

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 August 12, 2014. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Roger MacMillan, Ralph Snell, and Wendell Tripp. Also in attendance was Zoning Enforcement Officer – Tavis Austin and Deputy Village Clerk – Jennifer Truax. Five members of the public were present.

Ms. Drerup called the meeting to order at 5:00 PM.

Regular Agenda

25 Eagle Street (Glenn Hubbell) – proposed addition to a residential structure

Mr. Hubbell explained the proposed addition to provide a handicap accessible bedroom and bathroom on the first floor of the home. He stated that they have looked at purchasing a different home but have not found one that is suitable.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Hubbell to review the proposed window configuration.

Mr. Hubbell stated that he is proposing two double hung single light windows, ganged with a transom.

Mr. Drerup stated that although the shutters on the other windows are not operable they appear to be authentic and she appreciates that effort. She continued to state that the proposed shutters on this window seem out of place as they do not go the entire length of the windows nor are they wide enough to cover the window as shutters were intended to do.

Mr. Hubbell stated that he could increase the size of the shutters.

Ms. Drerup stated that it might be more appropriate to eliminate the shutters from this window. She further stated that she does not think the window is visible from a public way.

Mr. Snell stated that the window is visible from Beaver Street. He stated that he does not feel that the use of shutters on this window configuration is the best choice.

Mr. Hubbell stated that he was unsure about the shutters and is happy to remove them altogether.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Hubbell to review the proposed back porch extension.

Mr. Hubbell stated that the roof will be extended to cover the lift.

Ms. Drerup asked about the support posts for the roof.

Mr. Snell stated that a single post is shown in the drawing. He pointed out the post in the drawing.

Ms. Drerup asked if all of the trim would match the existing.

Mr. Hubbell stated that all the trim would match the existing and would be wood. He stated that Cooperstown Construction would be doing all of the work.

Ms. Drerup asked about the siding material.

Mr. Hubbell stated that the siding would be cement board, smooth side out. He clarified that all of the trim would be wood.

Ms. Drerup asked what siding material is on the existing porch.

Mr. Hubbell stated that it wood siding which was installed at the time of construction in the late 60s to early 70s.

Ms. Drerup clarified that the windows would be Marvin simulated divided light.

Mr. Hubbell stated that they would be and shared the spec book for the windows.

Mr. Snell asked about the foundation.

Mr. Hubbell stated that it would be a poured concrete crawl space.

Mr. Snell asked if the concrete would be left raw or parged.

Mr. Hubbell stated that he did not know if the concrete would be parged.

Mr. Snell stated that they may want to consider parging the concrete. He further stated that the porch roof extension, with only one support column looks as if it could flap in the breeze and therefore he might want to consider cutting the extension back some.

Mr. Hubbell stated that the contractor stated that the proposed work is structurally sound.

Mr. Snell stated that visually they may be happier with the appearance if the roof extension was smaller.

Mr. Hubbell suggested ending the roof at the end of the porch.

Mr. Snell stated that would look more proportionate and be more aesthetically pleasing. He stated that the proposed 4" X 4" post at the proposed height will look rather spindly. He suggested that the post be trimmed out to give it a more substantial look.

Mr. Hubbell stated that he would trim out the column.

Ms. Drerup asked if the windows were vinyl or aluminum clad. She pointed out that the email in the file indicated vinyl but she believes that the manufacturer only makes aluminum clad.

Mr. Hubbell stated that the windows would be aluminum clad.

Dr. 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: August 12, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed residential addition at 25 Eagle 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;*
- *The requirements of SEQRA have been met for this action;*
- *The structure is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(c), and (3)(d).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed residential addition at 25 Eagle 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 12th day of August 2014, determine that the proposed work at 25 Eagle 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 with the following conditions:

- *The windows be Marvin double hung aluminum clad;*
- *The porch roof not extend south beyond the existing porch roof;*
- *The column be boxed out in lue of a simple 4 X 4.*

Mr. Snell seconded the motion and the following discussion was held.

Dr. Tripp asked if proposed work was in the required setbacks.

Mr. Austin reviewed the footprint and stated that the proposed project does not violate the setbacks which are 10 feet per side and 20 feet in the rear. He stated that there is plenty of distance between the construction and the property lines to meet this requirement.

A vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Snell, Tripp Motion carried.

The board determined this project to be a major alteration to the property.

Lakeview Drive South Tax Map # 115.19-1-35.00 (Reberta O'Neill-Kieler for Weinstock family) – Proposed new single family residence

Mr. Austin informed the board that although this proposed construction is outside the waterfront overlay district being greater than 100 feet from the lake, it will require a special permit due to the fact that the current zoning map indicates the waterfront overlay district as being 200 feet from the lake. He stated that the application has been referred to the Trustees for the special permit.

Ms. Drerup asked if the map was incorrect.

Mr. Austin stated that he and Village Attorney, Martin Tillapaugh agreed that the map is incorrect. He further stated that they have asked that the map be corrected with the next zoning law change. He explained that the written law states that the waterfront overlay district is 100 feet from the shore but the map reflects 200 feet. He stated that although the written law would be the legally binding law it is in the best interest of the applicant to use the greater distance to ensure that there is no question regarding the legality of the approvals.

Mr. Snell stated that the drawings indicate “for concept only.” He questioned whether this was a conceptual approval or if Ms. O’Neill-Kieler was expecting approval tonight.

Ms. O’Neill-Kieler stated that she is looking for approval this evening. She explained that she puts “for concept only” on all of her drawings so that contractors do not use them for building.

Ms. Drerup stated that she also thought that the request was for conceptual approval as there are materials missing such as details regarding windows.

Ms. O’Neill-Kieler stated that the material list was provided. She helped Ms. Drerup locate the material list which was within the application.

Ms. O’Neill-Kieler stated that she has updated drawings due to changes to two of the elevation drawings and asked the board if she can replace the drawings which were previously submitted.

Mr. Snell stated that he is okay with reviewing the updated drawings as he does not see any point in wasting time reviewing old drawings.

Ms. Drerup concurred.

Ms. O’Neill-Kieler replaced the drawings and explained changes to the west and south elevations due to the addition of exterior stairs.

Ms. Drerup asked for the details of the siding.

Ms. O’Neill-Kieler stated that the siding would have an 8” reveal and would be cement board.

Ms. Drerup asked if she was correct in inferring that the roof has exposed rafter tails.

Ms. O’Neill-Kieler stated that the rafter tails would be exposed with tongue & groove cedar in between the rafters.

Mr. Snell asked what material would be used for decking.

Ms. O’Neill-Kieler stated that the decking material would be composite.

Dr. MacMillan asked what material would be used for siding.

Ms. O’Neill-Kieler stated that the siding would be a smooth cement board.

Mr. Snell asked what would be used for a garage door.

Ms. O’Neill-Kieler stated that she does not know what specific door will be used at this time. She indicated it would have a similar look to what is proposed.

Mr. Snell stated that he would like to see exact specs on the garage door.

Ms. Drerup asked Ms. O’Neill-Kieler if more detailed elevations would be developed to apply for the County Building Permit.

Ms. O’Neill-Kieler stated that she would not develop more detailed elevation drawings.

Mr. Snell asked what material would be used for the chimney.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that a decision on that material has not been made but she believes it will be face brick. She explained that they are trying to develop a camp look while remaining in character with the neighborhood.

Mr. Snell asked for details on the proposed stone wall.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler explained that the stone wall is a retaining wall.

Mr. Snell asked if there would be a railing along the wall.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that no railing is planned. She explained that they are trying to have a clean and simple look to the property.

Mr. Snell asked about the garage.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that it is a two car garage. She explained that due to the setback requirements from the homeowner's association and the setbacks required for the sewer line easement in the rear yard the placement of the house was difficult.

Ms. Drerup asked what materials would be used for the porch columns.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that they would be a square extruded material probably PVC.

Ms. Drerup stated that there is literature for two different decking materials submitted with the application and asked which would be used.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that no decision on which company would be used has been made at this time but the decking material will be a composite. She further stated that the columns would also be a manmade material and would be 8" X 8", with a shoe mold to keep the camp look.

Mr. Snell asked about the details for the railing.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that it would also be a manmade material.

Ms. Drerup asked if the spindles would be square.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that she plans to use a square 1" X 1" spindle to keep the look lighter.

Mr. Snell stated that the sheen of the manmade materials could create a problem for the desired look and recommended something with a low sheen.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler took Mr. Snell's advice and said she had not thought about that but concurred that it could be problematic.

Ms. Drerup asked what material would be used for the roof.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that it would have 30 year architectural shingles in a dark color such as weathered wood or dark gray.

Ms. Drerup asked for the detail of the lattice located under the porch.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that the lattice would be custom built of wood. She stated that she has not found a manmade material used for lattice that has an authentic look.

Ms. Drerup asked what materials would be used for the steps.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that it would be the same material as the decking.

Ms. Drerup stated that the application indicates that the doors will be Anderson 400 series. She asked for specifics on the windows.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that they are vinyl clad exterior with a wood interior.

Ms. Drerup clarified that other than the lattice there will not be any exterior feature which is wood.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that they may change to cedar siding but the goal is for the home to look like wood without the required maintenance. She stated that siding will be smooth as she feels it is the textures in manmade materials that get you into trouble visually.

Ms. Drerup asked about the horizontal trim band shown on the north elevation.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that the trim would be flat but would have a slight profile. She indicated that it would not carry around to the front side of the home.

Dr. MacMillan asked who the contractor for the project is.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that Mr. Karl Dykstra would be building the home.

Ms. Snell asked for information regarding the elevation which was not included in the application.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that all four elevation drawings had been included and helped Mr. Snell find the one he had missed.

Mr. Snell stated that given the 8" reveal of the siding it will be difficult to get the windows to line up appropriately. He suggested that the heads of the windows all be located at the same height and the location in the siding be taken into consideration when the exact height is determined.

Dr. Tripp asked if it is necessary to review these fine architectural details as the law only deals with the basic visuals of the compatibility with the neighborhood.

Ms. Drerup read aloud section 300-26.E (3)(d) *"Visual compatibility with surrounding buildings, structures, and properties, including proportion of the property's front façade, proportion and arrangement of windows and other openings within the façade, roof shape, and rhythm of spacing of properties on streets, including setbacks;"* She explained that these detail do affect the proportion and rhythm.

Mr. Snell stated he is still concerned over the drawings being labeled "concept."

Mr. Tripp asked Mr. Snell if he doesn't believe the proposal.

Ms. Snell stated that he does not know to what extent the drawings are still conceptual.

Dr. Tripp asked if he felt they would ask for one thing and build something else.

Ms. Drerup stated that if the owner did building something else the board would have no standing in court to say that they did not have approval due to the fact that the drawings say "for concept only." She stated it would be similar to the situation HPARB previously encountered where the fence approved was not what was installed but due to words "sample fence" in the application the court upheld the property owner's right to use discretion.

Mr. Snell asked if it was intended for the windows to be behind the porch posts.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that when designing the house her first priority was the placement of the doorways. She explained that once the doorways were in place she placed the columns symmetrically, and then placed the windows. She further explained that there is a lot going on inside of the home and she worked to provide the best for the client both in exterior and interior design.

Mr. Snell asked if all of the proposed cement board shingles have been removed in the new plans.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that all of the siding will be clapboard or flat vertical board.

Mr. Snell asked Ms. O'Neill-Kieler if she would remove the "for concept only" from the plans submitted for Village use and review.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler agreed to do so and proceeded to remove that statement from the drawings.

Ms. Drerup asked about the flat siding under the porch and if it would have vertical grooves.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that there would not be vertical grooves. She explained that it would be either a manmade or wood material with no grooves or battens.

Ms. Drerup asked if the east entrance would have just steps to enter, rather than a porch.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler concurred it would just be one step the width of the door.

Ms. Drerup asked the dimensions of the columns.

Ms. O'Neill Keifer stated that the columns are 8" X 8".

Ms. Drerup asked if the south elevation columns would also be 8" X 8" as they appear smaller on the drawing.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler corrected herself and stated that the south elevation will have 6" X 6" columns.

Mr. Snell 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: August 12, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed new construction at Lakeveiw Drive South, Lot # 19, Tax Map # 115.19-1-35.00, 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;*
- *The requirements of SEQRA have been met for this action;*
- *This is new construction and therefore not listed in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(c) and (3)(d).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed new single family residence at Lakeview Drive South Lot 19;

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 12th day of August 2014, determine that the proposed work at Lakeview Drive South, Lot 19, 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 with the following condition:

- *The approval is contingent on other government required reviews.*

Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Snell, Tripp Motion carried.

The board determined this project to be new construction.

34 Delaware Street (Jessie Ravage) – Proposed rear porch renovations

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and asked Ms. Ravage about the distance from the north side property line asking if it was at least the required 10 feet from the property line, as there is no dimension shown.

Ms. Ravage stated that it is at least 10 feet from the property line.

Ms. Drerup stated that she wanted to be sure that it did not need to be referred to the ZBA.

Ms. Ravage stated that she does not believe that is necessary but will go if needed.

Mr. Snell 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: August 12, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed rear porch renovations at 34 Delaware Street, Cooperstown, NY

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

Mr. Allstadt stated that the weight is not a concern as when they rehabilitated the residence they sistered new rafters on to the existing rafters.

Dr. MacMillan asked if it would be necessary to remove the gutters.

Mr. Allstadt stated that they would not take down the gutters as the panels were installed father up the roof.

Dr. MacMillan asked if snow and ice backup would be a problem.

Mr. Allstadt stated that he has heat tape in place which prevents ice and snow from backing up. He further explained that the panels will warm up and melt off snow of about 2 – 3 inches.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Allstadt if he was taking advantage of the rebates and tax credits.

Mr. Allstadt stated that NYSERDA is reimbursing \$1.00 per watt which is equivalent to the cost of a panel.

Ms. Drerup asked if that left only the installation changes for his cost.

Mr. Allstadt stated that the approximate cost of the project is \$25,000 and NYSERDA is paying the installer approximately \$8,000 and he will be billed the balance. He stated that in addition to this cost reduction he will receive a 25% State tax credit and a 30% Federal tax credit. He explained the way his electric account is credited and that it will take approximately 7 years for the panels to pay for themselves.

Mr. Snell 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: August, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed solar panels at 18 Main 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;*
- The requirements of SEQRA have been met for this action;*
- The structure is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(e), and (5).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed solar panel installation at 18 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 12th day of August 2014, determine that the proposed work at 18 Main 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.

Dr. Tripp seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Snell, Tripp Motion carried.

The board determined this project to be a minor alteration to the property.

10 Linden Avenue (Joseph Mikiewicz) – Proposed window replacement

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and pointed out that the window which Mr. Mikiewicz is requesting to replace is specifically identified in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form.

Mr. Snell read the excerpt from the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form for the board.

Ms. Drerup stated that she tried to find specs online for the proposed window replacement but was unsuccessful. She stated she does not feel there is enough information to act.

Mr. Snell stated that the window guidelines, which are attached to his application, indicate that vinyl replacements are not acceptable.

Mr. Austin stated that he asked Mr. Mikiewicz to explain and/or show the board that the window to be replaced is deteriorated beyond repair but to date he has not received any additional information from him.

Ms. Drerup stated that even if the window is deteriorated beyond repair additional information is needed about the proposed replacement, such as is the proposed window the same proportions as the existing window.

The board discussed whether or not a decision could be made given the current information available with this application.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to table discussion regarding the proposed window replacement at 10 Linden Avenue until additional information regarding the condition of the existing window and details regarding the proposed replacement windows are provided. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Snell, Tripp Motion carried.

52 Chestnut Street (Linda Flynn) – complaint regarding removal of shutters

Mr. Austin stated that he received an email complaint from Mr. Kuhn regarding the removal of shutters from the residence at 52 Chestnut Street. He explained that Mr. Kuhn indicated that the shutters were removed to paint but two weeks after the completion of the painting had not been rehung. Mr. Austin further stated that a second complaint was filed after one month which asked if a permit had been received to remove the shutters. Mr. Austin stated that he spoke with Ms. Flynn and was told that the home is being used as a long term rental and when the shutters were removed for painting they disintegrated. He stated that Ms. Flynn has indicated that the shutters have since been disposed of after being advised that there was not enough wood remaining to repair them. He asked the board if they felt that he should find the property owner in violation or if they wanted to handle the situation by another means. He continued to state that there is no evidence that the shutters were ever there, such as mounting hardware.

Mr. Snell stated that if they were deteriorated there is a good chance that they were original.

Mr. Austin stated that they were wood but it is not known if they were original. He stated that if he finds that the owner allowed a feature to deteriorate then it should technically be the previous owner who is fined as Ms. Flynn has just recently purchased the residence.

Dr. MacMillan asked if shutters are considered a historic feature.

Mr. Snell stated that they are.

Ms. Drerup referred to section 300-26.E (4)(e) and (f). She noted that these shutters are not specifically mentioned in the GHD nomination.

The board reviewed file photos of this property.

Mr. Snell stated that if shutters were not considered a historic feature and are not important to the character of the property and neighborhood then the board should not have reviewed them as part of the application for 25 Eagle Street tonight.

Mr. Austin stated that at that location the shutters are still in existence but at 52 Chestnut Street they are gone.

The board reviewed other situations in which historic features have been removed and disposed of and how they were handled.

Ms. Drerup stated that she feels that the board should at least have the opportunity to visit the property, in context with the neighboring properties.

Mr. Austin stated that he would speak to Ms. Flynn about the situation and encourage her to apply for a permit.

Minutes:

Mr. MacMillan made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 8, 2014 meeting as presented. Ms. Drerup seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Snell

ABSTAIN: Tripp

Motion carried.

Other Business

The board reviewed the new model law regarding historic preservation.

Meeting adjourned at 7:01 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Truax
Deputy Village Clerk