

Present:

Eileen Kuster-Collins *Chairperson*
Toma Holley *Member*
Mary Mathews *Member*
Maggie McManus *Member*
Donald Yacopino *Chief Building Inspector*

Application 1: 65 South Broadway. Art Café. Site plan application for exterior alterations.

Building Inspector Review: Property is in DMU Zoning District. Proposal is to infill rear porch to the north, renovate front vestibule and modify rear kitchen window. Permission from library included in submission. Application complies with Zoning regulations.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application and the drawings dated 8/25/2014;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of Robert Silarski, architect on behalf of the applicant;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. There was no testimony from the public.

Board Findings and Conclusions:

1. Board members discussed the location of the kitchen exhaust vent that is visible in the passageway to the main entrance on the new wing of the library. The architect noted that other locations had been considered on the east façade but was concerned that the exhaust would be too close to occupied exterior areas. The architect also felt that the vent was high enough to not be a visual issue. The board was still concerned since the vent does not sit flush to the north façade and recommended that the architect review it again and consider a mockup before construction begins. The architect agreed to consider the board's recommendation.
2. The front west façade doors were discussed and the architect noted that the doors would have an inset panel similar to the bay window panels. The board agreed this is in harmony with the existing character of the building.

Conclusions of Law:

1. Having no further comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Holley, and is approved by a vote of 4-0.
2. The Architectural Review Board has considered the factors set forth in Section 5.15C of the Village Law of NY State as follows:
Whether the development or alteration is: A. In harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village; B. Is so detrimental to the surrounding area due to 1. Excessive similarity or dissimilarity to other nearby structures; 2. Inappropriateness of design.
3. The board concludes that the proposed alteration is in harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village and is not detrimental to the surrounding area.
4. On a motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Mathews, the board finds that the application be approved by a vote of 4-0.

Application 2: 11 Central Avenue. Site plan application for one story addition with rooftop deck.

Inspector Review: Property is in in SFR-1 Zoning District. Application is for a one story rear yard addition with rooftop deck. Proposal complies with Zoning regulations.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application and the drawings dated 8/22/2014, revised 9/15/2014;

2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of Kier Levesque, architect on behalf of the applicant;
4. Recusal by Member McManus since the applicant is a client;
5. ARB members knowledge of the site;
6. Site visits by members;
7. There was no testimony from the public.

Board Findings and Conclusions:

1. Board members discussed the application of the upper deck rails anchor bolted directly to the stringer. Although it is a rear deck, the deck is visible from the front or public way and this detail is not in harmony with existing front porch architecture in the Village. The architect replied that this created the most structurally sound attachment that is not prone to roof leaks. It was recommended by the board that the attachment be covered with a fascia board to hide the bolts. The architect agreed.

Conclusions of Law:

1. Having no further comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member Holley, approved by a vote of 3-0 with Member McManus recused.
2. The Architectural Review Board has considered the factors set forth in Section 5.15C of the Village Law of NY State as follows:
Whether the development or alteration is: A. In harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village; B. Is so detrimental to the surrounding area due to 1. Excessive similarity or dissimilarity to other nearby structures; 2. Inappropriateness of design.
3. The board concludes that the proposed alteration with subjected conditions, is in harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village and is not detrimental to the surrounding area.
4. On a motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Mathews, the board finds that the application be approved subject to the following condition as agreed to by the applicant's representative:
 1. The upper deck railing will be shielded on all three sides by a fascia board applied to cover the railing bolts.The motion is approved by a vote of 3-0 with Member McManus recused.

Application 3: 23 Summit Street. Site plan application to remove Bilco basement door and replace with new one story framed entry.

Building Inspector Review: Property is in in TFR Zoning District. It is a corner property with two front yards.

Per Article I VON§360-1.9E an area variance is required from Article IV VON§360-4.3, Table 4-1 Dimensional standards for the alteration/enlargement of a building with the following dimensional and developmental non conformities: existing front yard setbacks of 3.2 ft and 0 ft where 16.44 ft and 7.39 are required; a minimum side yard of 3.2 ft. where 5 ft. is required; a lot area of 3024 sq.ft. where 5000 sq. ft. is required and lot width of 36.8 ft. where 50 ft. is required.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application and the drawings dated 8/22/2014;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of Kier Levesque, architect on behalf of the applicant;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. There was no testimony from the public.

Board Findings and Conclusions:

1. Board members discussed the application and all agreed that the proposed addition is in harmony with the architecture of the Village.

Conclusions of Law:

1. Having no further comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Holley, seconded by Member McManus, approved by a vote of 4-0.
2. The Architectural Review Board has considered the factors set forth in Section 5.15C of the Village Law of NY State as follows:
Whether the development or alteration is: A. In harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village; B. Is so detrimental to the surrounding area due to 1. Excessive similarity or dissimilarity to other nearby structures; 2. Inappropriateness of design.
3. The board concludes that the proposed alteration is in harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village and is not detrimental to the surrounding area.
4. On a motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Holley, the board finds that the application be approved as submitted with a positive recommendation to the Zoning Board of Appeals.
Approved by a vote of 4-0.

Application 4: 9 West End Avenue. Neil McLaughlin for Marion Imperatore. Application to amend previously approved application by adding a balcony at rear of house.

Building Inspector Review: Property is in in TFR Zoning District. Proposal complies with Zoning regulations.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application and the drawings dated 8/25/2014,
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of Neil McLaughlin, on behalf of the applicant;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. There was no testimony from the public.

Board Findings and Conclusions:

1. Board members discussed the location of the post supports for the upper deck. It was noted that the post locations appeared random. None aligned with existing elements. The applicant stated that the left hand posts for the upper deck (as shown in the Rear Elevation and Right Elevation) would align with the posts below on the lower deck although they were not drawn that way.
2. The board recommended that the posts supporting the right side of the upper deck be shifted further right to clear the glass doors below. This was recommended for functionality. As drawn, the doors exit directly into the post, and the usable area is restricted by the post location. The applicant agreed. It was also noted that second story door installation was part of the application although not stated on the application.

Conclusions of Law:

1. Having no further comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member Holley, approved by a vote of 4-0.
2. The Architectural Review Board has considered the factors set forth in Section 5.15C of the Village Law of NY State as follows:

- Whether the development or alteration is: A. In harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village; B. Is so detrimental to the surrounding area due to 1. Excessive similarity or dissimilarity to other nearby structures; 2. Inappropriateness of design.
3. The board concludes that the proposed alteration with subjected conditions, is in harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village and is not detrimental to the surrounding area.
 4. On a motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Mathews, the board finds that the application be approved subject to the following conditions as agreed to by the applicant's representative:
 1. The left hand upper deck support post will align with the lower left hand support posts.
 2. The right upper deck post be shifted to the right for functionality.Approved by a vote of 4-0.

Application 5: 162 Main Street. "Social162". Application for three signs.

Inspector Review: Property is in in DMU Zoning District.

Applicant previously received ARB approval and variance (11/25/2013) for two perpendicular signs which were never installed-one on Main Street and one on Catherine Street. The variances will expire if signage is not installed prior to November 25, 2014. To avoid another variance applicant is requesting to: move previously approved Main Street signage to ground floor window; change design of previously approved Catherine Street sign and add a parallel sign, "SOCIAL", to space above Main Street awning. All signs comply with Zoning regulations.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application dated 8/26/2014,
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of Nidia Alexander, applicant;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. There was no testimony from the public.

Board Findings and Conclusions:

1. Board members reviewed the parallel sign in the upper gable on the front façade. The gable has asymmetrical vertical board and batten applied. The proposed sign that is to be directly painted on the surface would overlap the vertical battens. The board considered this inappropriate design and requested that the sign be individual pin mounted letters that could be mounted forward of the vertical battens for a more appropriate installation. The applicant agreed. The board requested that the letters be located in a slightly lowered position. This would create a better proportion to the scale of the gable façade. The applicant agreed.
2. Board reviewed the vinyl letters applied to the windows. Applicant noted that the letters would be applied to the window furthest left in the front elevation.
3. Board reviewed the east elevation sign to be applied vertically on the building. The board recommended that the letters in the word "social" be spaced more closely together to improve legibility. The applicant agreed. The applicant stated that the signage would be painted the burgundy color.

Conclusions of Law:

1. Having no further comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member McManus, approved by a vote of 4-0.
2. The Architectural Review Board has considered the factors set forth in Section 5.15C of the Village Law of NY State as follows:

- Whether the development or alteration is: A. In harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village; B. Is so detrimental to the surrounding area due to 1. Excessive similarity or dissimilarity to other nearby structures; 2. Inappropriateness of design.
3. The board concludes that the proposed alteration with subjected conditions, is in harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village and is not detrimental to the surrounding area.
 4. On a motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member McManus, the board finds that the application be approved subject to the following conditions as agreed to by the applicant:
 1. The front elevation parallel sign will be individual pin mounted letters, with the face of the letters forward (on a forward plane) of the vertical battens.
 2. The pin mounted letters will be located lower in the gable façade to create an appropriate proportion and scale within the gable.
 2. Board recommendation (non-conditional) that the letter “Social” on the east facing vertical sign be spaced more closely for improved legibility.
- Approved by a vote of 4-0.

Application 6: 188 Main Street. Francesca Bozorgomid. Site plan application to install handicap accessible ramp and relocation of entry door and one window.

Inspector Review: Property is in in DMU Zoning District.

NYS Building Code requires handicap accessibility for a change of use in a building, where feasible.

Proposal complies with Zoning regulations, however, stairs as drawn on **Proposed Elevation** appear to be placed beyond property line on Village property.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application dated 8/26/2014,
2. Building Inspector review;
2. Testimony of David Giudice, tenant;
3. ARB members knowledge of the site;
4. Site visits by members;
5. There was no testimony from the public.

Board Findings and Conclusions:

1. Board members reviewed the proposed ramp and entry stairs. As noted in Inspector’s comments, the entry stairs appear to project into Village property. The board noted that shifting the stairs back may impact the design of the ramp. The board expressed concern that there was an existing electrical panel located on the east façade where the main entry steps were to be located. The applicant stated that the entry stair could not fit in any other location due to the ramp. The board expressed concern that the ramp design was not in harmony with the architecture of the Village nor did it effectively relate to any desirable existing elements on the building. The building maintains some Victorian features such as inset panels, and corbels under the front and east eaves. There is also a rear balcony that maintains original porch rail details. The board felt the ramp was not in harmony regarding the following proposed elements: 1. The continuous run of the rail and spindles without repetitive posts; 2. Posts that were not consistent with post details in the Village, ie proposed posts level with tops of rail, no post cap; 3. Exposed footings, 4. No screening below the ramp, 5. Non-proportional location of entry door, 6. Entry not easily identified as the main entry, 7. Oddly shaped gap between the ramp runs. The Board felt that the ramp is a very prominent element on Main St with a main entry atypically located on the side elevation. The details of all elements need to be carefully considered and resolved.
2. The board requested that board comments noted above be considered. The board also requested that the applicant incorporate a device such as an arbor over the entry to focus attention

away from the ramp and direct focus on the entry. The applicant suggested that corbels similar to those on the building be incorporated to support an entry device. The board agreed with this suggestion.

3. The applicant agreed to revise the drawings based on board comments. The board agreed to interim review of the revised drawings. If the entry stairs are shifted back out of the public way, and if, as a result, the ramp design is impacted, the applicant would need to return for full board review.

Conclusions of Law:

1. Having no further comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member McManus, seconded by Member Holley, approved by a vote of 4-0.
2. The Architectural Review Board has considered the factors set forth in Section 5.15C of the Village Law of NY State as follows:
Whether the development or alteration is: A. In harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village; B. Is so detrimental to the surrounding area due to 1. Excessive similarity or dissimilarity to other nearby structures; 2. Inappropriateness of design.
3. The board concludes that the proposed alteration with subjected conditions is in harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village and is not detrimental to the surrounding area.
4. On a motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member Holley, the board finds that the application be approved subject to the following conditions as agreed to by the applicant:
 1. The applicant is to revise the ramp railings, posts, caps, screening under ramp; and entry door details.
 2. The revised drawings will be submitted in the interim for review by two members of the Architectural Review Board. Should the revisions be disapproved, the applicant must return for review by the full board.
 3. The applicant will confirm that the entry stairs can be shifted back from village property without impacting the ramp. Should the shift impact the ramp, the applicant will revise and return for full board review.Approved by a vote of 4-0.

Application 7: 188 Main Street. Hudson Valley Sign for NYS CBD.

Inspector Review: Application for one parallel sign and one perpendicular sign on Main Street.

Property is in in DMU Zoning District.

Application is for two signs but renditions for three signs included. At six sq. ft. the perpendicular sign complies with zoning regulations, however: no mounting details have been supplied; no information regarding distance from sidewalk to bottom sign is offered and no information is supplied detailing how far bracket protrudes from building or how far from curb line it is to be installed.

The parallel sign proposed for Main Street façade also meets Zoning requirements.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application dated 9/2/2014;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of David Giudice, tenant;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. There was no testimony from the public.

Board Findings and Conclusions:

1. Board members reviewed the application of the parallel sign on the front façade and found it to be in conflict with the architectural elements on the building. There is an adjacent transom above

the door that creates a height line across the building. The board requested that the proposed sign align with the top of the transom. The board also requested that the sign relate to the architecture of the window located directly below the proposed sign. The sign should be widened to be in proportion with the window. Lastly, the aspect ratio of the lettering to background differed greatly from the signage proposed on the perpendicular sign. The board requested that the ratio be changed to be similar to the perpendicular sign. The applicant agreed to all board requests.

2. Board reviewed the perpendicular sign and noted Inspector comments requesting mounting details and required distance and size information. The applicant noted that the bracket would be mounted on center between the two right hand corbels under the eave, and would be directly adjacent to the parallel sign.

3. The applicant indicated that the parallel sign on the east façade was to be omitted.

Conclusions of Law:

1. Having no further comment by the public, the public hearing is closed on a motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member McManus, approved by a vote of 4-0.

2. The Architectural Review Board has considered the factors set forth in Section 5.15C of the Village Law of NY State as follows:

Whether the development or alteration is: A. In harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village; B. Is so detrimental to the surrounding area due to 1. Excessive similarity or dissimilarity to other nearby structures; 2. Inappropriateness of design.

3. The Board concludes that the proposed signage with subject conditions is in harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village and is not detrimental to the surrounding area.

4. On a motion by Member Mathews, seconded by Member McManus, the Board finds that the application be approved subject to the following conditions as agreed to by the applicant:

1. The front elevation parallel sign will be aligned with the top of the adjacent transom above the door, and will be widened to be proportional to the window directly below.

2. The aspect ratio of the front elevation parallel sign will be revised to be similar to the ratio (of letters to background) indicated on the perpendicular sign.

3. All signage material will be a matte finish.

4. The applicant will indicate compliant mounting and dimensional requirements for the perpendicular sign, as noted by the Building Inspector.

4. The drawing will be revised to indicate these changes and will be submitted to the Building Department for record.

Approved by a vote of 4-0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:35.

Eileen Kuster-Collins, Chairperson