

VILLAGE OF MAMARONECK

MINUTES

July 20, 2020

TO: Board of Architectural Review

FROM: Frank Tavalacci, Acting Building Inspector

Minutes of the Board of Architectural Review meeting held on Thursday July 16, 2020 at 7:30 p.m. Online

B.A.R. APPROVED

8/20/2020



Present:

Bill Bintzer - Chairman

Athena Maikish

Ivonne Levin

Andy Wollowitz

Cindy Lee – excused

Will Long – Village Director of Planning

Mr. Bintzer stated we're 1 person short, there's 4 out of 5 members here. If any submissions feel their odds would be improved by having the full Board here, they can defer to the next meeting without prejudice.

If any interested parties or neighbors would like to speak, you're certainly welcome to do so. I'll try to remember to ask if there are any comments. If I don't remember, just raise your hand to speak.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of the meeting held on June 18, 2020 were not approved as there wasn't a quorum of Board members from that meeting at this meeting.

OLD BUSINESS:

No old business

BAR minutes
7-16-20

NEW BUSINESS:

1. 1600 HARRISON AVENUE
RENOVATION OF EXISTING FREESTANDING SIGN
JAMES BOTSACOS – PROPERTY OWNER

Mr. Botsacos shared the drawing of the proposed sign and pictures of the property on screen.

He stated it's a roadside sign located at the turn off of Tulip Lane, which was a public thoroughfare that's right next to the condominiums. We share the thoroughfare with Miller & Clark and 1600 Harrison Avenue, the Rockledge Building.

The existing sign has been there since before we've owned the property in 2008. The need for roadside exposure for some of the existing tenants would be helpful. The new sign is better looking and will accommodate a few more tenants who seem to need the help to continue business. We have the parking lot to accommodate about 120 parking spaces.

Mr. Bintzer stated it fits the sign ordinance in size. The colors are compatible with the building and it's a direct replacement of the existing sign. It seems like a nice upgrade, it's fine by me.

Ms. Levin stated it looks good. Mr. Wollowitz agreed.

There was no public comment.

Approved as submitted

Motion IL

Second AW

None opposed

Passed 4-0

2. 151 MAMARONECK AVENUE
FAÇADE SIGN FOR CKO KICKBOXING
SAN SIGNS & AWNINGS
No appearance by applicant
3. 362 MAMARONECK AVENUE
FAÇADE SIGN FOR BOLERIA BRAZILIAN BAKERY
DANIEL PETRONE – DESIGNER

Mr. Petrone shared the drawing on screen.

He stated it's a black pan sign with ½" white Cintra letters and Brazilian bakery will be white vinyl. The gooseneck lights are there already.

Ms. Levin stated I think it will look better if it lines up with the window, and the storefront frame.

Mr. Bintzer stated I agree. It seems a little funny that the white rectangle above lines up with the windows below and the sign is neither here nor there. It's not small enough that it's freestanding. It's like it wants to be the same length.

Mr. Wollowitz agreed.

There was no public comment.

Approved with proviso that the sign will be the width as the window frame underneath.

Motion AM

Second AW

None opposed

Passed 4-0

4. 501 HALSTEAD AVENUE
FAÇADE SIGN FOR OSTERIA PADRE PIO
MARCO VARRIALE – BUSINESS OWNER

Mr. Varriale shared the drawing on screen.

He stated it's a very simple wood sign with classic letters. It's 10' feet and the wall in the back is 17' wide, there's 3' on the left and right. The letters for Padre Pio will be 11" and for Osteria 6".

Mr. Wollowitz stated it seems out of scale in the picture.

Ms. Levin stated I have a little concern about the height of it. I don't know if it's that curve, if that is smaller than the parapet behind it or is it contained. It seems like it should be contained, I think it would look better.

Mr. Varriale stated the sign is going to be perfect inside the white brick. There will be a light shining up from the bottom so it won't bother car traffic at night.

Ms. Maikish asked about the material.

Mr. Varriale stated it's a wood base with an aluminum panel on top and print on top.

Mr. Bintzer asked if the awning is part of the application.

Mr. Varriale stated I'm just asking for approval of the façade sign.

Mr. Wollowitz shared a picture of the building with the existing signage from the previous restaurant.

Mr. Varriale stated that his sign will be the same size as the existing sign and be contained in the rectangle. The awning will be all black or it will say Italian restaurant. The other awnings are/will be all black.

The lighting will be simple just to shine on the name. I think it will be black.

Mr. Long suggested that the Board could approve the application with the condition that the applicant provide a picture of the light fixture to staff to which staff would send to the Board for their approval.

The Board agreed with Mr. Long's suggestion.

Mr. Bintzer stated we will stipulate that the sign must be below the gray band, the awnings will all be black and that you submit a picture or catalog cut of the light fixture.

There was no public comment.

Mr. Long asked if there will be any security cameras on the exterior of the building.

Mr. Varriale stated there will be exterior security cameras on the side of the building going to the parking lot.

Mr. Long suggested bringing that to the Board now so he doesn't have to come as it may require him to come back to the Board.

Mr. Bintzer stated I'm not sure if we normally would be approving the security camera, unless it were part of an overall renovation. If somebody is just adding security cameras, I don't know that would normally come to us.

Mr. Varriale stated the system is there already, I'll be putting up new ones because the ones that are there now are broken.

Approved with proviso stated by Mr. Bintzer above.

Motion AW

Second IL

None opposed

Passed 4-0

5. 535 THIRD STREET
ROOF MOUNTED SOLAR PANELS
BILL GEIGER – TRINITY SOLAR

Mr. Geiger shared the drawings and pictures on screen.
He stated there will be 8 panels, 4 on the back and 4 on the right side. There's an 18-degree pitch on the side roof and a 37-degree pitch on the back.

Mr. Bintzer stated it's a fairly modest installation and isn't really visible from anywhere.

Mr. Long shared a picture of the house on screen showing 2 trees in front of the house. He asked if there's been a tree there at any time.

Mr. Geiger stated that may have been a previous picture.

Mr. Bintzer asked if there's a tree there now.

Mr. Geiger stated I believe these are the most recent pictures (the pictures showing no trees). It's possible they did remove trees.

Mr. Wollowitz presented a picture on screen dated Sept. 2018 that did not show any trees in front of the house.

There was no public comment.

Approved as submitted
Motion AW
Second IL
None opposed
Passed 4-0

6. 320 BISHOP AVENUE
REAR 2 STORY ADDITION AND 2ND FLOOR ADDITION
OSCAR OVALLE – ARCHITECT
NATALIE AND THOMAS RATHBAUER – HOMEOWNERS

Mr. Ovalle shared a picture, a rendering and the drawings on screen. He stated we want to remove this roof (he indicated the area on screen) and put a 2nd floor here the width of the house. Here, (he indicated the area on screen) will be a 1st floor addition. He presented the rear, right and left side elevations. The new windows on the left side will be small, for privacy. The new windows on the rear will be larger. The materials will match the existing. The patio will be new.

Ms. Maikish asked about variances.

Mr. Ovalle stated we are ok with setbacks, height, FAR and coverage.

There was no public comment.

Approved as submitted

Motion IL

Second AW

None opposed

Passed 4-0

7. 877 ORIENTA AVENUE
2ND FLOOR ADDITION
ARNOLD WILE – ARCHITECT

Mr. Wollowitz shared the drawings and pictures on screen.

Mr. Wile stated this house has two 2nd floors. We're doing a small addition to the 2nd floor to connect the two existing 2nd floors. Everything is going to match.

Ms. Maikish asked about the current use of the room over the garage and the windows.

Mr. Wile stated the current room over the garage is a playroom, bedroom and bathroom, it will be the master suite. All the existing windows will remain. We're building directly above the existing.

Ms. Levin asked about the roof not matching the existing. It's a little below, correct?

Mr. Wile stated yes, it has to do with the depth of the existing. The important thing is to keep the angles of the roof the same as the existing. It's going to align in the back. It's recessed in the front. The level of the room above the garage is 2 steps lower than the main body of the house. The roof of the addition is a continuation of the roof of the main house and it's a little bit higher than the existing roof above the garage because the garage and the roof above it.

Mr. Bintzer asked about the plane of the roof on the left.

Mr. Wile stated the addition and the roof are on the same plane as the existing main body of the house.

Ms. Levin stated maybe a roof plan would help.

Mr. Bintzer stated I think in order to keep the angle of the centerpiece the same as the angle of the main house when it comes down from a lower elevation it sticks out from the lower roof. I think that's what's happening. It's a little hard to visualize it. A roofline, 3D drawings or elevation from the side would help.

What about the materials?

Mr. Wile stated the wood siding and asphalt roof will match. The roof currently matches on both roofs.

Mr. Wollowitz stated I'm not convinced that this all makes sense with this plan. I think a roof plan definitely would have helped. This is the part you're saying is flush (the area was shown on screen), but that's not flush with this.

Mr. Wile stated you're right. This part in the back of the house is flush with the existing, however, where you're pointing is 2 steps higher than the part that it's flush with and therefore the roof is a little bit higher because it's a 2 step difference.

Ms. Levin asked what if you gave us a little sketch?

Mr. Bintzer stated I think we need to see how these roofs work. I think you need to come back with drawings to show how these roofs go together.

Mr. Long stated I suggest the applicant also come back with the right and left side elevations.

Mr. Wile stated you can see that the new part that we're building and the old part above the garage are flush.

Mr. Bintzer stated we can't see that. That's what we've been trying to figure out, but we don't understand it.

Mr. Wile stated the building is flush, but the roof of the new part is higher than the old part.

Mr. Bintzer stated we tried we just can't figure it out. We need the drawings to be able to understand it.

Mr. Wile asked you want an elevation from the side of the house to explain the roofline?

Mr. Bintzer stated from both sides and in particular the garage side.

Mr. Long suggested that the elevations be in color.

Adjourned to future meeting.

8. 526-530 FAYETTE AVENUE
DEMOLISH 2 EXISTING STRUCTURES AND CONSTRUCT A NEW 3 STORY
COMMERCIAL BUILDING
GREGG DEANGELIS – ARCHITECT
GREG MASONE – OWNER

Mr. DeAngelis shared renderings, pictures, drawings, the landscape plan and material samples on screen.

He stated it's the buildings on the corner of Fayette and Ogden Avenue towards the southern end of the industrial district. Mr. Masone and his sons operate a construction company out of the house on the left. The one the right is a 1 ½ story residence. The lots have been combined through a process with the Planning Board.

It's a 3-story building, the lower level is in the flood zone. We have storage and utility space on a raised platform and the entry lobby and some garage space in the lower level. It's a lot of building for 2 floors, it's a little under 7,500 sf. It has some height to it but it's not one of the larger buildings. We sited the building on the corner and ended up with a pass through under the 2nd floor of the building to a parking lot in the back. There are some spots under the building and there's a garage portion for a few cars and small visitors lot coming off Fayette.

We're adding a couple of Red Maple street trees and minimal foundation plantings, there's not a lot of space for it. We're incorporating a green roof as well as stormwater management.

Basically, it's a concrete block. The lower level needs to be flood resistant material, so we have a concrete block base of a darker color and then rising up where we have an elevator shaft and stair coming down on this side and then using larger forms. The idea is it's an industrial area, large base, simple forms, some warm grays.

The middle zone is fiber cement panels and it's a rain screen principle. They're 18" by 6'. In the middle are some simulated wood to give it some texture and to accentuate some of the larger forms.

Mr. Bintzer asked about the parking and the scroll down screen.

Mr. DeAngelis stated the gate is for security after hours. It's a roll up gate. This is where the gate is (he indicated the area on the drawing on screen), there's a driveway curb cut here into the back lot. This shows their 3 garage spaces and then about 8 spaces out in the open lot. That's the main parking area for the

company and the tenants. There isn't access to this parking through that gate. The 3 spots have their own garage doors, probably a grayish color. It's like a traditional garage.

Mr. DeAngelis went through how to enter the building from the parking areas and the interior floor plans of the 2nd and 3rd floors.

The front of the building faces Fayette with mostly glass on the corner. There are high windows to kind of partially visually get some separation between the upper and lower body and also for some daylight and ventilation.

Ms. Levin asked about the fiber cement panels.

Mr. DeAngelis stated they're solid, opaque with a textured surface. They're matte, not glossy. The wood grain adds some texture. There will be a horizontal orientation.

Mr. Long asked looking as the rendering going from the main street going back, it looks like it's all in one plane, like it's all somewhat of a rectangle. Is there anything you can do to break up the mass of the building along the particular façade?

Mr. DeAngelis stated we do have some relief where the rain screen is a few inches outward of the CMU. That will provide somewhat of a shadow line and the windows are set in a little bit so that will help to accentuate that shadow line a little bit. Our sense was given what we're working with within the tightness of the site, that this would do a lot to break it up. There is some separation between the base between the materials and some of the modest pushing in and out of materials and windows that'll help.

Mr. Long asked is there anything that can be done at street level, it looks like a blank wall at street level.

Mr. DeAngelis stated that's why we added a little extra color with the block. The front entry has some room for plantings and we're putting some landscaping and trees along there.

Mr. Long stated as a planner, I look at things from an urban design standpoint. To me it kind of turns its' back on the corner because the front doors in 530 turn away from the corner as opposed to having that on the corner. Is there any reason why that happened? That would give the pedestrian, bring a feeling and aesthetic at the street level.

Mr. DeAngelis stated one of the primary things is Fayette is one-way going in this direction. Anyone in a car is coming this way and then they're turning around. This will be a very visible and often seen façade. The other side will have some opening. During the day the gate will be open, and we put some windows in there to open it up a little bit.

Mr. Bintzer asked why the first level windows are so high. Is there a reason you couldn't make them a little deeper further down to look a little bit more like a street façade and a little less like a blank wall?

Mr. DeAngelis stated this corner is where the utilities are. They're at least translucent. This whole wall is wrapped between the sprinkler system and water system and RPZs for the electric panels. We're up on a platform 5' up off the ground. I don't see how we could bring down a window into that, we'd be looking at all kinds of stuff.

Mr. Wollowitz asked between the 2nd and 3rd floor on that corner, you have window panels that aren't really windows, right?

Mr. DeAngelis stated correct. We have some spandrel panels here.

Mr. Wollowitz asked couldn't some of that be repeated further down just to define the corner?

Mr. DeAngelis stated I understand what you're trying do. I think it takes away from the character of the building though.

Mr. Bintzer stated I understand architecturally you've got this block and it's sitting on this base and I see where you're going with that. On the other hand, walking

by a concrete block wall isn't a pleasant experience and something that could be done to make it more interesting and have a little bit more of a variation to it, I think would be helpful. Could you consider articulating the color of the base material with the upper level material to accentuate that look on top of the base and give it a little bit less of a monolithic character? Your CMUs are basically very similar in color to your other things. In your other projects the colors have changed. I'm thinking that articulating between those two materials might help break down the monolithic character of it on the Ogden elevation for example. Working on the coloring a little bit, kind of makes it look less similar. It's a little matchy matchy now and it makes it look more monolithic.

Ms. Levin stated looking at this elevation, it seems a little monolithic. Could you break up the volumes, in a similar way to the opposite elevation? For some reason the other elevation is more pleasant to me.

The stair at the exit door, I wonder if there's any way to engage it a little bit better, it's kind of floating there. Maybe framing or using the panels.

Mr. DeAngelis stated they are different kinds of construction systems. This is more of a current law and is blocked off at top. I'm trying to think, I hear your concerns. All of things are kind of tied in there, maybe we can add some more variety in a block or something. He showed pictures on screen of other large buildings in the area. We looked for some inspiration around here, we didn't find a whole lot. Maybe more of a texture block along the base, maybe give it a little more of a sense of depth, kind of a split face. Maybe we can take a second look at the colors.

Mr. Bintzer stated in particular this elevation could stand some relief. I think the easiest way to do it is by color and texture. A grander gesture would be to expand these windows. I think the overarching comment is can we do something to make that ground level a little bit more pedestrian friendly, looking ahead to a point where there might be a pedestrian walking there.

Mr. Masone stated we've been working on this since 2017. I truly appreciate all your comments, but on the practical end as a builder, the wall underneath those short windows in the corner, don't forget the floor has to be raised up 4'. You have gas, you have PRV, the elevator equipment and electric panels. That area is quite crowded so to change those windows would be very difficult. I have no idea where we'll put the utilities if that were to happen.

Mr. Long stated no one is suggesting changing the utilities. I guess the Board is asking are there any architectural features that can be added that won't change the form and the location of things. It's not structural.

Mr. DeAngelis stated I think we can look at the colors again of the block. I don't want it to look like it's just a mix-match. Maybe we can add banding or something.

Mr. Bintzer stated I don't know to what extent we can do this but we're talking about things which don't affect the form of the building. It seems to me you could get permits for a lot of things to get started and then come back with the final finishes.

Mr. Long stated if that's the case, the suggestion would be you could approve the project with the condition that the applicant come back at your next meeting to show you the revised elevation.

Mr. Bintzer stated that's what I would suggest. I wouldn't think that would necessarily need to hold up the preliminary development steps.

Approved as to the form and architecture, reserving judgment as to the final finishes, colors and fenestration.

Motion AW

Second AM

None opposed

Passed 4-0

Applicants must bring photographs of the subject premises and adjacent properties to the Building Department at the time of submission. If not received, your application will not be heard by the Board at this meeting.

Please inform the Building Department 48 hours prior to the meeting if you are unable to be in attendance.

NOTE: Any application that must return to the next meeting must be submitted to the Building Department no later than July 6th to be placed on the next agenda.

NEXT BAR MEETING IS SCHEDULED FOR TUESDAY AUGUST 4, 2020