Lawrence, New York, November 2, 2009

A Regular Meeting of the Board of Building Design of the Incorporated Village of Lawrence was held on Monday, November 2, 2009 at the Lawrence Village Hall, 196 Central Avenue, Lawrence New York 11559 at 7:17 P.M.

Those members present were:

Chairperson Benjamin Sporn

Member Ronni Berman Member Eva Staiman Member Barry Pomerantz Member Barbara Kupferstein

Those members absent were:

None

Alternate Member Myrna Breitman attended the meeting so as to be available to provide the Board members with information about her reasons for her decision regarding the previously reviewed wall application for 8/10 Dogwood Lane that is scheduled for a public hearing during this meeting.

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

Chairperson Sporn called to order the regular meeting of the Board of Building Design at 7:17 PM. Proof of posting for the meeting was submitted. The agenda included four new applications and one prior application which was scheduled for a public hearing. With the applicant and her architect already present for the public hearing, Chairperson Sporn made a motion that the Board proceed with the public hearing first, the motion was seconded by Member Pomerantz and approved by the full Board.

The following prior application was considered:

Heller – 8/10 Dogwood Ln. – A public hearing was held regarding the brick wall at the rear of 8/10 Dogwood Lane which previously submitted on September 25, 2008 and

approved by the Board of Building Design on October 6, 2008 then amended on October 2, 2009 by the applicant. The amended plan was conditionally approved by the Board of Building Design at the October 5, 2009 meeting. The applicants, through their architect, requested a public hearing regarding the conditionally approved wall. The applicant, Mrs. Heller and her architect Richard Bienenfeld were present. Mr. Bienenfeld submitted a set of architecturally rendered drawings made up of four drawings which were marked as Applicant's submission #1 and a package made up of four photos which were marked Applicant's submission #2. The submissions were distributed to the Board and reviewed. Mr. Bienenfeld explained to the Board the reasons for the design, the need for the low retaining wall and the higher wall behind; he explained the extensive plantings and landscaping to be installed behind the retaining wall and in front of the higher wall. The Board held a discussion regarding the submitted drawings and photos and questioned Mr. Bienenfeld regarding the plantings. Two members stated that they approved of the extensive landscaping to be installed because they worried that lighting from the house might distract or blind drivers on road behind the house and the landscaping would block lighting from the house and property. Amendments to the design were offered to the architect, including low plants be installed in front of the lower wall and additional landscaping to be installed at the point where the lower six foot high brick wall will transition to the higher six foot high brick wall to hide this transition point. No parties appeared to oppose this matter and no members of the public were in attendance for the public hearing. The Board voted on the application as amended as follows: Mr. Pomerantz yes, Mrs. Berman yes, Chairperson Sporn yes, Mrs. Staiman yes, and Mrs. Kupferstein yes. Chairperson Sporn closed the public hearing at 7:41 PM.

Before proceeding with the new applications on the agenda Chairperson Sporn questioned Mr. Goldman regarding the proposed new guidelines for circular driveways.

Mr. Goldman advised Mr. Sporn that no final decision had been made yet. Chairperson Sporn asked Mr. Goldman about the proposed Trash Enclosure Legislation discussed by the Board of Building Design, Mr. Goldman explained that Mayor Felder had contacted him by memo and distributed same. The mayor stated "that at this point, we are not ready to act on this matter".

The Board proceeded to review the new applications.

The following new applications were considered:

Leifer – 1 Amberly Rd. – Install inground swimming pool, paving, pool equipment, and fence. The members discussed the application and the zoning variance that was granted for this pool application. Member Berman raised the issue that there was a need for landscaping to be installed around the pool equipment to hide it from view from the adjoining property and from Amberly Road. Members Sporn, Berman, Staiman, Pomerantz, and Kupferstein voted unanimously to approve the application for the pool, paving, pool equipment and fence with the condition that landscaping must be installed around the pool equipment to hide it from view from the adjoining property and from Amberly Road.

<u>Gerber – 63 Muriel Ave.</u> – Install inground swimming pool, paving, pool equipment and fence. The members reviewed and approved the application as submitted. Members Sporn, Berman, Staiman, Pomerantz, and Kupferstein voted unanimously to approve the application

<u>Vanderheide – 600 Ocean Ave.</u> – Replace existing five foot high chain link fence and six foot high wood fence with all new six foot high wood fence on the rear property line.

The Board discussed the application. Mrs. Berman requested that the new fence be

installed no closer to Albro Lane than where the present chain link fence ends. Members Sporn, Berman, Staiman, Pomerantz, and Kupferstein voted unanimously to approve the application with the condition that the new fence will not be closer to Albor Lane then where the present chain link fence ends.

Lichtman – 136 Harborview East. – Install five foot high gray PVC fence in right side yard area. Mrs. Berman questioned why the application was given to the members so late and thus did not provide the members a chance to visit the site. It was explained that the application was submitted late by the home owner. The Board discussed the application, noting that several questions would need to be addressed by the applicant before the Board could completely review the application: The Board questioned whether the gray fence would match the house; whether there was to be a gate in the fence; where was the gate to be located. Mrs. Berman suggested that landscaping should be planted in front of the new fence. Members Sporn, Berman, Staiman, Pomerantz, and Kupferstein voted unanimously to defer the application and requested that additional information be provided.

No parties appeared to either support or oppose any of the above matters and no members of the public were in attendance. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:15 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