

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

February 13, 2013

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

Member absent: Peter Downey

1. Old Business:

A. Alex Hillis representing St. Pauly Textile, submitted on behalf of St. Mary's Episcopal Church, 1 Chestnut St.

Mr. Hillis presented the Board with a picture of the revised version of the proposed shed. The following are the revisions:

- Pine board-and-batten siding with trim along the bottom and the top of the shed.
- Although the HDRB does not have purview over color, the applicant opted to indicate that the shed will be a single color similar to the granite of the main church building (including the trap door chute), and that two signs will be darker than the original submission, with the intent to match the existing St. Mary's sign.

The double doors are on the long side of the shed and are used to pick up items and must be accessible for trucks. The door on the short side will enable church members to organize the shed. K. Foley said the shed is so much improved and she appreciated the effort that the applicant had made to make the changes suggested by the Board.

Mr. Hillis noted that the alternate placements of the shed previously suggested by Board members could not be done due to steep gradients. K. Foley noted that, given the sensitive modifications to the shed, the placement of it will have much less impact on the church and grounds. C. Bachan commented that this proposal is much more attractive than the shed placed at Trinity Church in Fishkill; Mr. Hillis countered that that shed has received many compliments. K. Foley said that Mr. Hillis had done a good job making the shed site-specific to St. Mary's.

Chairman Zgolinski called for a vote on the shed application as amended. It was approved 4-0.

Chairman Zgolinski called for a vote on the site location of the shed, which is the original proposed location. It was approved 4-0.

The applicant needs to submit 3 copies of the updated materials list and updated images.

B. Steve Gazzola, 6 Stone St.

The Applicant presented a request for the installation of exterior wooden storm windows to go over all existing windows. They will be flush mounted and made of cedar and have period appropriate metal hardware. The installation will start on the front windows first. The Chairman called for a vote on the application as submitted. It was approved 4-0.

C. Stephanie Hawkins, 15 Academy St.

The Applicant proposed a two story addition on the rear of her house. A. Zgolinski asked if there would be a need for a public hearing, and the board members felt it was necessary.

S. Hawkins reviewed the application. The addition will be 6 feet 2 inches deep and include the following:

- A back door and stair landing.
- Two small sky lights on both sides of the roof.
- A false window above door.
- Lattice skirting to mask concrete piers
- Corner boards will be placed between the original fabric of the house and the addition.
- The siding will match existing novelty board siding.

It was suggested that one larger skylight be used on each roof rather than two smaller ones which don't line up with anything else on the facades. Photovoltaic panels will be on the roof of the main mass.

A public hearing was scheduled for March 13, 2013 at 8:00 P.M.

2. Public hearing

Joe Meyer, Kemble Ave. Tax map #48.12-2-74-1 and 74-2.

Chairman Zgolinski reviewed the public hearing process.

Juhee Lee-Hartford, River Architects, represented the applicant.

Present for the applicant was Juhee Lee-Hartford, River Architects, Mr. Joe Meyer and his daughter Ms. Carolyn Meyer.

Juhee Lee-Hartford reviewed the site as being densely wooded, sloped, with a ledge and a large boulder on site; there are no structures on parcels immediately to the east and west. The application was for a contemporary, single family home on two combined lots, built on the ledge. Ms. Lee-Hartford reviewed surrounding homes and buildings in the neighborhood, describing how she drew inspiration from asymmetrical rooflines around the village (including historic images) and in particular on a shed to the east of the site. Ms. Lee-Hartford thanked the board for their suggestions in the workshops, and noted that many ideas raised have been incorporated into the design and improved on it significantly. The proposed building was described as follows:

- Having a green roof
- The garage, on the first floor, is set back to minimize its visual impact; the upper floor is cantilevered.
- Driveway tucked into the slope to minimize its visual impact.
- Façade has rustic, natural appeal with stained wood siding (possibly cedar).
- Overhang on entry way with trellis.
- Great room will have walls of windows along the west and north sides.
- The grandmother suite over the garage will have a porch along the front.

Material:

- An historic stone wall on the site will be referenced in stone facing of the lower floor's west exterior to its junction with the garage.
- The garage will be stucco on the first floor

- Siding - vertical wood
- Asymmetrical gable roof
- Solar tubes instead of skylights.
- Railing on the deck will be cable and will be capped with wood.
- Vegetative plugs on the green roof.
- Windows will be all wood and triple glazed.
- The garage door will be stained to match the stucco.
- Lattice/trellis (cedar) around the entry way (top and side of door) will be stained to match the stucco.
- The retaining wall on the west side of the driveway will be 4 feet tall (the maximum allowed by the Code).
- A window was added to the garage on the southeast side to allow light on the interior of the garage.
- The deep ledges in the front of the great room will have planter boxes.
- Flashing will be dark metal.

New drawings will be presented showing the revised entry way and cantilevered garage. Ms. Lee-Hartford noted that the line of no disturbance (placed on the lot by the previous subdivision) has expired so it is no longer valid.

At 9:07 P.M. the chairman gave the public a few minutes to review the drawings.

At 9:15 P.M. the Chairman opened the meeting for public comment.

Mr. Michael Robinson, 25 High Street - noted he is very impressed with the design, how the foundation reflects the stone walls all around Cold Spring, loves the roof line which is a complement to the historical roof lines, loves the board-and-batten which is a really great choice, and from an energy point of view the fenestration provides heat as well as great views. It is a beautiful modern design. At this point, A. Zgolinski asked for clarification from the architect about the siding asking if it was board-and-batten or vertical board siding; the response was vertical board siding.

Mr. Joe Meyer - noted he appreciated River Architects' work on his project.

Public comment period was closed at 9:17 P.M. The meeting was then opened for Board member comments.

A. Zgolinski - questioned the window added to the southeast side of the garage by noting it seems to stick out, looks a little out of place. Mr. Meyer noted the window will bring more light in the garage and it is not seen from the street. K. Foley said that she felt the owners were so successful in minimizing the garage portion by pushing it back and now the window seems like an exclamation point drawing the eye to the garage.

C. Bachan – said that she appreciated the difficulties of the site, and with the demands of the interior program and the energy concerns, as well as the Historic District concerns, she commends the owners and the architect on the design. She said the only concern she had was where the existing old stone wall meets with the lower level façade stone cladding. She noted she has seen examples, particularly in

Nelsonville, of stone street walls that are obviously veneers. She is hopeful that on this design the true look of fieldstone will be achieved. J. Lee-Hartford said that the mason would like to take the stone from the site, hand cut it and transition from bigger to smaller pieces as he moves away from the rebuilt and into the house's foundation. C. Bachan said she felt this is the most important element that ties the design in with the Village's historic character. K. Foley said that the stone walls in the Village are significant character defining features and that it is unfortunate that the municipally-owned stone walls are the ones collapsing. K. Foley felt that getting local stone from the site will ensure that the color is right, and using a recessed joint will help achieve the look of an historic stone wall. C. Bachan said that it is hard to marry that concept with a modern house, but the architect has done it.

K. Foley - noted she wished more members of the public and the press were here to see this presentation; this project is an excellent example of what new construction in an Historic District can be – a product of its time and yet it tied back to the Village's history. She said she appreciated the very clear lines that the architect drew between local historic precedents and the design. She felt that setting back the garage and accentuating the entryway met what were the only somewhat problematic elements of the design. She noted the tiny window over door continues to feel like an afterthought because its scale and shape is so unlike anything else on the facade. C. Bachan felt the problem is the placement of the window. K. Foley said it was not a deal-breaker to her, but that is the one spot where the design does not seem whole. K. Foley said that she is pleased that a green roof is being installed in the Historic District.

A. Zgolinski inquired about the flashing; the applicant stated that it would be a dark metal drip edge. A. Zgolinski suggested lead or zinc coated copper to tie it in with the color of the stone.

The Chairman called for a vote on the application. It was approved 4-0. K. Foley commented that there are likely to be members of the public who will wonder how this contemporary design relates to the district, and suggested that River Architects make a public presentation similar to what she presented to the board.

The chairman requested updated drawings including details of the drip edge. J. Meyer said that the process has been an excellent introduction to a friendly Village.

3. New Business:

A. Gallery 66, 66 Main St.

The applicant proposed a painted letters or possible vinyl letters on existing trim above the windows to replace the existing temporary sign; the applicant said she would prefer paint. Chairman A. Zgolinski noted that if it is going to be painted it does not have to come before the Board. C. Bachan said that if she chooses vinyl and the sign is less than 4 square feet, it also does not have to come before the Board. K. Foley asked the applicant to clarify the size, since the extant sign is the entire width of the trim. The applicant confirmed the new sign will be smaller as represented in the images she submitted.

B. Danielle Locastro and Michael Musso, 19 Parrott St.

Madeline Sanchez, Architect, and Michael Musso were present for the applicant. The Applicant proposed the following one story addition with a side entrance:

- The addition will be to the rear and side of the building; 625 sq. ft. is being added.

- An existing shed will be relocated.
- The addition conforms to all setback requirements.
- The design will reflect the original structure and be scaled to defer to it
- The massing and roof lines will reflect surrounding houses as well.
- Wood windows with divided lites and surrounds to match the surrounds on the main mass
- The porch and lights will have simple details to match the existing house.
- Shutters and window hoods are proposed to be added on the primary façade of the main mass ,
- Gutters will be ½ round aluminum gutters
- A chimney for a fire place will be included in the addition

The fenestration will be as follows:

- with the exception of basement windows described below, all new windows will be wood with sills and casings to match existing windows; proportions, however, will be different than existing windows; muntin configurations will reflect existing muntin patterns
- The proposed wood windows will be double paned energy efficient windows; there will be no storm windows on the addition.
- east (primary) façade: windows are unchanged, but the applicant proposes to add a decorative hood to those on the second floor
- south façade: windows on the main mass are unchanged; on the addition, two clad windows will be installed in the basement to match existing basement windows and on the first floor two shorter casement wood windows will accommodate kitchen uses
- west façade: all existing windows will change; on the second floor one existing window will be infilled entirely and two shorter windows will replaced the other two; on the first floor, a shorter casement window at the north end will accommodate kitchen uses and wooden French doors will open on a central stoop and be covered with a bracketed overhang; at the basement level, a fiber glass cottage -style door will be added for basement access.
- North façade: on the second floor, the existing window will be replaced with a shorter casement window to accommodate a bathroom; on the first floor, the decorative stair window at the east corner remains but three existing windows are subsumed by the addition and new windows to match historic windows will be added; on the basement level, four new clad windows are added (the two in the addition are slightly smaller.
- The northeastern-most portion of the addition has a gable roof, as does the southwestern; the transition between the two is made by a hipped roof.
- The overhang on the stoop at the addition's east entrance has a hipped roof as well.
- Existing windows on the main mass are wood with aluminum storm sashes; these are not being replaced except those that are being modified.

Materials proposed will be the following:

- Fiber asbestos siding will be matched with an asbestos-free composite product; asbestos abatement will be performed wherever the existing house is punctured.
- Roofing will match existing roofing.
- Mud room door will be painted wood door; cottage -style with divided lites with antique nickel hardware.
- Wood storm doors with interchangeable screens and storms.

- Basement door (partially below grade) will be fiberglass.
- Shutters are flat panel shutters, Shaker-style.
- Light fixtures brown with art glass shades.
- Front porch decking, skirting and stairs are proposed to be composite material ;
- Railings, spindles, newel post (square), baluster (square) and newel cap will be wood.
- Back porch columns are fiberglass; porch gets very little sun and there is a mold problem on the property.

The Board members reviewed the proposal and suggested the following:

- A. Zgolinski noted that the shutters and frieze board are not appropriate to a Craftsman house. The applicant noted they will remove the shutters, frieze boards, fascia and hoods from the entire project.
- A. Zgolinski said there will be a noticeable difference between the old single-pane windows with aluminum storm windows (flat appearance) while the new double-pane windows which will have no storm windows (set back appearance). If the new window is double hung, it may have an exterior wooden screen. The applicant pointed out that the front of the house will have no new windows; the sides of the house where there will be mixed window types will not be very noticeable from the street. K. Foley and C. Bachan agreed that they would not be noticeable. A. Zgolinski noted that exterior vinyl-clad wood windows are permitted in the local district.
- K. Foley noted that the applicant is adding a lot of square footage to the house but the addition respects the existing house and it fits with it harmoniously.
- A. Zgolinski discussed that composite material are not allowed in the Historic District. The front of the house is obviously the most visible; the front addition will have a combination of wood and composite materials on and around the front porch. K. Foley pointed out that composite material was approved for the Rapalje back porch deck which is visible from the street. M. Early suggested the use of mahogany instead of a composite material. The applicant pointed out that the front porch gets no sun and that that side of the house gets a lot of mildew now. The applicant will bring in samples of the deck boards including mahogany and the bead-board. The applicant agreed to change the front porch columns from a composite material to wood. The area under the front porch addition will be open so composite material bead-board skirting will be used. C. Bachan said that lattice would not be appropriate to the period of the house.
- The Board accepted composite materials on the back porch.

A public hearing was scheduled for Wednesday, March 13, 2013 at 8:00 pm.

Chairman A. Zgolinski reviewed the list of neighbors and informed the applicant to use certified notification. The applicant was told to drop off the drawings a week before the public hearing for public review.

C. Michael Robinson, 25 High St.

The applicant proposed additional solar panels on the west facing roof of an addition to the main mass. The applicant proposed that the ¾ inch conduit be run from the array, through a hole in the soffit then down behind the copper down spout on the Northern Avenue side of the house. A small portion of this pipe will be visible where it goes through the soffit next to the down spout and then will be hidden behind the leader. The pipe will then go through a second soffit (on the first floor bay) before continuing to the inverter. The new arrays will be similar to the existing and are expected to be most

visible from the ball field to the north. The inverter for the new arrays will be located on the existing exterior brick foundation, near the west side of an existing bay, and will be about 16 inches by 24 inches; it will look like a medium-sized circuit breaker. Plantings will be used to obscure the inverter from view. Another meter will be located nearby and obscured by an existing bush.

K. Foley moved to accept the application as presented and C. Bachan seconded the motion. The Board reviewed the proposed conduit route; A. Zgolinski felt it would be risky to cut through two roofs. He proposed an alternate route across the two roof peaks and joining into the current inverter. M. Early wondered if there would be a safety concern with that route because of high winds. The Board also discussed the location of the inverter box and the number of utility meters that will be in one area, as well as the benefits of clustering the utility items. The Chairman called for a vote on the application. The vote was 3-1. A. Zgolinski voted no because of his concerns related to the roof and what he felt was the inappropriate clustering of too many utility items.

4. Correspondence:

- Minutes from other boards to review.
- Request for budget – A. Zgolinski noted that requests to the Trustees must be submitted by Feb. 22nd. K. Foley suggested requesting funds toward some portion of reviewing and updating the ordinance and the guidelines so that the HDRB can demonstrate good faith effort toward completing these necessary projects. She felt that funds are necessary to hire a consultant experienced with ordinances and guidelines across the state who can recommend best practices. She noted that SHPO representatives have already stated that agency's willingness to help fund this project in light of recent local controversies.

While supporting this concept, A. Zgolinski expressed his concern that the board's first priority should be finishing the Larson Fisher survey review, including:

1. Determining data validity
2. Determining what structure photos are still needed and
3. Migrating the data to a web-accessible format.

M. Early volunteered to work on the photos. K. Foley suggested that we determine what is needed for the survey completion and include it in the request as well. A. Zgolinski pointed out that the HDRB went significantly over budget this year with the court stenographer and the legal fees related to the Butterfield project. K. Foley felt that even if the funds aren't granted, the HDRB should document the need and the board's good faith effort to resolve issues that have arisen over the past year. The request would set the stage for a point in the future when more funds are available. The board agreed and M. Early and K. Foley volunteered to draft the request. K. Foley will contact Julian Adams at SHPO to get an idea of average costs related to ordinance and guideline review and get a sense of what funds are available from the state. The request for funds could then go to the Village Board and to the CLG.

- K. Foley asked if there had been any follow up by the building inspector on an inquiry from a member of the public (Eric Wirth) on the materials used on porch repairs at Hudson House. L.

Valentino is going to try to find the correspondence so that the Chair can follow up with the building inspector.

- C. Bachan brought up modifications at 30 Wall St which do not seem to have been referred to the HDRB. M. Early will follow up with the Building Inspector.
- New York Metropolitan Transportation Council – notice of public comment period.
- Putnam County Department of Health – regarding lead poisoning.
- Bill from Putnam County News and recorder in the amount of \$44.18.
 - Legal notice for Joe Meyer for \$32.24.
 - Monthly meeting \$11.94.

5. Minutes:

- A. Zgolinski discussed the process for reviewing the minutes. The objective is to create a single document for the Board to review at meetings, rather than all members reviewing drafts. K. Foley said she thought the new process is workable, but that in the last iteration she did not have sufficient time for review. Also, there need to be some guidelines as to the content and wording in the minutes; for example, if there is discussion about something outside the purview of the Board, the minutes need to make note that the Board acknowledges that the topic is outside its purview. A. Zgolinski said that the majority of the comments come from M. Early and K. Foley, so those members should work with L. Valentine first. He proposed that L. Valentino send the first draft of the minutes to M. Early, that M. Early then make any changes and then M. Early and K. Foley will work through those minutes before sending them to the rest of the Board members. The goal is to have the draft minutes sent to the Board members by the Monday preceding the Board meeting. If M. Early and K. Foley cannot agree on an item in the minutes and input is required from other Board members, both representations will be shown in the minutes and annotated as such. That version of the draft minutes will then be reviewed at the next Board meeting. K. Foley said she felt the minutes should not be a transcript, but she felt strongly that major issues discussed, majority views and any dissenting views should be recorded along with the rationale for the views.
- The minutes of December 12, 2012 were reviewed and revised. A. Zgolinski said he would like minutes to avoid the use of manufacturer's names. K. Foley moved to approve the amended minutes and C. Bachan seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as amended by a vote of 4-0.
- The minutes of January 9, 2013 were reviewed and revised. C. Bachan moved to approve the minutes as amended and K. Foley seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as amended by a vote of 4-0.

6. Board Business:

Comprehensive Plan review by M. Early

Chairman Zgolinski asked about the relationship of the Comprehensive Plan to the draft Local Waterfront Revitalization Program policy relative to historic resources (Policy 2), which had been circulated to the Board. M. Early reviewed the following with the Board members:

- The Comprehensive Plan (CP) has been adopted by the Village Board. The next step is a Local Waterfront Revitalization Strategy (LWRS) which elaborates on projects. It adds specifics about projects that can be important to the Village. The LWRS has been completed and was sent to and accepted by the state last year. The Village is not required to approve it. The LWRS is available on the Village website.
- The Local Waterfront Revitalization Program (LWRP) must be approved by the state.
- The LWRP will replace specific state policies as applied to the Village of Cold Spring.
- The entire Village falls into the Local Waterfront Area
- The state has defined 13 Policies which must be addressed in the LWRP.
- The LWRP is used by the state and the federal governments when determining if or how any state or federal government project applies to the Village.
- The Special Board plans to send the draft LWRP document to all Boards in the Village; a particular interest in the LWRP is the climate change and sea level rise.

K. Foley moved to adjourn the meeting and C. Bachan seconded the motion the meeting was adjourned at 12:25 P.M.

Al Zgolinski, HDRB Chairman

Date