

Christopher & Hope Caulfield
1 Jacoby Street
Croton on Hudson, New York 10520

April 30, 2024

Robert Luntz, Chairman,
and Members of the Planning Board
Village of Croton on Hudson
1 Van Wyck Street
Croton-on-Hudson, New York 10520

*Re: Berger – 213 Cleveland Drive
Proposed Accessory Dwelling Unit*

Dear Chairman Luntz and Members of the Planning Board:

My husband, Christopher and I, own the property at 1 Jacoby Street, which is the property adjacent to the proposed accessory dwelling unit at 213 Cleveland Drive. While we respect the fact that the applicant desires to build an accessory dwelling unit, we have concerns regarding the size, location, and layout of the proposed unit.

Foremost, is the size of the unit. The recently updated accessory dwelling unit regulations limit the size of accessory dwelling units to a maximum of 800 square feet (sf). However, the applicant is currently proposing a 1,050 sf accessory dwelling unit, which is 250 sf greater than the maximum allowed and would require an approximately thirty-one percent (31%) variance. In addition, this extra 250 sf would make it comparable in size to the surrounding homes, including ours. This begs the question of what creates the necessity for a variance of an extra 250 sf? On the surface such a variance seems excessive.

As to the location, the proposed dwelling unit appears to be about 45 feet from our home, but over 100 feet from the Berger's home. Respectfully, the Board should not permit an oversized accessory dwelling unit to be closer to a neighbor's home than to the residence to which it is accessory. If the Board is so inclined to consider granting a variance for the extra 250 sf, then certainly the setbacks should be larger and the building should have to comply with the setbacks applicable to principal dwelling units.

As to the layout, we question the request for a new second driveway with a two-car parking area. The Berger's current driveway provides two garage parking spaces and ample outdoor driveway space for the parking of additional vehicles; no additional parking to serve an accessory dwelling unit on the lot should be needed. There is also ample street parking near the Berger's property. The provision of a separate driveway and two-car parking area further reinforces the appearance that the proposed oversized unit is a separate principal dwelling and not a dwelling accessory to the Berger's home.

Robert Luntz, Chairman,
and Members of the Planning Board
April 30, 2024
Page 2

In conclusion, it is respectfully submitted that the proposed dwelling unit, which is oversized, significantly setback from the Berger's principal residence, and has a separate driveway and parking area, reads like a separate principal residence rather than an accessory dwelling unit. It is in direct contrast to the policy of the new accessory dwelling unit law which provides that the accessory dwelling unit should be designed so that the lot gives the appearance of having only one single-family dwelling. For these reasons, it should not be approved as proposed.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Handwritten signatures of Christopher J. Caulfield and Hope Caulfield in blue ink. The signature of Christopher J. Caulfield is on top, and the signature of Hope Caulfield is below it.

Christopher & Hope Caulfield