

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

A Regular Meeting of the Board of Building Design of the Incorporated Village of Lawrence was held on Monday, June 7, 2010 at the Lawrence Village Hall, 196 Central Avenue, Lawrence New York 11559 at 7:25 P.M.

Those members present were: Chairperson Benjamin Sporn
Member Ronni Berman
Member Barry Pomerantz
Member Barbara Kupferstein
Alternate Member Shoshana Weinstock

Those members absent were: Member Eva Staiman

Also present were: Ronald Goldman, Attorney to Board of Building Design, Thomas P. Rizzo, Secretary to Board of Building Design and Gail Daniels, Building Department.

Chairperson Sporn called to order the regular meeting of the Board of Building Design at 7:25 PM. Proof of posting for the meeting was submitted. Five members of the board were present for a quorum. The meeting was called to order with the following members present: Chairperson Sporn, Member Berman, Member Pomerantz, Member Kupferstein and Alternate Member Weinstock.

Upon a motion by Member Pomerantz and seconded by Member Berman with the following vote cast:

Ayes: Chairman Sporn, Member Berman, Member Pomerantz, Member Kupferstein and Alternate Member Weinstock, the minutes of the April 12, 2010 and May 3, 2010 Board of Building Design meetings were approved as submitted. Before the Board proceeded with the agenda items, Mr. Rizzo explained that due to the July 4th holiday the original Board of Building Design meeting scheduled for July 5th 2010 had to be rescheduled, the next available date was Monday July 12th, 2010. The Board unanimously agreed with the change of the July meeting from the 5th to July 12th 2010.

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

The meeting agenda included nine new applications and four prior applications; one of the prior applications was scheduled for a public hearing before the Board of Building Design. Chairman Sporn noted that since the reporter was present for the public hearing, that the Board hold the public hearing first and then continue with the rest of the agenda items. Chairman Sporn asked for a motion to take the public hearing first; a motion was made by Mr. Pomerantz. and seconded by Mrs. Berman to take the public hearing first, Mr. Goldman noted for the record that the motion was unanimously approved by all members of the Board to take that application out of order.

The following prior application was considered:

Rokosz – 50 Meadow Ln. – Install additional paving for circular driveway. Mr. Rizzo asked if the applicant or their representative would step forward and identify themselves for the record, Mr. Shrage Rokosz came forward and identified himself as the property owner. Mr. Goldman explained for the record that this was a public meeting with a public hearing and the Board meets pursuant to the open meetings law and meets publicly and this specifically is a public hearing which is being recorded pursuant to the rules that govern the Board of Building Design, anyone in the audience should be aware that the Board gets each application before the meeting and as individuals review and investigate the applications and make site visits and you will find that the questions from the Board are specific due to review and investigate members have done and they have focused in on important points. Mr. Rokosz explained that he understood that his application was first heard by the Board on April 2010 meeting and he intended to present his case at that meeting but due to a miscommunication with the Building Department as to the correct date of the meeting and since he received no written notice of such meeting Mr. Rokosz requested that this be considered his first meeting before the Board on this application since he was not present for the first meeting. Mr. Rokosz then presented twelve

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

exhibits to support his application and claims that the location of his home on Meadow Lane is a dangerous location on the heavily traveled Meadow Lane. Mr. Goldman noted for the record that the Board was in the process of reviewing that exhibits submitted by the applicant. Mr. Rokosz noted that he had review previous application for circular driveways; both write and recorded records for the Moskovits application of 30 Margaret Ave. and Berkowitz application of 240 Broadway with a driveway on Rosalind Pl. Mr. Rokosz noted the guidelines used by the Board for circular driveway, a property at lease 68 feet wide with a front yard depth of 50 feet from the curb. Mr. Rokosz noted that he did comply with the zoning rules to install the paving. Mr. Rokosz noted that the records indicate that the Board of Trustees noted that the guideline for circular driveways was only a guideline, an abstract and not a law and Mr. Rokosz pointed out that the Mayor and Board had never adopted these guidelines and the Board had comments about the guidelines and recommended changes to the guidelines which is still an open matter. Mr. Rokosz also noted that from the audio tapes, it is clear that the position of the Board of Building Design and the Board of Trusts has consistently been that the guidelines do not apply at all when safety is an issue. Mr. Rokosz noted that at the January 2009 meeting the Board of Trustees stated that exception to any guideline is appropriate for a driveway and Mr. Rokosz quoted the Board "on a high traffic street were it is really is a safety concern". Mr. Rokosz noted that the Board specifically recognized the safety issues on Meadow Lane, Broadway and Rockaway Turnpike all three are high traffic roads. Mr. Rokosz continued to quote the Mayor and Board of Trustees and the Board of Building Design regarding the applications for circular driveways for Moskowitz of 30 Margaret Ave and Berkowitz of 240 Broadway and compared those applications and locations to his application and property location. Mr. Rokosz listed other circular driveways approved by the Board of Building Design that did not comply with the

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

guidelines and submitted a list of homes that have circular driveways that do not comply with the guidelines. Mr. Rokosz stated that the majority of homes with circular do not comply and his home was in character with these homes. Mr. Rokosz noted that he had meet with Mr. Smollett and Mr. Ryder and they agreed that his home location on Meadow Lane was a dangerous location and noted other safety issues regarding the location. Mr. Rokosz pointed out the proposed landscape plan for the front with the proposed circular driveway. Mr. Rokosz completed his presentation by stating that for safety issues his driveway should be approved over the guidelines and personal esthetic issues. Mr. Sporn stated that he disagreed with many of the characterizations made by Mr. Rokosz without addressing the merits at the last meeting recognizing the safety issue this Board said that you should be granted a turn around so that you could enter your driveway, turn your car around and come out front wards. Mr. Sporn noted that Mr. Rokosz is located on a county road and the Village of Lawrence could not grant a curb cut permit for the county road and asked if he had submitted an application to the county for a curb cut. Mr. Rokosz explained that he had not filed with the county. Mr. Rokosz explained that he did not need the curb cut right now he had the required lot coverage to install the driveway and he was willing to go to Nassau County for a curb cut. Mr. Sporn questioned then what Mr. Rokosz was asking, a circular driveway where you exist the same way you enter? Mr. Rokosz explained that he was asking for the driveway indicated in the picture which was to cover part of his front yard with paving, if the Board does not have jurisdiction over the curb cut he understood and again stated that he did not need the curb cut at this time. Chairman Sporn continued to questions what Mr. Rokosz was requesting to do, if he did not have the second curb cut and how it would differ from what the Board offered at the pervious meeting, a turn around. Again Mr. Rokosz stated that he was not at the other meeting and submitted a letter regarding his application and

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

was surprised that meeting had taken place the previous day when he was told the meeting was in two days. Mrs. Berman stated she was missing something was Mr. Rokosz asking for a circular driveway or a turn around, Mr. Rokosz stated he was asking for a circular driveway. Mr. Rokosz stated that a turn around would not help him with three cars and that the shape of his lot would not work with a turn around. Mrs. Weinstock stated that she visited the block and was disturbed about the amount of traffic on the street and agreed that if Nassau County was willing to give him the curb cut that the safest way for Mr. Rokosz to get in and out of his driveway would be a circular driveway and a circular driveway was more pleasing to look at then the turn around. Mr. Goldman asked to clarify what was being requested, was the purpose of the circular driveway is that you pull in at one curb cut and exit at a second curb cut face first, every one in general agreed that was what was requested. Mr. Goldman questioned that if Mr. Rokosz was not asking for a curb cut what was his intention, Mrs. Weinstock believed that Mr. Rokosz was not asked the Village of Lawrence for a curb cut and Mr. Rokosz explained that he understood that the Village of Lawrence could not give him the curb cut he was asking the Village of Lawrence to approve the driveway or lot coverage. Mr. Sporn explained that he did not have any zoning issues so what was he asking for; Mr. Rokosz asked why he was denied. Mrs. Kupferstein stated that she felt that the turn around could satisfy the safety requirement and the driveway did not come close to the guidelines however Mr. Rokosz did bring up a lot of information and since Mr. Rokosz requested that this be treated as his first meeting with the Board did the Board need to render a decision or could she have to time to process the information on non complying driveways brought forward and Mrs. Kupferstein wanted to be fair and she would like more time to consider the application and render a decision. Mr. Sporn noted that over the years, before the Moskovits matter, yes exceptions had been made to the guidelines

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

and that so many exception had been made that the exceptions almost became the rule and when you look with hind site at exceptions made you do not get the full context and feeling for why they where made, subsequent to that meeting the Mayor provided the Board with a recommended guideline which was a minimum width greater then what the Board required namely seventy feet wide not sixty eight feet wide but a front yard depth of forty five feet as apposed to the fifty foot front yard depth used by the Board, Chairman Sporn noted that this application failed with either of the guidelines. Mr. Rokosz stated that he did not think he failed to comply with the forty-five foot front yard set back but he stated that his safety issue argument would over ride any guidelines. Mr. Goldman asked Mr. Rokosz if he intended to drive over the curb until you got a curb cut. Mr. Rokosz said no. Mr. Gold questioned then would Mr. Rokosz defer any action until he resolved the issue with the county. Mr. Rokosz stated that he could proceed with his work and deal with the county on the curb cut at a later date. Mr. Sporn noted that when he visited the site the driveway was already installed. Mr. Rokosz stated that he had not installed the driveway he did not have ground coverage, he was preparing to do the planting and ready for plantings he just dug up the dirt. Mrs. Berman questioned that was not a circular driveway at the site, Mr. Rokosz said he was preparing for the circular driveway he had not put in black top or gravel it was just dirt. Mrs. Berman stated that this was really new to her hearing this application and Mr. Rokosz stated the same was true for him since he was not at the first meeting of the Board he did not know what the Board looked at he had just submitted an application he had not submitted his letter. Mr. Goldman asked Mr. Rokosz what arrangements or what was his thinking in the event that the county where to deny him the curb cut, what would be his options. Mr. Rokosz did not see how the county could deny him the curb cut, and he did not see how that was an issue for this board. Mr. Rokosz stated that he owned his home the consequences for

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

doing something that is not esthetically pleasing would fall on him and would detract from the value of his home, he would not do anything that would detract from the value of his home. Chairman Sporn stated that it was a fair question, if Nassau County says you could not have a second curb cut, what he would do with the paving. Mrs. Weinstock noted that he could just use the paving as a turn around, pull in pull back and go forward but Chairman Sporn noted that is what was already suggested for the applicant to do. Mrs. Weinstock noted that if he gets the curb cut he could come in and come out and any delivery person will do the same without worry. Mrs. Kupferstein noted that there was a house on Muriel that has since been sold and remodeled so this condition no longer exists but it had a circular driveway without the second curb cut, it was not a county road, the village denied the circular driveway after it was begun and independent of my personal opinion whether this should be approved or not, putting one in place and then not having the curb cut was an unsightly condition. Mr. Rokosz questioned how it was an unsightly condition. Mrs. Kupferstein noted it looked like a road to nowhere. Mr. Rokosz noted that the curb is only one inch high at his home so it will not be unsightly and the view would be the same as in the pictures. Mrs. Kupferstein would recommend getting a picture of whether the county will be favorable to a curb cut. Mr. Rokosz stated that he is just asking for ground coverage and did not need a variance he does not see why this board should deny him. Chairman Sporn explained that this board was looking at the esthetics of what he wants to do in the front yard. Mr. Rokosz asked Chairman Sporn if the picture he had was not esthetically pleasing. Chairman Sporn stated it was hard for him to relate to a picture of a circular driveway when the county had not approved the curb cut; it seems to him that coming to the Board of Building Design was premature. If it was Mr. Rokosz intent to have a circular driveway exit onto the street then he needed a permit from the county. All of the Board members

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

discussed other options and questions Mr. Rokosz as to what he would do with the driveway if he installed the driveway but did not get permission for the second curb cut. The length discussion between the Board members and Mr. Rokosz continued regarding granting the driveway without a curb cut permit from Nassau County. Mrs. Weinstock asked Mr. Rizzo what the county requirements were for a curb cut, Mr. Rizzo explained that he was not aware of the Nassau County's requirements for curb cuts, the Village of Lawrence did not deal with the county regarding these matter, residents were reference to the county regarding filing permits and required fees for the permits from the county. Chairman Sporn brought the issue to a vote, Chairman Sporn voted to approve the application for the paving for a circular driveway on the condition that the county grants a second curb cut. Mrs. Berman voted in agreement with Chairman Sporn. Mrs. Kupferstein was asked what her vote was on the application, Mrs. Kupferstein stated that she agreed that the location was dangerous but she had concerns over the engineering of the circular driveway, would the design of the driveway accommodate a large vehicle or three vehicles, would the circular driveway be effective to maneuver vehicles, would the driveway address all of the safety issues. Mrs. Kupferstein understood that the other board members were willing to grant it without any conditions should the county approve the curb, she would like Mr. Rokosz to obtain a curb cut permit from the county first and then come back to the Board of Building Design. The Board members, Mr. Goldman and Mrs. Kupferstein discussed her concerns. The Board returned to voting on the application Mrs. Kupferstein abstained from voting on the application, Mr. Pomerantz and Mrs. Weinstock voted to approve the application with the condition that the applicant obtains a curb cut permit from the county first. Chairman Sporn stated that the application is approved conditional on the county granting the curb cut and the design is as set forth. Mr. Rizzo asked if the landscape plan was approved as submitted for the

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

circular driveway. The board briefly discussed the landscape plan that was submitted as part of the circular driveway plan with Mr. Rokosz. The board agreed that the landscape plan was approved for the circular driveway as submitted by Mr. Rokosz with his application for the circular driveway. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Members Sporn, Berman, Pomerantz, and Weinstock voted to approve the application with the condition that the applicant obtains a curb cut permit from the county first and the landscape plan as submitted, Mrs. Kupferstein abstained from the vote.

The following new applications were considered:

Dorf – 7 Dogwood Ln. – Inground swimming pool, pool equipment, paving and fence.

The members reviewed the application. Mr. Rizzo explained to the Board that the application was to install an inground pool in the rear yard with paving and install a black chain link fence around the rear yard to enclose the pool. It was noted for the record that Mr. Dorf, the property owner was present for her application. Member Berman questioned the installation of a chain link fence. Mr. Rizzo noted that the Board of Building Design guide lines allowed installation of a chain link fence as part of a pool enclosure and the proposed five foot high fence was to be installed on the side property lines and the rear property line and in both side yards to create an enclosed area for the pool. Several Board members discussed the use of a black chain link fence; Mr. Pomerantz recalled that they had recently turned down a black chain link fence for a pool enclosure. Mr. Rizzo reminded the Board that in the referenced situation, that pool was to be fenced independently of the black chain link fence that was requested for the rear and side property lines, the requested black chain link fence would not be part of the pool enclosure. The applicant, Mrs. Dorf of 7 Dogwood Lane address the Board to explain that there was a change regarding the fence. Mrs. Dorf explained that on the rear property

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

line was an existing wood fence and now the plan was to replace the existing wood fence on the rear property line with a new wood fence to match what was there. Mr. Rizzo asked Mrs. Dorf to explain what type of fence was on the rear property line now since that information was not provided. Mr. Goldman suggested that Mrs. Dorf indicate on the submitted plan what the change was and Mr. Rizzo questioned what type of wood fence existed and Mrs. Dorf stated that it is a wood stockade fence, Mr. Rizzo asked which side of the fence faced in, was it the good or finished side, which way did the existing fence face. Mrs. Dorf explained that the finished side of the existing fence faced in at the present time. Mr. Rizzo explained that to comply with the New York State Code for a pool enclosure the horizontal boards of the fence must be on the inside so you can not climb the fence to get into the pool area. Mrs. Dorf stated that when the fence is replaced with a new fence that the finished side would face out, Mr. Rizzo asked what was the height of the existing fence, Mrs. Dorf believed that the existing wood fence was at least five or six feet high. Mr. Rizzo asked how high the new wood fence was planned and Mrs. Dorf stated at least five or six feet high. Mr. Goldman asked that the record be amended to show that the applicant was asking for a new wood stockade fence on the rear property line and the black chain link fence on the two side property lines and in both side yards and confirm this with Mrs. Dorf, she agreed. Mr. Goldman wanted the diagrams adjusted to show the change to the fence. The Board discussed that black chain link fence and Chairman Sporn asked Mrs. Dorf if she would consider an aluminum or estate style fence, Mrs. Dorf stated that the reason for the black chain link is that on Dogwood all the back yards run together and it look like a base ball field and all the families are friends and all the children play together and go from one yard to another and as people have installed pools they have put up chain link fences which appeared to be the most neighborly and friendly and Mrs. Dorf did not want to put up something that

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

would offend her neighbors. Chairman Sporn noted that it appeared that none of the Board members had a problem with the plan. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Members Sporn, Berman, Pomerantz, Kupferstein and alternate member Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the application as submitted and amended. Mrs. Dorf asked what would happen to her permit now; Mr. Rizzo explained that the permit would be amended to show that the pool was approved with a six foot high wood stockade fence on the rear property line and with a five foot high black chain link fence on the two side property lines and in both side yards.

Mael – 90 Washington Ave – Install inground swimming pool, pool equipment, paving and fence, construct pool house and screen porch addition to existing deck. Mr. Rizzo explained it was two applications one for the pool and one for the pool house and screen porch. The members reviewed the application the Board discussed the pool house and screen porch addition. Mrs. Berman explained that she tried to look in the back yard but no one was home. The Board discussed that set back for the pool house and reviewed the plot plan and discussed the location of the pool house and screen room, Mrs. Berman asked if the bushes were staying in the area for the pool house, Mr. Mael asked what location she was referring to on the property. Mr. Mael explained that the pool house was not visible from the street it was in the front left side of the property with existing an existing tree blocking. It was noted that the pool house was behind existing landscaping and Mr. Mael explained that the indicated planting belong to the neighboring property and his landscaping was in front and the pool house could not be seen. The Board did not note any problem regarding the pool house or screen room. The Board next reviewed the pool, the paving and the pool fence. Mr. Mael in reviewing the drawing from the pool company noted that the fence location had been changed and Mr. Mael amended the drawing to show the correct location for the pool fence. The Board questioned which

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

estate fence style was to be installed in the two side yards. The Board and Mr. Mael discussed the different styles of estate fence and the Board and Mr. Mael agreed on a style of fence to be installed. Mrs. Berman noted that the estate style fence would be located in the side yards visible from the street; Mr. Rizzo confirmed this and explained that the remaining required pool fencing would be black chain link. Mrs. Berman asked where the trash storage area was located and Mr. Mael explained that the trash area was located around the corner of the house but in front of the proposed estate style pool fence. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Members Sporn, Berman, Pomerantz, Kupferstein and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the application for pool house, screen porch, pool as amended regarding the pool fence location.

Reich – 82 Harborview West – One story front addition, second floor rear addition and interior alterations and alter garage space. The Board reviewed the application. Mr. Rizzo explained that a variance had been granted for this application. Mrs. Berman questioned what the variance was for regarding the garage. Mr. Rizzo explained that they had reduced the size of the garage. Mrs. Berman had a question if there was a variance granted for the garage why did the plan show two garage spaces. Mr. Rizzo noted that the plans did not reflect what the application was for. Mr. John Macleod came forward and identified himself as the architect for the project. Mr. Macleod and Mr. Rizzo reviewed the submitted plans and the plans that were approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals, it was determined that when Mr. Macleod submitted additional plan copies for the Board of Building Design to review that he submitted an older set of elevation drawings and floor plans. One previously submitted set of correct plans was in the file for the Board to review. Mr. Macleod explained that the granted variance allowed the applicant to convert one garage bay to a room. Mr. Rizzo explained that the variance

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

allowed the applicant to change from a two car space to a one car garage space with one space converted to a room and one garage space door to be removed. Mr. Macleod explained that the other part of the project was a front addition to enlarge the dining room and a rear second floor addition to the right rear corner to raise the ceiling of the bedroom by a reverse gable roof and give more head room and install windows. Mr. Macleod explained that the siding and roofing would match the existing house and the Board reviewed photos of the existing house. Mr. Macleod explained that the dining room addition was to extend one and a half feet past the garage section of the house. Mr. Pomerantz questioned why on the right side elevation the new windows did not match the existing windows of the house; Mr. Macleod explained that the new windows would match the type of windows in the house with grills. Mr. Pomerantz asked if shutters would be installed, a review of pictures of the house indicated that the house did not have shutters now. The Board discussed the style of the garage door; Mr. Macleod explained that the door style on the drawing was a proposed door. Several Board members agreed that the proposed garage door did not match style of the house and Mr. Macleod stated that the existing simple style garage door could be reused or a new simple door installed. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Members Sporn, Berman, Pomerantz, Kupferstein and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the application with the condition that the new windows match the existing windows and a simpler style garage door is used on the one car garage.

Friedman – 15 Lakeside Dr. West – Two story front addition, two story rear addition, second floor addition, rear deck and alter flat roof. Mr. John Macleod came forward identified himself as the architect for the project and explained the application and the additions on the front and back of the house. The Board reviewed the plans. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Members Sporn,

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

Berman, Pomerantz, Kupferstein and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the application.

The following prior application was considered:

Goldner – 22 Herrick Dr. – Two story front addition, second floor side addition, rear addition and complete interior and exterior alterations to residence. Mr. Rizzo explained to the Board that they had approved this application at an earlier date, several Board members did not think the originally brick sample matched with the stucco and stone to be used on the house and asked for a new brick sample to be submitted. A new brick sample was submitted for the Board to review. Mr. John Macleod identified himself at the architect for this project and described the new brick sample. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the new brick sample. Members Sporn, Berman, Pomerantz, Kupferstein and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the new brick sample submitted.

The following new applications were considered:

Hoinig – 400 Tanglewood Crossing. – Install 8 foot by 16 foot prefab shed in rear yard. The Board reviewed the application for the prefab shed. Mr. Rizzo explained that the photo of the shed indicated shutters on the structure but the home owner indicated that the shed would not have shutters and would be gray in color with a dark gray roof. Mrs. Berman questioned why the photo of the shed showed shutters, Mr. Rizzo pointed out that it was a sample photo only and the shed would be located in the rear of the property. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Members Sporn, Berman, Pomerantz, Kupferstein and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the application as submitted.

Spetner – 59 Washington Ave. – Install six foot high beige PVC fence to replace existing wood fence on side property line and in side yard. The Board reviewed the

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

application, Mr. Rizzo explained that the applicant wished to install the PVC fence due to the fact that the arborvitae shrubs had died and this was the second time he had replaced the shrubs in this location and he wanted to replace the wood fence with a new six foot high PVC fence. Mrs. Berman questioned why the owner would plant arborvitae again when the first ones died. Several Board members did not think the existing wood fence was 6 foot high; the Board discussed the fence height and location. Mrs. Weinstock suggested that the application be approved with the condition that the new PVC fence must match the height of the existing fence to be replaced and Chairman Sporn asked that the fence have a matte finish. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Members Sporn, Berman, Pomerantz, Kupferstein and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the application with the conditions that the new fence must match the height of the existing fence and the beige PVC fence must have a matte finish.

Scharf – 2 Waverly Pl. – Install replacement fence 6 foot high PVC to match color or existing PVC fence on side property lines. The Board reviewed and discussed the application. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Members Sporn, Berman, Pomerantz, Kupferstein, and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the fence application as submitted.

Abadi – 14 Washington Ave. – Install replacement black chain link fence, 4 foot high on rear and right side property line and 4 foot high white PVC fence on left side, side property line and in both side yards. Mr. Rizzo advised the Board that this application had been amend several times since it was submitted, the last change was submitted to the Building Department this morning and copies of the changes where given to the Board. Mr. Rizzo described the changes and the new request was for a 4 foot high gray

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

PVC fence in the both side yards of the property and to replace an existing old, rusty and Mrs. Berman pointed out, leaning chain link fence with a new 4 foot high black chain link fence. The Board discussed the application. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Members Sporn, Berman, Pomerantz, Kupferstein, and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the fence application as amended.

Weiss – 77 Margaret Ave. – Two story rear addition and rear deck addition and demo part of one story front enclosed entrance porch. The members reviewed and discussed the application, Mrs. Weinstein and Mrs. Berman questioned why on the right side elevation there was just one oval window when there were no other oval windows on the existing house or the new addition. Mr. Pomerantz noted that none of the windows on the addition would match the existing windows. Mr. Rizzo explained that the applicant wanted to get started as soon as possible. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Members Sporn, Berman, Pomerantz, Kupferstein and Weinstock voted unanimously to conditionally approve the application. The Board requested that the windows in the addition match the window style in the existing house and requested that the one oval window in the addition be changed to match the existing window style.

Englander – 163 Harborview N. – Install inground swimming pool, pool equipment and fence. Mr. Rizzo explained that the Board had reviewed and approved the pool but the applicant had not picked a fence to enclose the yard. The applicant had now chosen a beige/tan PVC fence and was back to show the fence to the Board and submitted a picture of the fence type and color. It was noted that there was existing fencing that was to be used for the pool enclosure and the new fence was to be installed to enclose the balance of the yard. Mrs. Berman noted that the applicant was asking for a 6 foot high fence on

Lawrence, New York, June 7, 2010

the side property line. Mrs. Weinstock asked what type was the existing fence to be used for the pool area; Mr. Rizzo explained that there was no information submitted by the applicant regarding the existing fence to be used as part of the pool enclosure. The members reviewed the application and discussed that they would approve a 5 foot high fence on a side property line. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. Members Sporn, Berman, Pomerantz, Kupferstein and Weinstock voted unanimously to approve the application with the condition that the fence be 5 feet high only on the side property line.

The following prior application was considered:

Friedman – 4 Washington Ave. – Amend previously approved application, to change the siding. The Board reviewed the proposed stucco for the siding and the gray color picked by the home owner. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the proposed change to the siding for the project. Members Sporn, Berman, Pomerantz, Kupferstein and Weinstock voted unanimously the proposed stucco siding and gray color for the house.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:18 PM

This is to certify that I, Thomas P. Rizzo, Secretary to the Board of Building Design, have read the foregoing minutes and the same are in all respects a full and correct record of such meeting.



Thomas P. Rizzo