

**The regular meeting of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board (HPARB) of the Village of Cooperstown was held in the Village Office Building, 22 Main Street, Cooperstown, New York on Wednesday, March 15, 2017.**

**In attendance:**

- **Members Present:** Chair – Liz Callahan / Brian Alexander / Mark Mershon / David Sanford /Alternate – Gary Kiss
- **Members Absent:** Roger MacMillan
- **Others:** Zoning Enforcement Officer-Jane Gentile / Village Clerk – Mikal Sky-Shrewsberry / 14 members of the public

**Meeting was moved from regular Tuesday time slot to Wed to accommodate member schedules and assure the presence of quorum**

**Ms. Callahan called the meeting to order at 5:00pm**

**Public Hearing (1 Item)**

- **45 Delaware Street** (Josh Edmunds, Simple Integrity/owner)
  - Public hearing for the proposed demolition of house structure
  - Present/Participating: Josh Edmunds, Simple Integrity/owner
  - Public Comments / Discussion
    - **Ellen Pope (Otsego 2000)**
      - Objects to Demolition
      - Referenced letter sent to Board afternoon of the meeting (Wed, 3.15.2017) copy on file with Zoning Enforcement Officer
      - Key Points:
        - Law states that in a historic district demolition not allowed unless under hardship & hardship has not been clearly demonstrated
        - Can only make judgements based on the exterior condition because has not had access to photos/condition of interior to verify claims made by owner/contractor
        - House is typical of houses in neighborhood (1880-1915) / it is a corner house that serves as bookend for the neighborhood
        - Concerns of energy efficiency can be addressed through renovation - There are examples and information available demonstrating how to make historic houses energy efficient
        - Qualifies for historic preservation tax credits @40% if commercial / @20% if residential which can offset some of the costs
        - Stated that newly constructed, energy efficient houses should be built on empty lots in the village where they are already permitted
        - Stated that she recognized her own home in the condition description being used to justify the request for demolition
    - **Cynthia Falk @4 Grove St (representing herself as a resident- NOT as a trustee)**
      - Objects to Demolition
      - Key Points:
        - Although on southern edge of town and not on Main Street, house is located on a well-traveled street in a pretty conspicuous location especially because it is on the path many people take to the elementary school (Ms. Falk walked by it almost daily for 9 years)
      - There are 3 applicable parts of Zoning Law (the law needs to be the determining factor (regardless of compelling arguments): (1) Retention of historic fabric / (2) Economic hardship / (3) Energy efficiency

- (1) Believes Historic Fabric portion of the law requires that this property needs to be retained
  - Demolition is in direct opposition to the Guideline of retaining historic fabric  
Guiding principle: properties that contribute to the character of the village and/or the particular neighborhood be retained with historic features altered as little as possible
  - Does the particular property actually contribute to the village/neighborhood?  
Ms. Falk feels it clearly contributes when looking at Delaware Ave as a whole:  
one of several houses from the same time period /Gives a sense of the development of the southern end of town in the 1880s
  - National Register: uses the term “Integrity”= location, design, craftsmanship, materials, setting feeling and association (this is NOT a term used by the law)
  - Is the building in integrity? -can argue vinyl siding detracts / repairs to the foundation, poor wiring detracts
  - Test of integrity (what Ms. Falk teaches her students): Could a former owner recognize the building? Ms. Falk believes former owners going back 100 years could recognize it even if it is covered with a different material
- (2) Economic Hardship cannot be used as grounds for approving demolition tonight because the required procedures have not yet been followed and economic hardship has not been legally established
  - There are specific legal procedures that determine economic hardship (established through historical and legal precedent)
  - A developer is entitled to a reasonable return but not necessarily the highest possible return
  - If economic hardship is the grounds that demolition is being asked for then the permit needs to be denied at tonight’s meeting and a new application for economic hardship will need to be submitted and considered at a later date
- (3) Ms. Falk believes energy efficiency is not grounds for approving demolition for the following reasons:
  - The law says that energy efficiency needs to be taken into consideration but also specifies that it does not take precedence over the retention/preservation of the historic fabric and qualities of structures- demolition would clearly promote energy efficiency at the complete expense of historic preservation
  - Also suggests that energy efficiency needs to be considered from a broader view than just fuel (heat, electric etc). It needs to include the “embodied energy” already invested in the material (creation/transport) and labor of the existing structure / energy required to demolish and dispose / labor and materials required to build a new structure / quality of the materials themselves in terms of energy efficiency and durability
  - National Trust says when considering the broad definition of embodied energy it takes 30-50 years to recoup the energy required to replace an existing home with a new one even if the building can be made 30% more efficient in terms of fuel use = “the greenest building is an existing building”
- **Jesse Ravage @ 34 Delaware**
  - Objects to Demolition
    - Not a contiguous neighbor but invited to comment by the applicant (Josh Edmunds)
  - Read letter she wrote to the board (see copy attached to minutes)
  - Letter enumerates numerous reasons the house should NOT be demolished:
  - Stated that buildings can be both historic and energy efficient: these 2 qualities are NOT necessarily mutually exclusive

- **Angelica Palmer @ 43 Delaware**
  - No stance on demolition
  - Concerned about impact of construction noise on her guests – she runs a legit AirBnB
  - Requesting that work be conducted during a limited time frame
  - Josh Edmunds responded by saying his company's construction hours are limited to 8am-4:30pm M-F
- **James Dean @ 15 Delaware**
  - Concerned that a decision to grant a demolition permit will make serious problems for HPARB by setting a precedent
  - Cooperstown has many houses that are or seem to be in similar condition and may lead to large numbers of requests for demolitions that will be hard to deny if this demolition permit is approved
  - Suggested that it would be helpful if applications to demolish could be submitted/addressed before a home was purchased instead of after
- **Jon Edgington, Milford, NY**
  - Speaking as fellow contractor
  - Opinion on condition of actual structure:  
Not well constructed or energy efficient / only things of value are a few windows, doors and posts
  - Suggests HPARB can weigh in on shape and structure of a rebuild so the new structure looks historically accurate and adds to the character of the neighborhood/village
- **Josh Edmunds (owner/contractor of the property in question)**
  - Described the problems with the structure of the house and why restoration was not a financially viable option
  - Foundation not original / footings not below frost line / sig portion of roof lines not original / systems need complete replacement / interior needs great deal of serious work to make structurally sound
  - Cost of restoration = 1.5x cost of building new
  - Believes energy efficiency using new materials would reduce cost of heating from approx. \$4000/year to approx. \$300/year
  - Requested permission to read additional letters that the Board received from residents before the meeting. Ms. Callahan said the board members had received/read the letters but in the interest of time/completing tonight's agenda that reading them in public needed to wait until the rest of the business on the agenda was completed and to see if time allowed
- **Lee Edmunds @ 47 1/2 Susquehanna**
  - House at 45 Delaware has essentially already been demolished and replaced piece by piece over time
  - Rebuild can recreate lines and essential features
  - The real issue is about history rather than energy
- **Liz Callahan (HPARB)**
  - HPARB is trying to find ways to educate home buyers about village renovation/demolition restrictions/requirements before they purchase
- **List of Letters / Authors sent to HPARB before the Meeting**
  - *RONALD LYTEL - IN FAVOR OF DEMOLITION*
  - *PETER REGAN AND AVIVA SCHNEIDER - IN FAVOR OF DEMOLITION*
  - *ELIZABETH REDD AND TORRENCE DUTCHER - IN FAVOR OF DEMOLITION*
  - *ELLEN POPE - AGAINST DEMOLITION*
  - *JESSIE RAVAGE – AGAINST DEMOLITION*
- **Hearing kept open (while other agenda items addressed) to allow for possible additional comments by attendees arriving late)**

- **2nd request for Public Comments / the following additional comments were made**
  - **Luke Wyckoff @ 36 Delaware Street**
    - Discussion with Josh Edmunds clarifying reasons for demo request / background info about the house in question
      - Mr. Edmunds and Ms. Callahan reviewed the condition of the house
      - Mr. Edmunds explained his relationship to the house as owner/contractor: “the end is a customer” but Mr. Edmunds is assuming the “risk”
        - (TIME: 01:30:4) “I’m not the end person. It’s somebody else. If the project gets approved they’re on-board. So I’m taking the risk because I believe in what we are trying to do. So if it doesn’t get approved I will continue to be the owner of the house.”
    - Mr. Wyckoff expressed concerns and perspective regarding demolition of 45 Delaware
      - How does a new house valued at \$450,000 that is replacing an existing house valued at \$120,000 effect taxes on the street?
      - Is there a precedent being set? Mr. Wyckoff’s own house was in similar condition 4 years ago.
    - Discussion with HPARB: Where is HPARB going in terms of what is acceptable and what isn’t?
      - Mr. Wyckoff mentioned increasingly approved use of materials like Hardy board and Marvin Integrity and suggested changes in acceptable materials may reflect changes in the board members of HPARB
      - Ms. Callahan (HPARB) responded the changes were
        - NOT due to board composition
        - Were due to differentiating between what was ok to use on new vs existing construction
  - **James Dean suggested**
    - The impact of approving demolishment for 45 Delaware could be kept under control by identifying/specifying the specific qualities that make it a **uniquely** viable candidate for demolition (so that the board was not under obligation to approve the demolition of other village houses in states of disrepair)
- **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED AT 6:40 pm**

### Regular Agenda (9 Items)

1. **45 Delaware Street** (Josh Edmunds, Simple Integrity/owner)
 

Proposed building demolition

  - **Present/Participating:** Simple Integrity/owner
  - Description: see public hearing (above)
  - Discussion: see public hearing (above) and Board Discussion below
  - **Board Comments/Discussion:**
    - **Brian Alexander**
      - Lives on Delaware and is also a neighbor to the house in question
      - Precedent and Role of HPARB
        - Extremely concerned about setting precedent
        - Concerned that focusing on the question of demolishing structures rather than preserving them will make a mockery of the role/processes of HPARB: Why bother having HPARB if the focus is on demolition?
    - Buying a property in the historic district
      - As an relatively recent purchaser/renovator of a historic home in the village he has first hand experience of the challenges and costs
      - Buyers who are not willing to adhere to the responsibilities of owning a property in the historic district should not buy a home in it

- Appreciates the both sides of the argument (for and against demolition)
  - Does not want to see buildings sit vacant / wants the village to thrive
  - Does not want to change the fundamental face of the village
- HPARB needs to avoid irreversible mistakes
  - HPARB has made mistakes in the past that cannot be taken back because the structures no longer exist “once it’s gone it’s gone”
  - Wants to do everything possible to assure HPARB does not add to those mistakes
- Discussion with Mr. Edmunds regarding intent at time of purchase
  - In response to Mr. Alexander’s question, Mr. Edmunds stated that he purchased the house intending to have it demolished
- Mr. Alexander stated that although there are ways that the interior and exterior are inseparable, HPARB is only concerned with the exterior and it needs to remain the focus of the discussion/decision making process
- Serving the requirements of a historic district, village law and the role of HPARB requires that HPARB discussions need to focus on HOW TO MAKE EXISTING FABRIC WORK and not on demolition
- **Mark Mershon**
  - As an economist, he is sympathetic to Mr. Edmunds from cost/benefit analysis perspective
  - Does not believe Mr. Edmunds has adequately demonstrated/documentated his claims regarding the costs of restoration vs rebuilding
  - Chose to live in the village because of the character of the town, not the energy efficiency of its homes
- **David Sanford**
  - Long term village resident - has lived in the village for over 66 years
  - Construction/architecture background
  - 45 Delaware is the scariest house he has ever been in
  - Not sure it contributes to the historic fabric of the street
    - Can see original structure- appears to be a tenant house for a farm / not great craftsmanship
    - Believes updates since originally built detract
    - Not much of original fabric left because of the number of modifications
  - Agrees with Mr. Edmunds that saving it requires extensive dismantling and replacement
  - If HPARB approves demolition the board will have the job of making sure the replacement structure conforms/adds to the character of the street/village
  - Board needs to make sure new construction is not ranches or other structures that are different from the existing historic structures in the village
- **Gary Kiss**
  - Relatively new village resident
  - Chose to move into the village for its historic character (the reasons HPARB exists)
  - Worried it will open the door to many other teardowns
  - Feels it is a tough call and can only be justified if there is something particularly unique and compelling in the this case (as opposed to other village houses)
- **Discussion between Liz Callahan (HPARB) and Josh Edmunds (owner/contractor)**
  - Mr Edmunds asked the following questions:
    - If the interior is totally replaced and then HPARB gives permission to replace the siding, windows, etc – how does that fit with retaining the existing fabric? (In other words If the whole structure is essentially replaced one element at a time, how does it result in retaining more of the existing fabric than demolishing the house and building a new one?)
    - Does the board care what method is used to move the house to provide access to the foundation?

- Ms. Callahan responded:
  - HPARB's job is to retain, NOT replicate, the actual historic fabric of the village
  - Believes that much of Cooperstown's sense of community and economic sustainability is tied to the historic architecture which attracts both visitors and new residents
  - Demolition is diametrically opposed to the goals and concerns listed above
  - HPARB does not determine the process used (to stabilize the foundation) only about the end result which is the retention of historic fabric. Keeping the building as stable and sound as possible in the process so there is as little damage as possible to existing materials
  - That's how the law reads and it is HPARB's job to enforce the law
  - Because application did not address replacing siding and other external elements proposed in Mr. Edmunds hypothetical scenario they were not appropriate to consider at the current public hearing
- **Discussion of Demolishment of Rear Wagon Shed**
  - Ms. Callahan asked Mr. Edmunds whether he was seeking approval to demolish the wagon shed because of condition
  - Mr. Edmunds stated he did want to demolish the shed but did not list it specifically because he did not realize it needed to be separately from the request to demolish the house
  - It was discussed during the walkthrough
  - Tony Gentile, Code Enforce Officer was considering condemning the shed
  - Vote on approving demolition of shed to be done during the next HPARB meeting
    - Waiting to hear if it is officially condemned
- **Ms. Callahan stated that HPARB will provide info to help Mr. Edmunds make a case for economic hardship**
- **MOTION**

Mr. Sanford made a motion to approve demolition of the house at 45 Delaware Street:

*ACTION by the Village of Cooperstown, Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board*

*RESOLUTION DATE: March 15, 2017.*

*A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE a permit for demolition of the house at 45 Delaware Street, Cooperstown, NY as follows:*

*WHEREAS the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board has made the following findings of fact concerning the proposed application:*

- *A public hearing was held*
- *Although the structure is listed as contributing, Mr. Sanford's professional opinion is that the condition is "not livable" and restoration to a livable state would require extensive work and economic hardship*

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 15th day of March, 2017, determine that the materials and plans for 45 Delaware Street, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.*

*SECOND: The motion died for lack of second.*

*THE BOARD TOOK AN UNOFFICIAL VOTE*

*WITH THE FOLLOWING RESULTS:*

- *Ayes (1): Sanford*

- *Nays (4) Callahan / Alexander / Mershon / Kiss*
- **MOTION DENIED**

- Next Steps

- Mr. Edmunds can appeal on the grounds of hardship
- Will need to provide hard documentation showing actual costs
- Mr. Edmunds asked how he needed to handle documenting costs because his role as both owner and contractor mean that prices he provides won't carry much weight
- Needs to provide extensive documentation to show that demolition is required
- Structural Engineer needs to document the problems and pronounce whether the house is actually dangerous/beyond repair

**2. 78 Fair Street (Karen Graham and Solvay Glass Representative)**

Proposed replacement of non-original windows with new windows (eleven total- ten double hung and one picture window) (no zba review needed)

- Tabled to next meeting (April 2017)

**3. 7 Walnut Street (Bob Lopiccolo -New York Sash for homeowner)**

Proposed replacement of existing windows (25 total) with vinyl windows (no zba review needed)

- **Present/Participating: Bob Lopiccolo**
- Description
  - Presentation of documentation showing updated contract reflects changes agreed upon with HPARB at the February 14, 2017 meeting
  - Handouts show specs for all proposed windows
  - Grid between the glass will be covered on the outside by simulated divided lights (the 2 techniques will be combined to give desired appearance both inside and outside the home)
  - Photos of 3 styles of windows installed in brick (as requested at Feb 14, 2017 meeting)
- Discussion
  - The Board agreed that all the additional requirements specified during the February 14, 2017 HPARB meeting had been met
- **MOTION (FIELD CHANGE)**
  - To approve the updated plans for the replacement windows to be installed at 7 Walnut Street
  - Made: Mr. Mershon / 2nd: Mr. Kiss
  - Results:
    - Ayes (5): Callahan / Alexander / Mershon / Sanford / Kiss
    - Nays (0)
    - **MOTION CARRIED**
    - The Board determined this to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes

**4. 36 Walnut Street (John Wayne Butler and Jon McManus, McManus Engineering)**

Field change to HPARB Decision dated February 14, 2017 (no ZBA review needed)

- Present/Participating: No representative was at the meeting
- Description: Contractor requested changes prior to the meeting.
- Enforcement Officer, Jane Gentile reported these changes were:
  - new window relocated from north elevation to west elevation
  - replace new window with smaller window on north elevation

- All members had the chance to review the changes
- Discussion: None
- **MOTION (FIELD CHANGE)**
  - To approve field change for 36 Walnut as presented
  - Made: Mr. Mershon / 2nd: Mr. Kiss
  - Results:
    - Ayes (5): Callahan / Alexander / Mershon / Sanford / Kiss
    - Nays (0)
    - **MOTION CARRIED**
    - The Board determined this to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes

**5. 22 Lakeview Dr N (Christopher Taylor and Michael Dennis, MADesign)**

Proposed shop/garage addition (no ZBA review needed)

- Present/Participating: Mike Dennis-MADesign
- Description
  - 2250 sq/ft addition for garage /storage/workshop
  - Specifics
    - Replicates roof lines of neighboring roofs
    - Cedar siding on existing will be extended around the lower portion addition
    - Siding on upper portion will be smooth painted MDO plywood and trim
    - New roof shingles on addition will match existing or all shingles on existing will be replaced so everything matches
    - 2 Garage Doors in carriage house; style-painted
    - Arts and crafts details on windows and doors
    - Addition is approx. 7.5 ft taller than existing roof
      - Height is required to accommodate equipment
      - Minimizing appearance of height by digging into the slope
      - Designed so there will NOT be an impact on neighbors' views
        - Note: 3-4 neighboring houses just under 30 feet tall that DO impact views
- Discussion
  - Addition size more than doubles existing
    - Jane Gentile stated existing structure (not counting existing garage) = 1765 sq ft ±
    - Mike Dennis stated addition = 2250 sq ft ± (including garage)
      - Garage square footage not usually counted toward square footage of house
      - New construction will meet NYS energy code
    - Liz Callahan noted and Mike Dennis agreed that the addition would make the house look more than twice as big as the existing structure
  - Orientation to the street described (at request of Mark Mershon)
    - There is a fair bit of existing screening
    - Will be hard to see anything but the top of the structure due to the existing retaining wall
- **MOTION**  
**David Sanford** made a motion to adopt the following resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness:



*ACTION by the Village of Cooperstown, Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board*

*RESOLUTION DATE: **March 15, 2017.***

*A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE a permit for: **a proposed addition to the house located at 22 Lakeview Dr North, Cooperstown***

*WHEREAS the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board has made the following findings of fact concerning the proposed application:*

- *A public hearing is not required;*
- *Requirements of SEQRA have been met for this action;*
- *The structure is listed as non-contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic Nomination Form;*
- *Proposed work meets the criteria for appropriateness under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b)(c) / (3)(a)(c) / 5;*
- *Before any changes are made to posts or other architectural elements they need to be submitted as field changes for HPARB approval*
- *Approval*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regard to the **proposed addition to the house located at 22 Lakeview Dr North, Cooperstown***

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this **15th day of March, 2017**, determine that the **proposed addition at 22 Lakeview North, Cooperstown, NY** meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.*

***Brian Alexander** seconded the motion and a vote on the motion had the following results:*

- Results:
  - Ayes (5): Callahan / Alexander / Mershon / Sanford / Kiss
  - Nays (0)
  - **MOTION CARRIED**

**6. 278 Main Street (Norm Johannesen)**

Proposed single family house (no zba review needed)

- Tabled to next meeting (April 2017)

**7. 36 Elm Street (Deborah Geurtze)**

Proposed 9' x 12' deck (no zba review needed)

- Present/Participating: Applicant was not present
- Description
  - Application and information had been submitted to the board before the meeting. It included the following info:
    - 9' x 12' new deck located off of north east rear of house
    - pressure treated wood deck and railing supports with 1 x 4 pine uprights to be painted white
  - Jane stated
    - ZBA review not required because proposed structure would be no more than four (4') foot tall (thus not requiring a setback variance)
    - Everything was ok – nothing applicant needed to do/modify except get HPARB approval

- Will not impact parking
- Discussion
  - There was a question about whether windows were involved because they seemed to be indicated on the submitted drawings
    - No new windows were involved - Applicant was just proposing to build a deck
    - The submitted drawings were old and showed more than what was actually being proposed
  - There was no other discussion
- **MOTION**

**David Sanford** made a motion to adopt the following resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness:

*ACTION by the Village of Cooperstown, Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board*

RESOLUTION DATE: **March 15, 2017.**

A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE a permit for: **an addition of a deck at 36 Elm Street, Cooperstown**

*WHEREAS the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board has made the following findings of fact concerning the proposed application:*

- *A public hearing is not required;*
- *Requirements of SEQRA have been met for this action;*
- *The structure is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic Nomination Form;*
- *Proposed work meets the criteria for appropriateness under Section 300-26.E.(2)(b);*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regard to the proposed **addition of a deck at 36 Elm Street, Cooperstown;***

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this **15th day of March, 2017**, determine that the **proposed addition of a deck at 36 Elm Street, Cooperstown, NY** meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.*

**Mark Mershon** seconded the motion and a vote on the motion had the following results:

- Results:
  - Ayes (5): Callahan / Alexander / Mershon / Sanford / Kiss
  - Nays (0)
  - **MOTION CARRIED**

**8. 16 Susquehanna Avenue (Peter and Kristin French and Teresa Drerup, Altonview Architects)**

- a) Proposed removal of rear 1/3 of structure
- b) 2 story addition including 2 car garage (no zba review needed)
  - Present/Participating: Peter and Kristen French-Applicants, Teresa Drerup, Architect
  - Description
    - Proposing approx. 900 sq ft addition to be added to the back of the house which will incorporate a garage with an apartment above for the French family / extending driveway back to the new garage
      - Siding Material: Hardy Lapboard / Smooth / Painted / Color TBD
      - 3D Model demonstrated how the addition will integrate with existing structure

- Windows will be 1 over 1 Marvin Integrity with wood on inside
- Roof to match existing
- There will not be a stone covering (about 8" exposed)
- Discussion
  - **Applicants asked whether they were allowed to replace the siding on the existing structure** with the hardy board being approved for the addition so that the whole house would be covered in the same easy to maintain siding
    - Liz Callahan stated that
      - Changes to siding on the existing structure could not be approved at tonight's meeting because it had not been formally submitted on the current application that the Board was addressing
  - **Applicants stated that they plan on installing a garage door that is in keeping with the character of their house**
    - Liz Callahan requested that the applicants submit this information for HPARB review once it is known
  - **Discussion regarding the need for a demolition permit**
    - Applicants were unsure if a permit was needed because the area being demolished is essentially a "wood shed" and does not rest on a foundation
    - Liz Callahan stated that existing law requires a public hearing and permit
    - Public hearing regarding demolition will be set for the next HPARB meeting (currently scheduled for April 11, 2017)
    - The current application can be approved tonight contingent upon the results of the public hearing

○ **MOTION**

**Mark Mershon** made a motion to adopt the following resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness:

*ACTION by the Village of Cooperstown, Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board*

*RESOLUTION DATE: **March 15, 2017.***

*A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE a permit for: **a proposed addition to the house located at 16 Susquehanna Ave, Cooperstown***

*WHEREAS the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board has made the following findings of fact concerning the proposed application:*

- *A public hearing is not required;*
- *Requirements of SEQRA have been met for this action;*
- *The structure is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic Nomination Form;*
- *Approval of proposed addition is contingent upon approval of required demolition after a public hearing for demolition is held;*
- *Proposed work meets the criteria for appropriateness under Section 300-26E. (2)(b)(c) / (3)(a)(b)(c) / 5;*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regard to the **proposed addition to the house located at 16 Susquehanna Ave, Cooperstown***

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this **15th day of***

**March, 2017**, determine that the **proposed addition at 16 Susquehanna Ave, Cooperstown, NY** meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.

**David Sanford** seconded the motion and a vote on the motion had the following results:

- Results:
  - Ayes (5): Callahan / Alexander / Mershon / Sanford / Kiss
  - Nays (0)
  - **MOTION CARRIED**
- Next Steps
  - Public hearing for demolition to be held at next meeting (currently scheduled for April 11, 2017 @4:30pm)

**9. Review of Minutes for February 14, 2017 Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board meeting**

- No one had comments, changes or corrections
- **MOTION**
  - **Mr. Sanford** made a motion to accept the minutes of the **February 14, 2017** meeting as submitted.
  - **Mr. Alexander** seconded the motion
  - The vote had the following results:
    - Ayes: (5): Callahan / Alexander / Sanford / Mershon / Kiss
    - Nays (0):
    - **MOTION CARRIED**

**A. Other business**

- Next HPARB Meeting to be held: Tu, Apr 11 @ 4:30pm

**Meeting Closed: 7:22pm**

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Mikal Sky-Shrewsberry, Village Clerk (PT)

Letter read by Jesse Ravage

14 March 2017

Ms. Jane Gentile  
Zoning Enforcement Officer  
Village of Cooperstown  
22 Main Street  
Cooperstown, NY 13326

RE: Application for Demolition Permit by Joshua Edmonds, owner of 45 Delaware Street, and submitted in the name of his LLC, Simple Integrity

Josh Edmonds of Simple Integrity, LLC, invited me as a member of the community to comment on his proposal to demolish the present house at 45 Delaware Street, which he purchased earlier this month, and replace it with a “certified passive house.” Josh cites my potential interest due to my understanding of historic Cooperstown and my commitment to a sustainable future.

I reviewed the application filed in the village offices. The list of troubles itemized at the beginning of Josh’s addendum is a standard outline of work on a neglected, but still serviceable, historic building. It is all well within the range of any good contractor who works regularly on older buildings. Further, it’s not the expensive part of a rehab project; the interior and finishing work usually forms the larger part of the bill. And, 20% of the cost of such repairs could be recouped by the owner via a state historic rehabilitation tax credit program because the house is a contributing property in the Glimmerglass National Register Historic District. That tax credit covers interior work including mechanicals, kitchens and baths—anything unlikely to be removed as part of a subsequent sales agreement.

While he offers no figures, Josh tells me that the renovation costs for 45 Delaware are “disproportionate” to the cost of demolition and replacement. He refers the preservation board to Adam Cohen’s précis about Passivhaus to convey Simple Integrity’s vision for the new house they propose.

As an architect specializing in this sort of construction, Cohen’s firm’s website conveys an obvious bias, and it does not illustrate single occupancy domestic buildings. Flipping to the Principles page of the Passive House Institute website ([www.phius.org](http://www.phius.org)), this nonprofit offers an illustration strongly resembling the house at 45 Delaware with its deep eaves, gabled roofline, and two-story massing. This isn’t a surprise. Historic vernacular architecture frequently embodies the same design principles that are correctly espoused as sustainable by proponents of “new” energy efficient building paradigms.

I agree that sustainability is of utmost importance. Demolition of serviceable buildings requiring some repair is unsustainable because of the up and downstream costs. One of the largest components of our landfills is building materials. Those materials have a cost of extraction associated with them as do new building materials, although the latter nearly

always have a higher carbon cost than historic ones. The ethic of repair over replacement, on the other hand, is a basic tenet of sustainability. Most often, the greenest building already exists.

It seems penny wise and pound foolish to build a new shell for a passive building on a site when the house on the site already incorporates exterior features desirable for passive buildings. It seems especially so when those features are also defining characteristics of an established element of an historic streetscape.

The house forms a “bookend” at the south extent of the historic streetscape of Delaware Street. As far as a block and half north, its gabled front visually encloses the south end of the street. Historic neighborhoods like these rapidly lose their desirable visual integrity when individual houses are removed, greatly altered, or replaced.

We live in a village with good historic fabric. The visual historic integrity is considered contributing to the Glimmerglass National Register Historic District. The village’s comprehensive plan identifies the sense of place this integrity embodies as one of our primary draws and something to be valued and enhanced.

Since Josh Edmonds bought the house from the owner noted on the application, it appears that he acquired it intending to tear it down. This makes it especially important that the HPARB deny Simple Integrity’s demolition request; allowing it will set a precedent that opens a door the village has repeatedly determined it wishes to keep shut.

When we grant a demolition permit for a potentially serviceable building that requires some work to make it energy efficient, we chip away at the historic fabric of our village. And, we speak out of both sides of our mouths because we show that we will accept an unsustainable vision of a sense of place over respecting the one we already have. The proposed action offers a superficial savings at an unsustainable cost.

Very truly yours,  
Jessie Ravage  
34 Delaware St  
Cooperstown, NY 13326