

**Town of Southeast
Architectural Review Board
1 Main Street
Brewster, NY 10509**

Minutes – August 24, 2016

PRESENT: Thomas Frasca, Acting Chairman
Mary Larkin
Katherine Weber
Ashley Ley, AKRF
Victoria Desidero, Administrative Assistant

ABSENT: John Goudey, Chairman
Virginia Stephens

CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 PM

AGENDA: Pledge of Allegiance

Acting Chairman Frasca said I am going to take things a little out of order and start with item number four, Key Bank.

1. KEY BANK, 1505 Route 22, (Tax Map ID 46.-1-1.-1) – Review of an Application for a Sign

This was a review of an application for a Sign. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by Gloede Neon Signs, Ltd., undated
2. Elevation, Sign #001, prepared by Gloede Neon Signs, Ltd., undated
3. Plate Letters Horizontal, prepared by Gloede Neon Signs, Ltd., undated
4. Instrument Survey, prepared by Passero Associates, dated 11/2/12

Nancy Forrest of Gloede Neon Signs, Ltd., appeared before the Board. Acting Chairman Frasca asked if this is an update of an existing sign. He said oh it is a change from First Niagara to Key Bank. Ms. Forrest said actually it is a little smaller: the picture of the new sign is in the application. Acting Chairman Frasca asked the Board if there were any comments. Boardmember Weber said there is only one sign on the building? Ms. Forrest said yes and showed the Board samples of the sign material. Acting Chairman Frasca said so there are no other signs with logos? Ms. Forrest said no. Secretary Desidero said if there were other signs with logos they would have needed to submit those: they are just directional signs. Boardmember Weber asked how the sign is illuminated and Acting Chairman Frasca said it's backlit. He asked if there are any other signs and Ms. Forrest said there are directional signs on the property. Acting Chairman Frasca said he looked at those signs. Ms. Forrest said her understanding was there were no permits required for the directional signs. Town Planner Ashley Ley said the sign on the building is not backlit it is lit from the top. The Board discussed whether the directional signs need to be reviewed if the logo is changing. Ms. Ley read from the Town Code, Section 138-75(A) (3): "*The following signs are exempt from the provisions of this article, and do not require a sign permit or review by the Architecture Review Board: On-*

premises directional signs for the convenience of the general public identifying public parking areas, fire zones, entrances and exits and similar signs. Such signs shall not exceed one square foot per face and four feet in sign structure height. Business names, logos, and personal names shall not be allowed, including advertising messages and insignias. The number of such signs shall be limited to those determined by the Planning Board to be necessary for the safe and orderly circulation of traffic and as necessary to indicate specific traffic and/or parking regulations applying to the site." Ms. Ley said you can ask for the logos on directional signs but it would require a variance. Ms. Forrest said I have this in for review so if the directional signs need to be reviewed separately, that is fine. Ms. Desidero said but the Code says you can't put a logo on those. Ms. Ley said that is correct. The Board agreed that the directional signs could not be reviewed tonight because they don't already have approvals from the Building Department and need to be handled separately. Acting Chairman Frasca said we will vote on the building sign tonight and you have two choices: you can remove the logos from the directional signs or come back with those for an additional review. Ms. Desidero said you would go back to the Building Department first and they would refer those to the ARB if they don't need variances. Boardmember Larkin asked about the monument sign in Lakeview Plaza. Acting Chairman Frasca said they have not submitted anything on the monument sign but that would come from the landlord, right? Ms. Desidero said this is a bit unusual because normally they would have submitted for a Sign Program rather than one sign and when the application came in she was on vacation and was asked if the fee of \$75 was correct. She said Cathy in her office checked with the applicant who said it was not a sign program just one sign. Ms. Desidero said if you want to come back for the directional signs then include the monument sign as well and it will be treated as a Sign Program. Acting Chairman Frasca asked Ms. Forrest if she would rather come back next month with all of the signs at once. Ms. Forrest said she would prefer to get the building sign done now. Acting Chairman Frasca said so we will vote on the building sign tonight and the applicant will re-submit the directional signs and the monument sign as a Sign Program. Ms. Forrest said so if they don't want the logo on the directional signs, they don't need to be reviewed by the ARB? Ms. Ley said yes but it also needs to meet Code requirements for size. The ARB voted to **approve the sign** with the following conditions:

1. Approval is for building sign only;
2. Applicant will resubmit if more signs are requested;

Motion to Approve: Mary Larkin

Seconded: Thomas Frasca

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 absent

2. AT&T EMERGENCY GENERATOR, 87 Hillside Park, (Tax Map ID 67.-1-38-2) – Review of Site Plan Amendment

This was a review of an application for a Site Plan Amendment as referred by the Planning Board. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by FDH Velocitel, dated 5/2/16
2. Memorandum to Victoria Desidero from FDH Velocitel, dated 7/7/16
3. 10 Color Photos of Site with proposed generator

4. T-1, Title Sheet, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
5. C-1, Site Plan, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
6. C1.1, Enlarged Site Plan, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
7. C1.2, Equipment Layout, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
8. C-2, Generator Details, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
9. C-2.1, EH&S Details, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
10. C-3, Automatic Switch Transfer Details, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
11. C-4 & C-5, Equipment Details, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
12. E-1, Electrical Conduit, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
13. E-2 & E-3, Electrical Details, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
14. E-4, Alarm Details, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
15. G-1 & G-2, Grounding Details, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
16. GN-1, Legend & Abbreviations, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
17. GN-2, General Notes, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
18. GN-3, General Electrical Notes, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14
19. GN-4, General Structural Notes, prepared by Black & Veatch Corporation, dated 3/5/14

Sunil Schneider of FDH Velocitel representing AT&T appeared before the Board. He told the Board this is a generator being added to an existing cell tower site on Hillside Drive and he showed the Board a picture of the generator saying it is included in the packet of photos he just handed out. He explained where it is located in the compound and what it looks like. Acting Chairman Frasca said if I recall correctly there are other generators out there but you don't share them. Mr. Schneider said yes, each carrier has their own generator for emergencies. They talked about how many generators are on the site and how it is mounted. Acting Chairman Frasca said didn't you come in for another one of these? Ms. Ley said AT&T started the review process for two sites at once but this one got delayed for some reason and, while they finished the other application, they are just coming to the ARB for this one now. The Board talked about where the other site was. There were no comments or concerns from the Board. The ARB voted to **positively approve the application to the Planning Board** as presented.

Motion to Approve: Thomas Frasca

Seconded: Katherine Weber

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 absent

3. 131 FIELDS LANE, 131 Fields Lane, (Tax Map ID 78.-2-86) – Review of Site Plan

This was a review of an application for a Site Plan as referred by the Planning Board. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by JFM Architecture, dated 8/8/16
2. Pencil Sketch of Building, prepared by JFM Architecture, undated
3. A-01, Proposed Plans, Building Section & Building Elevations, prepared by JFM Architecture, dated 8/1/16
4. A-01, Proposed Plans, Building Section & Building Elevations, prepared by JFM Architecture, dated 8/1/16; last revised 8/9/16
5. LP-1, Lighting Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 2/29/16; last revised 5/31/16
6. SP-1, Layout & Landscape Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 1/20/16; last revised 5/31/16
7. D-1, Details, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 1/20/16; last revised 5/31/16

Jamie LoGiudice of Insite Engineering, Architect Joe Mansfield of JFM Architecture, and Owner Rob Alfredo appeared before the Board. Ms. LoGiudice said this is a proposed office/warehouse building at 131 Fields Lane. She said it is a two-story, 10,000 square foot building with parking and access drives. There are wetlands on the site and that is why the building is located where it is. She said there are a lot of steep slopes on the site as well. Ms. LoGiudice showed the Board the landscaping and lighting plans and said they will use native vegetative plants to mitigate the wetland buffer area. Mr. Mansfield showed renderings of the building and explained in detail the dimensions of the building; the means of ingress/egress and how it will be set up on the inside. He explained the architecture of the building and said it will be board and batten fascia with some stucco with a light color on the top and a darker color below with a metal canopy that wraps around. Mr. Mansfield showed the color renderings and named all the colors being used which, he said, are on the drawings. Acting Chairman Frasca asked where the lighting on the building will be and Ms. LoGiudice answered pointing to the locations on the elevations. They talked about some of the lighting being for security and that it will be auxiliary lighting at night. Mr. Alfredo said it is the same lighting and only some of them will be on sensors at night. Ms. Ley said the lighting levels are pretty low and meet current Town Code. Mr. Alfredo said the building is about 260 feet from the road. Mr. Mansfield said the change in elevation is significant to the point that the parking area blocks the view of most of the building: the building is placed back pretty deep into the site. Ms. LoGiudice said it is further blocked by the existing vegetation which we are not going to touch at all. Boardmember Weber said all of that is from the road but what other areas will see the building or the parking area? Mr. Alfredo said it is across from Durkin Water's entrance and shares about the same elevation as their water tank. He said there is nothing that can see it from the west or the east because it is benched into the hill. Mr. Mansfield said a good portion of this will be landscaped. Boardmember Larkin said on that note, on the landscaping: the plan is lovely on the color coded chart but the count don't match so there are actually more plants on the picture than on the list of plant and it should be the numbers shown on the plans. Mr. Alfredo said yes, I think the difference is mostly on the shrubs and it's all important, I get that, so we will make the list match the picture. Boardmember Larkin said I am glad you showed the rendering because the colors are very nice and I like the bronze awning. She asked if that could be continued across the front of the building and Mr. Mansfield said what you will see is a corner of the building and they talked about how the awning will be positioned over the entrance of the building. Boardmember Weber said she agreed it looks good that way and said it is a good to run that subtle contrast all the way across. Mr. Mansfield said yes, it will be two-toned all the way around. Acting Chairman Frasca asked Ms. Larkin to repeat her

comments as he was looking for one page and didn't hear her. She explained the way it looks it look from each angle and how the awning stops. Acting Chairman Frasca said normally I would have more comments about that and other building specifics but given the location and the surroundings and other buildings in the area, I think it is fine. Mr. Mansfield said we definitely made an architectural decision to not continue the band all the way across because it doesn't give the same accent feeling. Ms. Ley said this is a major project so it is a recommendation to the Town Board. He said the intent with the awning is to focus on that corner of the building as the entrance. Boardmember Larkin said OK, I see that. Acting Chairman Frasca asked Ms. Desidero if she captured Ms. Larkin's comments about the plantings and she said yes. The ARB voted to **positively recommend the application to the Town Board** with the following conditions:

1. Make the number of plants on the plant list match those shown in rendering SP-1

Motion to Approve: Katherine Weber

Seconded: Mary Larkin

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 absent

4. **BRAVCOR, LLC, 65 Fields Lane, (Tax Map ID 78.-2-15) – Review of Site Plan Amendment**

This was a review of an application for a Site Plan Amendment as referred by the Planning Board. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by JFM Architecture, dated 8/8/16
2. Pencil Sketch of Building, prepared by JFM Architecture, undated
3. A-01, Proposed Plans, Building Section & Building Elevations, prepared by JFM Architecture, dated 8/1/16
4. A-01, Proposed Plans, Building Section & Building Elevations, prepared by JFM Architecture, dated 8/1/16; last revised 8/9/16
5. LP-1, Lighting Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 2/29/16; last revised 5/31/16
6. SP-1, Layout & Landscape Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 1/20/16; last revised 5/31/16
7. D-1, Details, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 1/20/16; last revised 5/31/16

Architect Joe Mansfield of JFM Architecture and Owner Rob Alfredo appeared before the Board. Mr. Mansfield said the ARB previously reviewed this application in November of 2015 and we are proposing some minor modifications to the back of the building. He used the elevations to show loading docks with three bays and how the vehicles will come in and out of the property the same way. He showed all of the different elevations of the building and explained exactly what will be seen and the colors they are proposing for the loading docks which have not changed from the original plans. Boardmember Larkin asked about the color of the roof over the loading bays and he said it will match what is already there. Acting Chairman Frasca said and the concrete color is gray? Mr. Mansfield said it is a natural color. Acting Chairman Frasca said it is not being painted, no pebble finish or anything like that: just poured concrete? Mr. Mansfield said it really won't be that visible and explained where the entrance is relative to the loading docks and who will see it from each direction and who will not. Acting Chairman Frasca asked if the loading docks require

any special lighting and Mr. Alfredo said none of that is changing from the original approved plan. They talked about this and it was determined that nothing is changing but the loading docks. Acting Chairman Frasca asked if this is an approval and Ms. Ley said it was a major project the first time and, as such, it needs to go back to the Town Board. Acting Chairman Frasca asked if this is additional impervious surface and Mr. Alfredo said we had area to spare so that was addressed by Bibbo on the site plan and I don't think there was any modification that increased it. Mr. Mansfield said this was previously all impervious surface so we made no change back there, Ms. Ley said they are getting closer to the property line and both Mr. Alfredo and Mr. Mansfield agreed. There were no other comments from the Board. The ARB voted to **positively recommend the application to the Town Board** as proposed.

Motion to Approve: Mary Larkin

Seconded: Katherine Weber

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 absent

5. TEMPLE BETH ELOHIM, 31 Mt. Ebo Road, (Tax Map ID 46.-5-3) – Review of Site Plan Amendment

This was a review of an application for a change to an existing structure as referred by the Building Department. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by PC Studio Architects, PLLC, dated 8/8/16
2. T-100, Cover Sheet, prepared by PC Studio Architects, PLLC, dated 6/28/16
3. A-100, Plan, Elevation & Demolition Section, prepared by PC Studio Architects, PLLC, dated 6/28/16
4. A-101, Sections & Details, prepared by PC Studio Architects, PLLC, dated 6/28/16

Architect Paul Checco appeared before the Board. He said he was engaged by the Temple about a year ago when their concrete wall was failing. He said the wall is by the nursery school entrance. he said upon inspection we realized that when they constructed the wall about eight years ago, they used no masonry ties and the brick has been falling off. He said (Building Inspector) Michael Levine was gracious enough to allow us to strip off the brick and to try to restore the bricks without adding masonry ties would be foolish. The secondary reason, he said, is to take this wall a little further to provide better visual control since there are small children entering and exiting from that door and so we can see who is coming from the parking area. He said so what we want to do is to lower the wall down to the sidewalk level and replace the (inaudible) with a glass guard rail and then from this point down replace the concrete with stucco. He showed a view of the wall from the top of the hill and the view from Route 22 heading north and south saying there is very little visual impact and allows us to create a safer environment for the children. Acting Chairman Frasca said this is a much better looking wall and I think it is a really nice improvement. Boardmember Weber said yes, it is very attractive railing. She asked if the stucco will match and Mr. Checco said yes, absolutely, the stucco will match the brick. Acting Chairman Frasca said the original design was actually a little monochromatic and this is better. Boardmember Larkin said this is great: I love glass railings. The ARB voted to **approve the application** as proposed.

Motion to Approve: Mary Larkin

Seconded: Katherine Weber

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 absent

6. Approve Meeting Minutes June 22, 2016

Motion to Approve: Thomas Frasca

Seconded: Mary Larkin

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 absent

7. Close Meeting

Motion to Approve: Thomas Frasca

Seconded: Mary Larkin

Voice Vote: 3 to 0 with 2 absent

Signed By: _____

Thomas Frasca, Acting Chairman

Date: _____

11/16/2016