

Lawrence, New York September 19, 2011

A Regular Meeting of the Board of Building Design of the Incorporated Village of Lawrence was held on Monday, September 19, 2011 at the Lawrence Village Hall, 196 Central Avenue, Lawrence New York 11559.

Those members present were: Chairperson Benjamin Sporn
 Member Ronni Berman
 Member Barry Pomerantz
 Member Eva Staiman (arrived late)

Those members absent were: Member Barbara Kupferstein

Also present were: Thomas P. Rizzo, Secretary to Board of Building Design. Chairman Sporn called to order the regular meeting of the Board of Building Design at 7:22 PM. Proof of posting for the meeting was submitted.

The minutes of the July 11, 2011 Board of Building Design meeting were submitted to the Board for approval. Upon a motion by Member Berman and seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following vote cast: Ayes: Chairman Sporn, the minutes of the July 11, 2011 Board of Building Design meeting were approved as submitted.

The meeting agenda included seven new applications and no prior application.

Chairman Sporn stated that the applications would be reviewed in the order listed in the agenda.

The following new applications were considered:

Kleinschmidt – 284 Edward Bentley Rd. – One story rear screen porch addition to existing residence and rebuild portion of existing pergola. The Board reviewed the plans and the application. Mr. Gerard E. Meyer came forward and identified himself as the architect for the project. He submitted pictures of the existing pergola on the rear of the house and a picture of what the house would look like with the proposed screen porch

Lawrence, New York September 19, 2011

addition. Mr. Meyer explained that the plan was to replace part of the existing pergola on the rear of the residence with a new screened porch with an accessible roof deck above and to rebuild the remaining portion of the pergola. Mr. Meyer also explained the finish materials to be used for the screen porch and the existing brick paving in the new screen porch area was to be replaced with blue stone, also that the existing landscaping around the existing pergola and new screen porch would be kept when part of the pergola is replaced with the screen porch. He also explained that even though the property had streets on three sides the screen porch would not be seen well due to the existing hedges around the property. 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 Berman to approve the plan for the screen porch addition as submitted. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz, with the following votes cast: Chairman Sporn yes. Mr. Meyer thanked the Board.

Fistel – 100 Cumberland Pl. – Two story rear addition and interior alterations. The Board reviewed the application and plans. Mr. David Fistel came forward and identified himself as the property owner. As Mr. Fistel began his presentation to the Board, Member Staiman arrived and joined the other Board of Building Design members. Mr. Fistel submitted photos of the existing house for the Board to review. The Board Members discussed the proposed finish materials with Mr. Fistel. He explained that the existing vinyl siding on the front of the house would be used on the new addition and the roof of the addition would match the existing roofing on the house. The Board members and Mr. Fistel discussed the windows on the north east elevation of the house. Several Board Members asked if the shutters on the front of the house would be used on the north

Lawrence, New York September 19, 2011

east elevation. Mr. Fistel explained that when he and his wife had the front of the house sided with vinyl siding that the front needed something to improve the look so they added the maroon shutter, which improved the look of the front of the house. The Board and Mr. Fistel discussed the idea of adding shutter to other windows of the house and also discussed the bay windows on the south west elevation of the house. Several Board Members questioned Mr. Fistel about the octagon window on the south west elevation and the North West rear elevation drawings. Mr. Fistel explained that the master bedroom had a cathedral ceiling and these octagon windows would be in the master bedroom, the Board Members and Mr. Fistel discussed if the exterior look of the house was improved or lessened by these octagon windows. Mr. Fistel indicated that he would be agreeable to removing the octagon windows from the design. The Board members and Mr. Fistel discussed the stone to be used on the south west and North West elevations of the house, the Board noted that the plan indicated that the existing brick would be kept on the south east front elevation. Mr. Fistel stated that he and his wife had discussed replacing the existing brick on the front with the same stone to be used on other locations on the house. Several Board members discussed the idea that the stone siding on the south west and North West elevation was too low and would look better if installed to a higher point on the walls, possibly to a point level with the top of the entrance platform on the south east front elevation. The Board discussed this idea with Mr. Fistel. 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 Staiman to approve the proposed additions with the following conditions, 1) the octagon window on the south west and North West elevations will be deleted, 2) window shutters to match the front shutters will be installed on the windows on the north east elevation. 3) the existing brick

Lawrence, New York September 19, 2011

on the south east front elevation will be changed to the stone to be used on other locations of the house and 4) the low stone siding to be installed on the north west elevation and the south west elevation will be installed to a point even with the top of the stair platform on the south east front elevation. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Member Berman yes and Chairman Sporn yes. Mr. Fistel thanked the Board.

Spitz – 384 Donmoor Rd. – Install four foot high aluminum fence around pool equipment and six foot high aluminum fence on front property line and in front yard. The Board Members reviewed the plans and application. Mr. Scharf came forward representing the property owner Marilyn Spitz. The Board members discussed that the four foot high fence was being installed around the pool equipment and that the requested six foot high fence requested for the front property line and front yard would be replacing an old existing fence on part of the front property line. The Board members discussed the existing fence and the request to replace that fence with a new six foot high fence, several Board members did not favor approving a six foot high fence on the front property line. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. The Board conferred on the application. A motion was made by Member Staiman to approve the application with the condition that the front yard and front property line fence is approved for five feet high only and approved the four foot high fence around the pool equipment as submitted. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Member Berman yes and Chairman Sporn yes.

Lawrence, New York September 19, 2011

Meyer – 359 Central Ave. – Install awning on front of store. The Board reviewed the application and plans. The Board discussed the location of the property and the drawing, which indicates the proposed awning, will be pink in color, the Board discussed the colors of signs and other awnings near this location. Member Berman questioned if this was a fixed or moveable awning, the Board surmised that it would be a non-movable awning. The Board members generally agreed that the design of the awning was fine but they would like to see the actual color for the awning material. 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 Pomerantz to request a color sample be submitted for the Board to review before approving the awning. The motion was seconded by Member Berman, with the following votes cast: Chairman Sporn yes, and Member Staiman yes.

Thall – 54 Barrett Rd. – Second floor side addition and interior and exterior alterations. The Board reviewed the application and plans. Sharon and Simeon Thall came forward and identified themselves as the property owners. Member Staiman explained to the Board members that she had a family connection to Thall family and would abstain from review or voting on this application. Mr. & Mrs. Thall presented samples of exterior finish material, a dark gray vinyl shingle panel for the siding, a black and gray roof shingle and stones siding in shades of gray. The Board Members discussed the alterations and change to the roof. Mr. Thall noted that height of the roof was not being changed and the existing roof frame that was present was not being changed. The Board discussed the balcony off the master bedroom at the second floor rear of the house and asked about the railing for the balcony. Mr. & Mrs. Thall explained that the balcony was

Lawrence, New York September 19, 2011

small and you could only stand on it, it was not big enough to sit on and stated that the rail would be a black iron railing to match existing railings on the house. The Board members and Mr. and Mrs. Thall briefly discussed the stone siding that was to be installed and questioned if it would match the color for the siding and roofing, but decide that the stone chosen would be fine. 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 Pomerantz to approve the application for the addition and exterior alteration as submitted. The motion was seconded by Member Berman with the following votes cast: Chairman Sporn yes. Member Staiman abstained from voting.

Alpert – 30 Muriel Ave. – Install retaining wall and estate style fence, five feet high on north and south side property lines and retaining wall and estate fence six foot high on rear/east side property line and gates in side yards. The Board reviewed the application and plans. Mr. Joseph M. Fein came forward representing the Alpert application. Mr. Fein explained that the concrete wall would be installed and the estate style fence would be installed on top of the wall. The Board members questioned the need for the wall with the fence on top, Mr. Fein explained that the residence on the property, while still under construction, had recently been damaged due to flooding conditions at the site and the wall was to mitigate future damage from flooding and the fence was for the safety of his child. Member Berman asked if there was a landscape plan for the property, Mr. Fein explained that for the present time the plan was to install a lawn only. Member Berman questioned that there would not be any plants, bushes or trees planted? Mr. Fein explained that for his child's benefit it would be better just to have a lawn only. Mr. Fein explained that in the future he may add a line of plum trees along the right side property

Lawrence, New York September 19, 2011

line. The Board members and Mr. Fein held a long discussion regarding the look of the concrete wall and the need for the wall, Mr. Fein asked the Board members to look at his cell phone pictures of flooding on the property and the damage caused. Mr. Fein stated to the Board members that the level of the ground on his side of the concrete wall would be lower than the top of the wall. The Board members concluded that the wall would hold water from other properties from entering this property but it would also keep any flooding on the subject property from spreading to surrounding yards. The Board and Mr. Fein discussed what the total height of the wall with the fence on top would be. On the side property lines the combined height of the wall and fence would be five feet high and on the rear property line the combined wall and fence would be six feet high.

Member Berman asked about the sections of fence with a gate to be installed in both side yards of the property. Member Berman questioned the location of the proposed fence and gates in the side yards in relation to the location of the beginning point of the fence on both side property lines. Other Board members did not think the location of the fence and gates in the side yards was an issue. 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 Staiman to approve the application for the walls with fence on top as submitted. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Member Berman yes and Chairman Sporn yes. Mr. Fein thanked the Board.

Bais Medrash of Harborview – 214/218 Harborview South – Install six foot high beige PVC fence on rear property line of adjoining properties. The Board reviewed the application and fence plans. The Board asked if there was anyone present regarding this

Lawrence, New York September 19, 2011

application to install the fences. No one came forward. The Board noted that the two adjoining properties were owned by the congregation. Several Board members asked about the need for the fence and questioned what the rear adjoining property owners might think of a six foot high fence. Chairman Sporn suggested that the adjacent rear property owners might like the idea of a six foot high fence on the rear property line. The Board members discussed the issue of the existing rear property line fences of the adjoining properties and the fact that this new PVC fence would be installed next to an existing fence. The Board members discussed the possibility that trash, and leaves might collect between the two fences and weeds could grow between the two fences. 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 Pomerantz to approve the fence application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Member Staiman with the following votes cast: Chairman Sporn yes. Member Berman abstained from voting on this fence application.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:32 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