



**Architectural Review Board**  
Department of Planning & Community Development  
City Hall - Roosevelt Square  
Mount Vernon, New York 10550-2060  
(914) 699-7230 • FAX (914) 699-1435

Ernest D. Davis  
Mayor

John Humbach  
Chair

**MEETING NOTICE**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**PUBLIC MEETING**

A regular meeting of the Architectural Review Board will be held on Wednesday, **August 22, 2012 at 6:30 p.m.** in the Memorial Room, Second Floor, City Hall, Mount Vernon, New York, at which time and place the Board shall consider the following:

**ITEM # 1 APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- 1.1 Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting held on Wednesday, May 23, 2012.
- 1.2 Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting held on Wednesday, June 27, 2012.

Minutes from May 23, 2012 and June 27, 2012 are not ready yet.

**ITEM # 2 CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

Chairman explains that the Board is going to take the agenda items in a different order. He then, proceeds with Item 2.2, 140 Douglas Place.

**2.1 Case No. 14-2012: 130 Mount Vernon Avenue, (Section 164.68, Block 1063, Lot 1).**

The application of Jack Adesso, PLLC on behalf of owner Rella Fogliano is proposing to construct an 11-story mixed-use building.

SEQRA Determination: This action is a coordinated review and classified as an "Unlisted Action". Therefore, the Zoning Board as "Lead Agency" assessed the environmental significance. The Zoning Board issued a negative declaration on April 17, 2012.

The Chair reads the item into the record. The architect presents the application to the Board. The Chair provides background about the application. Then the applicant's attorney provides further clarity and indicates that he would like the Board to provide the Planning Board with a recommendation. The architect continues to discuss the proposal. The architect states that he has had design sessions with the Mayor and the Building Commissioner. Applicant made a model to scale so the Board could get a sense of the scale, mass, size and color of the proposed project. Architect made modifications recommended by the Building Commissioner which include the recesses to break up the mass and the windows being setback. The proposed building will have nice views according to the applicant. Alucobond panels will be used for the building. One of the board members asks how many colors the proposed building will have. The architect states 3 different colors along the base and 3 different colors along the top. Board Member Dais asks why are you using so many colors. The applicant responds that she likes the color palette. Board Member Sanchez asks about the durability of the material. The architect states that the Epcot Center is made of the same material and it has been standing for many years. The Chair states that he does not mind all colors. Board Member Sanchez asks about the previous Zoning Board approval. The attorney for the applicant responds about the previous Zoning Board approvals. The attorney tells the Board that there was no funding for Planning Board's site plan review and no funding for the Architectural Review Board's certificate of appropriateness. Board Member Fenniman states that it is completely inappropriate for that location and does not fit in with the character of the area. A Board Member asks why did you pick this material. The applicant states because it is "modern" and thought Mount Vernon needed a "modern" look. Board Member Myers asks if there are any other plans for this area. Planning Staff responds that at the current moment Planning Staff is seeking to rezone the area to accommodate future growth. The applicant wanted a new design with innovation. She says she saw this material in Harlem and liked the design. She does not want the building to fit in with the surrounding and she likes that building stands out. She thinks this will move the City forward. Board Member Fenniman states it is a basic building once the colors are removed and that there is nothing innovative about it and the building is still not in character. The attorney addresses character, planning and design. Board Member Fenniman states that once the colors are removed it is still a very basic building. The attorney tells that colors match the sun light and the area is ripe for development. Fenniman again expresses that the scale and mass are inappropriate for the area. The owner states that the building has three dimensional character because of the material. Board Member Meyers states that she does not like the fascia of the building because more architectural features are necessary for example a more traditional element needed for the building. The building needs more traditional integrity. Board Member Sanchez does not mind the building's size. She prefers a more traditional looking building. She states the building is more New York City style and not within the context of Mount Vernon. Therefore, there would be a shock value to building especially because of the colors. She does not like the color scheme of the building and the building is not unique for Mount Vernon. Board Member Dais does not like the colors for different reasons. The owner states she's been in Mount Vernon for over 30 years and likes the color scheme for the area. Board Member Myers still wants a more traditional element added to the building. Board Member Dais suggests a real balcony. The owner expresses that a real balcony will not work with the color scheme. The owner then expresses that she would like to work with the Board concerning the color scheme. Board Member Myers still wants a traditional element added to the building. The Chair expresses that the building's colors are edgy but not over the top. Board Member Myers asks about the occupancy and whether it's for low income or affordable housing. The owner replies that by stating that the building will match the rents within the area. Board Member Fenniman states the applicant did not go far enough with innovation. The owner states that all of her buildings are green but solar panels on this building will not have a return on investment and; therefore, they are not doing it on this building. Board Member Sanchez asks about the bedroom

counts. The owner states that there will be studio apartments, one-bedroom apartments and two-bedroom apartments. The owner will work to mute the colors. Board Member Sanchez states this is a gateway into Mount Vernon and the building is not representative of Mount Vernon. The applicant's attorney speaks about the location of the site and warranting a development of this type in the area. Board Member Myers states that the Board is attempting to work with the applicant and that the applicant should not take such a definitive stance when discussing the colors. The applicant states she wants to work with the City because she needs the City's support. The applicant's attorney again talks about future development of the area. Board Member Myers mentions that the Mount Vernon Chamber of Commerce is moving to Mount Vernon Avenue. Board Member Fenniman states that the proportion of the windows is off and that the windows are not complimenting the buildings. He further expresses that the windows should have more height. All Board Members agree with that statement. The applicant suggests adding sun shade devises to the building and making the windows larger. Accordingly, the applicant is going to come back to the Board's September meeting with the following modifications to the proposed design:

- Making the appearance of the proposal feel more like a residential building.
- Creating a more prominent front entry along MacQuesten Parkway by enlarging this fenestration; therefore, the doors should have greater height and the entry should have greater emphasis making it more imposing. The building is currently top heavy and the pedestrian scale is being lost because of that.
- Ensuring that the proposed street trees are going to be planted along Mount Vernon Avenue, MacQuesten Parkway and within the median of MacQuesten Parkway.
- Ensuring that all sidewalks and curbing are aesthetically pleasing and are not broken or cracked.
- Creating larger windows. The windows appear to be the same proportion as the finished panels; accordingly, the windows should be enlarged to make the windows a more prominent aesthetic feature.
- Installation of sun shade devises.

**The Architectural Review Board made the following recommendation to the Planning Board:**

- That the Planning Board should consider that the scale and mass of proposed new structure in relation to the property itself, surrounding properties and the neighborhood are appropriate.

The Architectural Review Board's recommendation was based on the following vote:

Board Members Present: 5

Motion: Board Member Dais

Second: Board Member Myers

Ayes: 4 (Dais, Myers, Humbach and Sanchez)

Nays: 0

Absent: 0

Abstain: 1 (Fenniman)

**2.2 Case No. 15-2012: 140 Douglas Place** (Section 159.70, Block 2004, Lot 14)

The application of Mark Mustacato on behalf of owner Gary and Cathy Offner is proposing to construct a two (2) story addition and detached garage in the rear of single family home in the R1-7 Zoning District.

SEQRA Determination: This is a Type II action; therefore, no further SEQRA assessment is necessary.

The Chair reads the item into the record. The applicant states, It's a one story addition to the rear of the house with basement entrance and that they are removing existing rear garage to eliminate the u-turn necessary to enter the garage. As a part of the application a new glass door and window will be installed. The materials to be used will be beige stucco with trowel finish. Applicant shows the Board samples. The applicant then states that the colors will match existing colors exactly. The applicant states that Vermont slate on roof to match existing roof material of the house. The applicant then states that the garage will have an asphalt shingle on roof to match color and texture of roof without being slate. The applicant also states that the garage will have gables facing all four sides. The garage will have stable doors for main entry. The Chair then states that he has concerns about the non-slate roof facing the street. Board Member Sanchez asks about the other structures in the area and Board Member Myers asks about other garages in the area. The applicant states that there is vegetation serving as buffer between the neighbors. Board Member Sanchez asks the applicant to discuss zoning compliance and the required setbacks. The applicant addresses it by saying the garage is zoning compliant and the further discusses actual dimensions of the setbacks. The Board then has a discussion concerning the asphalt shingle roof being visible from the street. Board Member Sanchez points out that most of the homes in that neighborhood are in a Tudor style and slate roofing material compliments that style. Board Member Dais asks a question about the current garage space. The applicant responds. The Board again expresses concerns that a non-slate roof in the area may set an unwarranted precedent. Board Member Sanchez asks whether the color of the stucco will match exactly. The applicant responds by saying that color will be computer matched and that the samples are close but not exact. Board Member Myers asks if there are any adjustments to the gutters and/or leaders. The applicant says "no, they are as reflected on the plan." **Board Member Dais makes a motion to approve provided that the roof of the garage is made of slate to match the existing house. Board Member Myers seconded the motion. All Board Members were in favor.**

**Note:** Work Sessions will be open to the public but closed to public participation subject to the Open Meetings Law, [Section 105 of the New York State Public Officers Law, Article 7].

**Note:** Items listed on the agenda are subject to change and amendments and/or additions may be placed on the agenda.

**Reminder to applicants:**

Sample of exterior finish materials must be presented at the meeting. Please be advised that approval from the Architectural Review Board does not constitute approval from the Building Department. Moreover, no work may be performed until a Building Permit is granted and conspicuously posted at the work site.

City of Mount Vernon                      5  
Architectural Review Board Agenda

Meeting Date  
August 22, 2012

Following the upcoming meeting set for August 22, 2012 the next regular meeting of the Architectural Review Board is scheduled to be held on Wednesday, September 27, 2012.

Vinroy Bell  
ARB Secretary

cc: Ernest D. Davis, Mayor  
Nichelle Johnson, Chief of Staff  
George Brown, City Clerk

Lobby  
Press  
Building Department