**Village of Cold Spring**

**Historic District Review Board**

**Meeting Minutes – April 20, 2022**

The Village of Cold Spring Historic District Review Board held a Meeting via videoconference as per Chapter 1 of NYS Laws of 2022 on Wednesday, April 20, 2022. Members present: Chair Al Zgolinski, Vice Chair Sean Conway, Andrea Connor, Todd Seekircher, and Lloyd DesBrisay. A. Zgolinski called the meeting to order at 7:42 p.m.

**Old Business**

**Public Hearing**

**20 Church Street, 48-8-5-3, Locally-listed area of the Historic District.** Jenny and Allan Kempson, Owners. Tom McElroy, Architect/Applicant. Dormers, second-story expansion, garage expansion, screen porch. Application materials were shared with participants.

T. McElroy described the property as follows:

* House is a1950’s cape style;
* Concrete retaining wall;
* Nine (9) foot wide single car garage with existing deck on

top of garage

* Stucco exterior at street level;
* Wood and asphalt shingles at second level;

Application described as follows:

* Expansion of building to increase living space;
* Full replacement of second-story to roof height;
* Addition of two dormers on front of the house (west elevation);
* Full width dormer on rear of building (east elevation);
* Construction of covered screened porch on expanded top deck;
* New horizontal steel bar guardrail on expanded deck;
* Expand existing garage to thirteen (13) foot width;
* Expand basement underneath deck;
* New garage door with horizontal wood with transom windows

along top separated by dividers;

* New first floor double-hung dark bronze or black aluminum clad

wood windows;

* New second floor casement windows, two over two grid style;
* Smooth finish stucco around main body of house;
* Dormer siding be of a neutral color clapboard;
* Expanded deck also to be neutral color;
* Standing seam metal roof;
* Wood front door with transom in same position as present;
* Upgrade to retainer wall and stairs;
* New upgraded staircase leads to all areas of house;
* Overall footprint remains same except on northeast side, albeit within ten (10) foot side yard.

T. McElroy stated the Owners were considering a two-panel Shaker style door but has not decided yet. T. McElroy stated they did not have window catalog cuts of proposed windows but provided the description as set forth above.

**Public Comment**

A. Zgolinski opened up the Application for public comment. A Zgolinski set forth protocol for hearing: state name and address and address comments to the Board.

James Geppner 18 Church Street commented that the proposed design is beautiful and in character with the Village.

No further comment from the public.

A. Zgolinski closed the Public Hearing.

**Board Comment**

A. Zgolinski asked for a catalog cut of the proposed railing for the Board. No other Members asked for catalog cut nor any of the public attendees.

S. Conway asked about the proportions of the garage door. T. McElroy stated the width had been reduced from fifteen (15) feet to thirteen (13) feet. Dividers will be added to the windows that run along the top of the garage door and continue between the windows.

T. Seekircher commented he was comfortable with the door being wood without having to see a catalog cut. A. Zgolinski suggested drawings note front door as being constructed of wood. S. Conway agreed that a bubble be drawn to that effect A. Connor agreed if the front door is labeled on the drawing there is no concern as to the manufacturer. S. Conway stated if there is glass involved in the front door, he would like to see it and T. McElroy agreed to that.

A. Zgolinski was not concerned as to the manufacturer of the proposed aluminum clad wood windows and would make notes on the drawings. A. Zgolinski will add notes to the drawings to reflect Board discussion.

S. Conway made a motion to approve the Application as modified. L. DesBrisay seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**30 Fair Street, 48.8-2-2, Nationally-listed area of the Historic District.** Ed Fortier and Sheng Wang, homeowners.Deck on rear of single-family home; new windows. Modified application materials were shared with participants.

In response to Board comments at the last Meeting, Applicants submitted modified drawings to show as follows:

* Existing windows and door on rear façade indicated by dotted line which

to be replaced by French doors and three new windows (400

Series Woodwright fibrex clad wood product);

* New stairs to be constructed to lead to rear yard;
* Painted wood square lattice panels with 1x4 surround;
* Catalog cuts of black metal balusters shown to Board for deck

railing instead of initially proposed wood;

**Board Comment/Discussion**

E. Fortier asked if white windows and white trim was preferred by the Board. T. Seekircher noted that color of windows is not within the purview of the Board; suggestions may be made but do not weigh in the approval process. S. Conway noted that in this application, the windows on the rear façade are not visible to the public right of way, however, if the Applicant desires in the future to replace the existing wood windows throughout the rest of the house, the Board would have to approve the replacement windows. Board would not be inclined to approve vinyl-clad windows as an acceptable replacement for original wood windows.

Discussion ensued as to patching areas of siding on the rear façade**.** Existing siding is asbestos shingles. E. Fortier stated he has not yet spoken to contractor about sourcing non-asbestos replacement shingles of a similar profile. E. Fortier stated he would like to replace the asbestos siding completely at some point. S. Conway asked if Applicants could replace the whole rear façade with a new material, or re-side a portion of the façade and match the color between asbestos shingle and clapboard. E. Fortier noted abatement of asbestos would be complicated. A. Zgolinski commented that the Applicant could use a simulated transite with minimum impact. L. DesBrisay commented that it was a lot to ask the homeowner to re-side the entire façade. L. DesBrisay and A. Connor agreed that either option as to siding was acceptable as the elevation is not highly visible from the public right of way.

Board Members agreed that no public hearing was required for this Application. Board further determined it would approve the Application as drawn with the qualification that the siding on the rear is either the entire rear façade at the edge of the deck is in be Hardie Board or Applicant can use new simulated transite material for patching.

S. Conway made a motion to approve the application as modified. T. Seekircher seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**New Business**

**8 Locust Ridge, 49.5-2-27, Locally-listed area of the Historic District.** Hass Murphy and Diane Blotnick, Owners/Applicants. Fence and shed. Application materials shared with all participants.

H. Murphy described the application(s) as follows:

**FENCE:**

* Installation of barrier fence to enclose recently built in-ground pool;
* Fence to be Classic Victorian picket to compliment 1910 house to be constructed

of red cedar standard stock pick from Campanella Fence;

* Fence to be forty-eight (48) inches as required by NYS Building Code

Standards as per NYS Uniform Code 2017 Code Supplement Section R236;

* Fence to have two (2) 4x4 post gate, outward opening self-closing gates with self-latching hardware;
* Two by two (2 x 2) spindles;
* Spindles mounted on two (2) rails only on inside pool fence so no “toe-hold” on outside of fence; No horizontal rails on outside of fence to “sandwich” pickets;
* Top of fence is forty-eight (48) from bottom rail;
* Each section of fence would be connected to a 4x4 post;
* Additional twelve (12) inches to porch railing increase height from thirty

(36) inches to forty-eight (48) inches for safety, as recommended by former Cold Spring Bldg. Inspector C. Mountain.

**Board Comments**

Discussion ensued as to the proposed height of the fence around the pool. S. Conway stated the appearance of the fence is within purview of the Board and application must be reviewed as submitted. L. DesBrisay and S. Conway had no issue with the Application as presented. A. Zgolinski expressed concern that the view from the public right of way would be only pickets and the posts would not be visible. A Connor agreed that pool fence should be forty-eight (48) inches to keep children from getting into the pool. Owners stated they are compliant with NYS Code regarding pool fences. For additional safety, they have also an automatic pool cover.

S. Conway made a motion to approve the application for the pool fence as submitted (not porch railing). L. DesBrisay seconded the motion and it passed 4-1-0-0 (Nay from A. Zgolinski stating that the design did not comply with the Design Standards).

**SHED:**

* Ninety-five (95) sq. ft. storage shed at location of pool project;
* 8’4” high and 8’0 wide;
* Shed will have four (4) electrical boxes, no plumbing, no partitions

or finishes;

* Siding identical to that of main house (1/2 inch x 6 inch primed cedar
* clapboard);
* Sloped, snow load shed roof with asphalt shingled to match shingles on

main house;

* 2’ x 6’ header beam;
* 1’ x 8’ pine base;
* Pocket doors;
* 1 x 5 trim around pocket doors;
* Two (2) inoperable windows on shed front on either side of pocket doors;
* Corner boards on front elevation and on side.

**Board Comments**

Board Members complimented the design of the shed, and noted the all-wood design matched Historic District structures.

S. Conway made a motion to approve the application for the shed as modified. T. Seekircher seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**Porch Railing**

Discussion ensued regarding a proposed increase the height of the railing on the porch to the house from 36 inches to 48 inches, as requested by the Code Enforcement Officer. A. Connor agreed the porch railing should be increased to the forty-eight (48) inch height for safety. S. Conway commented that Owners would have to make balusters taller. S. Conway further commented that such option would not disrupt the design if the new material was of a similar design. H. Murphy proposed making a taller railing instead of adding a barrier of different material to reach the recommended height.

H. Murphy also suggested a 1’ x 3’ lattice top that would match the lattice panel which will be placed back under the porch, instead of using taller balusters.

A. Zgolinski disagreed that the added height was necessary but agreed with L. DesBrisay that adding an additional barrier would be preferable for historic preservation purposes. S. Conway expressed concern that the option of adding an additional barrier would not be Code compliant. T. Seekircher questioned the necessity of raising the railing height, given that the top of the existing porch railing was approximately seven (7) feet from the ground.

A. Zgolinski noted the porch railing did not come before the Board. If the Owners determine, after consult with Phillipstown Building Dept., that they are not required to increase the height of the porch railing, there will be no need to return to the Board for approval. Owners advised to go forward with approved fence and consult Phillipstown Bldg. regarding the porch railing.

**Workshop**

**41 Garden Street, 48.8-2-27, Locally-listed area of the Historic District.** Maria DiMeo, Owner/Applicant.Rear fence. Images shared with all participants.

M. DiMeo asking for guidance on materials for a rear yard fence. Rear of property backs up against 30 Fair Street.

**Board Comments**

S. Conway noted Board met with homeowners on a prior approval for the extension of the kitchen.

A Zgolinski stated the Board has nothing to do with gas tanks. Her options are not limited to a wood fence but no chain link fences. L. DesBrisay noted vinyl fence is not permitted in Historic District. Owner proposed an Illusions Vinyl 6’ x 8’ with posts in between. Board noted 2021 change in Code that now permits, as of right, six (6) foot fence in rear of property.

S. Conway suggested a solid panel wood fence with lattice. While permitted, a black metal fence would not likely give the Owner the privacy she is seeking. Owner reminded vegetation is not within the Board’s purview. S. Conway noted the Board has not approved stockade fencing, but has approved fences with wide boards with a very narrow gap in them. Board noted that any proposed style of fence must it within the posts and not on the post surface.

Owner advised to submit Application, Site Plan, and proposed styles and materials.

**Board Business**

Update on Design Standards tabled until next Meeting.

**Public Comment** – None.

**Approval of Minutes**

Workshop and Additional Voting Session 02-16-2022 (AZ, SC, ACH, TS)

S. Conway made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. A. Connor seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0-1 (S. Conway absent).

Monthly Meeting 03-02-2022 (AZ, LD, TS)

T. Seekircher made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. L. DesBrisay seconded the motion and it passed 3-0-0-2 (S. Conway and A. Connor absent).

Monthly Meeting, 04-06-2022 (AZ, SC, ACH, LD)

S. Conway made a motion to approve the minutes as submitted. A. Connor seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0-1 (T. Seekircher absent).

**Adjournment**

S. Conway made a motion to adjourn. T. Seekircher seconded the motion and it passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

Submitted by Karen Herbert

 May 18,2022

Al Zgolinski, Chair Date