

Lawrence, New York May 7, 2012

A Regular Meeting of the Board of Building Design of the Incorporated Village of Lawrence was held on Monday, May 7, 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  
Alternate Member Shoshana Weinstock

Those members absent were:                   Member Eva Staiman  
Member Barbara Kupferstein

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 7:21 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 seven new applications.

*The following new applications were considered:*

**Wright Homes & Properties – 141 Washington Ave.** – Install 3 foot and 6 foot high PVC fence on rear property line and extend existing 6 foot high chain link fence with on the side property line and install 3 foot high chain link fence on side property line all with green privacy screening. Mr. John Novello came forward as the owner of the property and explained the proposed fence and reviewed the pictures submitted of the location. He explained the chain link fence would be adjacent to an adjoining commercial property and the PVC fence would be adjacent to an existing residential property on Mulry Lane.

Lawrence, New York May 7, 2012

Member Berman asked about a door in the adjoining building in the area where the new chain link fence was being requested and wanted to know if the door opened into the building or opened outwardly. Mr. Novello explained that the restaurant (adjoining building) was causing a garbage problem and restaurant patrons were trespassing on his private parking area under his building and using his parking area as a drive through pickup area for food orders. Mr. Novello explained that there were concerns regarding liability and had explained to the restaurant about the problem but the situation continued. The property line was very close to the door in the adjacent building but that the area was his property. Member Berman stated that the requested fence on the side property line would not keep people going to the restaurant from parking in his lot. Mr. Novello explained that at the end of the day a locked chain is used to close off his lot which requires him to be the first at the building in the morning to unlock the chain so tenants can get to his parking lot but this was necessary. Member Berman questioned how the existing chain link fence with the green privacy screening was done. Mr. Novello explained that the existing chain link fence with screening was there to block any view of the dumpsters and other eye sores from the restaurant. Member Berman stated someone might consider the chain link fence with privacy screening on the side property line more of an eye sore. Mr. Novello stated he was willing to install any style fence the Board liked. Mr. Novello reminded the Board that this was a commercial area and that the restaurant building next door has been painted in bright colors of yellow and orange over the years. Member Berman stated she was more in favor of the gray PVC fence proposed to be installed next to the residential property. Again Mr. Novello stated that he wanted to install a fence that the Board would approve but again it was a commercial area and

Lawrence, New York May 7, 2012

the chain link fence would be a more commercial type of fence but again he wanted to install a fence that the Board would approve. The Board Members discussed that request to bring the requested fence down to the street line on Washington Ave. which several Board Members did not agree. Mr. Novello explained that he requested this due to the garbage that came from the restaurant. The Board Members reviewed the requested fence location adjacent to the private residence on Mulry Lane. Member Berman did not approve of the proposal to bring the fence all the way down to the street line on Mulry Lane. Mr. Novello explained that Mulry Lane is a one way street and the fence would not block the view of traffic and presently there was an existing hedge line there about seven feet high. The Board Members held a long discussion regarding the proposed fence, the type of fence and the location of the fence in relation to the Washington Ave. and the Mulry Lane street line. Several Board Members stated that they did not have any issues with the requested fence adjacent to the residential property. 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 with the condition that the requested six foot high chain link fence with privacy screen proposed for the side property line be changed to a six foot high matt finish gray PVC fence and the fence cannot extend past the front wall of the building on the Washington Ave side of the building and the existing chain link fence be changed to match the new six foot high gray matt finish PVC fence. Also the requested three foot high and six foot high gray PVC fence on the rear line was approved as submitted. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast, Member Berman yes, Chairman Sporn yes,

Lawrence, New York May 7, 2012

member Pomerantz yes and Alternate Member Weinstock yes. Mr. Novello thanked the Board.

**Erlichman – 101 Lawrence Ave.** – Two story side addition, rear addition and interior alterations and alter front porch. Mrs. Erlichman came forward and identified herself as the property owner and stated she was here to discuss the exterior of her house. Mrs. Erlichman submitted a sample of the vinyl siding and a roofing shingle for the Board to review and she explained that the trim around the window would be white and the gutters on the house would be white also. In addition the front door would be black and the garage would be white. The Board Members reviewed the elevation drawings and the material samples. Member Berman asked about the existing brick on the house that was shown on the submitted elevation drawings. Mrs. Erlichman stated that the brick was to be removed and the whole house would be sided with the new gray vinyl siding. Chairman Sporn noted that the submitted plans indicated that new brick to match the existing brick would be used on the addition. Again Mrs. Erlichman stated that the brick was all being removed and only siding used. Chairman Sporn stated that the plans had been changed? Mrs. Erlichman agreed the plans had been changed. The Board members discussed the change to the siding. Alternate Member Weinstock questioned Mrs. Erlichman about the front porch and the window above the front door. Member Berman asked about shutters on the windows. Mrs. Erlichman stated she did not plan for shutters on the windows. Member Berman noted that the submitted drawings indicated shutters on the windows. Chairman Sporn, Member Berman and Alternate Member Weinstock asked about the open wall space above the new garage door, there are

Lawrence, New York May 7, 2012

windows on the front wall and then this blank wall area. Mrs. Erlichman stated that the area behind that wall was a closet. Alternate Member Weinstock asked Mrs. Erlichman about putting a window in the closet. Mrs. Erlichman explained that this walk-in closet is to be shared by her and her husband and they would lose storage space because of the window. Member Berman and Alternate Member Weinstock stated that they thought the house would look better with the added window. Mrs. Erlichman questioned if she could put in a dummy window, Member Pomerantz stated that might work and Member Berman stated that shelving could be installed in front of the window in the closet. Mrs. Erlichman stated she had the idea of putting a light and house numbers above the garage door. Member Berman stated that a light and number would not fill that large a space. Chairman Sporn agreed with the other Board Member that a window should be added to the front wall above the garage door, either a real window or a dummy window. Member Berman and Alternate Member Weinstock discussed the idea of shutters or no shutters on the front of the house and discussed wider trim around the windows in place of shutters but both Board Members agreed that the shutters or trim would improve the look of the house. Mrs. Erlichman asked the Board if she had to make those decisions now, the Board Members indicated that for her to proceed to finish the exterior of the house decision must be made. Mrs. Erlichman asked if she could call someone to help her with the decisions. The Board Member unanimously agreed to adjourn the application so Mrs. Erlichman could call someone to help make decisions and then come back to the board in a short time. The Board agreed to move on to the next application.

Lawrence, New York May 7, 2012

**Halpern – 109 Lord Ave.** – Extend existing six foot high white PVC fence onto rear property line to match previously approve white PVC fence on side property line. Mrs. Sharon Halpern came forward and identified herself as the property owner. She explained to the Board that her existing rear property line fence had been damaged by the last few storms and that she wanted to replace it with the same white PVC fence previously approved by the Board and state she had no neighbor to the rear of her property, she backed up to route 878. The Board Member reviewed the plans for the proposed additional fencing. Member Berman and Mrs. Halpern discussed the prior fence that was installed. Member Berman and Alternate Member Weinstock stated they had no problems with the requested additional fencing. 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. The motion was seconded by Member Berman with the following votes cast: Member Berman yes, Chairman Sporn yes, member Pomerantz and Alternate Member Weinstock yes.

**Erlichman – 101 Lawrence Ave.** – The Board returned to the adjourned application for Erlichman of 101 Lawrence Ave. Mrs. Erlichman explained that there originally had been three people coming with her to this meeting but they had all left her. Mrs. Erlichman stated that she agreed to black shutters on the front of the house and to add the additional window in the front wall above the garage door. The Board Members wanted to clarify that there would be shutters on the six front windows? Mrs. Erlichman and the Board reviewed the front elevation drawing which indicated that the existing 3 windows on the second floor and the two windows on the first floor would have shutters and the

Lawrence, New York May 7, 2012

one additional window to be added on the second floor. A total of six windows with shutters. 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 with the condition that the existing brick on the house would be removed and replaced with the new siding, one additional window would be added to the front wall space above the garage door and the six front windows would have black shutters. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Member Berman yes, Chairman Sporn yes, member Pomerantz yes and Alternate Member Weinstock yes.

**Bouskila – 250 Narragansett Ave.** – New residence with attached garage and driveway.

Mr. John Macleod came forward and identified himself as the architect for the project.

Mr. Macleod submitted a photo of a similar house to show the Board what the subject house would look like when completed. Mr. Macleod also submitted material samples and color choices for the stone, stucco, windows and trim for the Board to review.

Member Berman discussed with Mr. Macleod the height of the chimneys on the home and asked if the chimneys could be lowered. Mr. Macleod explained that the chimneys must comply with certain codes. The Board members reviewed and discussed the elevation drawings, the chimneys, the roofing and other finish materials and colors. He also discussed and explained that the project required no variances and complied with zoning. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Member Pomerantz to approve the application for the new residence and materials as submitted. The motion was seconded by Alternate Member Weinstock

Lawrence, New York May 7, 2012

with the following votes cast: Member Berman yes, Chairman Sporn yes, member Pomerantz yes and Alternate Member Weinstock yes.

**Klein – 183 Harborview N.** – New two story residence with attached garage. Mr. John Macleod came forward and identified himself as the architect for the project. He explained that there was an existing house on the site that was to be removed and the new house was approved with variances. Mr. Macleod submitted a line drawing of the front elevation that was the inspiration for the final plan for the house. The Board reviewed the plans and material samples for the stone, wood shingle color and roofing for the new house. Chairman Sporn asked if the whole house would be sided with stone and wood shingles. Mr. Macleod explained that the stone and wood shingles would be used on the front only and the sides and rear of the home would be wood shingles with white trim. Member Berman asked if it would be difficult to pull into the garage, Mr. Rizzo advised the Board Members that the set back from the side property line to the garage entrance was one of the granted variances. Member Berman asked about the variances granted. Mr. Macleod explained the variance that were requested and explained that the applicant had reduced the overages requested and reduced the size of the house and explained the other variances requested. Mr. Macleod explained that the applicant still needs to obtain a state variance regarding flood elevation. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Member Pomerantz to approve the application for the new residence and materials as submitted. The motion was seconded by Alternate Member Weinstock with the following votes cast: Member

Lawrence, New York May 7, 2012

Berman yes, Chairman Sporn yes, member Pomerantz yes and Alternate Member Weinstock yes.

**67 Sutton LLC/Lebovic – 67 Sutton Pl.** – One and two story side addition, one story front additions and interior alterations. Mr. John Macleod came forward and identified himself as the architect for the project. The Board Members reviewed the plans. Member Berman asked if there was any way to put shutters back on this house. Alternate Member Weinstock stated that the new style of the house and new windows with the stone siding, shutters would not work with this house now. Member Berman question the style of the grills on the windows. Mr. Macleod explained that the house will have casement windows with grills added to create a design to divide the glass. Alternate Member Weinstock stated she did not have any problem with the grill design on the windows. The Board Members and Mr. Macleod discussed the stucco and stone siding, color choices, front door, garage door and the etched glass windows around the front entrance door. Mr. Macleod explained that the owner wanted the grill design on the front windows of the home only, all the other casement windows on the house would not have any grills. The Board members discussed the addition of the gables to the front of the home and the addition to the front of the garage space. No one else appeared before the Board to support or oppose the application. A motion was made by Member Pomerantz to approve the application and materials as submitted. The motion was seconded by Alternate Member Weinstock with the following votes cast: Member Berman yes, Chairman Sporn yes, member Pomerantz yes and Alternate Member Weinstock yes.

Lawrence, New York May 7, 2012

**Samuels – 30 Herrick Dr.** – Two story side and rear additions, one story front addition and interior alterations. Mr. Rizzo explained to the Board Members that Mr. Capobianco, the architect for the project was to be here to discuss the application with the Board but due to a death in his family he would not be attending the meeting tonight. Mr. Rizzo stated that Mr. Capobianco stated to him that the design was pretty much self explanatory. Mr. Rizzo advised the Board Members that variances had been granted to this application. The Board Members reviewed the plans, and pictures of the existing house and a letter from the architect regarding finish materials. It was noted for the record that the majority of the addition would be done on the rear of the existing house with a one story addition to the front of the house to enlarge front entrance closet. The Board noted that the one story front addition was to have brick and stone siding like the existing house. Alternate Members Weinstock liked the look of the existing front door and small stained glass window next to the front door but due to the age of the door she would not recommend them to reuse the door. The Board Members discussed the existing front door and window. The Board discussed the idea of approving the application as submitted but asking the property owner, if possible, to reuse the existing front door and stain glass window in the new front addition. 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 for the additions and materials as submitted but with the condition that a light be installed near the front door. The motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Member Berman yes, Chairman Sporn yes, Member Pomerantz yes and Alternate Member Weinstock yes. The Board Members wanted to pass on the request to the property owners, if possible, that the

Lawrence, New York May 7, 2012

existing front door and stain glass window be reused in the new front addition. The Board Member wanted it noted that this was a request by the Board, not a requirement of the approved application.

With the completion of the agenda items the Board reviewed the minutes of previous meetings. The minutes of the January 9, 2012 Board of Building Design meeting were submitted to the Board for approval. Upon a motion by Alternate Member Weinstock and seconded by Member Pomerantz with the following votes cast: Ayes: Chairman Sporn, Member Pomerantz and Alternate Member Weinstock, the minutes of the January 9 , 2012 Board of Building Design meeting were approved as submitted. Member Berman abstained from voting on the January 9, 2012 minutes. Chairman Sporn noted that there were not a sufficient number of Board Members present that attended the April 2, 2012 Board of Building to vote on these minutes. Chairman Sporn asked that the April 2, 2012 minutes be submitted at the next meeting for review.

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