

**Village of Cold Spring
Historic District Review Board
85 Main Street, Cold Spring, New York 10516**

December 12, 2012

Members: Chairman Al Zgolinski, Carolyn Bachan, Marie Early and Kathleen Foley

Member absent: Peter Downey

1. Old Business:

Steve Gazzola, 6 Stone St. (windows)

The applicant noted he would like to restore the existing windows. Currently the windows do not open. The applicant asked for a Certificate of Appropriateness on replacement windows as an option only if something goes wrong with the restoration such as workmen or contractors not finishing the job.

If a replacement window is needed the Applicant noted the following:

- The replacement windows would be 6 over 6 simulated divided lights.
- If a window cannot be repaired all the windows on that façade will be replaced.
- The proposed window would be a Peachtree window made of wood.
- The Applicant believed the replacement window would be a pocket window which would replace the sash without hurting the trim.
- The replacement window would be a double glaze replacement but the original window is a single glaze window.

K. Foley noted that previously the applicant was going to talk to a preservation carpenter to get an assessment of the historic sashes. The applicant was then going to decide whether to replace the windows or restore them.

The Board members had the following suggestions:

- Zgolinski suggested that the five windows in the front façade should be inspected carefully to see if they can be restored. The contractor should look at the side windows to see if they could be used as a spare replacement for the front windows if needed.
- K. Foley suggested the applicant should have a full assessment on the restoration of the windows.

After a discussion over the repair or replacement windows the following was suggested:

Separate the application into two parts.

1. The front façade will just be a repair.
2. The two sides and rear will be for new windows.

M. Early moved to approve a motion with a modification to replace a total of seven windows on two sides and the rear of the house. C. Bachan seconded the motion. It was approved 4-0.

2. New Business:

A. Joe Meyer, Kemble Ave. (new Construction)

Representing the Applicant was Juhee Lee-Hartford, River Architects. The application proposed was for the construction of a new single family home to be built on two lots combined from a previous subdivision. Mrs. Hartford described the following:

- Build on an existing plateau.
- Garage at the bottom near Kemble Ave.
- A court yard in the back of the house which would focus on a boulder.
- There would be minimum disturbance to the hill.
- A retaining wall would be built to control the water coming down from the hill.
- There would be a green roof such as a lawn or garden.
- A stone wall base and wood siding used on the house to blend in with the background
- The angle of the building is at an angle due to solar gain.

A public hearing will be scheduled after a workshop meeting. A workshop meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, January 2, 2013 at 8:00 P.M.

A list of neighbors to notify of the public hearing was reviewed. It was noted that Kemble Ave. neighbors, adjacent neighbors on Marion Ave and Judith Rose should be notified about the public hearing.

Feedback from the Board.

M. Early noted the following:

- Setback should be similar to the neighbors, needs to relate to neighbors.
- The angle of the building is not the same as the neighbors, it faces at an angle.

C. Bachan noted the following:

- The angle of the building to the street is a problem.
- She would like to see more detail of materials.

K. Foley noted the following:

- Sees house relating to mid-century houses.
- The garage and retaining wall feels a bit like a LA hilly streetscape.
- New structures should look of their time.
- Sees the house relating to the surroundings,
- Great place to do a green roof.
- The style of the garage looks very suburban and does not fit into the Village.

A. Zgolinski noted the following:

- The building needs to fit into the context and suggested bringing photographs to the workshop meeting.
- The stone wall was part of an access Road to the Parrott Garage and could be used to fit into context.
- Angle of house can be angled to a minimum. Possibly a portion of the building can face the street.

- Board members can do a site visit.
- Suggested the Applicant should look at houses in the village to see how the grade was handled.

B. Kenny Elmes/Dunkin Donuts 33 Chestnut St. (menu board)

The applicant proposed a menu Board and noted the following:

- A separate speaker tower will be to the right of the menu board and noted trees will be planted to north side and a board to board fence to the back of the property.
- The back lighting will not be seen at all.
- Light coming down and facing the Plexiglas menu board will create a glare.
- A back light menu board will be the least offensive.
- The lights will be on from dark to 10:00 P.M. and two hours in the morning.
- The menu board is not made without back lighting.
- The menu board uses low wattage bulbs.

A discussion ensued regarding the lighting of the menu board and M. Early noted that the people on Marion Ave. will see the sign from the inside of their homes.

The applicant will be put on the January agenda.

Chairman A. Zgolinski noted that site lighting was not included in the approval and the light poles shown on the drawing should be put on the application with the sign board and cut sheets for the light poles are needed.

3. Minutes:

- The minutes of November 14, 2012 were reviewed and M. Early moved to approve the minutes as amended and C. Bachan seconded the motion. The revised minutes were approved 4-0.
- The minutes of November 28, 2012 were reviewed K. Foley moved to approve the minutes as amended and M. Early seconded the motion. The minutes were approved 4-0.

4. Correspondence:

- The Putnam County News & Recorder dated 11/30/12 for the amount of \$41.61 for legal notices for Butterfield Hospital site.

5. Board Business:

- The Board discussed the procedure for the upcoming workshop meeting for Butterfield Realty LLC.
- The Board discussed contributing vs. non-contributing buildings and the fact that criteria for contributing and non-contributing buildings are not defined in the Village Code.
- The Board discussed the different dates of the extensions added to the hospital building and the structural framing.
- There was a discussion comparing the Butterfield Hospital building to other buildings in the village.
- The Board discussed the procedure for developing the finding of facts.

K. Foley moved to adjourn the meeting and M. Early seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 11:09 P.M.

Al Zgolinski, Historic District Review Board Chairman

Date