
Variance for property 124 York Ave - #2925 SOUTHERN SUBDIVISION

From : mark dillon [REDACTED]

Fri, Nov 04, 2016 02:41 PM

Subject : Variance for property 124 York Ave - #2925 SOUTHERN SUBDIVISION**To** : lindsey gonzalez <lindsey.gonzalez@saratoga-springs.org>**Cc** : 'mark dillon' <mdillon@natek.com>, 'debbie dillon' <ddillon@natek.com>

Dear Zoning Board of Appeals:

My name is Mark Dillon and am the property owner of [REDACTED] Middle Avenue. I am writing in response to a Public Hearing Notification letter from Kimberly & Michael Southern who have applied for a variance on their property at 124 York Avenue. I understand that the public hearing on this application will be on Nov. 7th. I am submitting this written response in case I am unable to attend as I will be out of the area. It is my intention to attend if I am back in time for the meeting but would like the board know of my concerns if I am not.

My wife and I purchased the property at [REDACTED] Middle Avenue two years ago for many reasons: one being the location to the City and also due to the parcel next to us which is part of 124 York, was too small to build on or be subdivided. This is a property that has been this way since 1875.

We are not opposed to variances in general as they may necessary as to the special conditions to a particular piece of property that would create an undue hardship. I would hope that if I ever needed one I would be afforded the opportunity to seek one that was absolutely necessary.

The applicants have previously remodeled the existing house and now are seeking to add another structure/home to the premises. The proposed variance seeks to decrease the setbacks by 12ft on each lot and reduce the lot sizes by approximately 1,200 square feet. Such proposed lot sizes would be approximately 18% less than currently required. I certainly would have no issue if they were seeking a minimal variance due to the nature of the property. However, in this case the applicants are asking to split the parcels, add a new home and ask for a large variance both in setbacks and lot sizes, which is self-created.

We would be against the proposed two lot subdivision with the current plans for a new home to be constructed with the setbacks as proposed absent a showing of undue hardship.

Granting the variance as proposed would set a precedent that would allow for future property owners to squeeze in more than what is allowed and seeming only benefit said property owner.

Thank you for allowing me an opportunity to comment on the proposal.

*Regards,**Mark and Debbie Dillon**Property owner at [REDACTED] middle ave.*
[REDACTED]