

Lawrence, New York August 20, 2012

A Regular Meeting of the Board of Building Design of the Incorporated Village of Lawrence was held on Monday, August 20, 2012 at the Lawrence Village Hall, 196 Central Avenue, Lawrence New York 11559.

Those members present were: Member Ronni Berman
 Member Eva Staiman
 Member Barry Pomerantz
 Alternate Member Myrna Breitman

Those members absent were: Chairperson Benjamin Sporn
 Member Barbara Kupferstein

Also present were: Thomas P. Rizzo, Secretary to Board of Building Design. Acting Chairperson Berman called to order the regular meeting of the Board of Building Design at 7:15 PM. Proof of posting for the meeting was submitted. The meeting agenda included five new applications and one prior application. Acting Chairperson Berman stated that the Board would review the minutes after the agenda items were completed.

The following new applications were considered:

Lawrence Cedarhurst Fire Department – 75 Washington Ave. – One and two story additions and alterations to existing building. Mr. Ronald Goldman came forward and identified himself as the attorney representing the Lawrence Cedarhurst Fire Department, and he stated that also present was Mr. William Quintanilla of Frank G. Relf Architect P.C. and the First Assistant Chief of the Lawrence Cedarhurst Fire Department, Jack McHugh. Mr. Goldman explained that the Fire Department had obtained a variance from the Village to construct an addition to the building. The Board members reviewed the plans and elevation drawings and questioned Mr. Quintanilla regarding the exterior finish

Lawrence, New York August 20, 2012

materials to be used on the addition. Several Board Members questioned Mr. Goldman regarding the need for the addition. Mr. Goldman deferred to First Assistant Chief Jack McHugh. Chief McHugh explained that the size of the trucks and other equipment had required additional space. The Board Members discussed the needs of the fire department and the requested addition. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Member Staiman to approve the application and elevation drawings as submitted. The motion was seconded by Alternate Member Breitman with the following votes cast: Alternate Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Acting Chairperson Berman yes and Member Pomerantz yes. Mr. Goldman thanked the Board Members.

Kerr – 215 Causeway –One story front addition and complete exterior modifications to residence. Mr. Gerard E. Meyer came forward and identified himself as the architect for this project. Mr. Meyer stated that Mr. & Mrs. Kerr were also present. The Board Members reviewed the elevation drawings and the plans. Mr. Meyer explained that the proposed plan was to bring the house back to its more original design. The home had been altered and changed to a modern look with a two story high front covered entrance porch with all the trim and siding being replaced with a stucco finish. The new plan was to remove the two story high entrance porch. Add a one story front addition to enlarge the front entrance hall. Add a more in scale one story covered front porch with round columns. The stucco siding was to be replaced with cedar shingle siding and white trim. Add all new windows, a new front door with side lights and a new charcoal colored roof shingle. Several Board Members asked if the applicants had considered adding shutters to the windows. Mr. Meyer explained that shutters had been considered but due to the

Lawrence, New York August 20, 2012

window locations there was not room to install shutters. The plan was to install wider trim around all the windows in place of shutters. The Board agreed with the use of wider trim around the windows and doors. Member Staiman asked about the use of corbels at several locations on the house. Mr. Meyer explained that the corbel design was to enhance the flat look on the house. The rear the corbels were being used to add support to an existing second floor balcony. Member Staiman stated she had no problem with the corbels on the rear elevation but suggested that the other elevation might look better without the corbels? Other Board Members stated that they had no problem with the corbels in the design. The Board Members generally agreed that the proposed work would improve the look of the home. Member Staiman agreed the house would look very nice. It was just her view that the design would look better without the corbel in the design. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Member Pomerantz to approve the application with a request to remove the corbels from the front elevation. The motion was seconded by Acting Chairperson Berman with the following votes cast: Alternate Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Acting Chairperson Berman yes, and Member Pomerantz yes. Mr. Meyer thanked the Board and stated that he would discuss the corbel design issue with the applicants.

Chabbott – 33 Muriel Ave. – One story front addition. Ms. Margo Neri of Richard Bienenfeld Architect came forward representing the architect for the project. Ms. Neri indicated that Mrs. Chabbott the property owner was also present. The Board Members reviewed the plans and the elevation drawings. Ms. Neri explained the proposed addition and submitted a brick sample with printed information regarding the windows, trim and

Lawrence, New York August 20, 2012

the front door with side lights that would be used for the proposed addition. Several Board Members questioned Ms. Neri about the design of the addition and the number of columns on the front of the proposed addition. Member Staiman asked if the structure required all of the shown columns. Ms. Neri noted that the design indicated two columns on the right side of the addition where the front entrance door would be located. Then there would be four columns spaced out across the remaining front of the additions. She also indicated that the columns would be supporting the roof of the addition. Member Staiman asked if the two center columns could be removed from the design as those columns appeared to hide the addition behind the columns. The Board Members and Ms. Neri held a long discussion regarding the columns without a resolution to the matter. Mr. Rizzo asked the Board Members if they want to defer the application to give the designer and owner time to revise the plan. The Board did not want to defer the application. Ms. Neri asked for a moment to confer with Mrs. Chabbott and the Board agreed. Ms. Neri stated to the Board that the two center columns in the design at the front windows of the addition would be removed. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Member Staiman to approve the application with specific condition. That the two center columns on the front elevation would be removed from the design. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Alternate Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Acting Chairperson Berman yes and Member Pomerantz yes.

The following prior application was considered:

Glaubach – 3 Firethorn Dr. – Request to install six foot high gray PVC fence on the rear property line, on both side property lines and a five foot high fence in both side yard areas. Mr. Ronald Goldman came forward representing Mr. & Mrs. Glaubach, Mrs.

Lawrence, New York August 20, 2012

Glaubach was also present. Member Staiman stated that this application had already been reviewed by the Board, why was it before the Board now? Mr. Goldman explained that an issue had been raised by the adjoining property owner regarding the interpretation of the Boards approval of the fence and how the fence was installed. Mr. Goldman explained that the Board had approved the fence with the condition that the fence be installed no higher than the adjoining neighbors' chain link fence. Mr. Goldman also stated that he was under the impression that the neighbor had dropped their objection and decided to landscape on their side to block the view of the new fence. The Board Members asked Mr. Rizzo about this information. Mr. Rizzo advised the Board Members that Mr. Ryder, the Building Department Superintendent, received the same information from the neighbor regarding landscaping in front of the fence. Member Staiman stated that there really was no issue before the Board then. The Board Member review two pictures of the referenced new fence and the adjoining existing chain link fence and noted that the existing chain link fence was old, covered by vines, plantings and that the top of the chain link fence was not level. Additionally the chain link fence had several low spots and the fence dipped down in several locations below the new fence on the adjoining property. The Board Members generally agreed that there was no issue with how the new fence was installed compared to how the Board approved the fence. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Acting Chairperson Berman stated that she believed that the applicant had pushed the envelope a little with the way the new fence was installed but the Board did not have an issue with the fence and the Board would stand with its original vote and approval of the fence. Mr. Goldman and Mrs. Glaubach thanked the Board Members.

Lawrence, New York August 20, 2012

The following new applications were considered:

Huberfeld – 24 Briarwood Ln. – Replace existing 6 foot high wood fence with same type of fence on part of rear property line and on the Jorgen Street side property line and in the side yard area adjacent to Jorgen Street. Also install a matching 6 foot high wood fence on part of the rear property line and on the left side property line where there was no fence existing. Dr. and Mrs. Huberfeld came forward and identified themselves as the property owners. The Board Members reviewed the fence application and plot plan submitted. Acting Chairperson Berman noted that when she visited the site that the existing fence had been taken down already and a part of the new fence had been installed but was not what the Board would normally approve. Dr. & Mrs. Huberfeld explained that the fence company began to install the fence under the impression that permit had been approved at the meeting on August 13. Mr. Rizzo explained to the Board Members and Dr. & Mrs. Huberfeld that he had contact all the applicants and or the listed contractor for any applications scheduled for the August 13, 2012 Board of Building Design meeting and explained that the Board of Building Design meeting scheduled for August 13, had been canceled and was rescheduled for August 20. The Board Members and Dr. & Mrs. Huberfeld discussed the possible reason why the fence company put up the fence without having the issued permit in hand. Member Pomerantz stated that he was familiar with the subject property and remembered that there was a 6 foot high fence on the property line adjacent to Jorgen Street. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Member Pomerantz to approve the fence application with the specific condition that the wood fence shall be 6 foot high on the rear property and the side property lines adjacent to Jorgen Street. The fence on the north side property line and in the two yard areas was

Lawrence, New York August 20, 2012

approved at 5 feet high only. The motion was seconded by Acting Chairperson Berman with the following votes cast: Alternate Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Acting Chairperson Berman yes and Member Pomerantz yes. Acting Chairperson Berman asked Dr. & Mrs. Huberfeld if they understood that the 6 foot high fence already install on the north side property line would have to be replaced with a 5 foot high fence, they stated they understood and would advise the fence company.

Jungreis – 515 Ocean Ave. – Install 5 foot high chain link fence on part of rear property line. Mr. Glen Katz of Tennis Planning came forward representing the property owners. The Board Members reviewed the application and the plan for the location of the proposed fence. Acting Chairperson Berman stated that she had visited the site and was concerned about the different types and heights of fencing on the property. Mr. Katz asked what she was referring to. Chairperson Berman stated that part of the property adjacent to Briarwood Crossing had a brick wall then there was a 5 foot high wood stockade fence, then behind the wood fence was a very tall chain link fence and beyond that was another type of fence around the pool. Chairperson Berman asked about the high chain link fence. Mr. Katz explained that the chain link fence was ten feet high and was part of the tennis court and the wood stockade fence was also installed with the tennis court, both previously approved by the Board of Building Design. Several Board Members asked why the applicants wanted to install the chain link fence on the rear property line. Why there was an existing wood stockade fence on part of the rear property line? Mr. Katz explained that the applicant wanted to enclose their yard and the existing landscaping at the rear line made it easier to install a chain link fence. The Board Members and Mr. Katz held a long discussion about what was the applicants need for this section of fence to be installed and discussed the idea of extending the existing wood

Lawrence, New York August 20, 2012

fence on part of the rear property line. Mr. Katz stated that he did not think the applicant wanted a wood fence. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Acting Chairperson Berman to deny the application to install the chain link fence. The motion was seconded by Member Staiman with the following votes cast: Alternate Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Acting Chairperson Berman yes and Member Pomerantz yes. The Board voted unanimously to deny the fence application. Mr. Katz thanked the Board.

With the completion of the agenda items the Board reviewed the minutes of the June 4, 2012 and the July 9, 2012 Board of Building Design meeting minutes. Upon a motion by Member Pomerantz and seconded by Acting Chairperson Berman with the following vote cast: Ayes: Acting Chairperson Berman, Member Staiman and Member Pomerantz, the June 4, 2012 and July 9, 2012 Board of Building Design meeting minutes were approved as submitted, Alternate Members Breitman abstained from voting on the minutes, she stated she was not present for those meetings.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:10 PM.

This is to certify that I, Thomas P. Rizzo, Secretary to the Board of Building Design, have read the foregoing minutes and the same are in all respects a full and correct record of such meeting.

Thomas P. Rizzo