

From: "Rex Ruthman" [REDACTED] >
To: "Susan Barden" <susan.barden@saratoga-springs.org>
Cc: "Duane Miller" <Duane.Miller@saratoga-springs.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 14, 2016 12:26:37 PM
Subject: FW:



Susan Barden
Senior Planner
City of Saratoga Springs

Re: Rex and Elisabeth Ruthman Variance application
3 Garside Drive, Saratoga Springs NY

Dear Ms. Barden

I enclose pages six and seven of the previously submitted application for a variance with area variance information properly inserted in the correct spaces. Please let me know if there is anything further I should do.

I note as a point of information, that the neighbor at five Garside Drive (Dunn) recently had work done along my southerly lot line including a new deck, fence and parking area that my surveyor advises includes a fence and paved parking area encroaching ten feet inside my southerly lot line. The work is new. The property has been owned by Dunn (from Barter) about three years or so. The encroachment is indicated on the survey maps provided with my application.

I mention this so there is no confusion, if there is a site visit and review regarding the proposed

location of my structure as effecting the neighbors, or if the neighbor at 5 Garside objects on the grounds of proximity to my proposed work. In any case the side yard encroachment does not bear upon the setback issue regarding Garside Road'

Nevertheless, the work at 5 Garside DOES raise a question: How did the deck, fence and etc. for 5 Garside get approved, clearly outside any building envelope for lot 5 Garside, without ME getting a notice of any request for a variance? I would have been agreeable to any variance but not any permitting an encroachment.

I have put the neighbor on notice of the encroachment identified by the survey and frankly don't know what reaction there will be.

Very truly yours

Rex S. Ruthman

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.



image001.jpg

4 KB



20160414114957490.pdf

109 KB

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

The variance requested is not substantial

[1] It would not change the character or use of the land.

[2] It would not be inconsistent with the existing neighborhood

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 an adverse physical or environmental effect. In fact it will stabilize and protect wetland resources and uncontrolled runoff from the Applicant site into the lake; It will stabilize a steep slope area and the adjacent roadway; it will not adversely affect lake views, but rather preserve them compared to construction closer to the lake front.

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 hardship was not self created. At the time of purchase of the lot for 180,000 Applicant relied upon approved Subdivision plat that did not reference any site restriction related to the topography, the lake front, etc. The Plat did reference elevations and included a 100 year flood notation but nothing indicating the lot was not buildable as shown on the approved subdivision plat, which specified a building envelope with no noted restriction.

No restriction of any kind was known until Applicant was told that his application for a Building Permit would require a letter from DEC regarding wetlands. IN the process of contacting DEC, Applicant was told there were no NYS wetlands, but Applicant should also check the United States Army Corps of Engineers for federal wetlands. There were none of record, but Applicant was nevertheless directed to do a wetland survey, which was done at Applicant's expense, resulting in a wetland area that reduced the building envelope to approximately eighteen feet, which was about twelve feet inside the foundation of the proposed home, and several more feet inside a retaining wall required to stabilize the lot for construction. (see site maps submitted)

As a result of the original 25 foot set back, combined with the wetland determination well after subdivision approval, applicant has no practical way to build within the site envelope and requires a variance. Even with a variance the proposed structure will not be buildable without USAC permit to fill in part of the wetland established. Applicant needs the variance to mitigate the Wetland intrusion, and believes the resulting adjustments will serve the purposes of the original PUD, the Subdivision Plat, and Federal Wetland regulatory guidelines.

AREA VARIANCE – PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING (add additional information as necessary):
C -127: (Green Acres PUD)

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

Dimensional Requirements

Extend building envelope shown on subdivision plan by ten feet

From
25' from
Garside

To
10' from
Garside

_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Other:

My basic request is permission to build a @28 x 40 residence within fifteen feet of Garside instead of twenty five, because of a wetland now established that leaves about 43 feet of buildable lot depth including the present 25 foot setback.

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 applied for a permit to fill in the federal wetland (the application has been submitted herewith) but even if granted, a federal permit would NOT permit construction of the proposed residence unless the requested variance were also granted.

There is no other available relief except a variance, and in fact, if a federal wetland permit is denied, I will have to abandon the submitted building permit application entirely. There would not be sufficient area to build another structure more than ten feet deep and still leave necessary space to construct a required retaining wall.

There is no additional land available between Garside drive and Saratoga Lake, and side yard spaces are not an issue.

- 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:

Existing adjacent properties at 1 and 5 Garside Drive would actually benefit by having the applicant construct with the least intrusion of their lake views, which the requested set back would accomplish.