# Village of Cold Spring Historic District Review Board

**Meeting** **Minutes** **–** **September** **7,** **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, September 7, 2022. Members present: Chair Al Zgolinski, Vice Chair Sean Conway, Todd Seekircher, Lloyd DesBrisay (left meeting at 8:41 pm). A. Connor absent. A. Zgolinski called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m.

**New** **Business**

**40** **Main** **Street,** **48.12-2-4,** **Nationally-designated** **area** **of** **the** **Historic** **District.** Applicant/Tenant Stacey Dugliss. Property Owner, James Gary and Sarena Straus. (40 Main CS LLC). New shop signage.

S. Conway recused himself from the Application because he has a business and personal relationship with Applicant/Tenant.

S. Dugliss described the Application as follows using a “mock-up” exhibit and photograph of existing bracket:

* Signage to be installed on pre-existing bracket on front of 40 Main Street;
* Signage constructed of white (AZEK) composite weather-resistant material with black vinyl lettering “CS Apothecary” adhered to surface;
* White vinyl decal “CS Apothecary” to be adhered to interior far right window;
* Dimension of existing bracket is 192” x 24”.

S. Dugliss noted that the sign could not be made of wood due to size and potential warping.

# Board Comment

Discussion ensued as to size, appearance, and materials of signage. T. Seekircher commented that the sign looked very big and bright, and the vinyl lettering on the (AZEK) is not suitable for the Historic District. L. DesBrisay agreed that the sign looked very stark, and commented lettering looked too large. S. Dugliss noted that many signs in the Village are similar. T. Seekircher commented that the Board must consider the signage in the context of the Village.

A Zgolinski was not unsympathetic to the overall size of the sign. T. Seekircher agreed the size of the sign would fit into the historic existing bracket, although it is unknown if that bracket was approved by a prior Board, or was in fact “grandfathered in.” T.

Seekircher further commented that the signage as shown seems out of scale, and appears to cover the top of the garage, and the sides of the garage doors, and stonework. S. Dugliss replied that the Owner wants her to use the existing “grandfathered - in” bracket, and the sign was made to fit inside same.

A. Zgolinski stated that the proposed signage will not cause any change to the structure. Prior stamped approvals showed that the existing signage frame would remain. T. Seekircher confirmed (AZEK) is a paintable material.

S. Dugliss stated she could invert the colors to then match the proposed decal to be placed in the window. Board members agreed that would visually reduce the size of the sign and would create a more consistent and elegant appearance. S. Conway noted that there is precedent for the Board to require certain uses of color to mitigate impact on the District. L. DesBrisay suggested that the lettering have a specific dimension.

Applicant to provide signed Owner’s Endorsement.

T. Seekircher made a motion to approve the application as modified to inverse signage to white lettering on black board and lettering to be a maximum of twelve (12) inches.

L. DesBrisay seconded the motion and it passed 3-0-1-1 (S. Conway abstained; A Connor absent).

**25** **Chestnut** **Street,** **49.5-3-3,** **Nationally-designated** **area** **of** **the** **Historic** **District.** Tommy Hendrix, Owner. New fence for a single-family residential parcel. Application materials provided to all participants.

T. Hendrix noted that previously existing standard picket fence that ran along the back of the parcel had rotted out and was removed. T. Hendrix described the project as follows:

* Less than four (4) foot high cedar Nantucket style, capped picket fence to be installed around the from edge of house thirty-eight (38) feet to Wall Street with six (6) fence posts;
* Extend down Wall Street sixty-two (62) feet to rear corner of property with ten

(10) fence posts;

* Extend one hundred and twenty (120) feet along rear of property with twenty (20) posts;
* Extend twenty-five (25) feet along side yard with four (4) posts;
* Cedar wrapped 4” x 4” fence posts with cap approximately three and one-half feet (3 ½’) in height;
* Pickets 1” x 3” spaced two (2) inches apart;
* Fence to provide privacy from neighbors
* New fence will be located where old rotted fence used to be;
* Pickets to sit flush with posts;
* Posts to be visible only at transition points (gate or corner).

T. Hendrix stated overgrown hedges in front of property stone wall will be cut back and manicured.

A. Zgolinski asked if the pickets were proud of or in between posts. T. Hendrix replied the pickets will sit flush with the posts. Posts will be visible only from connecting points. A. Zgolinski noted that Design Standards require posts to be visible and fencing to run post-to-post.

S. Conway noted that the property is a corner lot, and therefore has two (2) front lot lines. S. Conway commented that the portrayal of the fence in the drawing is correct as to depth of the panel as it relates to the post, which separates each panel of pickets. The height of the proposed fence is reasonable for the side yard and appears compliant with Village Code. The Board has approved similar style fences in the past.

S. Conway asked about the installation of the fence along Wall Street and how it will relate to the existing stone wall. T. Hendrix replied that the fence will be slightly set back from the stone wall, but there will be no yard or overgrowth between the two. T. Hendrix also stated fence will be painted.

A Zgolinski asked if there is a stone wall along the back lot line. T. Hendricks replied there is not. A Zgolinski clarified that the approval is for a painted fence as depicted in the drawing and not the photograph. S. Conway added site plan should be modified to reflect construction detailing, and the set-back from stone wall as well.

S. Conway made a motion to approve the application as modified with construction details, painted finish and set back from the stone wall on Wall Street. T. Seekircher seconded the motion and it passed 3-0-1-1 (L. DesBrisay abstained as absent for portion of presentation. A. Connor absent).

**13** **Parsonage** **Street,** **49.52-60,** **Locally-listed** **area** **of** **the** **Historic** **District.** Guillarme Simard-Morrisette, Owner; Jon Moss, Architect. Rear second story dormer on a single-family residential building. Application materials shared with participants.

G. Simard-Morrisette described the project as follows:

* House is traditional Cape Cod;
* No full upstairs bathroom;
* Create new shed dormer on the rear of second floor;
* Expand existing bedrooms;
* Relocate half-bath while converting to full bath;
* Dormer siding and roof will match existing siding and asphalt roof;
* Full front construction 400 Series windows on dormer:
	+ Two (2) Double-hung, tilt-wash
	+ One (1) Awning window in new bathroom
* No change to front of house;
* No additional square footage to house.

# Board Comment

L. DesBrisay stated he had no objections to Application so long as siding, shingles, aluminum gutter shape matches what’s already present. L. DesBrisay asked if front shutters will be removed. G. Simard-Morrisette replied they had not planned on that.

S. Conway commented that the dormer will increase usability of the second floor without adding an addition.

Discussion ensued about the windows on the proposed shed dormer. A. Zgolinski asked if the awning window was for the new bathroom and G. Simard-Morrisette replied it was. T. Seekircher commented that style of window is more typically used in a basement but it is nearly invisible from the street.

A. Zgolinski asked if the new construction dormer windows are the same size as those below. J. Moss noted the windows on the rear façade are of varying sizes and styles but those on the dormer match each other and one window below.

A. Zgolinski noted that the windows on all elevations are double hung vertical windows, except for the awning window, and suggested adding a muntin to it. S. Conway noted that similar awning windows have been approved on past applications.

A. Zgolinski agreed noting that the horizontal awning window will not really be visible.

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

*(L.* *DesBrisay* *left* *the* *meeting* *at* *8:41* *p.m.)*

**61** **Paulding** **Avenue,** **49.5-3-3,** **Locally** **-** **Designated** **area** **of** **the** **Historic** **District.** Luke Hilpert**,** Owner. Application for change in construction as shown in a previously approved CoA. Renderings provided to all participants.

L. Hilpert seeks to shift location of second floor bathroom window on the front facade approximately one (1) foot towards garage. Current window placement is in line with window below, but places the second story window against an interior wall. Proposed shift will center the window on the interior wall.

# Board Comment

Board Members agreed shifting the window will improve the exterior appearance of the house and be in center of existing decorative brackets.

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

**46** **Paulding** **Avenue,** **49.5-3-1,** **Nationally-designated** **area** **of** **the** **Historic** **District.** Enrique Sevilla, Owner. Replacement of Front Door on a single-family residential building. *Applicants* *not* *present*.

# Request from Philipstown Town Clerk to look at proposed signage for the Town Hall.

Supervisor van Tassel, via the Village Clerk, asked for Board feedback on a new exterior signage scheme for Town Hall. The Board declined to provide feedback as there was no submission of a formal application. The Board did suggest they reconsider the proposed typeface.

**Board** **Business** **–** None

**Public** **Comment** - None

# Approval of Minutes

August Meeting 08-03-2022 (AZ, SC, ACH, LD, TS)

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

# Update on Design Standards

Board Members are continuing to work on the Design Standards.

# Adjournment

S. Conway made a motion to adjourn. T. Seekircher seconded the motion - it passed 3-0-0-2 (A. Conner and L. DesBrisay absent). Meeting adjourned 9:04.

Submitted by Karen Herbert

 October 5, 2022

Al Zgolinski, Chair Date