

Lawrence, New York June 13, 2011

A Regular Meeting of the Board of Building Design of the Incorporated Village of Lawrence was held on Monday, June 13, 2011 at the Lawrence Village Hall, 196 Central Avenue, Lawrence New York 11559 at 7:15 P.M.

Those members present were:           Member Ronni Berman  
  Member Eva Staiman  
  Member Barbara Kupferstein  
  Alternate Member Myrna Breitman  
  Alternate Member Shoshana Weinstock

Those members absent were:           Chairperson Benjamin Sporn  
  Member Barry Pomerantz

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 7:26 PM. Proof of posting for the meeting was submitted.

The minutes of the May 13, 2011 Board of Building Design meeting were submitted to the Board for approval. Upon a motion by Member Staiman and seconded by Member Berman with the following votes cast: Ayes: Alternate Member Breitman, Member Staiman, Acting Chairperson Berman, Member Kupferstein and Alternate Member Weinstock, the minutes of the May 13, 2011 Board of Building Design meeting were approved as submitted.

The meeting agenda included five new applications and no prior application. Acting Chairperson Berman asked for the first application.

The following new applications were considered:

**Schwartz– 45 Briarwood Ln.** – Detached garage, paving for driveway and curb cut.

The Board reviewed that application and plans. Mr. Rizzo explained that there was an existing detached garage, paving and curb cut on the property that would be removed and

Lawrence, New York June 13, 2011

a new detached garage built with a driveway and new curb cut. Mrs. Berman noted for the record that the house (45 Briarwood Lane) fronts on Briarwood Lane but this detached garage would be located adjacent to Waverly Place. Three gentlemen came forward regarding the application and identified themselves as Mr. John Winbery and Mr. Adam Wanaseja both of DH Murray Architecture, the architects for the project and the contractor, Mr. Glen Katz of Tennis Planning. Mr. Winbery and Mr. Wanaseja submitted a material samples for the proposed garage for the Board to review. Mr. Winbery and Mr. Wanaseja explained the application and discussed the proposal to remove the existing detached garage and the construction of the new garage with the Board. Mr. Glen Katz submitted a revised landscape plan for the area around the new garage. Mr. Katz explained that the original landscape plan had been submitted for approval with the tennis court that was presently under construction and previously approved by the Board. Mr. Katz explained that the landscape plan was changed to make room for the new garage building and driveway with additional plantings to be installed around the new garage and driveway. Mrs. Berman questioned Mr. Katz regarding the type of arborvitae to be planted. Mr. Katz explained the two types of arborvitae would be planted at different locations around the garage and tennis court. Member Kupferstein asked how the garage would be used, Mr. Winbery explained that the building would be used for parking two cars by the property owner. Member Kupferstein asked how the property owners would access the new garage, would there be a stones or a path. Mr. Winbery explained that the owners would cross the lawn area to get to the garage building. Member Staiman noted that there is an existing large circular driveway at the front of the house adjacent to Briarwood Lane. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. The Board members conferred on the application. A motion was

Lawrence, New York June 13, 2011

made by Member Staiman to approve the application for the proposed new detached garage, paving and curb cut with the indicated landscaping as submitted. The motion was seconded by Member Kupferstein, with the following votes cast: Alternate Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Acting Chairman Berman yes and Member Kupferstein yes and Alternate Member Weinstock yes.

**Kahn – 20 Muriel Ave.** – Two story front and rear additions, rear terrace addition, alter side addition and enclose first floor porch and complete interior and exterior alterations to existing residence. The Board reviewed the application, plans and a material sample board submitted. Mr. David Shteierman came forward and identified himself as the architect for this project and submitted copies of a computer generated drawing of the front of the proposed altered residence for the Board to review. The Board Members discussed the proposed plans and reviewed photos of the existing house. Acting Chairperson Berman asked Mr. Shteierman where the trash storage area would be located on the property. Mr. Shteierman explained that the trash storage area would be located on the south side of the house near the side door. Member Staiman asked about the windows by the stairs well. Mr. Shteierman explained that there was a beautiful circular stair behind the window and the window was designed to let in a large amount of light to the stairwell, the wall is made up of individual windows. Acting Chairperson Berman stated lets go back to the garbage issue for a moment. Whatever is worked out the garbage area is not to be seen from the street. Mr. Shteierman agreed and stated the garbage area would be hidden from the street. Acting Chairperson Berman asked if anyone else had any comments on the plan. Alternate Member Weinstock asked if the railing on the front porch plans would be white as shown. She did not think it matched

Lawrence, New York June 13, 2011

the house. Mr. Shteierman agreed and stated that the railings on the first floor would most likely be black to match the railings on the second floor. Alternate Member Weinstock stated it was a minor issue but did believe that the black railing would look better. Acting Chairperson Berman asked if this plan had been seen by the other neighbors during a variance hearing. Mr. Rizzo and Mr. Shteierman both explained that the proposed work did not require any variances. Mr. Rizzo stated these plans were only going to be reviewed by the Board of Building Design. The Board discussed the large windows proposed for the side of the house by the interior stairs. Mr. Rizzo asked Mr. Shteierman if the windows being discussed by the Board would have any grills or mullions or would the windows just be large plate glass windows? Mr. Shteierman stated at the moment there were no plans for the windows in question to have grills or mullions. Alternate Member Weinstock asked Mr. Shteierman if the windows would have stained glass. Mr. Shteierman stated that the windows may have a leaded design on the glass or an etched pattern on the glass and there would be window treatments for the windows for the home owners benefit as well as the neighbors. Mr. Shteierman stated that he thought that it was better to be looking at something enclosed in glass rather than a large wall of brick which would make the home look bigger. There would be windows on three sides of the stairs which protrude out but not as far out as the existing house. The Board discussed shades on the windows and again asked about grills. Again Mr. Shteierman stated that there were no plans for grills but leading could be added or an etched design could be added to the windows. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. The Board Members conferred on the application. A motion was made by Member Kupferstein to approve the proposed additions and alterations with a request that leading be added to the windows on the side of the house at

Lawrence, New York June 13, 2011

the interior stairs or the glass be etched. Acting Chairperson Berman added that a drawing of the windows must be submitted to the Board for final approval. Also that the trashed storage area must be located out of site on the property, Acting Chairperson Berman added that a drawing must be submitted for approval regarding the location for the trash storage area and show if the trash area will be hidden by a structure or by shrubs. The motion was seconded by Member Staiman with the following votes cast: Alternate Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Acting Chairperson Berman yes, Member Kupferstein yes and Alternate Member Weinstock yes. Mr. Shteierman thanked the Board.

**Englander – 163 Harborview N.** – Install six foot high solid PVC fence on the side and rear property lines. The Board reviewed the fence application. The Board Members briefly discussed the concrete box structure in the rear yard of the property; Acting Chairperson Berman explained to the other members that the only issue before the Board tonight for this property was the fence. Mr. Englander came forward and identified himself as the property owner. Acting Chairperson Berman explained to the other Board Members that she had met Mr. Englander when she visited his property regarding the fence application. She explained that she had discussed with Mr. Englander that the Board has approved six foot high fences on rear property lines, but the fence had to be level and could not be on top of that concrete thing in the rear yard. Mr. Englander explained that the fence would not be installed on that concrete structure. Acting Chairperson Berman asked if the fence would be in front of or behind the concrete structure. The Board Members and Mr. Englander discussed the location of the proposed fence in relation to the concrete structure; Mr. Englander explained that the fence would

Lawrence, New York June 13, 2011

be located on the property line and would block the view of the concrete structure from the adjoining properties. Mr. Englander explained that they were requesting a six foot high fence on the side property lines for religious and modesty issues to make it easier for women to use the pool, he had spoken to his side neighbors about the request for a six for side line fence and his neighbor to his left was planning to install a pool also. Acting Chairperson Berman explained that it was the Boards policy to limit side property line fences to five feet high, and explained that Mr. Englander could plant trees as tall as he wanted on the side lines. Acting Chairperson Berman noted that all of the surrounding homes are very high and Mr. Englander's pool area could be seen from the other properties, a six foot high fence would not block the view to his pool. Mr. Englander and the Board discussed his need and issues involved in requesting the six foot high side property line fence. Acting Chairperson Berman suggested a four foot high fence in the side yards to enclose the rear yard pool area. The Board continued to discuss the fence height and privacy issues with Mr. Englander. The Board stated that it could approve a six foot high fence on the rear property line and five foot high on the side property lines. Member Staiman made a motion to approve a six foot high fence on the rear property line and five foot high on the side property lines, the motion was seconded by Alternate Member Breitman. Member Staiman stopped the vote to ask the color of the PVC fence, and Acting Chairperson Berman asked if the fence had a finished side and an unfinished side. The Board reviewed the application which stated the fence would be beige in color and it was noted for the record that PVC fences are finished on both sides. Acting Chairperson Berman asked if Mr. Ryder of the Building Department could investigate this concrete box/planter and possibly recommend some rule changes to the Board of Trustees to regulate these things. Mr. Rizzo stated he would express this to Mr. Ryder.

Lawrence, New York June 13, 2011

A couple from the audience asked to be recognized, Mr. Rizzo asked them to come forward and identify themselves for the record. Mr. and Mrs. Radbell came forward and identified themselves as the property owners to the rear of the Englander property. They explained to the Board that they were very upset by the large concrete box that Mr. Englander had constructed in his rear yard adjacent to their rear property line. They had photos of their rear yard and what they look at in the Englander rear yard, the photos were given to the Board to review and the Board reviewed the photos and the concrete structure and discussed same with Mr. and Mrs. Radbell and Mr. Englander. Mr. and Mrs. Radbell explained that they had lived in the Village of Lawrence for many years and asked why the Village allowed this thing to be built and why the Board would approve it? Acting Chairperson Berman and the other Board members expressed sympathy for the issues brought up by Mr. & Mrs. Radbell and explained that the concrete box appeared to not be under Village of Lawrence jurisdiction and the issue of this concrete box/planter was not something they had review power over. The Board was here tonight to review the requested fence. Mrs. Radbell questioned why she would have to look at the six foot high fence on Mr. Englander property, which would be taller than her existing five foot high fence. The Board Members all explained that the Board did approve six foot high fence on rear property lines and noted that the six foot high fence would block any view of the concrete box/planter from the Radbell property. The Board members all expressed understanding for the situation regarding this concrete box/planter and would ask Mr. Ryder to investigate and make possible recommendations to the Board of Trustees. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Mr. Rizzo stated that a motion had been made by Member Staiman to approve the fence, beige colored PVC, six foot high on the rear property and five foot high on the side property

Lawrence, New York June 13, 2011

lines. The motion has been seconded by Member Breitman and the vote now is:

Alternate Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Acting Chairperson Berman yes, Member Kupferstein yes and Alternate Member Weinstock yes.

**Frisch – 1 Keewaydin Rd.** – Add second curb cut and additional paving for circular driveway. The Board reviewed the application and plans. Acting Chairperson Berman stated that she wanted to recommend that the Board table this application for tonight due to the fact that there is an eight foot high construction fence around the property and other site issues which make it difficult to view the site properly regarding the requested driveway, paving, and additional curb cut. Board Member Kupferstein and Alternate Member Weinstock stated that they believed that the application could be reviewed as they had plans with dimensions to review and then there was the question if the request complied with Board guidelines regarding the requested additional paving and curb cut. The Board reviewed the plans and determined what paving was approved with the original house and what would be added and where the additional curb cut would be located. Acting Chairperson Berman stated that the Board could vote on her recommendation to table the matter or proceed with the review. Member Kupferstein stated that the construction fence would not block her from reviewing the application. The general consensus of the Board was to review the application. The Board Members held a long discussion regarding the paving, setbacks distances for the paving, the second curb cut and possible landscaping. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. The Board members conferred on the application. A motion was made by Alternate Member Breitman to approve sufficient paving in the side yard area adjacent to Causeway and to create a turn- around area attached to the originally



Lawrence, New York June 13, 2011

approved driveway and require landscaping around this driveway and turn-around area. Member Breitman also made a motion to deny the requested second curb cut and to deny the addition of any paving forward of the front wall of the house toward Keewaydin Road. The combined motions were seconded by Member Staiman, with the following votes cast: Alternate Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Acting Chairperson Berman yes, Member Kupferstein yes and Alternate Member Weinstock yes.

**Wolfson – 203 Lakeside Dr. S.** – Enclose part of front porch, interior alterations and paving. The Board reviewed the application and plans. The Board Members discussed the existing finishes on the exterior of the house and the new materials. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. The Board members conferred on the application. A motion was made by Member Staiman to approve the application as submitted for review. The motion was seconded by Alternate Member Breitman with the following votes cast: Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Acting Chairperson Berman yes, Member Kupferstein yes and Alternate member Weinstock yes.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:42 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