

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

**Public Hearing
02/24/2016**

**230 Main Street, Nationally-Designated Area of the District
Construction of New Home
Applicant: David Reeves and Sarah DeFranco, Contract Vendees
Represented by Steve Ross of Westchester Modular Homes and Architect Uzziah Cooper Jr.**

HDRB members present: Chair Al Zgolinski; Vice Chair Kathleen E. Foley; Members: Carolyn Bachan, Andrea Connor, Sean Conway.

Chairman A. Zgolinski opened the meeting at 8:10 P.M.

Applicant Presentation

Return receipts confirming neighbor notifications were presented to the Board. Mr. Cooper presented the application, including materials cut sheets, to the assembled members of the public, incorporating changes based on comments from the HDRB in previous workshop sessions. Updates newly presented included:

- detached garage with same material palette as the primary structure; metal door with square panels and lights reminiscent of Colonial Revival garage doors
- brick risers and bluestone treads leading to bluestone stoop; wrought-iron rail
- exterior lighting selections

Public Comment

At 8:17 P.M. the Board recessed for five minutes so the public 5 minutes could review the application and supporting materials. At 8:25 P.M. the chair opened public comment.

Tim Brennan, 225 Main Street – Mr. Brennan requested that grade changes (i.e. excavation) be made to give the appearance of a lower front elevation and to reduce the visual impact of the foundation. He felt that the amount of exposed brick on the foundation made the structure appear too high. He additionally felt that the brick and stone stoop was incongruous in the neighborhood and would prefer wood as on surrounding houses. The dormers, he felt, added to the feeling of height on the house and he inquired about lowering them. In discussion of the site's grade, Mr. Brennan noted the grade can be returned to the west side of the house to give the site a more gently-sloping appearance and reduce the amount of exposed foundation.

Susanne Robertson, 220 Main St. – Felt that the amount of exposed foundation feels like a brick wall, and also commented on the height of the home on the grade; she raised particular concern about the height/length of the stairs. She additionally felt that the columns on the stoop seemed narrow, and more substantial columns should be used on the main entry. Ms. Robertson asked for clarification of the railing, as she thought the drawing looked like a wood railing. The applicant confirmed the railing was proposed to be wrought iron. Ms. Robertson felt a wrought iron rail would seem too thin at the entrance. A substantial front entrance is appropriate to a Main Street house, in her view.

Matt Koch, 3 Maple Terrace – Mr. Koch also felt that the foundation’s south and west elevations felt tall and heavy because of the amount of exposed brick. He also recommended a grade change to lessen the visual impact.

The Chair closed the public comment period at 8:45 P.M.

SEQR Determination

C. Bachan moved to classify the application as a Type II Action under SEQR, noting that it is a proposal for a single-family home. K. Foley seconded the motion and it was approved 3-0. A. Connor and S. Conway abstained.

Board Comments and Discussion

S. Conway inquired about the configuration of the stairs to the rear deck and the apparent inclusion of a hot tub at the rear of the house. The applicant confirmed that the basement plan is outdated; a hot tub is no longer under consideration and the stairs have been oriented to run parallel with the house, per HDRB request.

A. Zgolinski inquired whether the applicant would consider lowering the foundation. Mr. Cooper responded that shrubs and plants will mask the brick. K. Foley noted that plants and shrubs cannot be considered because they are not permanent (ie they can die). C. Bachan noted the challenge of the dual slopes on the site, and recommended to use of a graded planting bed to adjust the slope and reduce the exposed foundation.

K. Foley stated that there had been a lot of useful comments from the public about the stairs, and noted the predominance of wooden stairs, stoops and porches in the surrounding neighborhood, and asked to consider a change to from brick and stone to wood on the stoop. She suggested that perhaps a wooden stoop would mitigate the visual impact of the exposed foundation. She also supported a slope modification to further reduce the impact. Foley further wondered if a retaining wall would be needed to support grade changes, and noted existing, Village character-defining stone walls along Main Street. She stated that the Board should review any proposed retaining wall for appropriateness to the District,

citing the incompatibility of a recently-constructed stone wall to the east on Main Street. C. Bachan stated that raising the grade is a good solution and also recommended the use of a retaining wall.

Mr. Reeves stated that he prefers brick and stone for the stoop from a maintenance perspective and that he would be open to re-grading to address the exposed foundation.

K. Foley polled Board members on the materials of the steps and stoop asked the board members how they felt about the materials proposed. C. Bachan gave examples of risers with long runs on Main Street, as well as examples of blue stone treads and brick risers in other locations on Main. She stated that she could support the selected materials.

S. Conway asked the applicants why they chose the blue stone; Mr. Reeves cited maintenance.

A. Connor suggested that if the brick is broken up with wood at the stoop, its impact will be lessened. She also supported a grade change to reduce the appearance of the foundation's height. She noted that another reason landscape plantings cannot be considered to mitigate visual impact is that subsequent owners may remove plantings. She stated that the Board must look at the long-term impacts of the design.

Discussion ensued about the garage, with board members noting the relationship of its design and materials to the main structure. Square lights without muntins were recommended for the metal roll-up door (as shown in the cut sheet); the applicant noted that the side door will also be metal, without lites. S. Conway stated that he expected that the pedestrian door on the garage would have windows; this would have been his preference. The applicants requested that the Board approve the use of brick and stucco for the garage, so that they have budget flexibility as the project is constructed.

Chairman A. Zgolinski called for a motion to approve the application as modified in discussion. K. Foley requested to break up the application, as she would like to be able to support the majority of the proposal so that the Applicants can proceed. However, given the concerns related to the stoop and grading expressed by the public and Board members, she would like to address those elements separately. C. Bachan moved to approve the application as divided; A. Connor seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken on the application, excluding site grading and stoop design:

K. Foley	Yes
C. Bachan	Yes
C. Connor	Yes
S. Conway	Yes
A. Zgolinski	Yes

Board discussion of the stoop continued, with debate over the use of wood versus brick and stone for the risers, treads and landing. C. Bachan moved to approve the stairs and landing as proposed; A. Zgolinski seconded. A roll call vote was taken with the following results:

S. Conway	Abstained, citing the lack of clarity in the stoop drawings and inadequate documentation to fairly adjudicate the stoop proposal
K. Foley	No
A. Connor	No
C. Bachan	Yes
A. Zgolinski	Yes

The vote did not pass. The Chair asked the Applicant if they would consider a wood porch. The Applicants stated that they need to consider options. Members requested that the Applicants return with stoop drawings that better represent a wrought-iron railing, as well as a proposal for grading changes and any necessary retaining structures; the Applicant will be placed under old business at the 3/9/2016 regular monthly meeting to present a revised application.

The Chair closed the public hearing at 9:54pm, and requested that the Applicants submit three copies of all catalog cuts presented in the hearing, as well as copies of the revised site plan. K. Foley recognized the Applicants for their cooperative approach to the review process, and their spirit of compromise.

Board Business

1. Minutes

The minutes of November 11, 2015 were reviewed and revised. C. Bachan moved to approve as revised; K. Foley seconded the motion, and it was approved 3-0. A. Connor and S. Conway abstained as they were not on the Board at the time of the meeting.

2. Meeting Scheduling

The following sessions were scheduled for ordinance draft review workshops and agreed to notice the sessions on the Village website:

March 6, 2016 at 2:00pm

April 3, 2016 at 10:00am

May 1, 2016 at 2:00 P.M.

3. SHPO/CLG Grant Application

The Board of Trustees will vote to approve the draft application at their 2/23/16 workshop and the Village Clerk will submit the final application via FedEx to make the 2/29 filing deadline.

K. Foley moved to adjourn the meeting; C. Bachan seconded the motion and the Board voted unanimously to adjourn at 10:28pm