

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

**Monthly Meeting
12/09/15**

Members present: Chair Al Zgolinski; Vice Chair Kathleen E. Foley; Members: Carolyn Bachan and Jennifer Simard

Chairman A. Zgolinski called the meeting to order at 8:02P.M.

1 Old Business:

a. Sean Kearney, 24 Paulding Ave. Nationally-Listed Area; Porch Rail Finalization

The Applicant proposed details of the previously discussed but not yet approved porch railing and balusters. K. Foley moved to accept the application as submitted and J. Simard seconded the motion. The motion was approved 4-0. The Chair requested that clarification of construction details be submitted; Mr. Kearney agreed to submit them to the Village Clerk.

b. River Architects, 178 Main St. Nationally-Listed Area; Re-Construction of Existing Commercial Building

Vice Chair Foley recused herself from this application as she has done contract work with the applicant as a consultant on other projects. On advice of Village Attorney John Furst, there is no conflict for Foley to review applications on which River Architects is the project architect, but she should recuse herself from applications when River is either the property owner or the applicant.

James Hartford proposed exterior modifications to existing structure which included raising the building 2 feet. The Applicant noted he has been to a couple of workshops with the Historic Board C. Bachan moved to go to a public hearing and J. Simard seconded the motion. It was approved 3-0. Chairman A. Zgolinski asked the Applicant if he wanted to go to public hearing or wait until more board members are on the board. The Applicant chose to wait until more board members are on the board. The public hearing was not scheduled at this meeting. The Board requested a three dimensional model to be ready before the public hearing.

c. Anne impellizzeri, 15 High St. Locally Designated Area; Revision of Previously Approved Application

Juhee Lee-Hartford represented the Applicant with modifications to a previously approved application.

They included the following (full list of changes on drawings submitted 12/9/15):

- Overall Height – increases 6” to accommodate the structure between the housing boxes
- Windows – larger size throughout structure; tilt and turn casements rather than previously approved simulated divided lights; no muntins; taller windows in kitchen area and one eliminated on south elevation
- Primary Door – the door will be a custom-built wood door to match a provided sample photograph of an historic door found on another property in the Historic District

- Rear Porch – wider with shifted stairs; fixed roof retractable rather than a retractable awning
- Rear Porch Cable Rails – a metal strip will be installed along the base of the porch roof columns to accept the cables that will serve as porch rails
- Exposed Basement Foundation – stucco was proposed to cover the 8” insulation that will be installed on exposed foundation.

The board weighed the merits of stucco versus brick on the exposed foundation. Members considered that while brick would be a more appropriate material to tie this new construction back into the material palette of the surrounding Historic District, stucco would be considered if it is actual stucco (as opposed to a material like Dryvit) and finely textured. Chair Zgolinski expressed concern about the amount of exposed stucco given elevation shifts on the site and its long-term durability. The applicant agreed to consider brick as an option

At the Chair’s request, K. Foley moved to accept all elements of the application except the foundation material. J. Simard seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Recognizing that the application is for new construction and that the applicant has made many compromises from her original concept so that the new structure will be appropriate to the Historic District, C. Bachan moved to accept the use of stucco or the brick on the exposed foundation. J. Simard seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 3-1; A. Zgolinski voting against the motion, citing his belief that a brick foundation would be more appropriate to the District and because of the amount of exposed area.

2. New Business:

A. Sarah Gurland, 36 Pine St. Locally Designated Area; Installation of Solar Panels

The Applicant proposed the installation of solar panels on the main mass’s west roof slope. After reviewing the drawings with applicant, it was determined that they did not accurately represent the installation the applicant intended, and provided insufficient detail for the mounting mechanisms or cabling and transformer installation. Given the application’s similarity to previously approved solar panels, C. Bachan moved to accept the application pending submission of revised, final drawings to the chair for review. K. Foley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

D. Reeves and S. DeFranco, 230 Main St.; Nationally Designated Area; Construction of New Home

Vice Chair Foley disclosed that she is a neighboring property owner to the subject property and had received legal notice for the application’s hearing before the Village ZBA. She stated that she felt she could be objective in her review but offered to recuse herself from the application if either the Applicants or other Board Members had any concerns about her ability to be objective. The Applicants and Board Members stated for the record that they had no objection to K. Foley participating in the application review.

The Applicants proposed construction of a home on a lot previously subdivided from 224 Main Street. An Italianate-style house had been used as the basis for the home’s design, and all composite and plastic materials were proposed for exterior finishes. The Board reviewed the Design Guidelines for the Historic District with the Applicants, noting the requirements for overall massing, porches, siding, windows and doors in this portion of the District. Overall, Board Members felt that the massing and fenestration pattern for the structure was suburban in nature and not in keeping with the scale and massing of

homes in the surrounding District. Specifically, the proposed design appears “squat” in its proportions, as opposed to the height of the animated rooflines and tall windows of surrounding structures. Additionally, Members emphasized the ability to see all four facades of the home from public rights of way. Currently, only the main façade has design detail and the other facades have limited fenestration and visual interest; this also contributed to the suburban feel of the design. With these issues in mind, the Board felt that the application as submitted was unlikely to be approved, and suggested that the current application be withdrawn and one or more workshops held with the HDRB. The Applicants agreed and a workshop was scheduled for December 30, 2015 at 8:00pm.

3. Correspondence:

Voucher for the Putnam County News and Recorder in the amount of \$18.47 dated November 30, 2015.

4. Minutes:

The minutes of November 11, 2015 were reviewed; a vote to approve was deferred pending a wording modification to be proposed by Chair Zgolinski.

The minutes of November 19, 2015 were moved for approval as amended by J. Simard; K. Foley seconded the motion. The minutes were approved 3-0 (C. Bachan abstained as she did not attend the meeting).

5. Board Business:

After multiple contacts by both the Chair and Vice Chair, and full payment by the Board of Trustees, the consulting attorney, Bill Hurst, has not delivered the next draft of Chapter 64 revisions. A re-draft was requested by the Board on 9/16/15. HDRB members agreed to request Mayor Merandy’s assistance in securing the next draft from Mr. Hurst.

K. Foley moved to adjourn and J. Simard seconded the motion; the meeting adjourned at 10:29 P.M.

Al Zgolinski, Chair

Date