

**ARCHITECTURE AND COMMUNITY APPEARANCE
REVIEW COUNCIL
TOWN OF LEWISBORO**

Minutes, Monthly Meeting
September 10, 2008- 8:00 P.M.
Town Hall
11 Main Street
South Salem, NY 10590

Present: Re Hagele, Chairman
Ciorsdan Conran
Gail Ascher
Peter Clark
Diane Bilgore

Absent: None

I. The Meeting was called to order at the Town House, 11 Main Street, South Salem, NY, at 8:00 p.m., on Wednesday, September 10th 2008.

Review and adoption of the Minutes of the August 13th 2008 ACARC Meeting were held.

II. NEW SUBMISSION(S)

Cal. No. 14-08-ACARC/BD This is an application of South Salem Presbyterian Church, 111 Spring Street, South Salem, New York 10590 in the matter of the replacement of the existing retaining wall.
Sheet 30, Block 10807, Lots 1, 20, 21

Mr. George Van Marter was present to represent the applicant at the September 10th meeting. He stated that the church has a retaining wall that is literally tumbling down and needs to be replaced because it is a hazard. He stated that they hired an engineer and they decided to go with Redi-Rock retaining wall blocks which are made to look like stone. Mr. Van Marter stated that they decided to go with this product because the installation is quicker and cheaper as opposed to the poured concrete.

Chairman Hagele asked for clarification of the “L” shaped wall on the plan.

Mr. Van Marter responded that the existing retaining wall is “L” shaped but they are only replacing the part that is coming down which is perpendicular to Spring Street and parallel to the church.

Chairman Hagele stated that it looks like they are adding a concrete beam at the top.

Mr. Van Marter responded that the existing retaining wall is made out of 12” block and has no reinforcement wall. He stated that they will strengthen the wall with reinforcing rods.

Chairman Hagele asked why they choose limestone and not the cobblestone.

Mr. Van Marter responded that he went to the plant and did not like the look of the cobblestone. He stated that the limestone is a bigger scale and a personal choice.

Chairman Hagele stated the drawings call for a fence which is required by building code, but there are no details on the fence on the plan.

Mr. Van Marter responded that there is an existing 4' black chain link fence and they will reinstall it.

Mr. Clark stated that it is not visible from the street and only from inside the church.

Ms. Bilgore stated that limestone is very light and her preference would be the cobblestone barring the cost.

Mr. Van Marter showed the Council members the color brochure.

Ms. Ascher asked if anything will be done to the other dry stone wall.

Mr. Van Marter responded that they will repair the damage, but it actually is in good shape. He stated that it is covered with vines and growth.

Ms. Ascher stated that the chain link fence would be visible.

Ms. Conran asked if it is similar to the fence on the playground.

Mr. Van Marter stated that the playground is a split rail fence with wire mesh. He stated that you will not notice the black chain link fence.

Chairman Hagele stated that the smaller scale of the cobblestone will look significantly better. He stated that the limestone has an industrial look to it.

Mr. Van Marter stated that at a session there was discussion about the limestone and cobblestone. He stated that he may have urged them to decide on the limestone.

Mr. Clark stated that his initial opinion is he would go with the cobblestone, but it is a tough decision.

Ms. Bilgore stated that the cobblestone is her choice because of the color and scale.

Chairman Hagele stated that he likes the cobblestone.

Mr. Van Marter stated that the cobblestone is darker and a smaller scale. He stated that it takes the responsibility off of him.

Ms. Conran stated that she could go either way.

Ms. Ascher stated that she likes the cobblestone.

Chairman Hagele asked if the church board will go with the cobblestone. He stated that it will be a nicer look in the setting.

Mr. Van Marter responded that he will bring it to their attention.

Based on the foregoing, the members of ACARC resolved to approve the application as presented with the cobblestone and replacing the pre-existing fence as called for on the plans and by code. By motion Diane Bilgore; seconded by Peter Clark; In favor: Ciorsdan Conran, Gail Ascher, Peter Clark, Diane Bilgore and Re Hagele. To deny: None. Absent: None.

CASE ADJOURNED

III. FURTHER DISCUSSIONS

Cal. No. 13-08-ACARC/BD This is an application of Pouder Design Group, 4 Charles Colman Blvd. Suite 2, Pawling, New York 12564 [Owner of Record: Kenneth and Susan Wallach, 174 Mead Street, Waccabuc, New York 10597] in the matter of the proposed fence plans to include iron entry gate, iron fencing, welded mesh fencing and cobblestone paving at the entry gate.

Sheet 23, Block 11154, Lot 61

Mr. Nick Pouder, Principal for Pouder Design and Mr. Lucio DiLeo, AIA were present to represent the applicant at the September 10th meeting. Mr. Pouder presented the revised plans to the Council. He stated that they shifted the gate from the existing stone piers to a new location about 40' up the driveway near the balanced rock. Mr. Pouder stated that they added a curve on the detail of the transition of the gate so it is not squared off. He stated that having the first set of existing piers and then adding a second set of piers is heavy handed and an awkward transition.

Ms. Ascher stated that she realizes that the pier is not there, but it is awkward. She asked if they could have a 4' fence.

Mr. Pouder responded that a 4' fence would not keep the deer out.

Mr. DiLeo responded that they could add some architectural elements to tie it to the house or cottage.

Ms. Ascher stated that maybe it's the curve that needs to be more substantial.

Mr. Pouder stated a more flattened curve does not work. He stated that they are open to suggestions.

Mr. Clark stated that the convex curve and the concave curve don't work. He asked why the call box is so far away.

Mr. Pouder responded that it's a good place to hide it. He stated that the Donaldson gate across the street has a simple curve in the gate.

Ms. Conran stated that she appreciates that they made the changes. She stated that if the large band at the top of the gate and fence continued, it would seem more united.

Discussion regarding the curve of the gate and fence.

Ms. Conran stated that it doesn't sit right with her.

Ms. Ascher asked if the posts could be bigger.

Mr. DiLeo asked if they could do a 4 by 4 post instead of 2 by 2.

Ms. Bilgore asked if it could be softened up with landscaping.

Mr. DiLeo responded that it would not be seen from the street and it already is heavily landscaped.

Mr. Pouder stated that it is 80' from the edge of the road.

Chairman Hagele stated that the objection is the one doublet, if they went with 2 doublets with a curve it would carry the band through.

Mr. DiLeo stated that they should go with a 3 by 3 post and put a caplet on it.

Ms. Conran asked if there will be any lighting.

Mr. Pouder responded no.

Chairman Hagele asked if the applicant would consider the steel fence along where the proposed welded wire is located.

Mr. Pouder responded no, it is \$125/foot for the wrought iron fence. He stated that for the most part it is obscured with vegetation. Mr. Pouder stated that possibly a passerby could get a glimpse of the welded wire fence but it is a heavily wooded area and there is an 8' grade change and an existing stone wall.

Mr. DiLeo stated that when they restored the cottage, they made an effort to keep some of the pockets open and natural.

Chairman Hagele stated that the problem is you could see it.

Mr. Pouder responded that that is why they are using mesh in the front and not chain link. He stated that it meets zoning and it is a better solution.

Mr. Clark asked how long the gate section is.

Mr. Pouder responded that it is a panel on either side of the gate. He stated that they might need 2 panels on the north side and 6 panels on the south side.

Chairman Hagele stated that would vastly improve it.

Mr. Clark stated that the pedestrian gate should be smaller.

Chairman Hagele responded that it should be a surprise.

Ms. Bilgore stated that these are good changes.

Ms. Conran agreed.

Ms. Ascher stated she agreed.

Based on the foregoing, the members of ACARC resolved to approve the application as revised

- Documenting the change in the gate as sketched.
- The addition of the 6 foot wrought iron fence with approximately six sections to the left of the main gate and two sections to the right of the main gate to be measured at the site.
- The addition of plantings to the west side of the relocated gate screening the intersection of the wrought iron fence and welded wire fence.
- The addition of a 3” post with a ball finial and the curve articulated through two of the doublet sections.

By motion Chairman Hagele; seconded by Peter Clark; In favor: Ciorsdan Conran, Gail Ascher, Peter Clark, Diane Bilgore and Re Hagele. To deny: None. Absent: None.

CASE ADJOURNED

Cal. No. 10-08-ACARC/BD This is an application of Sansome Estates Inc., Le Chateau Restaurant, 1438 Route 35, South Salem, New York 10590 in the matter of the proposed installation of 3 signs on a freestanding post next to the existing sign.
Sheet 39, Block 10549, Lot 17

No one was present to represent the applicant.

The Council members reviewed photos of the proposed signs.

Ms. Ascher asked why the proposed signs are posted without approval.

Ms. Conran stated that there is a discrepancy between the formal style of the existing signs and the rustic style of the proposed signs.

Chairman Hagele stated the color and font should match.

The Council members questioned when the proposed signs were posted on the existing piers.

Chairman Hagele asked if this is a zoning issue.

Ms. Conran stated that she likes the placement compared to the previously proposed free standing post.

Chairman Hagele asked if there is lighting. He stated that they suggested a mock up not the actual sign.

Mr. Clark stated that it should be a matching color and font.

Chairman Hagele stated that he is not convinced that this is not a zoning issue.

Ms. Ascher stated that there are 6 signs now.

Chairman Hagele stated that he will review the Sign Ordinance. He stated that they can not act on it tonight.

Meeting adjourned.

