

CITY OF NEWBURGH
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION
123 Grand Street, Newburgh, New York 12550

Michele Basch, Chairperson
Omar E. Balbuena-Palma, Secretary
Phone: (845) 569-7380 Fax: (845) 569-0188

MINUTES
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION
Meeting of December 10, 2019

The monthly meeting of the City of Newburgh Architectural Review Commission (“ARC”) was held on Tuesday, December 10, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. at the Activity Center, 401 Washington Street, Newburgh, NY 12550.

Members Present: Michele Basch, Chairperson
Jeff Wilkinson
Christopher Hanson
Hannah Des Cognets
James Kelly
Jim Hoekema
Reggie Young

Also Present: Jeremy Kaufman, Assistant Corporation Counsel
Omar E. Balbuena-Palma, Secretary to the Land Use Boards

Minutes of the November 12, 2019 Meeting

Mr. Hoekema moved to approve the minutes from the November 12, 2019 meeting as submitted.
Mr. Hanson seconded the motion.
The motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

AR 2018-05

Applicant: Stephen Taya Property Development, LLC
Owner: Stephen Taya Property Development, LLC
Location: 197 North Miller Street

Returning for a determination on the stoop, brick façade, building paint and rear deck.

Michael Robinson, Applicant, appeared before the Board on behalf of the property owner.

The Applicant said he is returning to the Board for approval on the remaining portions of his application for 197 North Miller Street. He gave a brief overview of the proposal and highlighted the following:

- Building was stripped of paint. Natural brick color will remain;
- Proposal is to modify the existing stoop to add a bullnose and black railings;

- Proposing to create a simple rear deck on the existing foundation made out of pressure treated wood with turned spindles;
- Not proposing to paint the rear deck.

Mr. Kelly said the rear deck is only slightly visible from Dubois Street.

Mr. Hanson asked for additional details regarding the front steps. He asked if stone caps are proposed.

The Applicant said the addition is all masonry and will be shaped with mortar.

Mr. Young asked if the steps will look like the submitted picture.

The Applicant agreed. He said the masonry steps will have a decorative bullnose and painted with an elastomeric textured masonry coating that will be color matched to the existing brownstone trim. He said the proposed railing from Greatfence.com will be painted satin black.

The public hearing was opened.

There was no one present for or against the application.

The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Hoekema moved to approve the application as submitted.

The Chairperson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously via roll-call vote.

The Applicant said he submitted three (3) new applications for review and asked if the Board can advance them on the agenda.

The Board agreed to advance applications AR 2019-87 through 89.

The Chairperson said the Board will discuss applications AR 2019-87 through 89 together and vote on each application separately.

NEW BUSINESS

AR 2019-87

Applicant: Stephen Taya Property Development, LLC

Owner: Stephen Taya Property Development, LLC

Location: 193 North Miller Street & 192 Dubois Street

Application to install a new fence and gate.

AR 2019-88

Applicant: Stephen Taya Property Development, LLC
Owner: Stephen Taya Property Development, LLC
Location: 194 Dubois Street

Application to install a new fence.

AR 2019-89

Applicant: Stephen Taya Property Development, LLC
Owner: Stephen Taya Property Development, LLC
Location: 197 North Miller Street & 195 North Miller Street

Application to install a new fence and gate.

Michael Robinson, Applicant, remained before the Board on behalf of the property owner.

The Applicant gave a brief over of the project and highlighted the following:

- Proposing to install a black aluminum fence that gives the appearance of a black wrought iron fence on three (3) lots for security purposes;
- Proposing to install a wooden fence on the side of 194 Dubois Street;
- Proposing to install pedestrian gates at 197 North Miller Street & 195 North Miller Street and a dual swing gate at 193 North Miller Street & 192 Dubois Street.
- Proposed gate at 193 North Miller Street is approximately 12 feet long and will be used to secure off-street parking on the lot later.

Mr. Wilkinson confirmed the fences will be 36 inches tall.

Ms. Des Cognets asked for additional details regarding the proposed wooden fence.

The Applicant said the proposed wooden fence will be made out of cedar and will remain unpainted.

Ms. Des Cognets asked if the Applicant considered installing the same style of fence for all properties.

The Applicant said a uniform fence for all properties would be too expensive.

The Applicant said the cedar fence will not front the road.

The Chairperson confirmed the aluminum fence will have a four (4) foot return at 197 North Miller Street.

Mr. Hoekema confirmed the existing fence at 194 Dubois Street will be replaced.

With respect to application AR 2019-87 (193 North Miller Street & 192 Dubois Street)

The public hearing was opened.

There was no one present for or against the application.

The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Kelly moved to approve the application as submitted.

The Chairperson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously via roll-call vote.

With respect to application AR 2019-88 (194 Dubois Street)

The public hearing was opened.

There was no one present for or against the application.

The public hearing was closed.

The Chairperson moved to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Hoekema seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously via roll-call vote.

With respect to application AR 2019-89 (197 North Miller Street & 195 North Miller Street)

The public hearing was opened.

There was no one present for or against the application.

The public hearing was closed.

The Chairperson moved to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Hoekema seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously via roll-call vote.

AR 2019-73

Applicant: Eli Vaknin

Owner: Otherside Properties LLC

Location: 45 Liberty Street

Returning for a determination on the storefront.

Eli Vaknin, Applicant, and Dan Gilbert appeared before the Board on behalf of the property owner.

The Applicant said they revised the elevation for the storefront and highlighted the following:

- Proposing new or reclaimed four (4) panel residential entry door and a new Pella pre-hung commercial door;
- Adding gooseneck lights to the first floor;
- Adding two (2) columns to the storefront.

Mr. Kelly said the proposed columns in the elevations look abnormally large. He suggested reducing the size.

Mr. Hanson confirmed the Applicant is proposing to install metal columns.

Mr. Kelly confirmed the residential door will be made out of wood.

Mr. Gilbert said the intent is to obtain an existing older door but should that fail, they are prepared to purchase a new door.

The Chairperson confirmed three (3) lights will be added to the exterior. She asked if there will be any interior lights.

The Applicant said they will install an additional interior light as well. He said the exterior lights will be matching gooseneck lights painted black.

Mr. Young asked if the proposed windows will be installed to fit the existing window opening from brick to brick.

The Applicant confirmed that the proposed windows will be installed to fit the window opening from brick to brick.

Mr. Kelly confirmed the lights will be aimed downward towards the building.

The Applicant said one (1) spotlight will be installed by the door.

The public hearing was opened.

There was no one present for or against the application.

The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Wilkinson said the metal columns could be reduced in size. He said they should be 4-5 inches in diameter.

The Applicant said he has no issue in reducing the size. He asked if wooden columns are an acceptable alternative if they cannot obtain metal columns.

Mr. Young confirmed wrought iron columns are difficult to obtain. He asked if the storefront had any original columns left.

Mr. Gilbert said there are no original columns left on the storefront.

Mr. Wilkinson said wooden columns are acceptable. He said the Applicant should ensure the wooden columns do not compromise the structural stability of the building.

Mr. Young moved to approve the application as submitted, subject to the following conditions:

- Install 4-5 inch metal or wooden columns on the storefront;
- Install three (3) gooseneck lights aimed downwards on the building;
- Install a wooden door and windows that extend from brick to brick.

The Chairperson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously via roll-call vote.

The Chairperson said application AR 2019-76 through 79 will be presented together but the Board will vote on each application separately.

AR 2019-76

Applicant: Kamil Falkowski
Owner: 134 South Street LLC
Location: 134 South Street

Returning for a determination on the windows, repointing the brick and repainting the building.

AR 2019-77

Applicant: Kamil Falkowski
Owner: 140 South Street LLC
Location: 140 South Street

Returning for a determination on the windows, repointing the brick and repainting the building.

AR 2019-78

Applicant: Kamil Falkowski
Owner: 142 South Street LLC
Location: 142 South Street

Returning for a determination on the windows, repointing the brick and repainting the building.

AR 2019-79

Applicant: Kamil Falkowski
Owner: 174 Chambers Street LLC
Location: 174 Chambers Street

Returning for a determination on the windows, repointing the brick and repainting the building.

Kamil Falkowski, Applicant, appeared before the Board on behalf of the property owner.

The Applicant gave a brief review of the project. He said the intent is to install new windows on the buildings. He said the proposed window configurations for the buildings are:

- 2/2 aluminum square top windows with simulated divided lights and costumed sized to fit into the brick openings at 134 and 140 South Street;
- 6/6 aluminum square top windows with simulated divided lights and costumed sized to fit into the brick openings at 142 South Street and 174 Chambers Street.

The Applicant said arched top windows are not feasible because the neighborhood is not a safe area. He said the area experienced four (4) shootings recently and windows are consistently broken. He said buildings are vandalized by graffiti and it does not make sense to install expensive windows. He said installing Pella windows would cost approximately \$2,000 per window opening and it is not financially feasible to him because he must replace approximately 100 windows. He said about two (2) days prior, a neighborhood business closed down because customers are scared of the area. He said the police should do their part to curb criminal activity and he will do his part to improve the buildings. He said renovating the building and installing new windows will improve the look of the area and improve the community as a whole.

Mr. Hoekema said the argument of windows being broken is not a relevant consideration to him. He clarified that he is not automatically opposed to the proposed aluminum square top windows.

Mr. Kelly said the Applicant did not submit new pictures of the buildings to clarify which windows will be replaced. He said the proposed windows have false muntins on them and he is opposed to approving windows with false muntins. He said if the Applicant is making a cost argument for the windows, he should provide additional details documenting the actual cost. He asked if the window will be made entirely out of aluminum.

The Applicant said the proposed windows will be made entirely out of aluminum. He said the guidelines do not forbid the installation of windows with simulated divided lights.

Mr. Hanson said windows with simulated divided lights are acceptable.

Mr. Wilkinson asked for the total number of windows to be replaced.

The Applicant said 110 windows will be replaced.

Mr. Wilkinson said the Board was not provided with a façade drawing and he is missing details that would assist in rendering a decision. He asked for the individual price of one (1) aluminum window.

The Applicant said he is only replacing the windows and they will be replaced in the same existing configuration. He said the proposed windows cost approximately \$200 each.

Mr. Wilkinson said the Applicant did not provide an illustration that highlights which windows will be replaced and the specifications of those windows. He said the buildings have boards in between the windows and the brick. He said no information has been provided to illustrate how the new windows will look like once they are installed. He said no information has been provided regarding the window sills or the brick mold.

The Applicant said a board in each window opening encapsulates the windows. He said the windows will be replaced and will appear the same.

The Chairperson said the project will modify the optics of the street and the Board must carefully consider the details of this project.

Mr. Hanson said the project has a significant impact to the neighborhood.

The Chairperson asked if the window lintels will be replaced.

The Applicant said the existing window lintels are in good condition but replicating just one (1) lintel would cost approximately \$1,000. He said he is proposing to reshape the lintels with mortar.

The Chairperson said that is a hazardous proposal.

Mr. Young said the mortar pieces would fall off.

The Applicant said he is currently researching the best material to utilize.

The Chairperson asked if the Applicant considered applying for tax credits to offset the cost of the project.

The Applicant said he does not qualify to obtain tax credits for various reasons. He said one of them is because his earnings exceed the requirement. He said his earnings are tied up in other investments.

Mr. Kelly said because the Applicant is obtaining relatively cheap windows and because the Applicant's income exceeds the requirements for tax credits, the Applicant should look into obtaining alternative windows that would last longer.

The Applicant said the financial considerations are limited to the building itself. He said if he cannot generate enough income to cover the investment cost then it is not a feasible investment.

The Chairperson said it is not up to her to question why the Applicant chose to invest in the properties. She said if anything, safety has actually improved over time.

The Chairperson said over the years other Applicants have invested into streets with similar situations like South Street and they have been able to successfully rent out the buildings with little to no issues. She said her son lives on Hasbrouck Street and that street was once like South Street. She said the Board is aware of these external factors that may not be relevant to the application. She said the Board must follow the East End Historic District Design Guidelines.

Mr. Young said these buildings are significant to the neighborhood.

Mr. Hanson said the acquisition costs of these buildings were in the Applicants favor because of the conditions of the neighborhood. He said the savings should enable the Applicant to make the requested improvements. He said if the neighborhood did not have these conditions; the Applicant would have ended up paying several times more money for the buildings. He said this is part of urban revitalization everywhere but at the end of the day, the Board needs to follow the East End Historic District Design Guidelines.

The Applicant agreed and believed the proposed windows are acceptable under the East End Historic District Design Guidelines and if the Board considers the financial constraint that alternative windows are 10 times more expensive, then that should be enough reasons to approve the proposal.

Mr. Young asked for the number of arched windows on the buildings.

The Applicant said there are nine (9) arched windows on 134 South Street, six (6) on 140 South Street and 174 Chambers Street has approximately 45 or 50 arched windows.

Mr. Young said the Board would not require the Applicant to replace all of the windows with arched windows. He said only the portions visible from the street should have arched windows.

The Applicant said the property at 174 Chambers Street is a corner building and all 50 windows are visible from the street and need to be replaced.

Mr. Young said that is why it is important that those windows are replaced correctly.

The Applicant said the quality of the building is in poor conditions and the roof has been leaking for decades.

The Chairperson said the roof leaking is not relevant to replacing the existing windows.

The Applicant said if the roof is leaking, it will impact the conditions of the windows.

Ms. Des Cognets said the crime argument is outside the scope of the Board. If the Applicant is claiming a hardship then the Board must first procedurally deny the application and then have the Applicant return with appropriate economic documentation that shows the rate of return and the

cost difference. She said the Board should obtain all of those documents before approving any application based on economic hardship. She said if the Applicant intends to install aluminum windows, he should provide information that addresses the window criteria in the East End Historic District Design Guidelines. She said enough information was not provided to her to render a decision.

The Chairperson said metal frames may be appropriate in some commercial/industrial buildings but the buildings in question are neither commercial nor industrial.

The Applicant said the buildings have a commercial use on the first floor.

Mr. Wilkinson said aluminum clad windows are preferred and said a façade drawing would be helpful in clearing up questions by the Board.

The Applicant said he can provide the drawings but he is not changing the building. He said he is only changing the windows.

Ms. Des Cognets said Board was not provided with a make or model of the proposed windows. She said no information was provided to clarify if the windows can hold paint.

Mr. Young said an example of the proposed window would help the Board.

The Applicant said the example was approved for a different property he presented to the Board.

Mr. Wilkinson said the individual window cost seems too good to be true.

The Applicant said that is the cost of windows from New York City.

Ms. Des Cognets clarified that metal frames are allowed if the buildings are commercial/industrial in nature and not if the use is commercial.

Mr. Wilkinson said they are discussing a hardship application for a total rehabilitation project. He said the full costs need to be provided.

The Applicant asked why the full cost is relevant if he is proposing to change the windows only.

Mr. Wilkinson said claiming economic hardship does not mean the Board is allowed to approve an application just because the correct windows are too expensive. He said there is specific criteria that needs to be addressed which may be found in the City Code.

Ms. Des Cognets said the application must first be denied and the Applicant may appeal the decision under an economic hardship. She said then the Applicant must show a reasonable return cannot be realized and it must be proven to be substantial as demonstrated by competent financial evidence.

The Applicant said that's where the crime gets involved because no one wants to live in a crime infested neighborhood. He said the proposed windows are the same windows that were previously approved under a separate application.

The Chairperson said not every application is the same despite having similar proposals because the Board must consider varying factors related to each individual property. She said the Board is tasked with maintaining the historic fabric of the City and if the Board approves windows that do not allow for the proper sashes/lintels etc. then the purpose of the Board is moot.

Mr. Kelly said a drawing would help address the concerns of the Board.

Mr. Wilkinson said, in his opinion, the property at 115 Johnston Street would be an acceptable compromise if the arched top windows are too expensive.

The Applicant asked if the Board follows the East End Historic District Design Guidelines or reviews each application on a case-by-case basis.

The Assistant Corporation Counsel said the Board follows the guidelines. The Board is vested with the authority to interpret the guidelines and apply the interpretation to each application.

The Applicant asked if the Board would accept his proposal if it was modified similar to the project at 115 Johnston Street.

Mr. Kelly said he would be okay with that proposal provided an elevation was submitted for the project.

The Applicant asked if the Board would accept photos or a drawing for the elevation.

Mr. Kelly clarified that an elevation drawing is preferred.

The Chairperson asked if the Applicant would like to table the application and return with additional information.

The Applicant requested to table the application.

The application was tabled and the Applicant was informed to submit additional details for consideration and return to the next ARC meeting on January 14, 2020.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

AR 2019-82

Applicant: Antonio Aresco & Jin Kin
Owner: Antonio Aresco & Jin Kin
Location: 12 Spring Street

Jeff Wilkinson recused himself for application AR 2019-82.

Application to repair and shingle the roof; replace the windows, fascia, rakers, gutters and doors; and replace the front stoop in-kind.

Antonio Aresco & Jin Kin, property owners, and Jeff Wilkinson, Project Architect, appeared before the Board.

The Project Architect gave a brief overview of the application and highlighted the following:

- Repairing the roof;
- Replacing the windows, fascia, rakers, gutters and doors;
- Proposing wooden 2/2 windows;
- Replacing the front stoop in-kind;
- Restoring the stone lintels;
- Bluestone lintels to be retained.

Mr. Hanson confirmed the proposed windows will be 2/2 windows.

Mr. Aresco said the roof is rotted and needs to be replaced.

Mr. Hoekema confirmed new shingles will be installed on the roof but the pitch will not change.

Mr. Young confirmed the proposed doors will be Dutch doors.

The public hearing was opened.

There was no one present for or against the application.

The public hearing was closed.

Ms. Des Cognets moved to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Hanson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously via roll-call vote.

AR 2019-83

Applicant: Eulogio Santiago
Owner: 82 Carson Realty Partners, LLC
Location: 82 Carson Avenue

Application to install a new fence and ratify the existing siding and windows.

Eulogio Santiago, Applicant, appeared before the Board on behalf of the property owner.

The Applicant said he arrived in the City of Newburgh in 2017 and has since purchased at least 10 properties. He said he performs work by the book and has never had any violations issued. He said he is before the Board because a renovation to 82 Carson Avenue was done without approval by the Board. He said he was unaware that ARC approval was required and is requesting approval to rectify the violation, ratify the work, and install a new wooden fence. He said the property suffered fire damage and he renovated it to its previously existing condition.

Mr. Young confirmed the Applicant is asking for approval in retrospect.

The Applicant said he was made aware by David Kohl, the City's Economic Development Specialist.

The Applicant said the building was vacant for 12 years until he decided to purchase and renovate it.

Ms. Des Cognets clarified the property was purchased on February 6, 2019.

The Applicant said he submitted photographs that highlight the look of the building before the fire damage. He said he restored the property back to its original condition. He said he was unaware that ARC approval was required and it is not his intention to fool anyone.

Mr. Wilkinson said the work appears to be done in-kind.

Mr. Young said vinyl siding does not last very long and is toxic if it catches fire.

The Applicant said he installed vinyl siding because that was the existing siding of the building before the fire. He said the installed siding meets the building code.

Mr. Wilkinson said the Board is not in favor of vinyl modifications.

Mr. Hanson clarified vinyl was the last known material specification of the siding and windows. He said the renovation appears to be an in-kind restoration.

Mr. Kelly said other projects in the East End Historic District should not utilize vinyl.

The Applicant said he is not looking to argue and will follow the suggestions of the Board.

Mr. Wilkinson asked if the Applicant was not properly made aware that he was in the East End Historic District.

The Assistant Corporation Counsel said the Applicant should have been aware because it is part of the terms and conditions of any City-owned property sale. He said it may have been overlooked by the Applicant.

Mr. Wilkinson said adding a cedar lattice under the porch would improve the look of the property and prevent garbage from piling up.

The Chairperson asked if the Applicant intends to paint the railing white to match the color of the columns.

The Applicant said he is open to both suggestions but he must wait until the wood is ready to accept paint.

The public hearing was opened.

There was no one present for or against the application.

The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Hanson moved to approve the application as submitted, subject to the following conditions:

- Add a white cedar lattice under the porch;

Paint the porch white. The Chairperson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously via roll-call vote.

AR 2019-84

Applicant: Eulogio Santiago

Owner: 209 North Miller Realty Partners, LLC

Location: 209 North Miller Street

Application to ratify the existing windows.

Eulogio Santiago, Applicant, remained before the Board on behalf of the property owner.

The Applicant said he purchased the property in foreclosure from the bank and proceeded to renovate the property. He said the bottom four (4) windows of the building were in need of replacement and were replaced to match the three (3) windows on the second floor. He said he did not know ARC approval was required and he is before the Board requesting ratification.

Mr. Kelly said the three (3) windows on the second floor are not original to the building. He said the Applicant should have replaced the first floor and basement windows in-kind.

The Applicant said the windows are in-kind because they match the windows on the second floor.

The Chairperson clarified that replacing in-kind does not mean replacing the existing windows to match a different window elsewhere on the building.

Mr. Kelly said the door is not original to the building. He said the building should have a double door with a transom above.

The Applicant said he is capable of replacing the front door.

Mr. Young said there are many double doors on Grand Street that can be emulated.

Ms. Des Cognets clarified that the Board is not requiring the Applicant to replace the door.

Mr. Young clarified that he is suggesting the front door should be replaced.

The Chairperson read the East End Historic District Design Guidelines regarding windows and doors aloud for the benefit of the public and the Applicant. She said the windows match the original configuration of the removed wooden windows. She said those new windows may be painted white to match the color of the second floor windows.

The Applicant said he could do the suggested work.

Ms. Des Cognets said the Board may not require the replacement of the second floor windows but they can stipulate the correct windows on the first floor and basement. She said the window configuration on the first floor should be 2/2 while the basement should be 3/3. She said the windows should be made out of wood or wood clad.

Mr. Hanson suggested replacing the second floor windows to match the material type of the first floor and basement windows. He said the Applicant must utilize the correct windows on the façade.

The Applicant said he hopes the Board took into consideration the effort it requires to replace the installed windows. He said he is not before the Board to argue and will follow the determination of the Board.

The Chairperson said the Applicant is improving the community by renovating the buildings he owns in Newburgh. She said he should be proud of the work he is doing since he is now part of the fabric that makes up the City Newburgh.

The Chairperson said the Applicant should look into installing wood, wood clad or aluminum clad windows in the front.

Mr. Kelly said the windows should be true divided light windows.

Mr. Hanson encouraged the Applicant to replace the second floor windows.

Mr. Kelly said the Applicant should provide window specifications.

Mr. Young said the Applicant should clarify if he intends to replace the front door.

The Chairperson said the Applicant may return in January with additional information.

The Applicant said he will look into replacing the second floor windows but he will not be able to attend the January ARC meeting. He requested to table the application until February.

The application was tabled until the February 11, 2020 meeting and the Applicant was informed to submit additional information.

AR 2019-85

Applicant: Stephen Chinoransky

Owner: Stephen Chinoransky

Location: 162 Grand Street

Jeff Wilkinson recused himself from applications AR 2019-85 and 2019-86.

Chris Hanson said he assisted the owner of application AR 2019-85 in purchasing the building a long time ago. He said he received no financial benefit from the owner, has no financial interest in the property, and has neither made nor received any promises to/from the owner.

The Assistant Corporation Counsel asked Mr. Hanson if he can be a fair and impartial reviewer of the application from the owner.

Mr. Hanson said he will be a fair and impartial reviewer of the applications presented by the owner.

Application to replace the porch on the first and second floor; install a new third story porch; repair/replace the roof and paint the exterior using colors from the Benjamin Moore Historic Color palette.

Stephen Chinoransky, property owner, and Jeff Wilkinson, Project Architect, appeared before the Board.

The owner said the building is visible on two (2) sides and he is proposing to extend the existing porches to wraparound the building and add a walk out porch. He said the previously approved colors for application AR 2016-19 will be used for the project.

The Project Architect gave a brief overview of the application and highlighted the following:

- Repairing slate roof;
- Extending existing porches to wraparound the building;
- Installing a new walkout porch on the east elevation;
- Project may require area variance due to cupola.

Mr. Hanson asked if the building originally had a cupola.

The Project Architect said he is unaware if the cupola is original to the building.

The owner submitted an article for consideration (which was made part of the records) and said the existing deck was added approximately 19 years ago.

The Board discussed the history of the building.

The public hearing was opened.

There was no one present for or against the application.

The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Hoekema moved to approve the application as submitted.

The Chairperson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously via roll-call vote.

AR 2019-86

Applicant: Jeff Wilkinson

Owner: RMW Designs LLC

Location: 57 Lander Street

Application to install new windows, a new stoop; repoint the masonry; paint the exterior using colors from the Benjamin Moore Historic Color palette and repair the sidewalks per the City of Newburgh Streetscape Standards.

Jeff Wilkinson, Project Architect, appeared before the Board with Manuel Maldonado and Ronit Weinkrantz on behalf of the property owner.

The Project Architect gave a brief overview of the project and highlighted the following:

- Proposing a two-family dwelling at 57 Lander Street;
- Obtained Area Variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals on November 26, 2019;
- Replacing the existing windows with 1/1 Anderson 400 series double hung windows;
- Brick façade to be stripped and repainted Revere Pewter HC-172 (Benjamin Moore);
- Existing metal fence to be painted black;
- Sidewalk to be repaired/replaced per City of Newburgh Streetscape Standards.

Mr. Young asked for the original configuration of the windows.

Mr. Kelly said it is difficult to determine since the existing window configurations are not consistent on the neighborhood. He said the original windows would have been a mix of 1/1 windows, 2/2 windows and 4/4 windows.

The Project Architect said the owner prefers the 1/1 windows.

The Chairperson said she prefers 2/2 windows but since there are no original windows left, she does not have an issue with 1/1 windows.

Mr. Maldonado said a combination of window configurations would not look as pleasing as the proposed 1/1 windows.

The Board discussed the window configurations.

The public hearing was opened.

There was no one present for or against the application.

The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Kelly moved to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Hoekema seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously via roll-call vote.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Omar E. Balbuena-Palma
Secretary to the Land Use Boards