

Lawrence, New York December 17, 2012

A Regular Meeting of the Board of Building Design of the Incorporated Village of Lawrence was held on Monday, December 17, 2012 at the Lawrence Village Hall, 196 Central Avenue, Lawrence New York 11559.

Those members present were: Chairman Benjamin Sporn
Member Eva Staiman
Member Barry Pomerantz
Member Barbara Kupferstein
Alternate Member Myrna Breitman

Those members absent were: Member Ronni Berman

Also present were: Thomas P. Rizzo, Secretary to Board of Building Design. Chairman Sporn called to order the regular meeting of the Board of Building Design at 7:16 PM.

Proof of posting for the meeting was submitted. The meeting agenda included three new applications and one prior application. Chairman Sporn stated that the Board would review minutes after the agenda items were completed.

The following new applications were considered:

Passmore – 11 Barrett Rd. – Second floor deck addition, swimming pool, paving for circular driveway and patio and light piers. Dr. Craig Passmore came forward and identified himself as the property owner of 111 Barrett Road and Mr. Norman Lok identified himself as the P.E. for the project. The Board member reviewed the plans with Dr. Passmore and Mr. Lok briefly discussing the variances granted and finish materials. Chairman Sporn discussed the proposed circular driveway with Dr. Passmore and Mr. Lok regarding the distant between the front of the house and the existing curb line. Chairman Sporn asked the other Board Members if they had any issues with the proposed

Lawrence, New York December 17, 2012

alterations. None of the Board Members stated they had any problems regarding the proposed work. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Member Staiman to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Alternate Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Chairman Sporn yes, Member Pomerantz yes and Member Kupferstein yes. Dr. Passmore thanked the Board.

The following prior application was considered:

Nahmais – 575 Chauncey Ln. – Replace existing 6 foot high stockade fence on west side property line and install 4 foot high chain link fence on part of east side property line. Shlomo and Monica Nahmais came forward and identified themselves as the property owners. Mr. Rizzo advised the Board Members that they had reviewed this fence application before and wanted clarification regarding the requested fence and requested that the applicants provide additional information regarding the requested fence. Mr. & Mrs. Nahmais explained that there was an existing wood fence on the west side property line boarding the property now owned by the Hunt Club and there was an existing tennis court on the Hunt Club property, close to the side property line and the tennis court had an existing six foot high chain link fence on the side property line. They explained the Hunt Club had installed a wood fence several feet onto their property blocking part of the view of the tennis court. Mr. Nahmais showed the Board Members several pictures of the wood fence which he had on his I pad. Mr. & Mrs. Nahmais stated that their plan was to relocate the wood fence to the property line and extend the wood fence from the rear yard area going toward the street. The Board Members questioned if the fence would extend past the front wall of their house toward the street.

Lawrence, New York December 17, 2012

Mrs. Nahmais explained that the chain link fence allowed anyone on the tennis court to see into their yard and the six foot wood fence up against the tennis court fence would give her yard privacy. The Board held a long discussion with Mr. & Mrs. Nahmais regarding the requested six foot high wood fences up against the tennis court fence.

Several Board Members explained to Mr. & Mrs. Nahmais that the Board did not allow fences to extend past the front wall of a house toward the street. The Board Members and Mr. & Mrs. Nahmais continued to discuss the requested wood fence on the side line past the front wall of their home. Chairman Sporn proposed the idea of allowing the wood fence, to be the same height as the existing low chain link fence on the side of the tennis court, and the fence could extend past the front wall of the Nahmais home but only as far as the tennis court, and not all the way to the street. The other Board Members and the Nahmais's agreed to this proposal. The Board Members and Mr. & Mrs. Nahmais discussed the requested chain link fence on the east side property line. Mr. Nahmais explained that there was an existing chain link fence on the east side property line and they wanted to extend the fence toward the street. The Board Members questioned the reason for extending the fence? Mr. Nahmais explained that there was a dog on the adjoining property that would get out and come to the garbage pails on his property and several times when his wife and child were out in the front yard area the dog had come into the yard and scared them. The Board Members and Mr. & Mrs. Nahmais discussed the issue of the neighbor's dog and how extending the chain link fence would solve the problem. During the discussion the Board determined that the proposed additional chain link fence would extend past the front wall of the house. Additionally the Board did not think the additional chain link fence would keep the dog from coming into their yard.

The Board Members discussed other options for dealing with the dog issue with Mr. &

Lawrence, New York December 17, 2012

Mrs. Nahmais. After a lengthy discussion the Board Members agreed that they could not approve the additional chain link fence because they did not think it would solve the dog issue. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Member Pomerantz to approve the requested wood fence on the west side property line with the following conditions: 1) the fence can only be as high as the existing low chain link fence which is part of the tennis court on the adjoining property, 2) the fence can be installed past the front wall of the house but can only be installed adjacent to the tennis court and cannot continue to the street line. Member Pomerantz made an additional motion to deny the request to extend the chain link fence on the east side, side property line. Both motions were seconded by Member Staiman with the following votes cast: Alternate Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Member Pomerantz yes, Chairman Sporn yes and Member Kupferstein yes.

The following new applications were considered:

Tomaszewski– 50 Central Ave. –Rebuild front terrace and covered porch and enlarge covered porch area. Mr. Shmuel Flaum came forward and identified himself as representing Mr. Tomaszewski. The Board Members reviewed the elevation drawings and the plans. Several Board Members asked about the finish materials for the porch and the arch design in the front of the covered porch. Mr. Flaum stated that the arch design in the porch was to reflect the arch top of the front door. Several Board Members asked about the variance granted for this project. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Member Pomerantz to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Alternate Member

Lawrence, New York December 17, 2012

Breitman with the following votes cast: Alternate Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Member Pomerantz yes, Chairman Sporn yes and Member Kupferstein yes.

Zinberg – 27 Bayberry Rd. – Replace existing 6 foot high wood stockade fence on rear property line and on north and south side property lines and in both side yard areas with new 6 foot high khaki colored closed PVC fence. Mrs. Elaine Zinberg came forward and identified herself as the property owner. Mrs. Zinberg explained that she wanted to replace the existing fence which was damaged. The Board Members reviewed the plot plan for the location of the fence. The Board members held a short discussion with Mrs. Zinberg about the height of the existing fence and the requested new fence. Several Board Members had no issue with approving a 6 foot high fence on the rear east side property line but only wanted to approve the fence for 5 foot high at the other locations. It was noted for the record that this was a corner property abutting a busy street on the north side of the house. The Board Members discussed with Mrs. Zinberg the idea of a 6 foot high fence on the east side rear property line, a 6 foot high fence on the north side, side property line adjacent to Bayberry Road, a 6 foot high fence in the north side yard area adjacent to the driveway and a 5 foot high fence on the south side, side property line and a 5 foot high fence in the south side, side yard area. Mrs. Zinberg stated she had no problem with the fence being approved that way. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Member Staiman to approve the application for the khaki colored PVC fence with the following condition, the fence can be 6 foot high fence on the east side rear property line, 6 foot high fence on the north side, side property line adjacent to Bayberry Road, 6 foot high fence in the north side yard area adjacent to the driveway and a 5 foot high fence on the south side, side

Lawrence, New York December 17, 2012

property line and a 5 foot high fence in the south side, side yard area.. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Alternate Member Breitman yes, Member Staiman yes, Member Pomerantz yes, Chairman Sporn yes and Member Kupferstein yes.

With the completion of the agenda items the Board reviewed the minutes of the August 20, 2012 Board of Building Design meeting. Member Staiman made a motion to approve the August 20, 2012 Board of Building Design meeting minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following vote cast, Alternate Member Breitman voted yes to approve the minutes, Member Staiman and Member Pomerantz voted yes to approve the minutes. Chairman Sporn and Member Kupferstein abstained from voting on the August 20, 2012 minutes as they were not present for the meeting. The Board reviewed the minutes of the October 22, 2012 Board of Building Design meeting. Member Pomerantz made a motion to approve the October 22, 2012 Board of Building Design meeting minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Member Kupferstein with the following vote cast, Chairman Sporn voted yes to approve the minutes, Member Pomerantz and Member Kupferstein voted yes to approve the minutes Member Staiman and Alternate Member Breitman abstained from voting on the October 22, 2012 minutes as they were not present for the meeting. There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 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