project that is in compliance with the zoning codes.

Enjoy,

Johnny Miller

On The Spot Photos
[redacted]

From: [redacted]
To: "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2016 8:06:31 PM
Subject: 27 Jumel Proposal

Ms. Barden:
First, please know I appreciate the dedication and excellent work by the Zoning Board in dealing with the many challenging issues and proposals in our city.
The proposed development at 27 Jumel concerns me deeply. As currently documented, I object to it strenuously.
I'm a (retired) architect, I live at [redacted] Ludlow Street and the view from my property is up Jumel Place to the project site.
The character and density of my neighborhood is surely worth preserving. My wife and I have owned our home since 1977 and are grateful that zoning regulations have guided construction and development here, including several appropriate zoning variances that we've supported. We believe the neighborhood's defining character has (to date) been successfully retained.
The variances and exceptions requested for the 27 Jumel Place project are truly astonishing! If approved, their dramatic negative impact to the neighborhood character would be devastating in my opinion. The proposed change in density and contrasting setbacks is an affront to abutting neighbors and to the design vocabulary of the area.
The property at 27 Jumel is potentially a clean slate. But the applicant has chosen a design which seems to totally ignore its context and city regulations, creating a self imposed dilemma. It

completely disrespects the neighborhood and its long established and protected attributes.
I remain confident that the Board will reject such wrongheaded proposals, and further, will foster the possibility that the applicant may make future application for a project at 27 Jumel Place that is consistent with Saratoga's Comprehensive Plan and with zoning regulations, and which would require minimal, if any, variances.
Thank you, and your Board colleagues, for your continued attention to this matter.
James (Jay) Pollard

Confidentiality/Privilege Notice: This e-mail communication and any files transmitted with it contain privileged and confidential information from the City of Saratoga Springs and are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it has been addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or taking any other action with respect to the contents of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please delete it and notify the sender by return e-mail. Thank you for your cooperation.

---