

**Village of Tuxedo Park
Board of Architectural Review
Minutes of Meeting
October 21, 2021
7:00 P.M.**

Official Attendees: Sheila Tralins, BAR Chair
Christopher Gow, BAR Member
Josh Aaron, BAR Member
Rob McQuilkin, BAR Member
Attorney to the BAR Donald Feerick, (Feerick Nugent MacCartney,
PLLC)
Engineer to the BAR Andrew Warren, (McGoey, Hauser, and Edsall Consulting
Engineers, D.P.C.)
Building Inspector & Sec. John Ledwith
Recording Secretary Desiree Hickey

Absent: Christopher Boshears, BAR Member

Attendees: Meg Vaught, Michael Santoianni, Bryan Natinsky, Adam Gordon,
Jay Reichgott, Adam Farmerie, Jill Swirbul, Alexander Nicholson

Chair Tralins opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

**O’Neal & Gordon – 457 West Lake Road, Parcel No. 102-1-15, Greenhouse, Entrance
Columns and Gates:**

In attendance:

- Bryan Natinsky – Architect

The applicant returned to the BAR with revised plans for the greenhouse, entrance columns and gates. The alterations on the house have already been approved. BZA variances are subject to approval for the one-foot reduction adjustment of the greenhouse wall.

The architect reviewed revised drawings, lighting and materials. Included in the presentation was the stonework around the greenhouse and the proposed fieldstone veneer. The proposed gates paint color/Benjamin Moore-Graystone 1475 will require a site visit before final approval. The gate piers and stone walls around the greenhouse will have recessed up lighting. The entrance gates will have one light on each pier. The house sconces will be located on each side of the entrance door. The proposed Petrus sconces will have a dark bronze finish with LED lighting with 400 lumens and a 5-Watt bulb.

Member Aaron expressed that he was in agreement with the majority of the proposed plans but was concerned with the modern structure of the greenhouse. In contrast, Member McQuilkin expressed that the greenhouse was in keeping with the spirit of greenhouses constructed in Tuxedo Park. There were no comments from the Engineer, Building Inspector and the public.

A motion was made by Chair Tralins and seconded by Member McQuilkin to approve the revised plans submitted by architect Bryan Natinsky last issued on 10-7-21 with drawings for the greenhouse and gates marked as A206, A207, A208, samples as provided including Petrus square sconce as depicted in the photo in dark bronze with a clear glass shade for the house marked on A201 with 400 asymmetric luminaire lighting #17701/5 watt and the entrance pillars as presented in drawings, Benjamin Moore paint color Graystone 1475 for the gates will be approved subject to a site visit with a mock up sample to include a site review of stonework and a one foot shorter greenhouse wall based on BZA adjustment.

The vote of the Board was a 3 – 1 approval in favor of the motion.

Vote of the Board:

Chair Tralins – aye

Member Gow – aye

Member McQuilkin – aye

Member Aaron - nay

Santoioni – 62 Clubhouse Road, Parcel No. 107-1-32, Extend Deer Fence with Cedar Fence:

In attendance:

- Michael Santoianni - Homeowner

The applicant appeared before the BAR to replace deer fencing on the south side of the property with a cedar fence to match the same configuration of the previously approved side yard fencing. The application does not require any variances. The fence measures 2' off the property line. Neighbors are in support of the application.

Chair Tralins noted the BAR was in receipt of a memo, from the Building Inspector, stating that the drainpipe on the Santoianni property was provided as an accommodation to the Village a decade ago to provide drainage on Clubhouse Road. The DPW has no problem with the application as it is not a pressurized waterline.

A motion was made by Chair Tralins and seconded by Member McQuilkin to approve the proposed cedar fence to continue the existing fence as measured and presented and to include the memo from John Ledwith and a document to refer to with the map presented on screen and letters from immediate neighbors.

The vote of the Board was a 4 – 0 approval in favor of the motion.

Francis/Farmerie – 119 Laurel Road, Parcel No. 107-1-75.2, Address Fence Violation, Construction of Fence, Proposed Changes to Fence Code:

In attendance:

- Adam Farmerie – Homeowner

The applicant appeared before the BAR for an erected fence that had not been approved. The fence was not well received by neighbors. The fence is higher than what is permitted by the Village Code. The Building Inspector discussed with the applicant that the fence was

unacceptable and a new plan needed to be presented to the BAR. The new drawings and plans were presented to the BAR.

The applicant was seeking to maintain the fence that was erected on the upper terrace and only 1 to 2 feet away from the property line. The fence abuts neighbor Reichgott's property line. The applicant proposed removing the taller eight-foot section along the lower terrace and replace with a sloping stone wall to connect with the existing retaining wall that connects to the driveway below. The applicant was in disagreement with the regulated setback and noted that he would be interested in changing the code or seeking a variance.

During public comment, neighbor Reichgott presented photos depicting the fence from his side of the property. Mr. Reichgott noted that he was an engineer and was supportive of a tasteful and beautiful modification to the landscape. He expressed that the applicant did not provide enough detail in his sketches to fully understand the proposed plan as it pertains to the height and the connection to the two stone walls and should not be piece-meal. The applicant noted that the original plans they had presented were more extensive but were modified to exclude the pool and tennis court because Mr. Reichgott was not in approval of several things in their plans thus the anticipated length of time it would take for approvals would not be likely to be in a short amount of time. Again, he noted he wanted to mitigate the issue by removing the eight-foot section of fencing and replace with a stone wall that would fit with the landscape.

Member Gow stated that the stonewall made sense from the BAR's perspective, but a detailed plan would need to be presented.

A further discussion ensued with neighbor Reichgott commenting that in his view the fence was a monstrosity that ran along the property line. Although he is in favor of people doing what they want with their property, he looks to the BAR and BZA to enforce Village rules. The applicant noted that he felt the key to the current discussion was the appropriateness of the proposed design that had been presented.

Chair Tralins suggested that the applicant and Mr. Reichgott should have a discussion about what would be an acceptable compromise. From the perspective of the BAR, getting rid of the eight-foot fence and replacing it with stone was not offensive. The applicant agreed and that removing the eight-foot fence would release the pressure of the current situation and he would apply for the necessary variance and begin to lobby for a code change.

The BAR agreed this was a strong step in the right direction and the applicant will need to come back post variance. Until a variance is granted by the BZA and include removal of the lower fence with strategic plantings and the stone wall, the BAR cannot take action. The BAR noted the applicant's thoughtful presentation. The applicant invited neighbor Mr. Reichgott to reach out so they could further discuss the specifics.

Minutes Approved

A motion was made by Chair Tralins and seconded by Member McQuilkin to approve the minutes as read.

September 2, 2021

The vote of the Board was a 4 – 0 in favor of the motion.

Adjournment

At 8:15 p.m., a motion was made by Chair Tralins to end the meeting. Member Gow seconded the motion.

The vote of the Board was 4 - 0 in favor of the motion.

Respectfully Submitted,

Desiree Hickey
Recording Secretary