VILLAGE OF MONTEBELLO
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
FEBRUARY 13, 2007

The Village of Montebello Architectural Review Board (ARB) was called to order by the Chairman, Al Rubin at 9:01 p.m. on Tuesday, February 13, 2007. The meeting was held at Village Hall, One Montebello Road, in the Village of Montebello, NY 10901.

PRESENT	OTHERS
Al Rubin, Chairman	Robert Geneslaw, Planner
Jane Burke	Eve Mancuso, Engineer
Michael Iatropoulos	Ira Emanuel, Attorney
George Tonelli	William Pfaff. AIA, Consulting Architect
Barry Krane	Carol Adduce, Clerk
Peter Crotty, Alternate	

Rio Vista of Montebello -Public Hearing
Architectural Review

Application of Rio Vista of Montebello, 212 Orange Avenue, PO Box 627, Suffern, New York for Architectural Review for 20 homes on a 22 lot subdivision entitled Rio Vista Montebello, Inc., consisting of 17.467 +/- acres located on the northerly side of Montebello Road approximately 50 feet north of Hemion Road in the Village of Montebello, which is known and designated on the Ramapo Tax Map as Section 48.18 Block 2, Lot 1, in a LO-C (EP) Zone.

Present: Larry Turco, Applicant
Tom LiPuma, Applicant
Jay Hood, Esq.
Andrew Atzl, PLS
Fred Klink, Architect

Mr. Rubin stated that this is the first meeting of the Architectural Review for the application of Rio Vista of Montebello.

Mr. Geneslaw stated he has recommended William Pfaff of Pfaff Architects as a consultant to assist the Board in their review of this application. The Village Board still has to authorize Mr. Pfaff to work on this project and hopefully they will do that at their next board meeting. Mr. Geneslaw stated that Mr. Pfaff is recommending an hourly rate because he does not know how much time he will be spending on this project and suggested, based on his current understanding of the assignment, a budget of $6,000. That is not a “not to exceed”, that is an estimate of what is likely to be on an hourly basis assuming that there are not an extraordinary number of meetings. Mr. Geneslaw stated that he was asked by the Village Attorney to present this at the meeting to make sure that the applicant will be responsible for the fee.

Mr. Rubin explained that the Planning Board will also be acting as the Architectural Review Board (ARB). The ARB is to basically define the project so that it meets various objectives, one of which is the fact that it is an unusual site because it is on the same property as the mansion which has been deemed historical. He said what the Board is seeking is not expanding the mansion, but we want everything to blend in. Some of the concepts from the mansion could be included in the design of the new building, but not replicating the mansion.

Mr. Rubin stated that the reason for a consulting architect is that the Planning Board experience is limited. The ARB will take advice from the community as well as the Historical Preservation Committee, but the ARB has the responsibility of what the project will look like.

Mr. Rubin suggested that the applicant work with the architect and supply him with all the plans, concepts and information.

Mr. Turco stated that he agrees to pay the architect consulting fees for Mr. William Pfaff.

The applicant's architect, Fred Klink gave an overview of what the buildings would look like and explained the type of materials to be used. He stated that all of the buildings will have four families to a building, but will look like a large home except the two front units which will have two families each. Mr. Klink said that the units will be one story on the uphill and two stories on the downhill, and they will primarily be ranch living units with two bedrooms on the first floor, a great room, kitchen and a dining room and then you would enter down to the lower level. Mr. Klink stated when they looked at the building, because they were one story they looked like a ranch and were rather flat looking so they raised the elevation of the first floor to approximately a story and half so that the gutter line could be brought up a little bit and have a look that would be compatible with the mansion. Mr. Klink said that they put in some large windows and some three story windows which gives the effect of a somewhat two story look. He said by raising the elevation they were able to put in some cathedral ceilings and make it more interesting for the buyer. He described what the buildings would look like from front and back. The roof will have slate looking shingles and the front of the building will be brick, but from the window down it will be stone. Mr. Klink said that he tried to incorporate many of the features of the mansion.

Mr. Rubin stated that one of the things that we spoke about is we do not want to replicate the mansion, however, we would like some of the identifiable features of the mansion. He said that he is a little concerned with the color of the brick, instead of the same color of the mansion, maybe it could be a complimentary color; he liked the concept of stone and brick and raising the elevation of the first floor and he understands there was some restrictions because of the F.A.R. and that is why the chimneys in the rear do not go all the way to the bottom, but they look like they are sitting on the deck.

The applicant was asked to bring samples of the roof and to show the actual colors of the materials to be used. The applicant was also asked to bring in digitalized renderings based on reality for the Board to visualize and conceptualize how this would blend and harmonize with the mansion and also to see how it fits in with the landscaping.

Mr. Turco suggested having some site visits to look at the mansion and see what the roof lines will look like.

Mr. Pfaff stated that seeing materials up against the mansion is always appropriate. Looking at samples in daylight or up against the existing building, and may be at some point a mock-up, anything that helps the Board to understand the reality of what is being proposed is useful. He said
that the rendering presented does not seem to be a realistic view. His sense is that the mansion should dominate over these new buildings and you do not get that sense from these renderings. Mr. Pfaff stated that he likes the brick and stone, but maybe the color of the brick could be different so the mansion always stands out. The scale of details is important for example the columns and railings, these are all elements that need to be substantial otherwise they do not feel that they are of the period that we are being sympathetic to.

Mr. Rubin requested that the applicant communicate and work with Mr. Pfaff and submit renderings with changes for the next meeting. He also requested a report from Mr. Pfaff before the next meeting regarding the changes to the renderings.

Tom Campbell, 21 River Road, stated that he likes many of the features of the buildings but thinks that the buildings should not be all the same. There should be more diversity in design and the window placement could be different to avoid the cookie cutter look. He said that this property is unique in that it really has three approaches. In addition to Hemion Road there is also the east and west approaches on Montebello Road and the view from those approaches are important. Mr. Campbell said that his primary concern is, if parked cars will be visible from those views and how will it be screened, because he will be able to see the cars from his backyard.

Mr. Rubin made a motion to continue the public hearing at the next meeting of March 13, 2007.

MOTION: Michael Iatropoulos

SECOND: George Tonelli

VOTE: Unanimously accepted.