

Lawrence, New York, February 1, 2010

A Regular Meeting of the Board of Building Design of the Incorporated Village of Lawrence was held on Monday, February 1, 2010 at the Lawrence Village Hall, 196 Central Avenue, Lawrence New York 11559 at 7:22 P.M.

Those members present were:                      Chairperson Benjamin Sporn  
Member Eva Staiman  
Member Barbara Kupferstein  
Alternate Member Myrna Breitman  
Alternate Member Shoshana Weinstock

Those members absent were:                      Member Ronni Berman  
Member Barry Pomerantz

Also present were: Ronald Goldman, Attorney to Board of Building Design, Thomas P. Rizzo, Secretary Board of Building Design and Gail Daniels, Building Department.

Chairperson Sporn called to order the regular meeting of the Board of Building Design at 7:27 PM. Proof of posting for the meeting was submitted. Four members of the board were present for a quorum. The meeting was called to order with the following members present: Chairperson Sporn, Member Staiman and Alternate Members Breitman and Weinstock. The agenda included three new applications and two prior applications. The Chairman was advised that one applicant and his designers were present for the prior application for 22 Causeway and the designer and builder were present for the new application for 55 Lawrence Ave. As a courtesy Chairman Sporn elected to take those applications out of order and to allow the applicants and designers present to provide additional information regarding their application.

*The following new application was considered:*

**Gold – 55 Lawrence Ave.** – (One story rear addition and paving) As the Board began to review the application Member Kupferstein arrived at 7:34 PM and took her place with the board for a total of three members and two alternate members present for the meeting.

Lawrence, New York, February 1, 2010

The members reviewed the application and had questions regarding the proposed addition, the patio and the granted variance. While the Board Member reviewed and discussed the application, Mr. Goldman, Attorney to the Board of Building Design, explained to the audience that the Board members were not ignoring the applicant or other representatives present but were reviewing the drawings. Mr. Goldman explained that the drawings were sent out in advance of the meeting for the members to review though the Board members did not discuss the application until they met together in a public meeting. The Board discussed the different siding materials used on the south elevation of the house. The Board was advised that the builder and as well as a representative from Rabco Engineering, P.C. that produced the plans were present. The representatives came forward and were identified themselves to the Board; Maria Miro of Rabco Engineering and Tom Moffit the Builder. Ms. Miro began by explaining that there was a mistake on the south side elevation drawing. Two new windows that are to be located in two new baths to be installed in part of the existing house that was to be altered as part of the addition were not shown on the elevation drawing. The Board questioned why on the south side elevation drawing it appeared that the existing house was brick, then there was a one story section of the house sided in some kind of wood siding and then the side of the new addition next to this wood sided section of the house would be sided with brick. It was explained that the part of the existing residence to be altered as part of the new addition was from a previous addition to the original brick house and this previous addition was built with wood siding. The Board members questioned Ms. Miro and Mr. Moffit about the possibility of changing the existing wood siding to brick so that the south side elevation of the new addition, the previous addition and the existing house would all be a matching brick. Ms. Miro and Mr. Moffit stated that it was possible to have the south side elevation be all brick. Ms. Miro explained that there might be an

Lawrence, New York, February 1, 2010

additional change to the design. The new addition was designed with a pitched roof, and the existing one story section of the house to be altered next to the new addition had an existing flat roof with deck and railing above. Ms. Miro explained that there had been a leak problem connected to this flat roof and the owner and builder might therefore elect to change the flat roof to a pitched roof to match up with the roof of the new addition.

The Board did not voice any concerns regarding this possible design change. Members Sporn, Staiman, Kupferstein, Breitman, and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the application with the condition that the new addition and a previous addition on the south side would be sided with a brick to match the existing brick on the residence.

*The following prior application was considered:*

**Lowinger – 22 Causeway** – (Amend previously approved drawings, one story rear addition, two story front/side addition and interior alterations) The members reviewed the application and had questions regarding the proposed addition, the raised terrace on the front, the materials, the prior design which was being replaced and the granted variance.

The Board was advised that the home owner was present and a representative was present from Elias Associates, Inc. the designer firm that produced the plans. The representative came forward and identified as, Edda Elias of Elias Associates, Inc., Mr. Ben Lowinger, the property owner of 22 Causeway and Mr. David Shilling Architect/designer. The Board questioned the design of the addition in relation to the existing house and the brick, stone, glass and metal panels to be used to side the new addition. Ms. Elias and Mr.

Shilling explained that there had been some changes proposed that were not reflected in the elevation drawings and color renderings submitted for review. The original plan was for the existing unpainted brick on the original house to remain and the proposed new chimney and out door fireplace on the front side of the addition to be a matching brick

Lawrence, New York, February 1, 2010

and stone. Ms. Elias explained that the design had changed, that the existing brick on the house and the new brick might be painted in a gray tone to match the new stone on the addition, or another option was to replace or cover the existing brick with the same stone that is to be used on the addition. The Board discussed what effect these two options might have on the existing house and several members noted that they considered the existing house to be very nice as it presently exists. Ms. Elias and Mr. Shilling explained the ideas involved in the design and explained the use of the glass curtain wall on the front of the addition and the use of zinc metal panels to side the round section of the addition that would enclose stairs and how the color tones of the zinc panels and the stone would tie in to the coloring of the existing house siding. After discussing the design and the changes to the design as explained by Ms. Elias, Members Sporn, Staiman, Kupferstein, Breitman, and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the application with the condition that either the existing brick on the residence be painted in a gray color to compliment the new stone siding to be used on the addition or that the existing brick would be removed and/or covered or replaced with the same stone siding to be used on the addition. Ms. Elias, Mr. Shilling and Mr. Lowinger agreed to the condition. The Board asked how long it would be before a decision was made either to paint the existing brick or cover/replace the brick with new stone. Ms. Elias stated the decision would take about six to eight weeks to make. The Board asked to be advised of the decision regarding the brick or stone.

The Board returned to consider the remaining new and prior applications.

Lawrence, New York, February 1, 2010

*The following new applications were considered:*

**Kagan – 34 Lord Ave.** – (Second floor rear addition) The Board reviewed the application and plans and noted that they reviewed this property for a second floor side addition several weeks ago. The Board was advised that the second floor side addition did not require a variance and was begun under a separate permit and approval from the Board of Building Design. The rear addition that the Board was reviewing now required a variance which had since been granted and was now being review as a separate permit. The Board noted that the new rear addition would match the roofing and siding of the existing house and the side addition under construction. No one appear before the Board to support or oppose the application. Members Sporn, Staiman, Kupferstein, Breitman, and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the application as submitted.

**Salamon – 5 Andover Ln.** – (One story front additions, two story rear additions, second floor side and rear additions and interior alterations) The Board reviewed the application and plans, and questioned the reduced rear yard setback. The Board was advised that variances had been granted regarding the proposed additions. Mr. Goldman advised the Board that the property backed up to the Route 878 highway and that there was no opposition to the requested rear yard variance. Though the Board noted that the original house had shutters on the front second floor windows but the proposed addition/alteration drawings did not show window shutters, the Board determined that the new design did not require shutters. Board members Mrs. Staiman and Mrs. Breitman questioned the size of the second floor front middle window above the new front porch roof, nothing that the window looked too large for the space. They requested that the widow size be reduced to be in scale with the space above the new porch roof, that a smaller oval or square accent window was suggested. The Board also discussed the new roofing, siding

Lawrence, New York, February 1, 2010

and trim material samples and colors submitted for review. Several Board members disagree with the choice of a bright white color for the trim and beige for the siding.

After a brief discussion, the Board agreed to approve the finish materials and colors as submitted. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application.

Members Sporn, Staiman, Kupferstein, Breitman, and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the application with the condition that the second floor middle front window, located above the new front porch roof, be reduced in size. Board members Staiman and Breitman suggested that some type of accent window be used at the location.


*The following prior application was considered:*

**Vonderheide – 600 Ocean Ave.** – (Amend previously approved drawings, exterior alterations to existing residence, and change windows to doors, install patio and convert flat roof to second floor deck area) The plans for the residence now included replacing all of the windows in the residence and interior changes which required the relocation and enlargement of a window on the front of the house. Applicant wants to change previously approve sliding glass doors to french doors. The existing glass sun room on the side of the house that was to have the flat roof converted to a second floor deck must be completely rebuilt due to rot and structural damage. The sun porch will be completely rebuilt as per the new codes with new glass sliding doors and a new panel design above the doors and with the new deck above. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Members Sporn, Staiman, Kupferstein, Breitman, and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the application as submitted.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM

Lawrence, New York, February 1, 2010

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.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Thomas P. Rizzo", written over a horizontal line.

Thomas P. Rizzo