

**Village of Cold Spring Historic District
Review Board Meeting Minutes
January 5, 2022**

The Village of Cold Spring Historic District Review Board held a Meeting via videoconference as per Chapter 417 of NYS Laws of 2021 on Wednesday January 5, 2022. Members present: Chair Al Zgolinski, Vice Chair Sean Conway, Andrea Connor, and Todd Seekircher (Lloyd DesBrisay was absent).

A. Zgolinski called the meeting to order at 7:37 p.m.

Old Business

61 Paulding Avenue, 49.5-3-45.2, Locally - listed area of the Historic District. Luke Hilpert, Owner/Applicant; Joe Thompson, Architect, representing the Owners. Modifications to previously approved COA; Construction of Single-Family Home. Application materials shared with all participants.

J. Thompson described the modification to previously approved COA as follows:

- Two (2) foot increase in depth of residence reducing rear yard from 28 ft. to 26 ft., resulting in a roof height increase of approximately five (5) inches to maintain pitch (still within zoning regulation);
- Garage footprint moved two (2) feet closer to street to accommodate addition of French Patio Doors on southeast elevation;
- Add French Patio Doors on southeast elevation to provide access from kitchen to rear deck;
- Remove stair window from northwest elevation due to relocation of staircase inside house (from off-center location to traditional center staircase with vaulted foyer); change single window units to double window units (double hung grill pattern to match others);
- Change single unit window to double unit on second floor southwest elevation;
- Remove storage doors and add window on lower level of southwest elevation;
- Slightly shift location of two (2) separate kitchen window units on first floor southwest elevation to accommodate new kitchen layout;

J. Thompson stated the front façade porch will remain the most prominent feature on the front of the house (northeast elevation).

Board Comments

A. Zgolinski asked if the step-down foundations had changed on the northeast and southwest elevations. J. Thompson confirmed they had not changed. J. Thompson noted that on the modified design document of the southwest elevation showed an exposed, straight concrete retaining wall, five and a half (5 1/2) feet to six (6) feet, approximately twenty (20) feet from the edge of the deck.

J. Thompson confirmed that the concrete was going up to the underside of the garage wall and might be somewhat visible. J. Thompson also noted that there was a concrete wall there, retaining two and a half (2 1/2) to three (3) feet of earth due to an upward gradient under the deck, and the retaining wall goes up to the side of the garage wall. As a result, there is approximately five (5) feet of exposed foundation underneath the deck. That section would not be capable of a step-down.

Discussion ensued regarding the visibility of the concrete wall. A. Zgolinski, S. Conway, and A. Connor commented that due to the shadow of the deck, the construction of 63 Paulding, and the distance from the public right of way on Rt 9D, the concrete retaining wall would not be highly visible from the street.

J. Thompson stated there was no change in materials in the modification. S. Conway noted that the three windows on the rear façade (southwest elevation) if milled together, but be separated by trim to match the other windows. J. Thompson confirmed that the windows were actually three (3) individual units with full width casing and true trim. J. Thompson confirmed windows were Marvin aluminum-clad wood. Board Members agreed the modifications were minor. A. Zgolinski requested a set of prints showing the modifications.

S. Conway made a motion to approve the modification to the previously approved application as submitted. T. Seekircher seconded the motion and the motion passed 4-0-0-1 (L. DesBrisay was absent).

New Business

16 Garden Street, 49.8-2-39, Locally- listed area of the Historical District. Al Hemberger, Owner; Amir Ramon for Home Depot, Applicant. Replacement Windows on non-primary facades of residential structure. Application materials shared with all participants.

Project description was as follows:

- Replace three (3) existing wood windows on second floor back elevation of the house with white vinyl, double hung Simonton 6100 Series style windows (#1, #2, #3 on photograph);
- Replace existing vinyl patio door with Andersen 400 Woodwright patio door (#4 on photograph);
- Replace existing wood rear elevation basement window, with vinyl awning window, Simonton 6100 Series (#5 on photograph);
- Replace existing wood window on side of house with white vinyl, double hung Simonton 6100 Series style (#6 on photograph);
- All replacement windows are the same size, style and color with no structural change;
- No replacement of windows on front elevation of house;
- Proposed windows are replacement inserts.

Board Comments

A. Connor personally observed that the rear elevation of the house was not readily visible from the street, but noted that the side window would be more visible from the public right of way, as the house is close to the street. A. Ramon confirmed that side wood window was to be replaced with vinyl. S. Conway commented that while there was less concern as to the vinyl windows on the rear elevation (not visible to the public right of way), perhaps a better-quality replacement window be used on the side of the house.

A. Zgolinski estimated that the house could have been constructed in the early 1800s, and commented that the existing windows and shutters looked historic, and the historic fabric of the home could be impacted by the use of vinyl windows, even where not visible. A. Zgolinski expressed concern that the replacement window(s) not alter the historic fabric of the District, moreover the Design Guidelines do not allow for vinyl construct windows, but require vinyl clad wood. A. Ramon noted that the existing windows on the front elevation of the house were Andersen 400 series, wood vinyl-clad windows, replaced approximately nine (9) years ago.

Board Members agreed that because they are not visible from a public right-of-way, the proposed changes to the rear elevation windows could be separated from the application, and vinyl windows could be used. However, the Board insisted that the side window replacement be consistent with windows on the front elevation (Andersen 400 replacement series). A. Ramon stated he would advise the Owner of the Board's decision. A Zgolinski confirmed a referral from the Building Inspector was made.

There was no further comment nor questions from the Board.

S. Conway made a motion to approve the application modification to the previously approved COA. T. Seekircher

seconded the motion and the motion passed 3-0-0-2 (L. DesBrisay absent, T. Seekircher temporarily absent).

2 Locust Ridge, 49.5-2-29, Locally- listed area of the Historical District. John Hedlund and Kathleen Foley, Owners; Madeleine Sanchez, Architect/Applicant representing the Owners. Second floor addition at rear of existing house. Application materials shared with all participants. *Disclosure of Official Interests Statement* included in Application noting one of the Owners, Kathleen Foley, is currently Mayor of the Village of Cold Spring.

M. Sanchez provided an overview of the 2 Locust Ridge Road (hereinafter referred to as the "Property") as follows:

- 1902 Queen Anne house designed by Cold Spring Architect L.I. Mekeel;
- Property located high on a ridge;
- Arched dominant façade;
- L-shape plan with cross-gable;
- Front porch that extends around the side;
- Asymmetrical composition on the front;
- Palladian windows on gabled ends;
- Colonial rake and cornice molding;
- Cut-away bay window (dining room);
- Original windows with aluminum storm windows;
- Asbestos (transite) shingles covering house;
- 13' x 13' 2007 addition to rear façade (east) with horizontal clapboard siding and mahogany screen door
- Brick foundation/veneer running continuously around bottom edge of house;

Application materials included satellite map, photographs of the Property depicting views from: Mountain Road, Cedar Street (seasonal view of rear facade), #7 and #3 Locust Ridge (across street from Property), #4 Locust Ridge (to the left of Property) and 224 Main (to the right of the Property) to show neighborhood and provide context. M. Sanchez also displayed similar L.I. Mekeel designed Village properties. The proposed changes to the Property work would be visible from public right of way as indicated in photographs.

The Application proposes the following work on the Property:

- Add second floor addition at rear of house (east elevation) above existing 2007 addition for new master bedroom (13x13, same dimension as "L" section of original house);
- Remove existing roof from 2007 addition and replace with hipped roof with asphalt shingles, same dimension as existing cross gable roof;
- Partial removal of existing molding;
- Remove existing second floor upper windows on rear elevation, construct punch-out of existing interior wall to create entrance into new master bedroom addition;
- New seven (7) inch straight edge cedar shingle siding on new second floor addition (north, east south elevations);
- Retain horizontal six (6) inch clapboard on 2007 addition;
- Add rim boards to negotiate change to materials;
- New wood molding and trim to match existing molding;
- New aluminum gutters and downspouts to match existing ones;
- Replace existing mahogany screen storm with new mahogany door;
- New brick veneer (east, south and north).

M. Sanchez noted that the 2007 addition was originally a stoop with gable (1902). In 1929, a mudroom was added with a shed roof. The 2007 construction revealed original clapboard siding, as well as corner board and rim joists. Horizontal clapboard was used in 2007, The Owners hope to remove the asbestos shingles and replace with GAF Weatherside fiber-cement siding in the future.

M. Sanchez noted proposed addition does not increase the existing footprint of the 2007 addition. M.

Sanchez commented that the hipped roof would permit retention of the east elevation Palladian window and keep molding intact.

New windows at the following affected areas:

- East Elevation- Lower Existing Addition: replace window in existing mud room/laundry area of 2007 addition with two (2) white double-hung LePage Prestige wood windows (25 5/8" x 44 7/8") with new wood trim;
Upper New Addition – two (2) white double hung LePage Prestige wood windows (31 5/8" x 56 7/8") with new wood trim;
add new LePage Prestige awning window to left of second replacement window for renovated second floor centralized bathroom;
- North Elevation – Remove existing second floor window and replace with two (2) LePage Prestige awning windows for master bath;
remove existing window on 2007 addition and replace with one (1) LePage Prestige awning window in bathroom/laundry room;
add new LePage Prestige awning window to left of that replacement window (new office space).
Three (3) LePage awning windows to be added to upper new addition, placed above the headboard of bed;
- South Elevation – Replace existing windows on 2007 existing addition with two (2) white double-hung LePage Prestige wood windows;
add same style/size windows on new upper addition with painted trim.

Board Comments

S. Conway commented the design was perfectly logical and appreciated the trim line continuity; using the hipped roof would result in a decrease of bulk.

A Connor commented the design was beautiful, and while not a huge addition, was a big improvement of the Property.

T. Seekircher commented the addition was well designed, and the use of different sidings worked beautifully together.

A. Zgolinski noted that there were numerous small windows on the north elevation. While recognizing the purpose of the awning windows in the bathrooms, A. Zgolinski inquired as to the possibility of placing two (2) smaller double hung windows, one on either side of the bed, instead of the proposed three (3) smaller windows over the headboard. S. Conway also expressed concern about the concentration of smaller windows on the north elevation.

T. Seekircher suggested that a double hung larger window would be more traditional in appearance than an awning window on the bathroom/laundry room. M. Sanchez noted that a larger window would interfere with sink. He also suggested that smaller windows or no windows on the north elevation addition might work.

M. Sanchez responded that the Owners required natural light in the bedroom, but it was possible smaller window placed over each nightstand might be appropriate, however a larger double hung windows would be too big.

A, Connor commented that in the Mekeel design houses, the smaller square windows work in conjunction with the larger windows.

John Hedlund stated the double hung windows on the upper new addition on east and south elevations did provide natural light to the master bedroom area, even without the windows above the headboard.

Several reconfigurations of window sizes and placements were suggested by all participants, and will be considered by the Applicant and Owners.

Discussion ensued as to the appearance of the varying siding materials. A.Zgolinski expressed concern about the appearance of the different siding materials (transite, cedar shingles, horizontal clapboard). T. Seekircher inquired if the sidings could be painted the same color. M. Sanchez stated that they would be painted the same color as the house. A Connor commented that the proposed cedar shingles on the addition would not be visible from the public right of way in any event.

A Zgolinski inquired if there was enough transite material to patch. M. Sanchez stated that transite shingles to be removed for this renovation would be safely handled, and GAF WeatherSide profile fiber cement siding would be used for any patching.

J. Hedlund commented that the 224 Main Street had both shingles and clapboard, and when painted the same color, the materials were indistinguishable from one another.

Based on the discussion during the Workshop, M. Sanchez will prepare additional/revised sketches for submission to the Board in time for the next meeting on January 19, 2022.

The Members agreed to keep 2 Locust Ridge on the Agenda for January 19, 2022, for review of additional sketches, and vote on a Public Hearing to be held on February 2, 2022.

There was no further comment of questions from the Board.

Public Comment on 65 Paulding Avenue Project

Matthew Sherman of 65 Paulding Avenue addressed the Board was present to provide feedback on his experience with constructing 65 Paulding Avenue. He recognized the value of the Board, and the importance of the work that the Board does in the best interests of the community. M. Sherman stated that the process of approval was too lengthy and difficult and unclear. M. Sherman commented that unnecessary delay and expense as to the project was a negative and frustrating experience, and impacted relationships with neighbors in the community.

Board Comments

A.Zgolinski thanked M.Sherman for his comments, and while agreeing that the process can often be lengthy and difficult, it is necessary to preserve the integrity of the Historic District.

Board Business

Approval of 12/22/2021 Meeting Minutes: S. Conway made a motion to accept the minutes as submitted.

T. Seekirkcher seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0-1 (L. DesBrisay was absent).

Adjournment

S.Conway made a motion to adjourn. A. Connor seconded the motion and it passed by a vote of 4-0-0-1 (L. DesBrisay was absent). Meeting adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

Submitted by Karen Herbert



Al Zgolinski, Chair

January 19, 2022
Date