

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

Minutes – April 24, 2019

PRESENT: John Goudey, Chairman
Thomas Frasca
Virginia Stephens
Mary Larkin
Katherine Weber
Victoria Desidero, Administrative Assistant

ABSENT: Ashley Ley, Town Planner

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM

AGENDA: Pledge of Allegiance

1. WORLD INSURANCE ASSOCIATION, LLC, 3 Starr Ridge Road, (Tax Map ID 68.2-1.-100) – Review of an Application for a Sign

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

1. ARB Application, prepared by Dave Bruen, dated 3/28/19
2. Photo of Existing Sign over North Entrance, undated
3. Black & White Rendering of new sign, undated
4. Color World Insurance Associates LLC logo, undated

The applicant was not present at the meeting.

2. FORTUNE RIDGE HORSE BARN ADDITION, 30 Drewsclift Road, (Tax Map ID 78.-3-2) – Review of an Application for a 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 Kellard Sessions Consulting, dated 4/8/19
2. Memorandum to Chairman Goudey from Kellard Sessions Consulting, dated 4/9/19
3. A-101, Level 1 Floor Plan, prepared by EDI International, PC, dated 8/11/17
4. A-102, Level 2 Floor Plan, prepared by EDI International, PC, dated 8/11/17
5. A-200, Elevations, prepared by EDI International, PC, dated 8/11/17
6. A-201, Elevations, prepared by EDI International, PC, dated 8/11/17
7. A-300, Sections, prepared by EDI International, PC, dated 8/11/17
8. A-301, Sections, prepared by EDI International, PC, dated 8/11/17
9. A-302, Sections & Details, prepared by EDI International, PC, dated 8/11/17
10. 1 / 4, Site Development and Erosion Control Plan, prepared by Kellard Sessions Consulting, dated 7/28/14; last revised 5/2/18

11. Horse Barn Color Renderings, prepared by EDI International, PC, dated 7/25/15

Brian Hildebrand of Kellard Sessions and Steve Trendell of Fortune Ridge Home Builders appeared before the Board. Mr. Hildebrand said we are here for the horse barn project which was approved back in 2015 and is currently under construction with some changes came about to the plan as what's compared to the approved plan, which included the removal of dormers that were on the roof of the riding ring and the other change was an added exterior storage area to the rear of the building, basically a shed roof, 15 ft. wide, open on either side. He said the intent was to take the equipment and other things that are normally stored outside at an equestrian facility and give them a chance to be tucked away, out of sight, along the rear of the building so all the residents, I believe it is 23 or so lots beyond the barn, everyone would be driving by and this would give it an opportunity to be screened. The materials will still match the existing where the Hardie board and the stone veneer, he said, and just to show you... this was the previous plan to give you an idea of the colors and the same idea as far as color and material goes. Mr. Hildebrand said here you can see the dormers, which were previously approved, the reason to request the removal of the dormers are for access and maintenance as it is a metal standing seam roof so accessing them from the exterior could be dangerous and the interior would require a man lift or heavier equipment that might burden the operator. So, he said, the request was to take the dormers off and supplement windows to the rear that will allow light into the indoor riding ring. He said below the windows is the exterior storage area and you can see it blends in to the rest of the building. He said that is our request: we were sent here by the Planning Board because we are seeking a Site Plan Amendment. Chairman Goudey said so the dormers were originally glass and now you want to delete those and add more size to the windows or add more windows? Mr. Hildebrand said add windows that weren't previously there. He said do those windows match the other windows on the building and he replied yes. Chairman Goudey said can you show that on the original...? Mr. Hildebrand said they match the front elevation and that same larger window carries through to the back. Boardmember Weber said so the window is the same maker and same material as on the rest of the building and that is specified somewhere? He said yes, on the construction plans. Chairman Goudey said what exposure is that, is that the side that the new extension is... so the roof will come out underneath that window line? They both said yes. Chairman Goudey said so the extension is open on both ends and is 15 ft. from the building out to the outside wall? Mr. Hildebrand said yes. He asked what is the finished, opened end going to look like: are you going to wrap some siding around... is this going to have a reveal? Mr. Trendell said we'll have siding that will wrap around this and the stone here and the siding will come up and this will be open here and this will be a finished fascia here. They talked about the roof being the same material, same pitch and that there are no load issues. Chairman Goudey confirmed there are no windows on the extension. He asked about the flooring and Mr. Hildebrand said it will be Item 4 or compacted gravel. Chairman Goudey asked if there will be lighting within the overhang and Mr. Trendell said we will probably put some in there just for security. They talked about what people will be able to see looking into the open ends and it was determined that the property grades down toward the wetland and it won't be visible except from the driveway into the barn area. Chairman Goudey expressed concern that it not be too brightly lit and Mr. Trendell said it is not going to be too bright and the lights won't be on unless someone is in there. Town Planner Ashley Ley said what is going to be stored in there? Mr. Trendell said a tractor, an ATV and stuff for the horses. She

said you wouldn't want doors so people driving in the driveway wouldn't see all this stuff? Mr. Trendell said you might be able to see some of it but it is mostly tucked way back so that line of sight is really hard; you would have to come right up on it to see through it. Mr. Hildebrand said I think the intent is rather than to have more storage space is to take things that are usually left outside and just hide them. Chairman Goudey said I think the idea is good, I am just curious about what it will look like and how it will be lit. Mr. Trendell said the lights will be recessed up so you won't see the fixtures just the light shining down when it is on. The Board talked about the details that were provided for the lighting. Boardmember Frasca said I actually think it looks better without the dormers. Other members agreed it is a better approach and will look good. Boardmember Frasca said so stalls 14 through 21 will have windows? Mr. Hildebrand said the windows are on the arena part. The Board discussed the view of the structure from various angles. Boardmember Frasca said one more question is what will the window treatment be, not divided light windows, just a single glass pane and they don't open? Mr. Trendell said yes, they are all fixed. The ARB voted to approve the application as submitted.

Motion to Approve: Thomas Frasca

Seconded: John Goudey

Voice Vote: 5 to 0

3. RED ROOSTER DRIVE IN, INC., 1566 Route 22, (Tax Map ID 46.-2-43) – Review of an Application for the Addition of a New Structure to a Previously Approved Building

This was a review of an application for a New Structure as referred by the Building Department. The application contained the following documents:

1. ARB Application, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 4/10/19
2. Memorandum to Chairman Goudey from Insite Engineering, dated 4/10/19
3. SP-1, Site Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 4/10/19
4. A, Aerial Photo, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 4/10/19
5. Architect Binder for Proposed Pergola provided by StruXure Outdoor, (14 Sheets)

Jamie LoGiudice of Insite Engineering, General Contractor David Penney and Jeff Ginty of StruXure Outdoor appeared before the Board. Ms. LoGiudice said we originally submitted to you for a new pergola for the Red Rooster; we would like to review portions of that with you tonight. We understand, she said, that there were additional concerns with their site adjustments as we submitted and presented to the Historic Sites Commission last week and then also, I understand that you are going to be doing a joint meeting next month to review additional requested information. She said so we would just like to review those site features with you tonight as well and then provide comments from your Board and be able to adjust them at the next meeting. Basically, she said, the pergola is proposed on the back of the newly constructed addition and will be 20 by 36. Mr. Ginty handed out packets to the Board members saying this is just a rendering to show what it will look like and also a set of building plans. He said you can see in the rendering, it is basically a pergola system, manufactured out of aluminum, and it has louvres on the top that operate somewhat close to a window blind: hit a button and they open and close, so they can provide shade on the hot days and then, of course, when they are closed, it becomes a waterproof environment so there is built-in gutters so the water... so that way they

can have people sitting outside on a Friday night given an evening storm comes through and they can't bring their guests inside so it is pretty much guaranteed revenue out on the patio versus a retractable awning where if it was to rain or get windy, they would have to pull it in and however many guests they have outside, they would have nowhere to bring them in. He explained the history of the company and that this is a newer system to the United States. Chairman Goudey said there is pitch on this away from the building? He said yes. Chairman Goudey asked about the gutters and Mr. Ginty showed him how they are constructed using samples of the product and explained in detail how the gutters work. The Board asked questions about how water tight this system is, about ventilation and lighting options. Mr. Ginty said these are totally customizable so they can have anything they want: ceiling fans, lights, TVs, etc. Boardmember Frasca said the rendering has fans. Mr. Ginty said the company is in Georgia and they did the rendering sight unseen but they can add any accessory they would want being the components are all hollow so you can snake wires through them for anything. Boardmember Stephens said these louvers are pretty durable: what if you have a foot of snow? He said we've seen them with four feet of snow on them but, typically, for the winter you are not going to be using the space so you would just open the louvers for the winter and disconnect the power or they can be engineered to however much weight they need to hold. Chairman Goudey asked where are the mechanicals or motors or what is it that operates the louvers? He said if you look on the last page of the building plans, you'll see motors which are actually electronic pistons. They discussed how these work in detail. Chairman Goudey asked if there is a way to attach siding to the pergola and Mr. Ginty said yes, it can be solar screens or vinyl screens, motorized or manually operated, things like that. Chairman Goudey said I am asking because I think we need to know that: I think that changes the entire look of the entire structure if there are sides put on it. Mr. Ginty explained how the drop-down curtains work. Boardmember Frasca said but you are not proposing in this rendering a clear vinyl or a sunscreen? Mr. Ginty said I would imagine there would be because in the spring and late fall, if you wanted to do something like that and maybe drop some radiant heat in there or something. I don't know officially, he said. The Board said but that is not before us tonight? Mr. Penney said some of the preliminary discussions that we had: mosquitos and bugs; how do we prevent mosquitos and bugs and also how do we protect said structure that has an alternate to it from the damaging public... He talked about the advantages and disadvantages of having the sides. Mr. Ginty said it is a discussion point: I gave them a price on it but in order to meet the look they are trying to achieve, which is more of a high-end, classy clean, it's a pretty good financial investment to do that so if it was to happen it would happen in somewhat of a phase two. He explained the factors that would impact a decision about the sides and the financials. Chairman Goudey said one thing I am getting at is if that does happen, I am sure there are egress issues, and it also raises issues of how it will look and the approvals. Mr. Ginty gave a detailed explanation about ways they can handle egress. Boardmember Frasca said so tonight you are just proposing what we see here tonight: there will be no additional... Mr. Ginty said as of tonight, no. Chairman Goudey said tonight is for information only: there is no decision being made tonight. This is a discussion, he said, and I think we understand that. He said this is not something that the ARB is going to take on ahead of the Historic Sites Commission and, as a matter of fact, I won't vote on this until we've spoken and we get the blessing there first because it is a moot point otherwise. Chairman Goudey said at our next meeting on the 22nd, we will have a joint meeting and we will all discuss it and Historic Sites will let us know what they feel. Boardmember Frasca said initially, when they came to us it was to add an addition that would be married to

the building and existing structure and for us to preserve the originality of the look and this certainly does alter it significantly. Chairman Goudey said it is on the back, I will say that, I like what I see. I think it is a great system if it does everything you say it does, he said, but appropriate for the site is what we are here talking about. Mr. Ginty said the nice thing about these is... what is shown here is more of a modern look but even if they needed something more of a New England look, these pergola cuts are rafter tails so they can even be wrapped with AZAK or something to even resemble... Boardmember Frasca said it's a nice look. Mr. Ginty said they could have more of a country look or more 'New England' where this is just simple, more modern. The Board discussed the different options and expressed their own opinions about style. Boardmember Weber said I think the architect did such a wonderful job with the original addition architecture and to have a pergola capture that style is definitely a challenge so I would think that collaborating with them on the available finishes and customizations to see how you can make this tie in aesthetically with the plan for the main addition is the way to go. She expressed concern about this being a disconnect because she said you do see this part of the building when going northbound. She said if you are able to come back with 'this is what it looks like open' and 'this is what it looks like with sides' and how it all relates to the building... Boardmember Frasca said one of the things I am concerned about is this is very industrial looking as opposed to... Mr. Ginty said as I said the options are endless so however you want to take it... (Multiple people talking.) Boardmember Frasca said I think the idea of the system is good and I am impressed with the shutter system and all of that; I think it is just the architectural blending now. Mr. Ginty said ultimately for them, it's the revenue at the end of the day. The Board discussed that the purpose of the pergola is understandable but there are concerns regarding the architectural choices that need to be made. Boardmember Weber said if you are still working with the architect who came to us previously on the building, maybe just ask what he thinks. Mr. Penney said we'll engage Ed (Loedy) with that. Boardmember Weber said the New England finish is not quite on point either because it is a modern building in a way and this is more 'Miami Circa Now' as opposed to... Mr. Ginty said that is why we provided the renderings and on the first page is kind of the angle you will see from the road. Chairman Goudey asked if they can match the building white? Mr. Ginty and Mr. Penney both said it is very close to the building color and no one would see the difference. Chairman Goudey said this proposed style with the upper part, would that be closed off or open? They discussed the possibilities for the sides at length and Ms. Ley said if you are going to put sides on it, you are going to have to come back to the ARB. Secretary Victoria Desidero said that is the question: do they have to have it approved now as part of this or can they come back later for the sides? Ms. Ley said if you are not proposing to install them right now, then you can come back later for ARB and Historic Site Commission review of the blinds because the cost of that would be high enough to trigger ARB review. Ms. Desidero said or you can show it all now and just propose it as a phased approach. Mr. Ginty said it is in phases. Mr. Penney said that is a great suggestion: we will approach it with a phased approach and we will have different options because nothing is in stone yet... is it a clear glass look, is it a color, is it a screen? We will present the phased approach, Mr. Penney said. Chairman Goudey said if there are other options that may complement the building or look like it fits or almost disappears or becomes more of the same style of the building, you may want to have those options as well because we are not architects, we are not designers, that's not what we do. He said and Historic Sites won't necessarily either but to know that we could round the edges or we could soften this, I think that also helps in presenting the options. He said the squared look, this style may not please, however,

there may be another style you have that might look better. Mr. Ginty said that is as simple as it comes so from there... Mr. Penney said we can do a lot of different things. Boardmember Frasca said you need something that reflects the theme of the building. Chairman Goudey asked about the size of the deck versus the pergola size and Ms. LoGiudice said it basically comes to the center of the addition and then back the 20 ft. and there is another 18 ft. 4 in. off the addition. They talked about steps off of the deck being removed for safety reasons and the finding of a well near the deck. Ms. LoGiudice explained the ramp and the railings. Ms. Ley asked if the railing system was modified from the original approval and Ms. LoGiudice said it was: originally it was iron with a horizontal cable rail but the insurance company also pointed out that is a climbing feature for small children and if they could climb up and over the top and fall off, that was not suitable. She said so we changed those to vertical rails and stainless steel that are maintenance free and we feel they blend in a little bit better with the steel on the windows. Ms. Ley said so when you come back you will need to bring samples of that, photos for both Historic Sites and the ARB to review. Ms. LoGiudice said I do have some photographs to share of what was installed and she handed them out. Chairman Goudey asked about the ramp versus the stairs and where the ramp is located relative to the deck. (Multiple people talking.) They discussed where all the exit doors are located. Ms. Desidero said did you get Historic Sites approval for the doors because I know there was some talk about going to see them about that? Ms. LoGiudice said we did and I asked if they could forward their approval. Ms. Desidero asked Town Councilwoman Lynne Eckardt: they went separately about the double doors, correct? Historic Sites Boardmember Cathy Croft said yes and (Chairman) Danielle (Cylich) sent it to you but maybe you haven't received it yet. Ms. Ley said the wooden railing on the ramp right now is that just temporary for construction? Ms. LoGiudice said yes that is just to have the deck open to the public so no one would fall off and the actual rails will be installed over the next few weeks. Mr. Penney said we had to do a re-fabrication but we needed to make the deck safe in the meantime. Chairman Goudey said we are just trying to bring up all the things that the 22nd meeting... (Multiple people talking.) They talked about which rails shown are final and which are being changed. Chairman Goudey said when they do come back with changes from the original, will we have the original to see at the same time to see what we originally approved? Boardmember Larkin said is it your plan to let the IPE weather because I deal with a lot of IPE and it needs to be stained every year. Mr. Penney said we had to delay the application of putting the IPE down because we had it stained by the manufacturer. They talked about the difficulty of maintaining and cleaning food areas and especially IPE. The Board discussed what is needed on May 22. Ms. Ley said you need to bring your approved plans and then call out the changes that have been made and the changes that are proposed so bring before and after of the images and then, in terms of the pergola, you should provide a phasing plan that shows what you are proposing to do right now and what you may be proposing to do in the future. Boardmember Frasca said and it would be an approval? Ms. Ley said it would be an approval because this change doesn't trigger site plan review. The Board discussed that the other option is to come back later with the phased plan and just show what they want to erect now. Ms. Desidero said bring any samples or materials you think might be helpful since you will be presenting to both Boards. The Board discussed the deadline to get the materials to both Boards and agreed that a week before the meeting would be best. Mr. Penney said what triggers the Certificate of Occupancy because not all Boards treat this the same? He said every Town is different so what I told (Building Inspector) Michael (Levine) and (Assistant Building Inspector) Joe (Hernandez) is from a New York State Building Code standpoint, life safety, I'll have

all my blessings by Monday and all my paperwork in... He said can we get... Ms. Desidero said it's not a question for this Board, David (Penney), it is really a question for the Building Department: it can't be answered here. Mr. Penney said so the question with that is, and it's funny because every Town is different... then they will say I have to talk to these guys. Ms. Desidero said no, we work in the same building... you know that Michael Levine and I work in the same building and we talk about these things. She said and I will tell you the answer, they are not going to give you a CO until everything is approved by these Boards because the Building Department just doesn't do that. He said we have bonds that need to be... Ms. Desidero said that is for landscaping, that's different: we do take bonds for landscaping that cannot be installed on a timely basis because of whatever but that is different from the Building Department approving something that is not as it is shown on the plans... the way it was approved by this Board, the Historic Sites Commission and the Planning Board. Ms. Ley said you are going to need a field change for the re-orientation of the deck, that needs to go through the Town Engineer and you are going to need ARB approval and the Historic Site Commission approval of the changes. Mr. Penney said and the Building Department knows we are working on it and we are New York State Code Compliant, safe, everything is beyond up to snuff.

4. Meeting Minutes of February 27, 2019

Motion to Approve: Katherine Weber

Seconded: Mary Larkin

Voice Vote: 4 to 0 with Thomas Frasca abstaining

5. Meeting Minutes of March 27, 2019

Chairman Goudey suggested tabling the vote on the March Minutes until everyone has a chance to read them.

6. Close Meeting

Motion to Approve: John Goudey

Seconded: Katherine Weber

Voice Vote: 5 to 0

Signed By: _____

John Goudey, Chairman

Date: 5-22-19