

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

November 2, 2011

**Members present:** Chairman; Al Zgolinski Member: Carolyn Bachan, Peter Downey, and Kathleen Foley

**Member absent:** Pamela Colangelo

The Chairman opened the public hearing at about 8:02 P.M.

***James Geppner, 18 Church St.***

The Applicant proposed renovations to the exterior of the building. James Hartford, River Architects, explained that the project is an existing 1950's home. The proposal is for a Passive House. The applicant proposed the following:

- Replace and relocate windows the front façade. The proposed windows will be triple glazed windows with no trim.
- Roof line will stay the same height but dormers will be added.
- Exterior of the house will have exterior rigid insulation; clad with stucco.
- Garage door will have aluminum rails and glass panels.
- The porch will be made of clapboard siding.
- Garden wall will be stucco and brick.
- Front staircase will be replaced with an entrance at the ground floor.
- Solar panels were proposed.

The applicant presented the board with return request receipts for legal notices sent to adjoining neighbors.

James Hartford noted that the following revisions have been made to the application.

- Spacing of the garage door rails have been changed to be more square rather than rectangular.
- The type of metal siding on the tower.
- Solar panels for hot water have been removed.
- Horizontal banding on the south porch has been eliminated.
- Siding around the dormer and garage will now be clapboard siding.

Mr. Geppner noted he believed the proposal is consistent with the guidelines and the neighbors support the project.

The Chairman took a five minute recess for public to review the site plans.

Meeting resumed at 8:47 P.M. for public comment.

Chairman Zgolinski reviewed the procedures of the public hearing.

Ms. Stephanie Hawkins, 15 Academy St. – stated that she appreciated the soft recessed, polite rendering of the house; she also noted it's a great place to live and design is of good quality.

Simon Draper, Church St. -applauded the applicant for the visual improvement and in the future would like to see more sustainable energy projects.

Mr. Leo Sacks, 37 Church St. – stated that he liked the integrity and design of the proposal and he applauded the environmental design.

Mrs. Anne Impellizzeri, 15 High St. – stated that she liked the good design and that design echoed the village.

Mr. Michael Robinson, 25 High St. - complimented the design and thought the applicant had gone a long way toward addressing the questions of the Board from the first session. He stated that the HDRB and the Village need to balance owners' rights to build with the constraints of the village's design vocabulary. He encouraged the Board to examine the framework of the historic guidelines and to adopt a flexible approach.

Mr. Matthew Francisco, 18 Orchard St. stated that it is obviously a 50's building and asked why make reference to Victorian style structures? Mr. Francisco noted it's a beautiful design and will be very attractive. Mr. Francisco noted he was curious about what the goal is for non-contributing structures and asked if the Historic Board will in the future look at newer buildings as historic. Mr. Francisco asked the Board members "why, if there is a vacant lot, does a Victorian Style house have to be built?"

Chairman Zgolinski replied it is difficult to produce a contemporary design in a historic district. People struggle with trying to fit a sympathetic design into a historic district. Chairman Zgolinski noted the Board does allow for leeway in such instances.

K. Foley added that the issue of contributing and non-contributing is always difficult because it communicates a devaluing of the buildings identified as non-contributing, and gives the impression that they're not worth caring about. She said that the Board tries to examine each building on its merits rather than on the basis of its designation as contributing or non-contributing. Most mid-20<sup>th</sup> century buildings in this village are not located in the historic districts and therefore are not protected. As the community undertakes reviews of the guidelines and the status of the districts, we must think very carefully about buildings outside the current period of significance as they are, over time, obtaining their own historical significance.

Mr. Luke Fiske, 153 Main St. –noted the forward nature of a passive house is much more welcoming and noted that it is significant that all neighbors on the street support the proposal.

Chelsea Mozen, 13 Church St. – congratulated applicant on the design.

Chairman Zgolinski Closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

James Geppner noted that he educated himself on the subject of Mr. Francisco's comment contributing and non-contributing structure per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to Rehabilitation. He noted that a house which was built in one period should not be constructed to look like a house from another period.

Mr. Matthew Francisco, 18 Orchard St. - asked the Board members: How does a homeowner avoid having to build a period-style home? K. Foley responded that the HDRB does not force anyone to design new construction in a particular historic style; applicants sometimes come to the Board wanting to mimic a historic style and the HDRB must respond to the application.

James Hartford - noted some guidelines address the issues of not re-creating history in new construction.

A. Zgolinski stated that he disagreed. The guidelines are for modifications and features that are going to be preserved. Guidelines don't say you have to produce designs of a specific era and noted this proposal is an existing building but it is a new design.

James Hartford suggested reopening public comment in this particular point. The Chairman agreed.

Mr. Simon Draper Fair St. – stated that just because something is not significant now doesn't mean it will not be significant in the future. He noted that taking into consideration the poetry of village, the design creates something that fits in the Village. He feels the design makes a significant contribution to the Village. He stated that he would like to see more innovation in the poetry of the Village.

Mrs. Anne Impellizzeri, 15 High St. – stated that talk maintaining the 1950's design of the existing structure because it is not an outstanding representative of its period.

Mr. Luke Fiske, 153 Main St. – noted he agreed with the garage design being kept 1950's design.

Mrs. Ann Impellizzeri, 15 High St. - noted the ridge line is 1950's.

C. Bachan reported on an informal survey she took of mid-20<sup>th</sup> century houses around the village. There are many sub-styles within the 1950's and 1960's era. Cape-cod style houses have very straight ridge lines. Single story ranch houses have a ridge line facing the street with wood siding or sometimes brick. She stated that most have evolved over time with added dormers. She noted the building being proposed and its neighbor are so different from others of their time, and not remarkable. She felt that a few limited aspects of the existing structure reference the era for the most part.

The Chairman closed public comment again at around 9:30 P.M. and opened the meeting for Board member comments.

C. Bachan asked how the wall in front yard is being treated now that it is not a retaining wall. James Hartford noted that the grade is being lowered and the entrance is at the ground floor.

K. Foley asked why the applicant had removed the horizontal banding around the south porch. Mr. Geppner said that the change was made to accommodate the negative response some Board members had to the banding.

P. Downey asked if the garage door panels will be made of glass. James Hartford answered yes, security glass and aluminum.

K. Foley said that as first designed she felt the garage door was inappropriate, but as redesigned she thought it is appropriate. Some Board members felt the door looked commercial; she disagreed.

A. Zgolinski asked if the driveway is sloped. Mr. Geppner noted it slopes rather deeply.

K. Foley noted the stair tower design feels unresolved as compared to the rest of the structure, and noted that it seems more of the 1970s in style.

C. Bachan reference the full length windows as being similar to things added to 1950's buildings.

C. Bachan expressed concern over the introduction of commercial metal cladding in the tower

and the garage door she noted that metal siding is used mostly on commercial buildings. James Hartford noted getting a garage door appropriate to the 1950's house is very difficult.

K. Foley noted the garage door looks very sleek does not look like a commercial door.

P. Downey noted he liked garage door but the tower doesn't look like it fits on the building. Mr. Geppner noted the tower was needed for interior stairs and to keep the house at 1 ½ story.

A. Zgolinski noted he did not think the siding on the tower references board and batten as the applicant asserted and noted the windows are not all the same. James Hartford responded that the larger pane window ties in with the window by the garage. The entrance window is more prominent. The narrow window is about 30 inches wide. A. Zgolinski asked how much above the floor is the sill? James Hartford responded pretty close to the floor. A. Zgolinski felt that the metal siding on the tower is not appropriate in the district and he felt its inclusion added too many materials to the design; he noted that wood, stucco and a standing seam metal roof are already being used.

James Hartford suggested using the same standing seam as on the roof. A Zgolinski stated that he did not think that would be appropriate.

C. Bachan noted the tower to her seems more like a bump out.

P. Downey suggested that the tower seems suspended in the air and recommended anchoring it to the ground somehow.

K. Foley stated that as a reconstruction she felt the form, massing and materials of the design are appropriate, particularly because of the reference they make to forms and materials throughout the district. She is comfortable with the proposed siding on the tower.

C. Bachan agreed with A. Zgolinski regarding the inappropriateness of the material of the siding.

A. Zgolinski noted he shared P. Downey's concern about tower design.

James Hartford noted the bump out is needed to accommodate interior stair height. The tower comes out 6 ½ inches from the building. Mr. Geppner asked if the tower would be acceptable if it went the full height of the house and lined up with the window. James Hartford noted this is a renovation which is working with an existing structure. It is important structurally for the interior configuration of space.

P. Downey suggested making the tower about 2 inches out instead of the 6 ½ inches being presented.

C. Bachan noted the window on the tower does not line up with anything.

A. Zgolinski noted he has no problem with metal siding but there may be a siding closer to board and batten than the material is being proposed.

James Hartford commented that it seems as if there are particular issues around which the Board will not reach consensus. He asked if approving the application is based on 100 percent member agreement or majority agreement. A. Zgolinski answered that the approval is determined by a majority vote.

A. Zgolinski noted the Board can vote on proposal as presented or if James Hartford agrees the Board can work with the applicant to resolve issues of concern. A. Zgolinski noted the Board has 15 days from the close of the public hearing to make a decision.

K. Foley moved to close the public hearing and P. Downey seconded the motion. The public comment period was closed at 9:59 P.M.

K. Foley moved to approve the application with the exception of the tower and asking the Applicant to come back to discuss the tower. P. Downey seconded the motion. Chairman called for a vote on the application as submitted with the exception of the tower. The application was approved with the discussed revision by a vote of 4-0. The applicant will come back next week to discuss the tower.

C. Bachan moved to adjourn the meeting and P. Downey seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 10:08 P.M.

---

Al Zgolinski, Chairman HDRB

---

Date