

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

Minutes – February 27, 2019

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

ABSENT: Thomas Frasca
 Ashley Ley, Town Planner

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM

AGENDA: Pledge of Allegiance

1. FROGGY'S DELI, 1620 Route 22, (Tax Map ID 46.-2-39) – 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 Owner John Russo, dated 2/11/19
2. Landlord Approval Letter from Garden Homes Management, dated 2/1/19
3. Multi-Tenant Sign Program Approval from ARB dated 1/29/14
4. Froggy's Deli Building Sign Rendering, prepared by Signs & Printing, undated

Owner Tony Russo appeared before the Board. Chairman Goudey said you are here for a sign and I believe it is up, correct? Mr. Russo said it is already up and this is a plastic sticker. Boardmember Stephens said so you put the sign up before getting the approval from us? Chairman Goudey said the Froggy name is up? Mr. Russo said yes, sorry. Chairman Goudey said we know that the sign box is there, it used to say Bernie's Deli and so now your sign is up and in place? He said yeah, sorry. Boardmember Larkin said does it look like this now? He said yeah. Chairman Goudey said it looks just like that. He said as happy as we are to have you in Brewster, I did get a chance to see it and I did see that we don't have samples in front of us but I don't particularly have an issue with it but I am only one person on the Board. Boardmember Weber said I haven't seen it but as long as it looks like the rendering then I think it's fine. Boardmember Stephens said the normal procedure is that you bring the samples of the colors of the sign so we know exactly what we're approving and that we approve it before it goes up is also the normal way. Chairman Goudey said it is a simple sign, we know the location, and it's within the confines of the Multi-Tenant Sign Program. The ARB voted to approve the application as submitted.

Motion to Approve: Mary Larkin

Seconded: John Goudey

Voice Vote: 4 to 0 with 1 absent

The Board discussed how to deal with applicants that come after their signs are already erected going forward.

2. FWL GROUP, 200 & 280 Fields Lane, (Tax Map IDs 78.-2-1 & 2) – Review of an Application for a Site Plan

This was a continued 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 Insite Engineering, dated 10/3/18
2. Memorandum to Chairman Goudey from Insite Engineering, dated 2/12/19
3. Aerial Map, prepared by Insite Engineering dated 2/21/18
4. OP-1, Overall Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 4/2/18; last revised 2/12/19
5. SP-1, Layout & Landscape Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 4/2/18; last revised 2/12/19
6. SP-2, Grading & Utilities Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 4/2/18; last revised 2/12/19
7. SP-3, Erosion & Sediment Control Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 4/2/18, last revised 2/12/19
8. LP-1, Lighting Plan, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 7/23/18; last revised 2/12/19
9. D-1, Details, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 4/2/18; last revised 2/12/19
10. D-2, Details, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 7/23/18; last revised 2/12/19
11. D-3, Details, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 7/23/18; last revised 2/12/19
12. A-10, Proposed Floor Plan, prepared by Sergio Marin Architecture & Design, dated 11/9/18
13. A-20, Elevations Front/Right, prepared by Sergio Marin Architecture & Design, dated 11/9/18
14. A-21, Elevations Rear/Left, prepared by Sergio Marin Architecture & Design, dated 11/9/18
15. S-1, Sections, prepared by Insite Engineering, dated 2/13/19
16. PAC-CLAD Petersen Color Guide, provided at October 24, 2018

John Watson of Insite Engineering, Architect Sergio Marin and Property Owner Sunil Gupta appeared before the Board. Mr. Watson said we were here once for an initial meeting, had some comments that we responded to, and we are here for our presentation. Mr. Watson said we prepared some sight lines for the concern about visibility of the building showing three separate sight lines. He showed an aerial view indicating the proposed building, Fields Lane, 684 with the rest area, and the onsite pond to give context as to where the property is situated and explained the surroundings. He said there are three different cross-sections; AA shows 684 northbound, the rest area, the pond the building and next door. He said the vertical scale was exaggerated to give a sense of what's really happening on the vertical and shows 684 Northbound, a tree line, the property line, the wetland, Vermeer, and where the proposed building is to be located. He said 684 is high, the rest area is a little lower, then the pond and there is some visibility from the highway and rest area that will be somewhat screened by the vegetation. The building will have trees

behind it and it will not be like a building on top of a hill, he said. Section BB shows similar areas. Section CC shows 684 down to the wetland, back to the building, and over to Fields Lane and is screened by topography and when driving up 684 it will be visible off to the right but will not be right in your face. Chairman Goudey said with the Vermeer building, is that the relationship roof to roof? Mr. Watson said yes, pretty much, within feet. Mr. Marin said the Board requested to know what the building will look like from the road and prepared some views. He explained the views. Chairman Goudey said no one wants to hide the building, but this gives a good reference of where it is. Mr. Watson said the beauty is it's a 30,000 sq. ft. building that is relatively tall but is in a large area that is relatively flat so the scale and proportion of the building to the lot seems smaller because there is nothing around it to compare. Mr. Marin showed the board 3D views. Mr. Watson said another interesting thing we did with the building was we wanted to max out the square footage of the building but because of the wetlands on three sides, the stormwater system, parking, and truck loading we ended up with an awkward-shaped building but does make it look interesting architecturally. Mr. Marin said the building is blue and gray for the most part and showed the material for the exterior as well as the wood slats. Boardmember Stephens said that's the color of the wood slats? Mr. Marin said yes. Mr. Watson said we don't anticipate mechanicals being up on the roof because the building is big enough that we expect to put everything inside the building but if we do put anything on the roof, we would gladly add notes to say that we will build a screening fence around it with the same building materials as the building. Boardmember Larkin said where are you putting the mechanical room. Mr. Watson said inside the building and although nothing is set yet we are anticipating office space in the front and the majority of the back will be storage/warehouse space. Chairman Goudey said there will be some sort of a condensing unit or cooling tower I am sure. He continued: which view is the one coming down the road? Mr. Marin pointed to the appropriate view on the plan. Mr. Watson said we knew we wanted a big building but tried to keep it narrow from the front with the mass across the back. Mr. Marin said we also broke down the material to break it up. Boardmember Larkin said what is the blue? Mr. Marin said the blue is going to be that color blue and showed the sample material. He said it is going to be dark gray and blue in the sample material. Boardmember Larkin said do you have a Pantone color that we could put into the minutes or an RN number? Mr. Marin said we brought it last time, but it's called out on the plan. Mr. Marin said Matte Black and Interstate Blue on drawing A-21. Chairman Goudey said I think it has character and I like the way it's laid out on the property. He said I'm not that worried about the 684-sight line after seeing the bright lights that the Vermeer building has. He said can you tell us about the outside lighting? Mr. Watson said we will be using LED lighting and there will be only building-mounted lights that are all night-sky compliant and full shielded. He said there are different types of lights at different heights and they are on the plan. We also show all the isolux curves for the lighting with two foot candles to 1 to 0.5 to 0.1 and showed where each would be on the plan. Mr. Watson said we tried to only light up the building. There will be lights under all the doors and especially the loading dock in the back, he said and there is no lighting out front for the entrance and the main parking spaces at 2 to 2-1/2 to a high of 3-1/2. Chairman Goudey said that's good, especially so you are not blinded as you are coming down the street. Boardmember Stephens said there's no signage? Mr. Watson said not now because we don't know what the uses there will be but it is not open for retail. Boardmember Weber said I think the clarifications are extremely helpful and makes it a lot easier to visualize the finished product. Chairman Goudey said if there are mechanicals needed on the roof in the future the same materials will be used for

screening. Mr. Watson said yes. Chairman Goudey said we can't speak to height or anything like that but I think these days there is nothing that would typically be that tall. Mr. Watson said this building is actually stepped so expect that any mechanicals would be placed on the lower roofline and screened. Chairman Goudey said I don't know how to word it and I don't want to be too restrictive but I think there are three sides that I would be concerned about if it's on the step down: the Vermeer side, the front side and the rest area side. Boardmember Larkin said: 'sufficient screening will be provided to protect the exposures.' Ms. Desidero said the way it reads now is: 'if mechanicals are needed exterior in future, same materials will be used to screen them sufficiently on all exposures.' Boardmember Larkin said I reviewed the landscape plan and it's excellent. The ARB voted to positively recommend the application to the Town Board with the following conditions:

1. If mechanicals are needed exterior in the future, the same building materials will be used to screen them sufficiently on all exposures.

Motion to Approve: Katherine Weber

Seconded: Mary Larkin

Voice Vote: 4 to 0 with 1 absent

3. Meeting Minutes of February 6, 2019

Motion to Approve: Virginia Stephens

Seconded: John Goudey

Voice Vote: 4 to 0 with 1 absent

4. Close Meeting

Motion to Approve: Mary Larkin

Seconded: John Goudey

Voice Vote: 4 to 0 with 1 absent

Signed By: _____

John Goudey, Chairman

Date: 4-24-19