

HISTORIC DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD
85 Main St. Cold Spring, NY 10516

March 14, 2012

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

1. Correspondences:

Preservation Advocate

Preservation Magazine

Building Department – building permit denial for Stephanie Hawkins

New York Metropolitan Transportation Council – Notice of Comment Period

Scenic Hudson - letter regarding submission of outstanding items

Zoning Board of Appeals - minutes regarding lot coverage variance for 18 Fair St.

Andrew Hall - letter regarding new construction at 14 Stone St.

Building Department - building permit denial regarding conversion of garage into a convenience store.

2. New Business:

Joe and Paula Martin, 212 Main St.

Applicant was represented by Mike Waldron, Vertex Construction and Finishing. The Applicant proposed to replace a door and 3 sets of jalousie windows on the enclosed porch at the back of the house. The proposed replacement door was a historic three panel wood door and the proposed replacement windows were to be vinyl double hung windows with surface applied muntins to match the muntin arrangement of the windows in the house.

A. Zgolinski noted that vinyl windows are not allowed in the National Register portion of the District.

There discussion among Board members as to the most appropriate muntin configuration for these windows.

K. Foley noted that this addition was an enclosure of a rear porch which is clearly different from the main house. The siding and detailing are different and appear to be of a more recent era. She questioned whether or not we should be trying to make the windows match the windows of the main house. She stated that it was probably more appropriate to have them appear more modern to match the period of the addition.

A. Zgolinski asked Mr. Waldron if any other changes were contemplated such as replacing the siding. Mr. Waldron answered that the only exterior changes were the door and windows. In addition, there would be some repair work on the inside.

The consensus of the Board was to follow the more modern aesthetic of the addition as it presently is. The Board discussed options with the Applicant and Mr. Waldron agreed to the following changes to the Application:

- Windows will be wood windows – 1 over 1, with no applied muntins – with the exterior trim to be narrow.
- Exterior door to be a wood door with a large pane of glass similar to the door presently there.

The Chairman called for a vote on the application as amended. It was approved 5-0. The Applicant to submit revised drawings with the trim detail and catalog cuts of the door and windows.

3. Old Business:

Henry and Vera Keil, 34 West St.

Henry Keil, the applicant presented the Board with revised drawings based on the discussions of February 8, 2012; The Applicant presented the Board with the following:

- Elevation of 4 facades – both existing and proposed
- Site plan
- Perspective drawings which showed porch and railing details.
- Post and beam configuration at the rear of the building for the parking area.
- Caps on the railing posts
- Wooden French doors for the 2nd and 3rd Floors.
- ½ half rounds copper gutters and leaders.

The Board members commented very favorably on the revised design. A. Zgolinski asked if perhaps some structural bracing would be required at the post and beam at the rear of the building. P. Colangelo suggested that a trellis would be appropriate in that location. The Board stated that the proposed configuration was acceptable and that if the Applicant so desired, he could add a trellis or horizontal bracing member.

C. Bachan asked what type of door would installed in the back of the elevator. Mr. Keil responded that it would be a solid door to match the others in the building.

A. Zgolinski asked if half height intermediate guardrail posts would be required on the sides and back similar to those on the front façade. He felt that the distance from full post to full post may be too long. Mr. Keil responded that he would have to check. The Board agreed that if required structurally, the addition of these posts were also acceptable.

The Chairman called for a vote on the application as amended. It was approved 5-0. The Applicant will submit the following:

- A blown up detail of the post, rail and half size intermediate post with the cap.
- On one of the drawings call outs of the materials being used
- Catalog cut on solid door for elevator.
- The light fixtures will be submitted for approval at a later time. The Board asked Mr. Keil to look at the ceiling of the underside of the exterior decks when making his choices.
- Investigate whether or not he needs to add intermediate post on the side and back railings.
- The addition of a horizontal bracing member or trellis in the back

4. Board Business:

Paul Henderson and Beth Sigler, 14 Stone St.

The Board examined its records of the replacement of an existing shed at 14 Stone St. in light of the complaints to the Village by neighbors. Several of the Board members visited the site prior to the meeting.

The Board's review of the file showed that the Board followed all of its standard procedures. The Application was approved and a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued on 8/13/08. Chairman Zgolinski reviewed the steps the Board normally takes in the review process. The Board did not hold a public hearing in this case because public hearings are normally held on changes to the District which are deemed significant. W. Bujarski, the Village Building Inspector stated that the structure being built complied with the Certificate of Appropriateness from 2008.

Susan Peehl and Andrew Hall, 13 Fair St. questioned the approval, stating that the size and height of the shed being built was not in scale with the other structures in back yards. A. Zgolinski pointed out that several other structures in back yards were taller than what was shown in the Application. There was discussion between the neighbors and the Board about whether the shed was appropriate to its location.

Fred Norgaard; presented photos and read a letter dated 3/14/12.

During the discussion, the question was raised about the foundations. The Certificate of Appropriateness states that the new structure was to be built on existing foundations. The neighbors claim that the foundations were rebuilt, and done so larger and higher. A. Zgolinski pointed out that this question is a zoning issue which is not in the purview of the Board. W. Bujarski stated that he would have to check but he thought that the footprint was exactly the same.

Several neighbors who were present also complained about not having notification that an application for the change was being reviewed by the Board. A. Zgolinski stated that their normal procedure was to publish the agenda of application in the PCN&R and post it on the Village website. There was a discussion about whether the Board should require of all applicants that their neighbors be notified. In addition, there was discussion about what criteria to use for calling for a public hearing. The Board stated that it would take the comments and discuss further whether or not to change the Board's procedures. K. Foley stated that she would prepare for discussion by the Board a list of criteria to use when determining whether or not a public hearing is called for applications presented to the Board.

Bill Burjarski suggested that the neighbors submit an application to the ZBA for interpretation of the zoning ordinances.

P. Colangelo moved to adjourn the meeting and K. Foley seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 11:06 P.M.

Al Zgolinski, HDRB Chairman

Date