

## APPLICATION AMENDMENT NARRATIVE

**Property:** 13 Alpine Street  
**Applicant/Owner:** Apres Ski LLC  
**Agent:** Adam Dash, Esq.  
**Zoning District:** BB (before), UR (now)  
**Case#:** P&Z 21-051  
**Date:** September 15, 2021

Per the request of the Zoning Board of Appeals (“ZBA”) at its September 1, 2021 meeting, Applicant hereby amends its Application for Modification regarding the above-referenced Property to revise the prior approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals in Case # PB 2016-75 on August 2, 2017, as it may have been previously amended or revised.

Revised modification plans are filed herewith which show the current Revisions being sought.

The Revisions now being sought are as follows:

### 1. Rooftop Staircase Overrun

Proposal: The right-side elevation staircase overrun on the roof, which is adjacent to the rooftop elevator overrun, has been extended to match the height of said adjacent elevator overrun.

Prior approval: A rooftop hatch and ladder was originally approved for rooftop access, which was lower than the adjacent elevator overrun.

Rationale for Revision: Access via a staircase makes for easier and safer rooftop access for maintaining, replacing and repairing rooftop HVAC equipment, clearing rooftop drains of debris, addressing any issues with the roof, removing leaves, snow and ice, and similar activities. It is harder to get people and equipment on the roof for these purposes with just a ladder and a hatch. The staircase overrun will be the same height as the adjacent elevator overrun, so that no increased height of the building will be created by this revision.

## **2. Batten Pattern**

Proposal: The batten pattern at the top floor and right-side stair tower has been adjusted.

Prior approval: The batten patterns in these locations were different styles and colors, which made the stair tower stand out.

Rationale: This change will optically join the stair tower, elevator tower, and siding to unify the building's appearance, and will cover the seams on the boards.

## **3. Sign**

Proposal: New cast stone signage at the center of the front façade is now proposed to read "13 Alpine Street".

Prior approval: The previous cast stone signage at the center of the front façade which said "Faulkner Brothers" was to remain.

Rationale: The previous "Faulkner Brothers" signage was destroyed by the previous property owner. Applicant/Owner did not destroy said signage.

## **4. Granite Veneer**

Proposal: The veneer at the front wall headers and columns is to be changed to cast stone (Arriscraft or Similar).

Prior approval: The previous veneer was to be granite.

Rationale: The cast stone is more in keeping with the building and neighborhood. The granite siding is extraordinarily expensive and does not fit with the style of the building.

## **5. CMU Block**

Proposal: CMU block is to be used on the Easterly wall.

Prior approval: Glass block was previously proposed on the Easterly wall.

Rationale: The abutting neighbor to the East has requested that that CMU block be used instead of the previously approved glass block on the Easterly wall to enhance said abutter's privacy and to eliminate light emanating from the garage. That abutter grows plants on that wall and does not want them disturbed.

## **6. Door and Window Pattern**

Proposal: The door and window pattern at the front left side ground floor space has been altered as shown in the elevations filed herewith.

Prior approval: The door and window pattern at the front left side ground floor space was different.

Rationale: This revision was previously approved as de minimis, and is being included in this application for completeness and transparency. The changes were made to accommodate interior layout revisions which interfered with the previously approved door and window pattern.

## **7. Windows**

Proposal: The windows have been slightly altered on all facades as shown in the elevations filed herewith.

Prior approval: The windows were slightly different.

Rationale: The changes were made to accommodate interior layout revisions and structural requirements arising from Applicant's structural engineer's revisions to the permit set.

## **8. Front Wall**

Proposal: The front wall has been replaced as shown in the elevations filed herewith.

Prior approval: This revision was approved as de minimis before the current Applicant purchased the Property, and is being included in this application for completeness and transparency. The original front wall was destroyed by the previous Property owner. Applicant did not destroy said wall.

Rationale: Due to the instability of the original garage's front façade, the original front wall had to be removed and rebuilt.

## **9. Horizontal Iron Railings**

Proposal: The iron railings are to be horizontal.

Prior approval: The iron railings were vertical.

Rationale: Horizontal railings allow for a more modern design.

## **10. Screening on the Roof**

Proposal: Cedar screening of the rooftop mechanicals with safety tie-offs are being proposed as shown on the plans filed herewith.

Prior approval: No screening was on the approved plans.

Rationale: The tie-offs provide safety for workers having to access the rooftop mechanicals. The screening hides the mechanicals from view.

## **11. Balcony Expansion**

Proposal: The wood decking is being extended to three sides of Unit 401 on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor roof (a/k/a the fourth floor deck), thereby creating a larger balcony. Additional planters and florals are being proposed to help create a bee habitat.

Three options are being proposed:

- A. Mount the railing on top of the parapet wall and construct a raised planter at the inside of the railing; or
- B. Place the railing inside of the parapet wall on the deck and place planters on the parapet wall up to railing height to address neighbor's privacy concerns; or
- C. Place railing inside of the parapet wall on the deck and place planters inside of the railings on the deck.

Prior approval: The balcony of Unit 401 on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor roof (a/k/a the fourth floor deck) was smaller.

Rationale: This revision provides for more outdoor amenity space in a project where the building takes up most of the lot, as well providing additional greenery to beautify the building. The abutters, who would be most affected, have not raised any objection to this revision.

## **12. Ground Floor Planters**

Proposal: Cast concrete planters at the front of the building on the ground floor are being proposed.

Prior approval: The ground floor front planters were to be granite.

Rationale: The granite planters are extraordinarily expensive and do not fit with the style of the building.

### **13. Size and Spacing of Planters**

Proposal: The size and spacing of the planters have been altered on all facades as shown on the plans filed herewith. The previously approved plans called for "planters around terraces." The design intent shown then conveyed a continuous wall around the Second floor terraces. The width and depth of the planters were not annotated in those conceptual plans. Visually, the continuous wall terminated a few inches below the top of railing and the planter was approximately 3' wide, measured from the edge of the deck to the outside face of the continuous wall. The edge of the deck is annotated as 4.5' from the outside face wall below.

Prior approval: The size and spacing of the planters are being proposed to be different. The proposed plans call for a continuous wall around the terraces with planter boxes aligned with the top of the railing. The boxes are approximately 30" long x 12" wide x 18" deep. In order to align with the top of the railing, these are placed on a raised platform at the inside of the continuous wall. The edge of the decks is 3.5' from the outside face of wall below.

Rationale: The changes were made to provide aesthetic appeal and to accommodate the neighbor's concerns about privacy.

### **14. Second Floor Deck**

Proposal: The second floor deck at Unit 201 has been reduced in size.

Prior approval: The second floor deck at Unit 201 was larger.

Rationale: The change was made to allow for more privacy.

### **15. Rooftop HVAC Units**

Proposal: The rooftop HVAC units have been located on the roof, near the roof edge, as shown on the plans filed herewith.

Prior approval: There was no roof plan previously approved, although the prior ZBA decision mentioned that the prior building owner would seek to locate all mechanicals in the ground level garage.

Rationale: This change was made because the HVAC units can only go on the roof. The building takes up almost the entire lot, so the units cannot go on the ground. Code does not allow the units to be in the garage. The units were located near the roof edge to avoid nine large penetrations through the flat roof membrane to avoid future possible roof leaks. In their current location near the roof edge, the penetrations for the units are through the side of the parapet, thereby reducing the potential for roof leaks. Relocating the units to a different location on the roof would be large expense for no real change, as the units cannot be readily seen from the ground. The abutters, who would be most affected, have not raised any objection to the units' location near the roof edge.