

Town of Southeast

Architectural Review Board
67 Main Street
Brewster, NY 10509

Minutes from the meeting of September 21, 2004

PRESENT: Armand Giglio (Chairman), Challen Armstrong, Tom Frasca, Virginia Stephens, & Angela Morelli, AA

ABSENT: Ron Harper

ORDER: 7:30 PM

AGENDA:

Pledge of Allegiance

Campus at Fields Corners - Michael Zarin is present to represent the project. He states that he has a problem with the final provision noted on the ARB's resolution to the Planning Board. The provision states that each home in the subdivision will need to be approved individually by the ARB. (SEE ATTACHED)

Mr. Zarin believes that, not only is this a misinterpretation of the code, but that it will be very inefficient, and they need some certainty in knowing what they can build. He will submit his concerns in written form to the Board. (SEE ATTACHED LETTER)

Mr. Giglio states that this will be discussed with Mr. Rohrman, Planning Board Chairman, and a written response will be forwarded to Mr. Zarin.

Mack's Diner/Highland Diner & Coffee Shop - Terri Hahn is present with revised drawings for the project. She states that the ARB's suggestions of losing the "swoop" over the entry element and the inclusion of a stone element that extends up the entry have been incorporated into the design. All four sides of the building are depicted and include the stone also. The delivery area screening is shown on the rear elevation, and mechanicals will be hidden behind the raised entry element.

Mr. Frasca makes a motion to approve the project as presented.

Mrs. Stephens seconds the motion. All are in favor.

Terravest Phase 3, Buildings 2,3,& 4 - Terri Hahn is representing this project also. She is here for a preliminary approval of the general construction concept of buildings 2,3,& 4 of T3. Building 1 - Ace Endico- has already received ARB approval, and the intent was to make these buildings consistent with Building 1. The buildings will be divided into office and warehouse use spaces. The smooth and split-faced block will be in earth

tones, with banding. All windows will be banded, and the larger buildings will have larger banding around the windows to keep everything in scale.

Due to requirements of the Planning Board, the rear facades will be broken up & screened from I-84 by an extensive tree planting plan. The Planning Board is also requiring low level down lighting in the rear of the buildings.

Mrs. Armstrong makes a motion to approve the preliminary drawings as presented. Mr. Frasca seconds the motion. All are in favor.

De Lisi Moffatt Accessory Building - Philip Franze, Architect, is present to represent the project. This project is for a barn look accessory dwelling that will be used as a storage/work area and as office space. The building is 25' x 25' and will be opposite of the established dwelling. Neither building on the site is visible from the neighboring homes. The dwelling is a gray stucco house with white trim and black architectural shingles. The accessory building will have vertical clapboard siding in a semi-transparent gray stain to show the wood grain, white trim, a shingle roof to match the house, and a Connecticut Fieldstone Base which is a variable gray. It has a cupola and the front elevation has an extended dormer.

Mr. Frasca makes a motion to approve the project as presented.

Mrs. Armstrong seconds the motion. All are in favor.

RIC Construction - This application is being represented by John Petrillo. It is for a new home to be built in Maplewood North. Mr. Petrillo presents photos of the neighboring homes for the board members' review, and states that all lots in the development are at least one acre.

Mr. Frasca makes a motion to approve the project as presented.

Mrs. Armstrong seconds the motion. All are in favor.

Weston Chase - Chris Lyons is present to represent this project. It is for an twelve lot development off Turk Hill Road. All homes are about 4,000 square feet on level lots. They will have hardy plank siding with mahogany front porches.

Mr. Frasca makes a motion to accept the project as presented.

Mrs. Armstrong seconds the motion. All are in favor.

Meadows at Deans Corners - Chris Munch from Fortune Home Builders is present, along with Jenna Burger from Carol Kurth Architects to represent this project. They have presented to the board some preliminary home designs for the 103 lot subdivision, but they are really here for input from the Board on how to go about presenting the application. Mr. Munch states that the ARB application is geared to one lot projects, not large subdivisions, and he does not want to complicate the process to inefficiency.

Each house will be between 2,600 and 3,600 square feet. Each site will be about one acre and some of the details will be vinyl or Hardy Plank siding, Architectural grade roof shingles, and earth tone colors. All of the variables are market driven, and dependent upon price point.

Mrs. Armstrong asks what his vision is for the architecture of this development.

Mr. Munch replies that the styles will be traditional and he would like the entire development to be cohesive. The land of each lot will dictate the house & landscaping. The customer will have some input on the landscaping as well.

Ms. Burger replies that there will be some unique details such as the repeating pyramids, the siding, the corner boards, the use of trellises and the details on the chimney.

Mr. Giglio states that this board is trying to come up with a system of looking at large, multi - unit subdivisions. He states that they would like to see actual materials and to be able to visit some of the existing developments built by Fortune Home Builders. He asks that when Mr. Munch returns he bring photos of some of the groupings of homes they have done as well. Mr. Giglio also points out that consistency is good, but that variety within the genre can be good as well. He offers an example of roof lines - There are all gable ends, but no hip roofs, and established neighborhoods.

Mr. Frasca and Mrs. Armstrong note that they would also like to see the variables that will be offered in landscaping, the variation of homes, the exact materials with colorboards and texture, scale drawings, how the site will be treated as a whole, and the designs for a level lot vs. a sloped lot, vs. a very steep lot.

Mr. Frasca makes a motion to adjourn. Mrs. Stephens seconds the motion. All are in favor.

67 Main Street
Brewster, NY 10509

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD REPORT

Date: August 18, 2004

To: Town of Southeast Planning Board

From: Armand Giglio, Chairman, Architectural Review Board

Subject: Campus at Fields Corners Subdivision

At its August 17, 2004 meeting, The Architectural Review Board reviewed the following submissions of the subject applicant:

- 1) Letter from Zarin & Steinmetz, Attorneys at Law, dated August 16, 2004
- 2) Rendering entitled "6 Manor House Types" dated 8-17-04
- 3) Drawing titled "Typical Cul-de-sac Landscaping Plan" dated 08.03.04
- 4) Drawing titled "Overall Grading Plan" dated 2/13/2004
- 5) Drawing titled "Overall Layout Plan" dated 2/13/2004

By a vote of 4 to 0, one member absent, the Architectural Review Board APPROVED the subdivision as proposed.

Town Code Section 3-3A(4), requires the Architectural Review Board to approve "plans for residential structures in proposed subdivisions". Since the homes in the subdivision are proposed to semi-custom, the applicant's submission did not include specific Plans for each home site. Thus this Approval extends only to the architectural renderings and other drawings submitted as listed above. As required in the Code, The Architectural Review Board will review Plans for each individual proposed residential structure as part of the Building Permit application review.

Armand Giglio, Chairman
Architectural Review Board
Town of Southeast

September 22, 2004

By Hand Delivery

Mr. Armand Giglio, Chairman
Architectural Review Board
176 Turk Hill Road
Brewster, NY 10509

Re: Campus at Field Corners Project,

Town of Southeast, New York

Dear Chairman Giglio and Members of the Board:

First, thank you for the time at last night's ARB meeting, and the Board's continued hard work in reviewing the proposal for the Campus at Field Corners Project. We do appreciate it.

Per your request, the following is a summary of the points I made last night to the Board on behalf of Putnam Seabury Partners, L.P. ("Putnam Seabury"), with respect to clarifying that provision in the ARB Report dated August 18, 2004 (the "Report"), providing that while the Board "Approved" the Subdivision Project, the ARB feels compelled to "[a]s required in the Code . . . review Plans for each individual proposed residential structure as part of the Building Permit application review" for the Project on a go-forward basis.

Respectfully, I believe that this is a misinterpretation of the Code, as well as would defeat the overall purpose of the ARB review of "proposed subdivisions" in general, and in particular, the ARB's review and approval of the Campus Project, for the following reasons:

1. Section 3-3 (A)(4) of the Town Code, the provision cited in the ARB Report, specifically provides for the "review of plans" relating to "proposed subdivisions filed with the Planning Board." The language in Section 3-3A(4) addressing "planned subdivisions" is exclusive of the first part of this subparagraph cited in the ARB Report, which addressed "new residential structures in existing residential subdivisions." (emphasis supplied). The different circumstances are separated by the term "or," and are independent of each other.

2. That portion of Section 3-3(A)(4) addressing explicitly the review of "proposed subdivision plans" is meant precisely for the situation at hand. As in most municipalities, it is meant to allow the Town ARB to review and advise the Planning Board on subdivision plans as a whole, and not require an applicant such as Putnam Seabury to go before the ARB for each individual structure to receive approval on a case by case basis. This would be completely impractical, and not achieve the desired certainty in the process.

3. Indeed, Section 3-5 (D) of the Code addresses this principle in requiring that the “ARB shall make every effort to avoid undue financial hardship on any applicant in support of the intent of this chapter.”

4. It is for this reason precisely that Putnam Seabury provided the Board per its request with exhaustive drawings, several boards of actual material specifications, to scale visual computer renderings and detailed enforceable restrictions in accordance with the Code’s provisions on similarity and dissimilarity. I think that the ARB agreed that it had sufficient information before it to fulfill its charge to “ensure high standards for the visual environment of the Town” concerning the Project, while, again, allowing the desired certainty in the review process. Accordingly, the Board voted to “Approve” the Campus “subdivision” pursuant to Section 3-5(B)(1) of the Code.

5. As set forth in the Town Code under Section 3-5(B), the proper procedure would be for the Town Building Inspector and/or other appropriate Town official’s to ensure, in their review of Putnam Seabury’s subsequent Building Permit Applications, that they complied with the submissions and commitments cited in the ARB Report. In contrast, any proposed “substantial changes” from the Report contained in the Building Permit Application would need to be re-submitted to the ARB for its approval under Section 3-5(G).

6. This is the way that most municipalities handle subdivision ARB reviews. Requiring individual approvals from the ARB for each structure or an initial block of approvals as discussed, would defeat the overall purpose of the ARB review, as well as not permit Putnam Seabury to finance the project or market the units in advance.

7. It is essentially the same or analogous process for Site Plan review. The Planning Board approves the Project specifications, and it is then the responsibility of the Town Engineer and other Town officials to ensure that the Applicant comply with such approvals in conjunction with its individual Building Permit and Construction Applications. Any material changes from the Site Plan would need to be re-submitted to the Planning Board.

In light of the foregoing, we would request that the ARB amend its Report to delete the requirement that the Applicant submit individual or additional proposed residential structures to the ARB as a precondition for receiving individual Building Permits.

Should you have any questions or wish to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me. As always, thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Respectfully,

Michael D. Zarin

MDZ:jc

cc: Honorable George Rohrman, Chairman of the Planning Board
Angela Morelli, Administrative Assistant to the
Architectural Review Board
Harvey Schulweis/Steve Caldwell