

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

A Regular Meeting of the Board of Building Design of the Incorporated Village of Lawrence was held on Monday, July 11, 2011 at the Lawrence Village Hall, 196 Central Avenue, Lawrence New York 11559 at 7:15 P.M.

Those members present were:	Chairperson Benjamin Sporn
	Member Ronni Berman
	Member Barry Pomerantz
	Member Barbara Kupferstein (arrived late)
	Alternate Member Myrna Breitman
	Alternate Member Shoshana Weinstock

Those members absent were:	Member Eva Staiman
----------------------------	--------------------

Also present were: Thomas P. Rizzo, Secretary to Board of Building Design and Gail Daniels Building Department. Chairman Sporn called to order the regular meeting of the Board of Building Design at 7:22 PM. Proof of posting for the meeting was submitted. The minutes of the June 13, 2011 Board of Building Design meeting were submitted to the Board for approval. Upon a motion by Member Berman and seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Ayes: Alternate Member Breitman, Alternate Member Weinstock, Member Pomerantz, Chairman Sporn, Member Berman and Member Kupferstein, the minutes of the June 13, 2011 Board of Building Design meeting were approved as submitted.

The meeting agenda included seven new applications and one prior application.

Alternate Member Weinstock made a motion to take the prior application for Frisch first; explaining that she was one of the board members that reviewed this application at the previous meeting but she had to leave the meeting early tonight so was making the motion to take this application first. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

with the following votes cast: Ayes: Alternate Member Breitman, Chairman Sporn, Member Berman and Member Kupferstein.

The following prior application was considered:

Frisch – 1 Keewaydin Rd. – Add second curb cut and additional paving for circular driveway. Mr. John Novello and Mr. Steven Frisch came forward, Mr. Novello identified himself as the designer for the driveway and Mr. Frisch identified himself as the property owner. Chairman Sporn noted for the record that the Board members who reviewed this application at a prior meeting would primarily be reviewing the application. Mr. Rizzo advised the Board that Mrs. Staiman was not available to attend this meeting and that Mrs. Kupferstein is scheduled to attend tonight's meeting but had not arrived yet. Mr. Novello began his presentation to the Board but stopped as Member Kupferstein arrived and took her place with the other Board Members. Mr. Novello proceeded with his presentation; he explained the property is located on the corner of Keewaydin Road and Causeway. The request for the circular driveway on the Causeway side of the property was for safety reasons, the house fronts on Keewaydin Road but the garage entrance faces Causeway. Mr. Novello presented several photos of Causeway which illustrated the heavily landscaped side of the subject property as well as other photos of Causeway and the adjoining properties. Mr. Novello stated that the garage entrance faces Causeway with one curb cut on Causeway, the location for a second curb cut would be down from the first curb cut, near a fire hydrant and the heavy plantings in the area would hide both curb cuts. The Board Members discussed the photos among themselves; Member Weinstock asked Mr. Novello if one curb cut would be located on Keewaydin Road. Mr. Novello explained that both curb cuts would be on the Causeway side of the property.

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

Mr. Novello explained the request for the circular driveway was for safety reasons. Due to the heavy landscaping on Causeway, it would be difficult for Mrs. Frisch and her daughter to ingress and egress the property on to Causeway due to heavy traffic because the street is used to access to the country club and back Lawrence. Mr. Frisch stated he wanted to maintain the trees on the Causeway side but if he can only have a single curb cut he would have to clear away a significant amount of trees to safely back out. Member Berman explained when the application was first reviewed the Board of Building Design proposed the creation of a turnaround area so no one would be required to back out onto the street. Mr. Frisch requested to explain several examples of his proposal to the Board. Mr. Novello and Mr. Frisch explained the number of garage spaces and outside parking spaces and how the approved paving with the turnaround, suggested by the Board of Building Design, did not provide sufficient parking spaces for the family, visiting children and would make the turnaround area unusable to exit the property. Member Berman suggested cars could park on Keewaydin Road. Mr. Novello and Mr. Frisch pointed out that Keewaydin is a narrow street to park on and parking on Causeway can be dangerous due to traffic, it is the intent to keep all cars from parking in the street for safety reasons. Mr. Pomerantz and Mr. Frisch discussed the distances from the building to the curb on Keewaydin Road and Causeway. Mr. Novello and Mr. Frisch stated the house was 30 feet back from Keewaydin Rd and 22 feet back from Causeway. It was clarified that the stated setbacks were from the building to the property lines not the curb lines. Member Kupferstein asked if the proposal still included additional paving next to the original driveway, paving that would extend from the side of the main driveway to Causeway and past the front wall of the house into the front yard area adjacent to Keewaydin, Mr. Frisch stated that was an option proposed for a turnaround

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

area if they do not get the second curb cut, the proposed paving on the other side of the driveway, located between the house and Causeway is too narrow to use as a turnaround area. Member Berman questioned Mr. Frisch about the location of the driveway for the original home, that driveway was located on Keewaydin, why did he put the driveway for the new home off Causeway? Mr. Frisch stated that he was not aware at that time that there would be the problem with a driveway off Causeway. Member Berman asked Chairman Sporn to review the guidelines used by the Board of Building Design for circular driveways. Chairman Sporn reviewed the guidelines and noted that the applicant's proposal for a circular driveway and second curb cut fell short of the guidelines used by the Board. Chairman Sporn stated that to approve this request would provide a precedent for other requests for circular driveways that do not meet the guidelines. Chairman Sporn noted that the Board's view was to keep a more country look to the Village of Lawrence, more driveways that did not meet the guidelines would lead to a more urban look for the Village. Mr. Frisch noted that might be true in most cases but that he had a significant amount of trees on the side of the house and the front of his house is very clean with a lawn and looked very country and the side of his home is very clean with the many trees and very country like, but for safety purposes he would have to cut down many trees, to safely back out. The loss of trees would make the area look more urban if the Board wants him to go in that direction, versus two openings so his wife could drive out without having an accident on a road with fast traffic and few lights, maintaining the trees would keep the area more country. Member Kupferstein questioned Mr. Frisch about the distance between the property line and the curb line along Causeway which appeared to be six feet and asked if it was just grass and trees located on the strip of Village land. Mr. Frisch agreed it was just grass and trees on that Village owned

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

land. Member Kupferstein agreed there would be a visual barrier to seeing the property and understood the applicants request for the circular driveway but questioned if this would not create a blind driveway? A line of trees and then suddenly a car coming out, was that considered? Mr. Frisch and Mr. Novello stated that the car exiting the site would be facing the street. Member Kupferstein stated it may still be necessary to trim back some of the trees for safety and if any other Board Members agreed it may be helpful to have a more developed landscape plan submitted as opposed to the random planting of the trees now. Mr. Frisch and Member Kupferstein discussed proposed landscaping in relation to the proposed circular driveway and second curb cut and the need for a more developed landscape plan if other Board Members agreed. Member Kupferstein noted that the proposal still did not comply with the guidelines. Mr. Novello stated that the guidelines are more for front yard, this driveway is on the side and there are no homes on Causeway facing this driveway just trees. Member Berman discussed with Mr. Frisch and Mr. Novello that this is the way they planned the house, if the house have been put further back on the lot they could have had a circular driveway on Keewaydin and the applicant was coming to this Board because of poor planning on their part. Mr. Frisch and Mr. Novello discussed with the Board what the look of the house would be if there was a circular driveway in front of the home on Keewaydin with seven cars in the driveway open to public view as opposed to the planned garage and driveway on the Causeway side hidden by the trees. Chairman Sporn gathered the Boards views and stated that the Board did not feel it could approve such a drastically different plan from the guidelines. The applicant could go to the Board of Trustees regarding this Board decision. Member Kupferstein asked if the paved area between the house and Causeway could be widened, but it was explained that a platform and steps to

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

a side door and steps to the basement were in the way. The Board discussed and offered other ideas including one curb cut out to Keewaydin Road but the idea was rejected by other Board Members. Member Berman stated that the Board was not comfortable with approving the request for a circular driveway and second curb cut and the Board had made a proposal for a turn-around area off the existing driveway between the side of the house and Causeway. The Board and applicant continued to discuss other options regarding the driveway. Chairman Sporn stated he had an idea for a compromise, the original plan had paving next to the original driveway but extending into the front yard area in addition to the paving for the circular driveway and second curb cut. Chairman Sporn noted that several Board Members did not like the idea of this additional paving extending into the front yard but if this paving was approved and offered an area big enough to turn around would the applicant still need the second curb cut. Mr. Frisch stated he could accept that proposal. Mr. Novello submitted a drawing that reflected the idea proposed by Chairman Sporn, which called for paving on the side of the driveway extending into the front yard and paving on the other side of the house between the house and Causeway, but without the second curb cut. The Board reviewed the amended plan and questioned what the paving materials would be. Mr. Frisch stated that the paving would be some type of concrete paving stone in a color. The Board also asked questions regarding landscaping around the driveway, Mr. Frisch stated there would be landscaping around the driveway. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. The Board members conferred on the application. A motion was made by Alternate Member Weinstock to approve the amended plan for the additional paving with landscaping around driveway and colored paving stone material to be used. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz, with the following votes cast: Chairman Sporn

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

yes, Member Kupferstein yes, Member Berman yes, and Alternate Member Breitman yes. Mr. Frisch and Mr. Novell thanked the Board for their consideration.

Alternate Member Weinstock thanked the other Board Members and excused herself and left the meeting at 8:00 PM.

The following new applications were considered:

Kassai – 16 Auerbach Ln. – Two story rear/side addition with rear deck, second floor side addition one story front additions and interior alterations. The Board reviewed the application and plans. Mr. Boris Abdurakhmano came forward representing the design professional and Mrs. Kassai identified herself as the property owner. Mr.

Abdurakhmano explained the locations of the additions to the home and the finish materials to be used. The Board Members discussed the proposed additions and the metal roofing to be used on parts of the house. Mr. Abdurakhmano explained that metal roofing was used on part of the existing house and the new metal roofing on some additions would match the existing metal roofing. The Board clarified what sections of the house would have metal roofing. Member Pomerantz questioned which windows would have shutters as the plans indicated only some windows would have shutters, Mr. Abdurakhmano stated all second floor windows would have shutters if that is what the Board wanted. Member Kupferstein asked what materials would be used on curved walls on the rear addition and if a railing design had been chosen? Mr. Abdurakhmano stated the house would be all brick siding and a final railing design had not been chosen yet. The final railing was dependent on budget but the railing would have a simple design and most of the railing was located on the rear of the house with some railing on the front of the house but it would be a simple design. Mr. Rizzo asked the Board to clarify what windows would have shutters? Member Pomerantz stated that shutters are

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

requested on the second floor windows. Mr. Abdurakhmano stated the plan was to have shutters on all windows. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. The Board Members conferred on the application. A motion was made by Member Pomerantz to approve the proposed additions and alterations with shutters on all the windows of the house. The motion was seconded by Member Berman with the following votes cast: Member Kupferstein yes, Chairman Sporn yes, and Alternate Member Breitman yes. Mr. Abdurakhmano thanked the Board.

Wolfson – 140 Harborview E. – Exterior alterations to existing residence. The Board reviewed the application and plans. The Board Members reviewed the plans and application. Mr. Warren Meister came forward and identified himself as the architect for the project and submitted additional photos of the existing residence and additional drawings of proposed alterations. Mr. Meister discussed and explained the drawings and illustrations submitted to the Board. Additionally he discussed the finish materials to be used and how the windows, roofing and siding are to be changed for new materials and the refinishing of the existing brick on the house. Mr. Meister noted that due to the heavy plantings on the site most of the house is not seen from the street. Member Kupferstein asked how the existing brick was to be refinished. Mr. Meister explained that the process involved covering the brick with a mixture of paint with sand aggregate. Member Kupferstein asked if the process was to make the brick look more like stone. Mr. Meister agreed with Member Kupferstein and stated that they wanted to create a more tailored look of stone. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. The Board conferred on the application. A motion was made by Member Berman to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Member

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Member Kupferstein yes, Chairman Sporn yes, and Alternate Member Breitman yes. Mr. Meister thanked the Board.

Jungreis – 515 Ocean Ave. – Install tennis court with six foot high wood fence on Briarwood Xing property line. The Board reviewed the application and plans. Mr. Glen Katz of Tennis Planning Corp. came forward and identified himself as the contractor for the project and introduced Mrs. Jungreis the property owner. Mr. Katz submitted a color landscape plan for the tennis court and a plant list for the project. Member Berman questioned Mr. Katz regarding a requested fence as part of the application on the Briarwood Xing property line. A previous plan submitted by Mrs. Jungreis which indicated the location where a six foot high fence was requested on the Briarwood Xing property line was shown to Mr. Katz. Mr. Katz explained that the stockade fence was requested for additional screening of the tennis court with plantings on the property side of the fence. Member Berman requested that the fence be moved further back from the street to be in-line with an existing brick wall along part of the Briarwood property line. Mr. Katz stated he did not see a problem with moving the stockade fence back from the street but he did not know how far the existing brick wall was from the property line and wanted to review the drawing and see if he could scale the drawing to see what the setback distance was for the wall. The Board Members reviewed the plan and the requested location for the stockade fence and discussed the request for a six foot high fence in this location and discussed the location for the higher fence around the tennis court itself. Member Berman asked if the fence was moved back would the foliage be left there in front of the fence or would the fence be bare? Mr. Katz explained that the existing brick wall was about fifteen feet back from the property line and if the fence had

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

to be moved back that far, the applicant would lose part of their property and the owner was already required to move the tennis court back from the property line. Mr. Katz pointed out that the fifteen foot space could be used for the landscaping and room for a grassy area between the plantings and tennis court. Member Berman pointed out that Briarwood Lane is very narrow at this location. Mr. Katz suggested that the fence could be moved back five feet from the property line and not hurt the property. The Board members discussed the fence setback. Mr. Katz explained that there are existing tree that would be affected if the fence was moved further back and the owner wants to keep these trees but the trees must be pruned back so as not to impact on the tennis court. The Board agreed to only require a five foot setback from the Briarwood Xing property line for the stockade fence but will only approve the fence for five feet high. Mr. Katz discussed this with Mrs. Jungreis, she agreed to a five foot setback for the fence and a five foot high cedar wood stockade fence. The Board Members and Mr. Katz briefly discussed the five foot high fence and the changes in the level of the property along Briarwood Xing, Mr. Katz stated that the a five foot high fence would be installed. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. The Board members conferred on the application. A motion was made by Member Pomerantz to approve the tennis court with the landscape plan submitted and with the wood stockade fence on the Briarwood Xing property line, the fence to be set five feet back from the property line and the fence to be five feet high. The motion was seconded by Alternate Member Breitman, with the following votes cast: Member Kupferstein yes, Chairman Sporn yes, and Member Berman yes. Mr. Katz thanked the Board Members.

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

Rosenbach – 104 Hards Ln. – Install six foot high wood fence on side property line.

The Board reviewed the application and plans. Mrs. Rosenbach came forward and identified herself as the property owner. The Board Members discussed the request for a six foot fence on what is by the zoning code a side property line. Mr. Rizzo reviewed the Board of Building Designs guidelines for the Board, it was noted for the record that regarding corner lots, for the installation of fences, the front and rear property lines will be based on the location of the front door. It was noted for the record that the front door of the subject property faces Hards Lane, making the requested location to install this six foot high fence a rear line. Mrs. Rosenbach confirmed that the area adjacent to the requested fence location was the rear yard for her home. Member Berman asked if the bushes along the property line where the fence was to be installed belonged to Mrs. Rosenbach and if the bushes would be removed to install the fence. Mrs. Rosenbach stated she did not know if the bushes belonged to her but they would not be removed and the fence would be put up behind the bushes. The Board reviewed the submitted land survey for the property regarding the location of the lines of bushes. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. The Board members conferred on the application. A motion was made by Member Berman to approve the fence application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Member Kupferstein yes, Member Berman yes, Chairman Sporn yes, Member Pomerantz yes and Alternate Member Breitman yes.

Silverstein – 27 Briarwood Ln. – Second floor rear addition and interior alterations.

The Board reviewed the application and plans. Mr. John Macleod came forward and identified himself as the design professional representing the Silverstein/Weinberg family

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

for this project. Mr. Macleod submitted roofing and trim sample for the Board to review and described the conditions of the existing house and the proposed addition above existing one story sections. Mr. Macleod explained that the plan was to match the existing finish materials on the house. Member Pomerantz asked about the existing slate roof. Mr. Macleod explained that slate roofing is very expensive to match and that with the addition the only slate roofing left would be on the front of the house. The new roofing would not match the slate and the decision was made to remove all of the slate roofing from the house. It was noted for the record that the existing roof on the garage was asphalt shingle now, not slate and the garage roof would be removed for the addition. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. The Board members conferred on the application. A motion was made by Member Pomerantz to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Member Berman with the following votes cast: Member Kupferstein yes, Chairman Sporn yes, and Alternate Member Breitman yes. Mr. Macleod thanked the Board.

Amar – 200 Ocean Ave. – One and a half story front/rear addition and interior alterations to existing residence. The Board reviewed the application and plans and discussed the additions. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. The Board members conferred on the application. A motion was made by Member Berman to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by Alternate Member Breitman with the following votes cast: Member Kupferstein yes, Chairman Sporn yes, and Member Pomerantz yes.

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

Block – 22 Dillon Dr. – Extend existing fence on side property lines and install fence in both side yards. The Board Members discussed the fence application and pictures of the fence. Mr. Rizzo advised the Board that the fence was already installed and this application was coming to the Board after the fence had already been installed. Mr. Rizzo explained that the Building Department was informed that a fence was installed/extended without a permit. The Building Department investigated and sent the home owners a letter advising them to file the required permit application to extend the fence. The owners submitted a fence application which was sent to this Board for review. The Board members reviewed the photos of the fence and held a discussion regarding which section of the fence appeared to be old and original due to the dark coloring and which fence section were newer. The Board noted that they were having a difficult time determining what fence section was new and what was existing. The Board discussed the drastic change in the height of the fence, from the newly extending the six foot high fence on both side property lines and then changing to a four foot high fence in both the side yards to enclose the rear yard. Several Board members noted that the fence was poorly constructed and poorly installed with the support posts on the finished side of the fence with old posts being used to support the new fence sections. Several Board Members suggested that the old fence sections and the new fence sections should be painted so that they matched; Chairman Sporn stated that within several months the new fence would age and look more like the existing fence. The Board continued a long discussion of how to make the poorly installed fence look better. The installation of landscaping was suggested by several members to hide the fence but other members stated that would require additional cost to the applicant. The Board Members discussed conditionally approving the fence application but requesting changes to the fence and the

Lawrence, New York July 11, 2011

submitting of a landscape plan for the area in front of the fence. Other Board Members did not support the conditional approval of the application. The members discussed deferring the fence application with a request that the fence must be changed in several ways and the fence must be installed in a more professional way and be level and even. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. The Board members conferred on the application. A motion was made by Member Pomerantz that the fence application be deferred with a request that the newly installed of six foot high stockade fence sections on the sided property lines be changed to five foot high and the four foot high sections of fence in the both side yards be changed to five foot high too, also the fence be installed in a more professional manner, even and level. Also the applicant has the option to remove all of the new fence sections installed and withdraw the requested fence application. The motion was seconded by Alternate Member Breitman with the following votes cast: Member Kupferstein yes, Member Berman yes, and Chairman Sporn yes.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:48 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