

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 Tuesday, April 11, 2017.

**In attendance:**

- **Members Present:** Chair – Liz Callahan / Brian Alexander / Mark Mershon / David Sanford / Roger MacMillan / Alternate – Gary Kiss
- **Others:** Zoning Enforcement Officer-Jane Gentile / Clerk (PT) – Mikal Sky-Shrewsbury / 8 members of the public

**Ms. Callahan called the meeting to order at 4:31pm**

**Ms. Callahan read the guidelines for public comment**

**Public Hearing (1 Item)**

1. **45 Delaware Street** (Josh Edmunds, Simple Integrity/owner)  
**Public hearing for hardship case for demolition of house structure**
  - **Present/Participating:**
    - Josh Edmunds, Simple Integrity/owner
  - **Public Comments / Discussion**
    - **Ellen Pope (Otsego 2000 / Village resident-28 Elm Street)**
      - Submitted a letter to HPARB before the meeting
      - Believes that this is NOT a case of hardship
      - Hardship is demonstrated through 3 criteria / ALL 3 of which need to be met
      - So far 45 Delaware has only addressed 2 of the 3
      - Criteria 1: Danger to public
        - Only danger to the public called out in engineering report is the chimney which is in danger of falling down
          - A chimney in danger of collapse can be rectified without demolishing the whole house
          - Ms. Pope's own chimney has been taken down and is in the process of waiting to be rebuilt
          - There are a number of homes in the village that are in danger of collapsing completely and present a much greater danger to public yet are allowed to remain standing
      - Criteria 2: Lack of Reasonable Return on Investment
        - Mr. Edmunds purchased at 60% of assessed value
        - House "has a lot more life in it" and is a lot like many of the houses in the village in terms of framing, structural issues etc
        - Mr. Edmunds could use tax credits to create a reasonable rate of return as a homeowner
          - Mr. Edmunds has estimated \$565,000 to gut and rebuild
            - As homeowner: credits = apx \$50,000
            - As investment property could recoup 40% of total rehabilitation costs
        - Financial situation is self-inflicted because Mr. Edmunds knew the condition of the house before he purchased it
        - Believes HPARB approval of hardship in this case would set precedent of demolition by neglect – which is a dangerous precedent

- Ms. Pope is providing information on tax credits and “Greenest Building” report quantifying reuse (relevant section on single family residential)
    - In every instance the rehabilitation of a single family residence is more efficient in terms of both energy and economics than new construction
  - Criteria 3: Finding a purchaser
    - Mr. Edmunds has not had time to even begin trying to sell
  - Ms. Pope 5 minutes speaking period was complete
- **Cynthia Falk (representing herself as a Village resident- 4 Grove Street / NOT representing Board of Trustees)**
  - Referring specifically to the law regarding the 3 criteria demonstrating hardship
  - Reviewed the file and has concluded Mr. Edmunds has begun the process of demonstrating hardship but has not yet met the necessary criteria
  - Criteria 1: Reasonable return
    - Can be difficult to assess for single family residential
    - Believes Mr. Edmunds purchased with idea of reselling
    - File focuses on cost of repairs
    - There’s a lot of relevant information used to assess this that is not part of the info on file (purchase price, listing price, assessment and/or appraisal values, intended selling price, etc)
    - Believes hardship may be inappropriate to consider because her understanding of info on file is that the cost to make repairs was actually slightly less than cost to replace the house
  - Criteria 2: Use
    - May be an argument given the current state of the building
    - Does not believe Mr. Edmunds has shown it cannot be used by himself or by someone else
  - Criteria 3: Reasonable effort to find a purchaser
    - May be satisfied if the house had been listed for significant period of time before purchased by Mr. Edmunds
    - If it was not on the market long the law requires the owner to look for someone who is willing to purchase and preserve the house
- Roger MacMillan (HPARB)
  - HPARB possesses the financial info Ms. Falk mentioned
  - Based on conversation with village attorney, does not believe that demolition requires ALL 3 criteria to be met
  - RE the 3<sup>rd</sup> criteria (Good faith effort to find a purchaser)
    - banks were unwilling to grant a mortgage on the house and insurance was also very difficult to get insurance
    - inability to get mortgage makes it difficult to reasonably expect Mr. Edmunds to find a buyer since they would be required to pay the full amount in cash while not having insurance means he has to hope it doesn’t burn down while looking for a buyer
  - Believes Ms. Pope’s statement about demolition by neglect is preposterous
  - Believes a number statements in Ms. Pope’s letter are false
  - Stated that
 

*According to the National Trust for Historic Preservation, government is not required to compensate property owners for bad business decisions, nor to guarantee a return on a speculative investment. Decisions regarding expectation of demolishing a "historic*

*property" must be governed by what is "reasonable." The applicant must show that the house cannot be sold "as is" or in addition "that the fair market value of the property in its current condition plus rehabilitation expenditures will exceed the fair market value of the house upon rehabilitation." Such considerations must be considered is any demolishing debate.*

- 45 Delaware is NOT a unique "bookend" property / term is being used to "Guild the Lily"
- Code enforcer has stated that the house is uninhabitable
- Has been surveyed by 2 engineers (1 of whom was certified) and Dr. MacMillan respects their opinions
- Seriously questions whether a reasonable rate of return can be gotten for this structure
- "It is a complicated issue"
- David Sanford (HPARB)
  - The state of the house is not a case of neglect but of poor judgement (improper decisions by previous owners/contractors regarding construction)
  - Knows previous owner and believes he may have been taken advantage of
  - Agrees with Mr. Forbes (engineer) that house is in deplorable state
- Mark Mershon (HPARB)
  - Concerned that no information has been given regarding possible disposition of the property under any scenario
  - Consequently there is no way to evaluate whether a reasonable return is likely to be obtained
  - HPARB needs more info
- Brian Alexander
  - Troubled by the issue of trying to establish hardship
  - Why would you knowingly buy a property in need of significant repair and then claim hardship when you have to repair it?
  - As an experienced contractor, Mr. Edmunds was knowledgeable about what he was getting into
  - HPARB's job is to preserve the existing built environment
  - Engaged in discussion with Dr. MacMillan regarding why Mr. Edmunds is attempting to demonstrate hardship
  - Does not agree with the idea that approving the demolition of one building is the beginning of a slippery slope that will lead to the demolition of many
    - Concerns about precedent should not be a determining factor
- Discussion between Liz Callahan and Josh Edmunds (owner/contractor) regarding providing HPARB with additional info
  - Mr. Edmunds stated he has additional info he can submit that he does not want to be part of the public record because it reveals proprietary business info
  - Ms. Callahan suggested the public hearing be left open until next month so the additional info can be submitted and reviewed
    - Hearings can be left open for 24 months under the law, Mr. Edmunds can determine the pace he wants to proceed at
  - HPARB will provide Mr. Edmunds with requests for additional information/actions
    - Mr. Edmunds was told an appraisal by a certified appraiser was important
  - Mr. Edmunds inquired whether it would be possible for HPARB to review his new financial material before next month
    - Ms. Callahan said HPARB could look into it but was not sure it was possible to review before the next meeting

- Josh Edmunds (owner contractor)
  - Does not see how purchase price plus renovation costs can come close to being recouped since reasonable sale price for the renovated house is probably about \$300,000 based on comparable sales in the neighborhood
  - Tax credits are not a helpful way of recouping money because they are long term and are not income
- After discussion Board suggested that Josh what a reasonable purchase price is for the house in its current condition based on comparable prices in the neighborhood
  - Mr. Edmunds stated he has that information
  - Ms. Callahan requested that he submit it with the other new financial info that he will be submitting to HPARB
- Liz Callahan
  - Found it hard to understand how the provided numbers relate to a reasonable return
  - More info will be helpful
- **Public hearing is being kept open until the next HPARB meeting (currently scheduled for May 2017) to allow new info to be submitted/considered**

### Regular Agenda (13 Items)

#### 1. **78 Fair Street (Karen Graham)**

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

- **Present/Participating:** Karen Graham, Owner
  - Tabled to later in the meeting to allow time for the Solvay Glass sales rep to arrive
- **Description:**
  - Made of Fibrex (Anderson Renewal)
  - Paintable (will be white)
  - Using full divided lights that will look exactly like existing / won't be able to tell difference from the street
  - Discussion of configuration (6 over 6)
- **Discussion:**
  - No discussion during current meeting  
(see prev discussions: HPARB\_01-10-2017 / HPARB\_02-14-2017)
- **MOTION**
- **Made by:** David Sanford / **Seconded:** Roger MacMillan
- Mr. Sanford made a motion to approve the replacement windows at 78 Fair Street:
  - *ACTION by the Village of Cooperstown, Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board*
  - *RESOLUTION DATE: April 11, 2017.*
  - *A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE a permit for the replacement of non-original windows with Anderson Renewal Windows(full divided lights to match existing configuration) (eleven total- ten double hung and one picture window), on the house located at 78 Fair 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 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)(a)(b) / (3)(a)(b)(c)(d)*

*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 11th day of April, 2017, determine that the work for 78 Fair 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:** Dr. MacMillan
- **THE BOARD TOOK A VOTE WITH THE FOLLOWING RESULTS:**
  - *Ayes (5): Sanford / Callahan / Mershon / MacMillan / Kiss*
  - *Nays (0)*
- **MOTION CARRIED**
- The Board determined this to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes

## 2. **91 Beaver Street (Jack Labudde and Josh Edmunds, Simple Integrity)**

Field change for rear deck (no ZBA review needed)

- **Present/Participating:** Jack Labudde and Josh Edmunds, Simple Integrity
- **Description**
  - Small back deck on back of dwelling: 6' x 9'
  - Info on file is clear (materials/layout/dimension)
    - Decking: Trex
    - Lattice & Skirting: PVC
    - Rail: Painted Mahogany
    - Spindles: Turned paintable material (not vinyl)
- **Discussion**
  - No discussion
- **MOTION (FIELD CHANGE)**
  - To approve field change for 91 Beaver Street for the addition of a 6 foot x 9 foot rear deck as presented
  - Made: Dr. MacMillan / 2nd: Mr. Sanford
  - Results:
    - Ayes (5): Callahan / Alexander / Mershon / Sanford / MacMillan
    - Nays (0)
    - **MOTION CARRIED**
  - The Board determined this to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes

## 3. **97 Pioneer Street (John Webb, Nelson Mondaca and Josh Edmunds, Simple Integrity)**

Proposed restoration of front porch. Replace columns, railing and stairs. Replace two (2) windows and shutters on front elevation (no ZBA review needed)

- **Present/Participating:** Josh Edmunds
- **Description:**
  - Current porch is aluminum sided and wrapped
  - Goal is to make it more aesthetically pleasing

- Renovation Plan
  - New roof
  - Upper cornice is not replaced (existing will remain)
  - New posts, railings, stairs
    - Existing square pillars will be replaced with round pillars (due to owners' personal preference)
  - Replacement shutters will be either composite or aluminum (same material as shutters on house)
  - Proposed application updates
    - to replace the vertical slats beneath deck with new slats of like material and same dimension (not on the original application)
    - to replace existing aluminum door with a wood door
  - Windows are spec'd on the plan
  - Front railing: top rail is stained / spindles painted
- All members had the chance to review the changes
- **Discussion:** None
- **MOTION**

**Made by:** David Sanford / **Seconded:** Mark Mershon

**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: April 11, 2017.*

*A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE the renovation of porch and replacement of windows/shutters as submitted for 97 Pioneer Street:*

*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)(a)(b)(c) / (3)(a)(b)(d);*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regard to the proposed work at 97 Pioneer 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 11th day of April, 2017, determine that the proposed work at 97 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown 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 / MacMillan
- Nays (0)
- **MOTION CARRIED**
- The Board determined this to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes

- **NOTE: Brian Alexander left the meeting at 5:10 and was replaced by alternate, Gary Kiss**

#### 4. **31 Chestnut Street (Matthew Hazzard for Cooperstown Chamber of Commerce)**

-Proposed removal of rear ramp to be replaced with wooden steps, concrete sidewalk and planters (no ZBA review needed)

-Discussion of future plans to replace existing cedar shake roofing with asphalt shingles

- **Present/Participating:** Matthew Hazzard
- **Description:**
  - Proposing removal one of the two existing ramps
    - The failing ramp to be removed is on the Fowler/Doubleday side of the building
    - Proposing replacement with stairs and sidewalk
  - Proposing different roofing material
    - Would like to replace existing cedar shakes with architectural asphalt shingles because of significant difference in cost of materials
      - Apx \$17,000 difference between cedar and asphalt shingles
      - Fundraising to pay for some portion
  - Will be returning with applications for additional improvements over the next year
- **Discussion**
  - **Liz Callahan-HPARB**
    - HPARB needs detailed specs for proposed shingles because of change in material
    - HPARB approval for roof will need to wait for a future meeting after specs have been submitted and reviewed
  - Inquiry (Dave Sanford-HPARB): Is removing the ramp a demolition?
    - No, it is NOT a demolition because it is not part of the building
      - Public hearing is NOT required
  - Inquiry (Liz Callahan-HPARB): Will wood used for steps match existing materials?
    - Matthew Hazzard stated it will match
      - Hoping to use a lot of material recycled from the ramp being removed
  - Inquiry (Matthew Hazzard): Is HPARB approval required to remove rotted planters
    - HPARB approval is NOT required because they are not part of the structure
- **MOTION**
  - **MOTION**
  - MADE: Roger MacMillan / 2nd: David Sanford

**Roger MacMillan** 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: April 11, 2017.*

A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE a permit for the proposed removal of rear ramp to be replaced with concrete sidewalk and planters and with wooden steps as required on the property located at 31 Chestnut Street, Cooperstown, NY

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)(a)(b) / (3)(a)(b)(d);

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regard to the proposed work at 31 Chestnut Street, Cooperstown, NY

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 11th day of April, 2017, determine that the proposed work at 31 Chestnut 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**
  - The Board determined this to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes
- **Next Steps**
  - Matthew Hazzard will provide HPARB with additional detail and specs about the proposed roof material
  - 31 Chestnut will be put on the agenda of the next meeting (currently scheduled May 9, 2017) to approve changes to the roof as described

5. **26 Delaware Street (Michael Swatling and Jon McManus, McManus Engineering)**

Proposed replacement of doors and windows (no ZBA review needed)

- **Present/Participating:** Michael Swatling and Jon McManus
- **Description by applicant:**
  - Plans, window schedule and notated images are on file
  - Bottom windows-mostly replacement windows
  - Upper windows-mostly new construction windows because openings need to be enlarged to meet egress requirements and new windows will keep costs reasonable
  - Uppers windows will look substantially like to existing / trimmed out the same - proposing Marvin Ultras
  - Replacement windows are all the same size
  - North elevation



- Planning to remove a small window - no room for it, in awkward place
- Replacing 2 square windows with same size windows
- Kitchen (lower level): Plan to removed 2 existing windows and replace with 1 over sink window as per specs
- Replacing street-side attic window on with a vent that matches existing on other side
- West Elevation
  - Intend to remove/replace the porch
    - Will return with replacement porch proposal next month
      - Will be centered on the building and slightly offset under window
  - Proposing to remove 2 windows - (one of them is on the end of the building where there are already 2 egress windows / feels the window is in an awkward position)
- South Elevation
  - Porch - replace cedar decking in-kind, square stock spindles (currently no spindles)
  - Remove existing window and replace with over sink window as per specs
- Door will be moved
- Remove Attached Shed
  - Noted that porch is an "O'Brien Special" (approximately 4 feet tall)
  - Ms. Callahan noted this will require demolition permit because it involves structure
  - Replace with porch (8 feet x 8 feet or 10 feet x 10 feet) with a gabled roof
  - Will provide details before next month's HPARB meeting
- Want to replace all 3 doors with fiberglass, details to be provided before next meeting
- Stated that the most important thing to address at this meeting was the windows
- Existing shutters are being kept, existing trim will be matched
- Submitted letter that stated next door neighbor does not object to proposed changes
- Ms. Callahan noted that some proposed changes may impact "the symmetry of the house"
- Plan to use vinyl to patch asbestos siding
  - Would eventually like to clapboard the house but that is for future plans
  - Have not tried to explore condition of siding under the current siding because concerned about the cost of asbestos removal
- Discussion
  - Board members did not have any questions
  - Ms. Callahan stated
    - Doors will be addressed the at the next meeting so HPARB can review details
    - More info is needed on the replacement vent (materials / configuration, etc)
      - Mr. McManus stated it will be a painted wood louver vent, close to same size
    - Info on the proposed porch including materials, configuration, details etc
    - A public hearing to address the demolition of shed will be held at the May meeting
- **MOTION**
  - **MOTION**
  - Made by: Mark Mershon / 2nd: Roger MacMillan

**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: April 11, 2017.*

*A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE:*

- *Replacement of windows and the resizing of 2<sup>nd</sup> story window openings*
- *Replacement of the south porch*
- *Removal of 2 first floor windows and replacement with 2 over-sink kitchen windows at 26 Delaware 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)(a)(b) / (3)(a)(c)(d);*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regard to the proposed work at 26 Delaware 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 11th day of April, 2017, determine that the proposed work at 26 Delaware Street, Cooperstown 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.*

***Roger MacMillan*** *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**
  - The Board determined this to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes
- **Next Steps**
  - Public Hearing set for May 9, 2017 for the demolition of west elevation shed

## **6. 92 Lake Street (Bill Lusk)**

Field change to address removal of existing vinyl siding on existing structure to be replaced with wood siding to match addition (no ZBA review needed)

- **Present/Participating:** Bill Lusk
- Description
  - Proposing to remove existing vinyl siding and replace with wood to match siding on the 2 additions that have already been approved
    - Wood is to be hemlock
  - House currently has vinyl siding, aluminum fascia, etc
  - Expects existing siding underneath the vinyl will be in bad shape because the of the bad condition of the siding that was under the vinyl on the back side of the house
  - Proposed to replace single pane windows with 6-over-6 Marvin integrity box inserts
- Discussion

- Liz Callahan stated it was difficult to approve the windows at this time because they were not included in the application that had been submitted before the meeting
- Board members did not have additional questions or comments
- **MOTION (FIELD CHANGE)**
  - To approve field change for 92 Lake Street for
    - the replacement of vinyl siding with wood to match additions
    - the replacement of existing windows with Marvin Integrity 6-over-6
  - Made: Roger MacMillan / 2nd: David Sanford
  - Results:
    - Ayes (5): Callahan / Mershon / Sanford / MacMillan / Kiss
    - Nays (0)
    - **MOTION CARRIED**
- The Board determined this to be a major alteration for reporting purposes

#### 7. 53 Pioneer Street (Representatives of 53 Pioneer Foundation and Redpoint Builders)

Follow up on existing permit

- **Present/Participating:** Teresa Drerup, volunteering services as architect and Tom Lieber, Board Chair
- **Description**
  - On File: Narrative explaining what has been done since last time they came before HPARB
  - Established a new Foundation associated with the building
    - They represent a 501(c)3 currently known as 53 Pioneer Foundation (name TBD)
    - Foundation has a Board, a Building Committee, some money
  - Building engineer has been there 3 times and is working with Tim Horvath to do selective interior demolition to discover cause of front wall heaving
  - Removing the porch indicates heaving is probably due to how the porch was attached which allowed water to penetrate the stones
  - Proposing rebuilding the front wall from that point down
  - Seeking HPARB approval to infill the well between the sidewalk and the building to stabilize the foundation and allow rebuilding of the wall
  - There is no longer a need for the well because there is basement access from the back
  - A future goal is to remove existing (hazardous) stairs and improve accessibility by replacing with a ramp in to the front entrance
  - Roger MacMillan stated that a ramp will create a dramatic change to the front of the building
    - Inquired if planned on having the ramp end in a landing in front of the door
      - Inquired why they want to remove the steps
    - Ms. Drerup explained there is not enough depth for a landing because of the way the steps are inset into the porch / you need 5' x 5' for a landing with a turn into the front door
    - Mr. Lieber stated the goal is to make a more accessible building although it will never be 100% handicap accessible
  - Liz Callahan asked Foundation representatives about proposed plans for infill and drainage
    - Building the wall before the ramp goes up?

- Depends because ramp may be part of the footing of the wall
- First the infill, then dismantle the wall
- What is the infill process?
  - Flowable fill aggregate (proposed by engineer) will be put in the well below grade, windows and doors in that area will be blocked out
  - Fill Will create a footing for existing foundation
- Removal of the porch showed the overhang was what caused most of the problems
- Footing needs to be stabilized, need to start from the bottom up
- Planning to incorporate a ramp starting from the same point as the fill
  - Do not think it will change the look of the front too much
  - Plan to reuse as much material as they can (posts, etc are in storage)
- Stabilizing the wall by creating a footing not contingent on ramp approval
- Wall will be built/made of faced cinderblock, plan to reuse all the original stones
- Plan to square things up as much as possible during the process
- Plan to come back to HPARB for window replacement but will try replicate what was there and save as much original material as possible
- Anything they do to the building will be a restoration
- Once the front wall is stabilized they will have to deal with the roof
- Stated they are excited to be trying to do the right thing for the Village / community
- Hope to get as much of the wall done before Fall 2017 as possible
- Concerned about the impact of Village sidewalk work and Smithy work on the fill
- **Discussion**
  - There was no discussion among HPARB members
- **Motion**
  - *No Motion Was Made*
  - *Applicants stated they were just providing HPARB with an update report and making sure that no one has a problem with the concept of the ramp*

8. **71 Chestnut Street (Charles and Barbara Lamb (current owners), Bank of Cooperstown (applicant))**

Proposed demolition of existing C. 1979 structure, listed as non-contributing in Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination.

- **Present/Participating:** Scott White, Bank of Cooperstown / Teresa Drerup, Architect
- **Description:**
  - 71 Chestnut is a non-contributing 1979 structure being sold by Charlie and Barbara Lamb
  - Bank of Cooperstown has agreed to buy the property from the Lambs if it is granted permission to demolish the structure
  - Public hearing required for demolition will be put on HPARB agenda for May
- **HPARB Discussion**
  - There was no discussion among HPARB members
- **Motion**
  - *No Motion Was Made*
- **Next Steps**

- public hearing set for May 9, 2017 for the demolition of structure

9. **48 Grove Street (Frank Miller for Clara Welch Thanksgiving House)**

Field change to make existing porch elevations level with interior floor elevation. (no ZBA review needed)

- **Postponed to later in the meeting because representative was not present**
- **Present/Participating:**
- **Description:**
  - Raised the porches and changed the substructure
  - Jane Gentile stated
    - Porch will be wood except fascia boards that are right above the lattice on the vertical face
    - 4 remaining porches will basically replicate the south porch raised in 2016
  - Liz Callahan stated: doesn't look any different / looks great
- **HPARB Discussion**
  - There was no discussion among HPARB members
- **MOTION (FIELD CHANGE)**
  - To approve field change for 48 Grove Street to raise existing porch elevations to be level with interior floor elevation
  - Made: David Sanford / 2nd: Roger MacMillan
  - Results:
    - Ayes (5): Callahan / Mershon / Sanford / MacMillan / Kiss
    - Nays (0)
    - **MOTION CARRIED**
  - The Board determined this to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes

10. **80 Beaver Street (Gary Kuch and Ellen Tillapaugh)**

Proposed installation of Bilco door to provide exterior access to basement. (no ZBA review needed)

- **Present/Participating:** Ellen Tillapaugh
- **Description:**
  - Propane tank will be relocated and screened (currently located in a window frame)
  - Enlarging the doorway and installing a Bilco door so that oil tank can be taken in and out
  - David Sanford suggested they look into purchasing removable stairs (made for the purpose of moving tanks, etc)
- **HPARB Discussion**
  - There was no discussion among HPARB members
- **MOTION**
  - Made by: Roger MacMillan / 2nd: Gary Kiss

Roger MacMillan 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: April 11, 2017.*

*A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE a permit for: installation of Bilco door to provide exterior access to basement on the house located at 80 Beaver Street, Cooperstown, NY*

*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. (5)*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regard to the proposed work at 80 Beaver Street, Cooperstown, NY*

*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 11th day of April, 2017, determine that proposed work at 80 Beaver 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.*

**Gary Kiss** *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**
- The Board determined this to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes

#### 11. **118 Main Street (Connie Haney)**

Proposed replacement of windows (no ZBA review needed)

- **Present/Participating:** Connie Haney
- **Description:**
  - Windows are in extremely poor condition
  - Proposed replacements (recommended by Bruce Hall to meet village guidelines)
    - All wood windows (Marvin Ultimate)
    - Painted to match
    - Exact same size and configuration as existing (1-over-1)
  - Realizes there is no real way to protect the windows from the elements so plans to use regular maintenance as a protective measure
  - Liz Callahan thanked Ms. Haney for doing the building justice and choosing great materials
- **Discussion**
  - There was no discussion among HPARB members
- **MOTION**
- Made by: David Sanford / 2nd: Roger MacMillan

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: April 11, 2017.*

*A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE a permit for: replacement of windows on the second and third floor of building located at 118 Main Street*

*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)(a)(b)(3)(a)(b)(c)(d) (5)*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regard to the proposed work at 118 Main Street*

*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 11th day of April, 2017, determine that the proposed work at 118 Main Street 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.*

***Roger MacMillan*** *seconded the motion and a vote on the motion had the following results:*

- Results:
  - Ayes (5): Callahan / MacMillan / Mershon / Sanford / Kiss
  - Nays (0)
  - **MOTION CARRIED**
  - The Board determined this to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes

## **12. Student input on changes to law**

- Present/Participating: 3 students (Amanda, Michael, Julia) from the Historic Preservation Class of the Cooperstown Graduate Program researched and wrote up an extensive set of recommendations aimed at streamlining the process and making things easier for both residents and the Board
- Some Key Elements of the Report
  - Updated the definition of demolition
  - Update the description of HPARB (recommended it be added to the Village website) to make it easier for residents to understand HPARBs function
  - Suggested that HPARB website should include FAQ to address things such as
    - “What happens if I do construction without going before HPARB?”
    - Matrix of elements required to be reviewed and acceptable replacements
  - Beefed up the sections related to demolition
- Jane Gentile stated that it could be helpful if the students identified other communities with lists of what residents were NOT required to come before HPARB for
  - HPARB could then recommend that the Trustees makes specific changes to the law reflecting this research and reducing the burden on HPARB
- HPARB board members commended the thoroughness, professionalism and usefulness of the report
- Feedback by HPARB requested by students (ASAP)
  - Feedback will not affect students’ ability to complete their assignment but will be helpful in making the report as useful as possible (which is their goal)
  - Liz Callahan stated that HPARB members will discuss the report and write-up board comments and suggestions for the students

- Students stated that *The more Cooperstown's laws correspond with NYS law, the more protection Cooperstown has*
- Students stated that the document was intended to be as useful to HPARB as possible
  - HPARB is free to update and make changes as needed

### 13. Review of Minutes for March 15, 2017 Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board meeting

- No one had comments, changes or corrections
- **MOTION**
  - **Made by: Roger MacMillan / 2nd: Mark Mershon**
  - **Roger MacMillan** made a motion to accept the minutes of the **March 15, 2017** meeting as submitted.
  - **Mark Mershon** seconded the motion
  - *The vote had the following results:*
    - *Ayes: (5): Callahan / MacMillan / Sanford / Mershon / Kiss*
    - *Nays (0):*
    - **MOTION CARRIED**

#### A. Other business

- In May HPARB meetings will revert to 5 pm start time
- Next HPARB Meeting currently scheduled to be held: Tuesday, May 9 @ 5:00pm
- May meeting will include an audit by a representative of the NYSHPO (CLG review)
- Plan to open each hearing scheduled for next month separately to avoid confusion

**Meeting Closed: 6:40pm**

Respectfully Submitted,

---

Mikal Sky-Shrewsberry, 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