

**Village of Cold Spring
Historic District Review Board
85 Main Street, Cold Spring, New York 10516
Public Hearing for Addition at 19 Garden St.**

April 23, 2015

Members present: Chair Al Zgolinski; Vice Chair Kathleen E. Foley; Members: Carolyn C. Bachan, Peter Downey and Michael Junjulas

Project designer Paul Henderson reviewed the application, noting the following:

- 19 Garden street is one of three matched Gothic Vernacular cottages in a row on the street; all three have been previously modified
- 19 Garden has a double lot to the south where addition will be placed
- The Applicant has had a series of workshops with the HDRB and made all recommended revisions to the design
- Drawings before the public are the same as the last submission with the following exceptions: a fence elevation, door hardware, cut sheets with selected materials identified notations in red
- The design stays within required setbacks, with the exception of the side yard setback approved by the ZBA with the support of a letter from the HDRB
- The roofline of the original structure is replicated in the design; siding on addition matches existing replacement siding; corner boards to match existing; water table to match existing
- Windows will be 2 over 2
- Rear deck flooring will be composite material

At 8:17 the Chair gave 5 minutes for public to review the models and the drawings. At 8:22 the meeting was opened for public comment.

Al Hemberger 16 Garden Street

Mr. Hemberger is concerned over the impact the addition will have on his view of the mountain and waterfall beyond. He reported being given the impression by his real estate agent that the open lot at 19 Garden could not be built upon. He fears that too much change in the Historic District will compromise the character of the Village; every change, every addition, impacts character cumulatively. Otherwise he thinks the project is well designed.

Hope Turino, 16 Garden Street

Ms. Turino expressed similar concerns to those of her husband, Mr. Hemberger, and asked the Board to look at a photo of the mountain and waterfall that she had brought.

Max Watman 15& 17 Garden Street

Mr. Watman's property is immediately adjacent to 19 Garden and also has a double lot. He expressed concern over the domino effect if the application is approved—that at some point a future owner will want to build on his lot as well and create a wall of large structures along Garden Street. Although he has concerns over the size of the addition, he thinks that overall it is well designed.

Travis Fyfe, 16 Stone Street

Mr. Fyfe loves the three houses being discussed and understands the desire not to change them. He also understands the need to let houses evolve to accommodate modern families and need for more space.

He expressed the wish that all applicants would be as sensitive as this Applicant has been and he supports the application.

In response to comments, Chair Zgolinski acknowledged that changes to historic houses are sometimes necessary to accommodate the changing needs of Village families.

Vice Chair Foley reviewed the process that had been undertaken with the applicant to arrive at public hearing. The HDRB felt that the first submission was far too large in comparison with the existing structure and over a series of workshops had worked to dramatically reduce its size. The applicant has worked in the spirit of compromise to reduce impacts both on the structure and on the neighborhood.

Public comment session was closed and opened for Board deliberation at 8:43pm.

C. Bachan stated that the western section of village is characterized by small houses. She feels that home buyers should consider the size of properties and their limitations before purchasing. She is concerned about the precedent the project sets for large-scale additions on small houses. She felt that there were a number of weaknesses in the design, but given site constraints the current application was as good as the proposal could be. Still, because of the scale of the addition and its relationship to the original house, she felt the project destroys the symmetry of the three cottages and does not fit Village character. She noted that she was not on the Board when the letter supporting a variance for this project was sent to the ZBA, and she didn't know if she would have voted to write it.

P. Downey stated that the house already has had two additions and, in his view, that is all that it can take and still retain its character and relationship to the other two Gothic cottages. He felt that the Applicant bought a house that was too small for his needs and should buy a bigger house and leave this small house as it is for another family to enjoy as it is. Still, because the applicant meant the Design Standards, he would support the application.

Michael Junjulas read a prepared statement (attached) relating his views on the project to the section of the HDRB Design Standards that relate to mass and scale. After reading his statement, he abstained from the vote on the project, citing his multiple absences during the workshops due to illness.

Chair A. Zgolinski stated that in his opinion the scale does not overpower the house. By pulling back the addition it will appear smaller and help keep the character of this house with the other cottages as a grouping. In his view, this is not different than additions the Board has previously approved to accommodate the space needs of an owner. Not allowing changes could lead to the house being unsellable and unoccupied, which he believes to be worse than the proposed changes.

The Applicant interjected to thank the Board for its work. He felt it was vital to mention that the Board had worked with him to get the project to where it is now, and to note that the proposal has not changed since the HDRB wrote a letter of recommendation to the ZBA in support of needed variances. He felt that the Board should understand that the lot at 19 Garden was simply skipped when the surrounding lots were developed. He felt that for Board members to claim that the project is out of character at this stage of review is out of order.

Vice Chair Foley stated that she struggled with this application from the beginning because of its mass and scale. She was resistant to earlier iterations that seemed to swallow the original structure, design

compromises have reduced its mass and scale, including reorienting the addition's mass and setting it back from the original structure. She does still believe that the three cottages relate to each other and are understood as a set despite previous additions. The additions defer to the rear of the houses and allow them to be understood as a related grouping. She acknowledged that one of the factors that make people appreciate the cottages together is that they are set apart from other structures on the street by the open space around them—the double lot to the south and the church parking lot to the north. This is a unique configuration in the Village, just as the Gothic Revival architecture of the three is unique. It is something of an anomaly in the lower Village, where small houses normally sit closely together and close to the street. The open lot next to 19 is something of a missing tooth in that regard, and the addition, because of its reduced scale and design relation to the original structure, seems to fill the void and better complete the streetscape. She felt that the Board has worked very hard to minimize the impact of the addition, but admitted still struggling with approving it because of the impact on these unique structures. She worried that over time Villagers would wonder how the HDRB had approved this addition. However, she felt that the applicant had worked in a spirit of compromise to mitigate the impacts of the project, meeting the Design Standards and the requests of the Board. Despite her reservations, she would support the application.

Chair Zgolinski called for a roll call vote with the following results:

Junjulas	abstained
Bachan	no
Downey	yes
Foley	yes
Zgolinski-	yes

P. Downey moved to close the public hearing at 9:18pm and K. Foley seconded the motion. The Board entered into a working session to discuss board business.

The Village Attorney prepared a resolution, titled "Compliance with Conditions for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the Demolition of Butterfield Hospital" (attached); all three conditions for the demolition of the Butterfield Hospital building have been met by that Applicant. K. Foley moved to approve the resolution as written and P Downey seconded motion. The resolution was approved unanimously.

K. Foley moved to adjourn the meeting and P. Downey seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 9:34pm.

A. Zgolinski, Chair

Date