

Lawrence, New York June 4, 2012

A Regular Meeting of the Board of Building Design of the Incorporated Village of Lawrence was held on Monday, June 4, 2012 at the Lawrence Village Hall, 196 Central Avenue, Lawrence New York 11559.

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: Thomas P. Rizzo, Secretary to Board of Building Design. Chairman Sporn called to order the regular meeting of the Board of Building Design at 7:22 PM. Proof of posting for the meeting was submitted. Mr. Rizzo asked Chairperson Sporn if the Board would review the minutes of previous meetings now. Chairperson Sporn stated that the Board would review the minutes after all agenda items were completed. The meeting agenda included three new applications and two prior applications.

*The following new application was considered:*

**Silber – 125 Sutton Pl. S.** – Two story front addition with garage space, second floor and two story rear addition, interior alterations and maintain existing rear terrace. Mr. Daniel Hyman came forward as a representative of John Capobianco, the architect for the project. The Board reviewed the plans for the proposed additions. Mr. Hyman read a letter and submitted the letter for the record explaining that the finish materials for the addition as well as the windows and doors would match the existing house. Mr. Hyman advised the Board there were recent changes to the plans regarding the windows on the

Lawrence, New York June 4, 2012

back of the residence. Mr. Hyman submitted a revised drawing which indicated that the windows on the rear of the home would have arched tops not square as shown on the plans submitted to the Board. Mr. Hyman noted that there might be other small adjustments to the plans regarding the final design for these windows and French doors. The Board Members reviewed the revised elevation drawing and discussed it among themselves and asked Mr. Hyman additional questions about the windows and finish materials and the landscaping around front walk area. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Alternate Member Weinstock to approve the application per the revised drawings. 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 Weinstock yes.

*The following prior application was considered:*

**Lowinger – 22 Causeway** –Amend driveway fence/gate application to add gates and arbor at front walk and driveway side gate. Mr. Ben Lowinger came forward and identified himself as the property owner of 22 Causeway. The Board Members reviewed the revised drawings for the gates and arbors and compared them to the previously submitted and denied drawings. Member Berman asked to review the history of this application. Mr. Rizzo advised the Board Members that the original application was for a large gate across the driveway with a smaller gate next to the larger gate, all set back on the driveway at the front wall of the house, that application was approved. Next the applicants requested to amend the application to add a single gate and arbor at the side of the driveway in the front yard and a matching double gate and arbor on the front walk on

Lawrence, New York June 4, 2012

the front property line, to replace existing wood gates and arbor. The request for the gates and arbors was denied by the Board. Alternate Member Weinstock asked Mr. Rizzo to review the issues cited by the Board in denying the requested gates and arbors which Mr. Rizzo did. Chairman Sporn questioned Mr. Lowinger if the new gates were solid in design. Mr. Lowinger stated that the gates were redesigned to look like and have the same branches design of the driveway gate. Alternate Member Weinstock asked if the new gate and arbor was the same size and height as the existing gate and arbor. Mr. Lowinger explained the new gate and arbor was the same size as the old one, just updating the design to match the altered house. Alternate Member Weinstock stated that the old gate design was more opaque and asked if the new gate was more open. Mr. Lowinger stated the new gate design was more open. The Board Members reviewed the plot plan and drawings of the gates and discussed the previously approved driveway gates and new gates and arbors and discussed the gates with Mr. Lowinger. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Alternate Member Weinstock to approve amending the original application for driveway gates to include the revised gates and arbors plan reviewed at the June 4, 2012 Board of Building Design meeting. The motion was seconded by Member Kupferstein with the following votes cast: Member Kupferstein yes, Member Berman yes, Chairman Sporn yes, Member Pomerantz yes and Alternate Member Weinstock yes.

*The following new application was considered:*

**Frucher – 168 Lakeside Dr. S.** – Replace existing fence on rear property line with a new 6 foot high khaki/tan PVC fence. Mr. Daniel Frucher came forward and identified himself as the property owner stating he had purchased this home in 1973. Mr. Frucher

Lawrence, New York June 4, 2012

stated that he had replaced his wood fence more times than he cared to remember and he and his wife now in their seventies were going to try a PVC fence. Several Board Members asked which fence Mr. Frucher was referring to. Mr. Frucher explained that he wanted to replace his rear line fence backing up to Rock Hall Road. Mr. Frucher explained that he originally wanted an 8 foot high fence but Mr. Rizzo explained that could not be approved, so he was requesting a 6 foot high PVC fence in the darkest color possible to match the other fences along the road, the style of fence being called belle terre. Member Berman asked how high the existing wood fence is that will be replaced. Mr. Frucher stated the existing fence was 6 foot high. Chairman Sporn explained to Mr. Frucher that the Board was concerned if the PVC fence would have a matte or dull finish, so not to reflect car lights. Mr. Frucher explained that the fence he looked at did not have a shiny finish, but he was agreeable to a matte finish. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Alternate Member Weinstock to approve the fence application as submitted but with the condition that the PVC fence has a matte finish. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Member Kupferstein yes, Member Berman yes, Chairman Sporn yes, Member Pomerantz and Alternate Member Weinstock yes.

*The following prior application was considered:*

**Alpert – 30 Muriel Ave.** – Amend a previously approved fence application to install 36 feet of additional 3 foot high estate style fence on part of north side property line. The Board reviewed the application and the location for the proposed additional fencing. No one was present to discuss the application with the Board. Member Berman noted that the requested additional fence would extend past the front wall of the house into the front

Lawrence, New York June 4, 2012

yard area. Alternate Member Weinstock asked if the applicant had given a reason to extend the fence into the front yard. Mr. Rizzo advised the Board that the request was to extend the spaced picket fence 3 feet high past the front wall, and he was not told a reason for the request. The Board Members noted that their guide lines do not normally approve fences past the front wall of a home into the front yard area. Chairman Sporn noted that exceptions had been made. Member Kupferstein asked if the same style of fence was to be continued. Mr. Rizzo advised the Board that they had previously approved a 5 foot high estate style fence on the side property line and it appeared that the request now was to add a 3 foot high estate style fence in line with the 5 foot fence, past the front wall of the house into the front yard. The Board Members discussed the requested fence and discussed what possible reason there might be for requesting this 3 foot high fence in the front yard. Several Board Members stated that they did not want to approve this fence against their guidelines. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Member Berman to deny the request to install the 3 foot high fence on the side property line extending into the front yard area. The motion was seconded by Member Kupferstein with the following votes cast: Member Berman yes, Chairman Sporn yes, member Pomerantz yes and Alternate Member Weinstock yes.

*The following new application was considered:*

**Raab – 23 Briarwood Ln.** – Install 100 feet of 5 foot high custom wood fence on part of south side property line. The Board Members reviewed the application and plot plan submitted. No one came forward to discuss the application with the Board. Member Berman noted that on the plan the applicant wrote that he preferred to plant bushes, and

Lawrence, New York June 4, 2012

questioned then why is requesting a fence. Mr. Rizzo noted that the applicant also wrote on the plan that he wanted bushes but only had a one foot space between his driveway and property line, which was not wide enough to plant bushes. Member Berman suggested that he could consult a landscaper to see if something green could be planted there. The Board Members discussed what if anything could be planted in that space. The Board Members noted that the requested fence was five feet high which the Board has approved and it was a wood fence, but the plan called for the fence to extend past the front wall of the house into the front yard area. The Board Members asked what was on the other side property line. Mr. Rizzo advised the Board Members that the applicant was not requesting any fence for the other side property line. Member Berman state that she remembers, after visiting the site, that there were bushes on the other side property line. Several Board Members discussed approving the fence but not past the front wall of the attached garage which was set further back from the road then the main front wall of the house. Chairman Sporn noted that the requested fence did meet the Boards guidelines and could be installed up to the main front wall of the house but not past that point into the front yard. The Board Members held a long discussion regarding the requested fence location, and the possibility of bushes being planted in the one foot wide space and the Boards guideline of not allowing fences in a front yard area. No one appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Alternate Member Weinstock to approve the fence application with the condition that the fence cannot extend past the front wall of the house into the front yard as indicated on the submitted plot plan. 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 Weinstock yes.

Lawrence, New York June 4, 2012

With the completion of the agenda items the Board reviewed the minutes of April 2 and May 7, 2012 meetings. Upon a motion by Alternate Member Weinstock and seconded by Member Kupferstein with the following vote cast: Ayes: Chairman Sporn, Member Kupferstein, Alternate member Weinstock, the April 2, 2012 Board of Building Design meeting minutes were approved as submitted, Members Pomerantz and Berman abstained from voting on the April 2, 2012 minutes as they were not present for that meeting. Upon a motion by Alternate Member Weinstock and seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Ayes Chairman Sporn, Member Berman, Member Pomerantz and Alternate Member Weinstock, the May 7, 2012 Board of Building Design meeting minutes were approved as submitted. Member Kupferstein abstained from voting on the May 7, 2012 minutes as she was not present for that meeting.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:35 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