

**THE VILLAGE OF COLD SPRING
HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD
85 Main St. Cold Spring, NY 10516**

June 9, 2010

Members present: Chairman; Al Zgolinski Members: Carolyn Bachan, Pamela Colangelo, Peter Downey and Kathleen Foley

1. Welcome New Member:

Chairman welcomed new member and local historic district resident Carolyn Bachan.

2. Minutes:

The minutes of May 12, 2010 were reviewed. K. Foley requested two changes to the minutes. P. Downey moved to accept the minutes as revised and K. Foley seconded the motion. The amended minutes were approved 3-0. P. Colangelo and C. Bachan abstained as they were not present at that meeting.

3. Correspondence:

- Preservation Alliance Review
- Referrals from the building inspector
- Bill from Larson Fisher Associates regarding the survey work done in Fall 2009
- Catalog and annual report from the Preservation League of New York State
- Letter from Trustee B. Campbell regarding marching in the parade for community day
- Minutes from other boards for review

4. New Business:

A. Eric Worth, 173 Main St.

The Applicant proposed to install half-round copper gutters; with half-circle hangers. The single-story, shed-roofed portion of the house will not have gutters. K. Foley confirmed that leaders on the primary façade will be moved to the side rather than running down the front of the porch columns.

The Chairman called for a vote. The application was approved 5-0. The Chairman asked the Applicant for 3 copies of catalog cuts of the proposed gutters.

B. Cold Spring United Methodist Church, 216 Main St. (Joseph Barbaro)

J. Barbaro, representing the Church Board, returned to the HDRB with a modified version of an earlier-proposed sign. The proposed sign would be 4'x 4' carved and painted wood, the lower portion of which would include several lines of changeable plastic lettering (not illuminated) The sign will be placed perpendicular to the street, and spot lights installed in the ground. The sign will be held up by chains.

The Chairman called for a vote on the application. It application was approved 5-0.

C. Michael Rapalje, 7 Cherry St.

The Applicant proposed the following:

- Replace wooden rear stoop with new decking, railing and spindles.
- Replace wooden decking with composite material.
- Remove the existing aluminum siding around the stoop with rails and spindles similar in profile to those existing on the front porch.

There was a discussion about the columns and the Review Board agreed that the existing columns would remain because it was a rear porch.

The Chairman called for a vote on the application. It was approved 5-0. The Chairman asked for 3 sets of the application packet and 3 copies of catalog cuts of the materials.

D. Louis Mejia, 9 Furnace St.

Karim Taylor represented the applicant, who was before the Board following a violation from the Building Inspector. The Applicant replaced two windows in the front of the house and two windows on the back of the house with neither a Certificate of Appropriateness nor a Building Permit. All four were replaced with double-hung vinyl windows, which, according to the design guidelines, are not allowable in the National Historic District. Ms. Taylor noted that the Applicant was unaware of the Historic District Review Board and the need for its approval. She noted that the existing windows were not historic and were replaced because they were rotting and had had makeshift repairs with duct tape. The Applicant submitted an application to replace the windows post-facto, as well as replacement of a rotted wooden sill on an additional window

K. Foley requested clarification from the Chair regarding past cases of post-facto applications. The Chair explained that the review Board can (1) fine the applicant and ask for the work to be reversed, (2) approve the work post-facto, or (3) approve the work with modifications or conditions.

A discussion ensued regarding the challenges of this property; many changes have been made in the past without approval, including those by the previous owner. Further, the windows that had been removed were themselves unapproved replacement windows. Precedence was also discussed, as well as the difficult position the Review Board and Village are placed in when asked to approve changes they would not have approved and have denied when requested by other applicants. The Review Board discussed the fact that the Applicant should not be penalized for work they did not undertake, but should not have their violation go unaddressed. The entire Review Board expressed reservations about this Application and in particular the precedent set by a post-facto approval.

The Chairman called for a vote on replacement of the windows and it was approved by a vote of 4-1. A. Zgolinski voted no stating that vinyl windows are not acceptable for use in the National Historic District, as per the Design Guidelines. The Chair then noted that the Application was also for replacement of rotted sills. He then proposed a compromise for the entire application: approve the replacement windows, but require the Applicant to remove the aluminum from the surrounds on *all* windows on the house. The Applicant agreed.

The Chairman called on a vote on the discussed condition to remove all the aluminum cladding. It was approved 5-0.

As part of the pre-vote discussion, members Colangelo and Foley provided the Applicant with careful descriptions of the types of projects that require HDRB review. Following the vote, the Chair warned the Applicant that she has been educated about the requirements and process of the HDRB as part of this review, that a rare exception has been made in the vote, and that if she commits a similar violation in the future the Review Board will not be inclined to compromise in violation processes. He further instructed the Applicant that the Review Board expects to receive a proper application, in compliance with the Design Guidelines, in advance of replacing the fifth window she referred to in the hearing. The Applicant agreed.

E. Jim Farnorotto (The Gift Hut), 86 Main St.

The Applicant proposed a vinyl sign with die cut letters that will be affixed to the outside of the store's front window. The Chairman called for a vote on the application. It was approved 5-0.

F. A. Zgolinski, 23 Market St.

The Applicant asked for a renewal of the application for rebuilding a previously approved shed. The Chairman called for a vote for a renewal of a Certificate of Appropriateness. It was approved 4-0. A. Zgolinski abstained.

G. K. Foley and John Hedlund, 2 Locust Ridge

i. Roof

The Applicant proposed a dark grey architectural-grade shingle to match what had been approved previously for an addition. Damaged bricks in the chimney will be replaced and the mortar repointed to match existing color and joints. Existing chimney flashing will be replaced; Review Board members requested that the new material be copper.

ii. Gutters

The Applicant asked for approval with options to accommodate possible discoveries once the existing roof is removed. Option 1: restore Yankee gutters if possible; option 2: hang metal half-round gutters and round leaders on main mass and addition.

A. Zgolinski noted that the Review Board does not need to approve replacing existing asphalt shingles with new asphalt or the chimney repair work as this is considered repair work.

The Chairman called for a vote on the roof and gutter proposal. It was approved 4-0. K, Foley abstained

iii Porch Repair

The Applicant proposed to restore historic materials that had been removed in previous repairs: horizontal lattice, brick support piers. Damaged columns on the south side of the porch will be replaced with new pine columns to match existing in height and profile. All horizontal rails will be replaced to match existing, and as many balusters as possible will be repaired. Where repair is not possible, new balusters will be turned to match existing in material and profile. Decking on south side will be replaced with mahogany to match existing in dimension.

The Chair noted again that these repairs which do not need approval by the Review Board.

iv. Porch Modification

The Applicant requested to add a set of stairs on the south side of the porch. She noted two other houses in the neighborhood, designed by the same architect, which have original side stairs. She requested to add the stairs between the center columns, with no railing if Code allows. P. Colangelo suggested placing the stairs in the last bay so that they better relate to the side door; the Applicant was willing to consider the option of the stair could be designed to accommodate the existing fence gate. The Chair asked that Review Board approve two options, one with a center stair and one with a terminal-bay stair.

The Chairman called for a vote. It was approved 4-0. K. Foley abstained. The chairman asked that the Applicant return to the Review Board with drawings if the Code requires stair railings. The Applicant agreed.

4. Board Business:

A) The Board discussed bollards proposed by the village for the municipal dock. The existing guardrail is going to be relocated so that the bollards can be placed as close to the water as possible. The Village is looking into installing two more bollards for boat moorings.

K. Foley noted that this proposal was discussed with the Mayor in an informal weekend session which included talk of a re-design for the fence. She noted that with only two members were present there was no quorum, and that the Mayor said he would be submitting a formal application.

B) K. Foley reported a lit “open” sign having been installed in the new consignment shop on Main Street. The shop’s name sign had been the subject of an application in May, but the “open” sign was not approved. She inquired about guidelines for lighted signs hung on the interior as this one is. The chair confirmed that unless grandfathered, no illuminated signs are allowed to be visible from a public right of way within the districts, and said that he would follow up with the Building Inspector.

K. Foley restated her confusion about what review is required for signs, including the time-frame in which a sign can be posted without HDRB review. The Chair confirmed a 30-day window for unapproved signs.

C) The Chairman noted that if the Board members have any questions regarding the composting ordinance, they should submit them to the Village Clerk.

D) P. Colangelo explained the window repair she is doing to her house, confirming that she repaired existing sashes with glass from other locations in the house. She has not replaced historic fabric with new windows.

E) The Chair reported that Jill Fisher of Larson/Fisher will make some of the changes to her final report that the Review Board requested, but has the support of the SHPO to reject others, including the removal of the contributing and non contributing columns from the survey spreadsheet. He confirmed that the Review Board will withhold \$1,000 from the final payment until the requested and approved changes are made. He also asked the Board to help complete work on the document (including photos) so it can be sent to SHPO. P. Downey and C. Bachan confirmed their availability.

K. Foley moved to adjourn the meeting and P. Downey seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 10:51 pm.

Al Zgolinski HDRB Chairman

Date