

**VILLAGE OF CROTON-ON-HUDSON
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
DRAFT MINUTES OF TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 2026**

PRESENT: Doug Olcott, Acting Chairman
Bill Goldsmith
Matt Berger

ABSENT: James Tuman, Chairman
Ethan Lewis

ALSO PRESENT: Ron Wegner, Assistant Village Engineer, PE
Len Simon, Village Board Liaison

1. CALL TO ORDER at 7:03 p.m.

Acting Chairman Olcott called the meeting to order and noted that he was serving in place of Chairman Tuman who was out of town.

Mr. Olcott also noted that only three members of the five-member Board were present, constituting the minimum quorum. He stated that because of the reduced membership, all applications before the Board would require unanimous approval in order to pass. Applicants were advised that they could choose to adjourn or withdraw an application if concerns arose during deliberations.

2. OLD PUBLIC HEARING

a) Joseph Arnow, architect representative for Meredith Korn, owner--59 Sunset Drive— Located in a RA5 Residence District and designated on the Tax Maps of the Village of Croton-on-Hudson as Section 79.05 Block 3 Lot 18. Request for side yard, total side yard, and lot width variances from Village Zoning Code Section 230-33(A) for a proposed 2 ½ story rear addition.

PRESENT: Joseph Arnow, Architect
Meredith Korn, Owner

Board members discussed the application following review of the prior meeting record and a site visit on March 21, 2026 regarding concerns raised by the neighbor at 64 Sunset Drive.

Mr. Goldsmith stated that although he was absent from the previous meeting, he reviewed the meeting video, considered all public comments, and participated in the site visit. He acknowledged thoughtful suggestions made by a neighboring property owner regarding preservation of a seasonal view, but concluded that the concerns did not rise to the level of an adverse impact on neighborhood character or the surrounding community.

Mr. Goldsmith further stated that while alternative designs may exist, he did not believe the suggested modifications were necessary or required under the zoning standards. He found no significant

environmental or physical impacts associated with the proposal and noted that, although the hardship was self-created, that factor alone did not outweigh the other considerations supporting approval.

Mr. Berger stated that during the site visit the Board was able to observe the neighboring property's concerns regarding views. He concluded that the proposed addition would not create a meaningful disruption and agreed the application should be approved as submitted.

Mr. Olcott stated that he reviewed the prior meeting minutes and visited the site before the meeting. He agreed with the conclusions reached by the other Board members.

The Board discussed and reviewed the 5 Factors:

The Board noted that neighboring properties, including the house directly across the street, have similar setbacks and second-story configurations. Letters of support were submitted from adjoining neighbors and nearby property owners, and no additional adverse comments were received from the public. The Board found that the applicant was constrained by the existing nonconforming structure and that the proposed addition maintained the existing setbacks. The Board concluded there was no practical alternative method to achieve the needed living space while remaining within the existing footprint conditions. The Board specifically noted that the requested relief for the side yard variance and the front yard variance was minimal and not substantial. The Board found that the proposal would not have any adverse physical or environmental impact on the neighborhood. The addition extends toward the rear yard only and maintains the existing setback alignment. No evidence of environmental or neighborhood harm was presented.

The Board acknowledged that the hardship was self-created, as is common with many area variances, but found that this factor did not outweigh the other considerations supporting approval.

The Board determined the 5 Factors:

1. No undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood nor detriment to nearby properties will be produced by the granting of the variance.
2. The benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by a method other than the requested variance;
3. The requested variance is not substantial;
4. The proposed variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district;
5. The difficulty alleged by the applicant was self-created.

MOTION: Mr. Goldsmith made a motion to grant a 2.3ft side yard, a 3.3ft total side yard, and a 5ft lot width variance for a 2 ½ story addition. Seconded by Mr. Berger. All in Favor 3-0. Roll Call: Mr. Goldsmith, yes Mr. Berger, yes, Mr. Olcott, yes (Chairman Tuman, absent, Mr. Lewis absent).

3. NEW PUBLIC HEARING

a) Matthew Dillon, owner—100 Young Ave—Located in a RA5 Residence District and designated on the Tax Maps of the Village of Croton-on-Hudson as Section 79.13 Block 1 Lot 13. Request for a side yard and front yard variance from Village Zoning Code Section 230-33(A) for a proposed 1st & 2nd story addition.

PRESENT: Matthew Dillon, Owner

Mr. Dillon introduced himself to the Board and explained that he and his family have lived at the property for approximately four years and recently welcomed a third child, creating a need for additional living space. He stated that the existing home is a Cape Cod-style residence built in the 1950s and that the foundation predates current zoning setback requirements.

The applicant explained that the existing house is nonconforming, located approximately three inches within the required side yard setback and approximately fifteen inches within the required front yard setback. The proposed project would extend upward and toward the rear yard without increasing the existing nonconformities.

Mr. Dillon also stated that he submitted letters of support from adjoining property owners and nearby neighbors, including neighbors directly across the street.

The Board asked and received clarification that the addition would extend toward the rear yard only. The existing side yard setback is approximately 7.9 ft; the proposed addition would maintain the existing setback alignment and that the requested variances were approximately: 0.1-foot side yard variance and 1.1-foot front yard variance

The Board noted that neighboring homes in the area had similar setbacks and second-story additions.

Acting Chairman Olcott opened the public hearing. With no members of the public speaking, the public hearing was closed.

The Board reviewed and discussed the five factors:

The Board found that the proposed addition would remain within the existing building envelope and would not move closer to any property lines. The Board also noted that neighboring properties, including the house directly across the street, had similar setbacks and second-story configurations. Letters of support were submitted from adjoining neighbors and nearby property owners, and no adverse comments were received from the public.

The Board discussed and agreed that the applicant was constrained by the existing nonconforming structure and that the proposed addition maintained the existing setbacks without expanding the degree of nonconformity. The Board concluded there was no practical alternative method to achieve the needed living space while remaining within the existing footprint conditions. The Board specifically noted that the requested relief for a 0.1-foot side yard variance and a 1.1-foot front yard variance was minimal and not substantial.

The Board found that the proposal would not have any adverse physical or environmental impact on the neighborhood. The addition extends toward the rear yard only and maintains the existing setback alignment. No evidence of environmental or neighborhood harm was presented.

Furthermore, the Board acknowledged that the hardship was self-created, as is common with many area variances, but found that this factor did not outweigh the other considerations supporting approval.

The Board determined the 5 Factors as followed:

1. No undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood nor detriment to nearby properties will be produced by the granting of the variance.
2. The benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by a method other than the requested variance;
3. The requested variance is not substantial;
4. The proposed variance will not an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district;
5. The difficulty alleged by the applicant was self-created.

MOTION: Mr. Berger made a motion to grant a 0.1 ft side yard variance and a 1.1ft front yard variance for an addition. Seconded by Mr. Goldsmith. All in Favor. 3-0. Roll Call: Mr. Berger, yes, Mr. Goldsmith, yes, Acting Chairman Olcott, yes (Chairman Tuman, absent, Mr. Lewis, absent).

b) Maragaret Crocker, owner—39 Palmer Ave—Located in a RA5 Residence District and designated on the Tax Maps of the Village of Croton-on-Hudson as Section 78.08 Block 4 Lot 19. Request for a front yard and rear yard variance from Village Zoning Code Section 230-33(A) for a proposed addition.

PRESENT: Margaret Crocker, owner
Lewis Roane, architect

Architect Lewis Roane presented the application and clarified that the request involved both front yard and rear yard variances, correcting the original application materials that referenced only a front yard variance.

The proposal involved extending and aligning an existing enclosed breezeway connecting the garage and house, along with constructing a canopy over the entrance area. The property is a corner lot with two front yard designations. Mr. Roane stated they were proposing to align the breezeway with the run of the house (toward Hunter Place) but because they were changing the roof that is why the Hunter Place side of the property is considered the front yard.

The Board discussed the property's existing nonconforming conditions, including a prior variance granted in 2016 related to the attached garage connection (was a detached garage but in 2016 it was connected to the house so it was no longer an accessory structure and therefore required a variance). Mr. Wegner,

Assistant Village Engineer explained that Mr. Roane and his clients were extending the connection to the front of the garage.

After review of corrected survey and application information, the Board identified the requested variances as 5.9 ft front yard variance and for a 12.7 ft rear yard variance.

Mr. Roane explained that earlier measurements submitted with the application were based on lower-resolution survey reproductions and were later corrected using a clearer original survey. He stated that the proposed addition would increase the house footprint by approximately 20 square feet, plus a canopy area.

Letters of support from neighboring property owners on Hunter Place were submitted into the record.

The Board stated that after discussion they understood the application as revised with no further questions from the Board, Acting Chairman Olcott opened the public hearing. With no members of the public speaking, the public hearing was closed.

The Board reviewed and discussed the five factors:

The Board found that the proposed addition was minor in scale and would be consistent with the character of the neighborhood. One Board member stated that the addition would “enhance the appearance of the house” and could be considered an improvement to the property. Letters of support from neighboring property owners on Hunter Place were submitted into the record, and no adverse public comments were received. The Board discussed and agreed that the applicant’s goals could not reasonably be achieved without the requested variances due to the existing layout of the house, garage connection, and the constraints of the corner lot. The proposal involved in-filling a small existing recessed area and aligning the entry connection with the existing structure. The Board specifically acknowledged that the requested variances were numerically substantial, noting approximately a 50% rear yard variance and a significant front yard variance. However, the Board found that this was mitigated by the property’s longstanding nonconforming conditions, including prior variances and the tight corner-lot configuration. It was agreed that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the physical or environmental conditions of the neighborhood and stated that the addition would improve the property. No evidence of environmental harm or neighborhood detriment was presented. Lastly, the Board acknowledged that the hardship was self-created, as is typical in many area variance applications, but determined that this factor did not outweigh the remaining considerations supporting approval.

The Five Factors were determined as followed:

1. No undesirable change in the character of the neighborhood nor detriment to nearby properties will be produced by the granting of the variance.
2. The benefit sought by the applicant cannot be achieved by a method other than the requested variance;
3. The requested variance is substantial but mitigated by the fact it is existing non-conforming;
4. The proposed variance will not have an adverse effect or impact on the physical or environmental conditions in the neighborhood or district;
5. The difficulty alleged by the applicant was self-created.

MOTION: Mr. Berger made a motion to grant a 5.9 ft front yard variance and a 12.7 ft rear yard variance for an addition. Seconded by: Mr. Goldsmith. All in favor 3-0. Roll Call: Mr. Berger, yes, Mr. Goldsmith, yes, Mr. Olcott, yes (Chairman Tuman, absent, Mr. Lewis, absent)

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Board deferred approval of the previous minutes from the March 17, 2026 meeting because two members present had not attended the prior meeting.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was duly adjourned at 7:36 pm.

Respectfully Submitted By,

Stefanie Correale
Secretary to the Zoning Board of Appeals