

Present:

Eileen Kuster-Collins	<i>Chairperson</i>
Mary Mathews	<i>Member</i>
Maggie McManus	<i>Member</i>
Lisa Buckley	<i>Alternate Member</i>
Donald Yacopino	<i>Chief Building Inspector</i>

Application 1: 220 Main Street. Edward Jones Investments. Application for two signs.

Inspector Review: Property is in DMU Zoning District. Building is on the corner of Main St. and Pond St. with two front facades. All signage complies with zoning regulations.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application and the drawings dated 9/ /2014;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of Brian O'Connor of Froehling Signs, representing 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 wording on the east façade signage. Members questioned if the sign was intended to be read as two separate statements "Edward Jones" and "investments" or as one continuous wording. The applicant's representative stated the sign should be read as one statement "Edward Jones Investments". The board recommended the spacing between words be altered and the applicant agreed.
2. The board questioned if the finish material was available in a matte or low gloss finish and the applicant's representative responded that it was available.

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 Mathews 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 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 spacing between the words "Edward", "Jones" and "Investments" will be revised to be equal sized spacing and will be spaced more closely as to read as one title or statement.
 2. The finish on all signage is to be of a matte or low gloss finish.The motion is approved by a vote of 4-0.

Application 2: 42 Ackerman Place. Robert Silarski for Jerome Linzenberg. Application to replace room at westside of house and install a generator.

Inspector Review: Property is in in TFR Zoning District. Proposal is to create an addition on the west side of the house. Records contained in the building department files indicate the previous structure to have been roofed over concrete patio.

Per Article I VON 360-1.9C(2)...This proposal does not create any new nonconformities but is nonconforming as to dimensional standards, and does not appear to be reconstruction "in Kind" in that it is no longer a roofed over patio but an enclosed addition.

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 nonconformities: existing front yard setbacks of 5.1 ft. where 18.69 ft. is required; a minimum side yard of 1.5 ft. where 5.35 ft. is required; a rear yard setback of 22.9 ft. where 28 ft. is required.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application and the drawings dated 9/19/2014;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of Robert Silarski, architect on behalf of the applicant;
4. 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 proposed addition which is set back from the front property line by 34.7 ft., and agreed that it would have minor impact on the front view, and that it is appropriate in scale and design relative to the existing structure.

2. The paving was reviewed. The architect indicated that the pavers are concrete pavers with permeable joints and were an improvement to the existing asphalt.

3. The board questioned if the proposed stockade fence could be shifted to allow for planting area. Board members stated that the existing street view of the house includes a very "green", planted side yard. The proposal for a 6 ft. high stockade fence directly adjacent to the driveway pavers created a drastically different view of the house. Board members agreed that this alteration was detrimental.

The applicant agreed that the locations of fencing and pavers could be altered to allow for a planting area.

4. The generator location was discussed and the architect indicated that the generator was set back far enough to be in the "side" yard as opposed to the "front" yard, and that a fence would screen it. The board requested that a sound buffer such as plantings be considered since the fence is a noise reflective surface directly adjacent to the generator.

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 Buckley, 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.

4. 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, with a positive recommendation to the ZBA for the required variances, the board finds that the application be approved subject to the following condition as agreed to by the applicant:

1. The location of the fence and pavers will be revised to allow for a minimum of 3 ft. of continuous planting area between the south side of the fence and the driveway pavers.

The motion is approved by a vote of 4-0.

Application 3: 60 Cedar Hill Avenue. Site plan application to demolish existing structures and construct mixed use buildings.

Building Inspector Review: Property is in in RMU Zoning District. 18 DU's per acre and 2 stories in height permitted.

Subdivision required for merging of lots.

Special permit required for Subdivision.

Special Permit required from Planning Board for increase of FAR from 0.75 to 1.0 of a Mixed Use Building.

Area Variance required for 24 Dwelling Units. 111 Dwelling Units Permitted; 135 Dwelling Units Proposed.

Height:

2 Stories permitted in RMU.

3 Stories permitted if building is LEED certifiable, which this proposes to be.

FAR:

Building calculated at 167,910 sq. ft. (Indicated as 1.0)

General Notes:

1. Professional office or studio accessory to a residential building requirement of 30% of first floor of principal building does not apply to multifamily building in RMU district.
2. Individual retail sales or services shall not exceed 5000 sq. ft. in floor area.
3. As proposed, the combination of commercial and residential units comprise 167,910 sq. ft. of 174,424 sq. ft. of permitted FAR. Applicant requires a variance for 24 DU's and will seek to use remaining FAR sq. Footage for residential use.

Board Review Based Upon:

1. The application and the Preliminary drawings dated 9/29/2014;
2. Building Inspector review;
3. Testimony of Drazen Cackovic, architect on behalf of the applicant;
4. ARB members knowledge of the site;
5. Site visits by members;
6. Testimony from the public:
Jeff Castaldo owner of the gym on Franklin St.
Allegra Gomez, owner of 55 Hudson St.
Frank Mancione, owner of 70 S. Broadway/55 Hudson St.

Board Findings and Conclusions:

1. Board members reviewed the following information presented by the architect, with the understanding that this is a preliminary application:
 1. A bike path is proposed along Franklin;
 2. A sequence of planting area, sidewalk, planting area is proposed along the elevation facing Cedar Hill Ave.
 3. The brook will be opened up and exposed from Hudson Ave. flowing towards Broadway.

4. The buildings will incorporate roof gardens, permeable pavers, and will seek to exceed energy conservation by 10% in order to obtain LEED certification.
 5. The materials proposed are brick, cement board siding, and possible corrugated aluminum.
 6. Approximately 8 live/work units are proposed on Hudson Ave.
 7. Buildings facing Cedar Hill will be two story town houses above a one story ground floor residence, totaling three stories.
 8. Ten units will be "affordable" units.
 9. All units in the development are rental units.
 10. Ceiling heights will be 9 feet.
2. Board members heard the comments by the public as follows:
1. Jeff Castaldo asked what the building elevation height is. The architects responded that the proposed height is 32 to 33 feet. Jeff also asked if there was any retail in addition to the live/work units. The architect indicated that there were 2 retail locations proposed for the corners on Franklin.
 2. Allegra Gomez was concerned about aesthetics, affordable housing, and drainage. The architect discussed materials, and number of affordable units. The location of the dumpsters was also discussed as being located adjacent to existing properties and a request that another area of the large site be considered. Ms. Gomez noted that the trucks come extremely early to maintain the dumpsters and it is very disruptive.
 3. Frank Mancione expressed concern regarding: parking proposed in close proximity to the rear of his property; safety; and issues of noise. The architect indicated that there would be plantings between the parking and the rear of the Broadway properties. Mr. Mancione was concerned it was not adequate planting area.

Architectural Review Board chairperson Collins recommended that members of the public attend the meetings of the other boards to address concerns not within review by the ARB, such as affordable housing, drainage, safety, noise. The ARB will respond to issues within their purview as outlined in the code.

3. The board preliminarily reviewed the proposed elevation. The elevation reviewed was the south Cedar Hill Ave. elevation. Board members agreed that the scale of the proposed elevations needed further consideration by the architect regarding:

1. Height- The property adjacent to the east is a typical wood frame, gable roofed 2 ½ story structure. The properties along Depot Place are diminutive gable houses. The proposed building is very large in scale and very different in type. The board suggested that the architect consider stepping back the 3rd story in elevations facing smaller scaled existing structures, such as those on Cedar Hill and Depot Place. The board questioned if a combination of two and three story structures could be proposed. The board questioned the consistent use of 9 ft. interior heights which also add to the scale of the building.

The board also observed that the addition of arbors on the roof of this elevation made the proposed buildings appear even taller in scale. The board had no objection to the use of arbors but requested that the architect consider scale when siting them.

2. Width- The board observed that the continuous cornice along the top of the elevation created a massing that seems too large in scale for the context of the existing buildings.
3. Construction materials: Members felt that the proposed materials are appropriate materials but that the continuous repetition of elements in the elevation did not assist in reducing the scale of the building or in creating enough visual interest. The board suggested that the architect reference both the residential elements of the village together with the industrial elements (such as those found in the existing Pavion brick structure and mill style buildings in the village) to create a visually interesting collection of buildings. This is a large development and the scale could be reduced if differing building types are combined. The current proposal suggests a repetition of the same elements through the entire block wide series of structures.

4. The visual impact of a fenced or gated pool centrally located in the view corridor from Hudson Avenue was deemed less appropriate by the board. The pool would present additional hardscape area in a sea of asphalt. A pool is also an excessively dissimilar element and atypical to any central location in the village. The few existing pools are in peripheral areas and not central to public view. The board asked the applicant to consider a green area as an alternative to a pool.

5. The board discussed elevations presented together with adjacent existing buildings, streetscapes, in order to better address and review scale, proportion, similarity, dissimilarity etc. The architect stated that renderings including adjacent buildings and streetscapes could be provided.

Conclusions of Law:

1. This is a preliminary application for approval, therefore the Board will render opinions but no decisions regarding the application.

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. All members agree that there is no objection to the demolition of the existing structures. The board opinions that with conditions, the general concept and direction of the proposed development is in harmony with the existing design and architecture of the Village and is not detrimental to the surrounding area. The board requests that prior to presenting the application in the future, the applicant consider board comments regarding issues of scale, repetition of elements and materials, and to consider the visual impact of a fenced or gated pool in a visible central location in the village.

The board requests that together with all required drawings and materials, the applicant include adjacent buildings and street widths in the proposed elevations, so the board can better review the scale of the proposed structures. The applicant has the option of presenting the adjacencies as single line profiles, or can present more detailed renderings if preferred.

4. The application remains open for further review.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15

Eileen Kuster-Collins, Chairperson