

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 October 14, 2014. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Liz Callahan, Roger MacMillan, Wendell Tripp and alternate – David Sanford. Member Ralph Snell was absent. Also in attendance was Zoning Enforcement Officer – Tavis Austin and Deputy Village Clerk – Jennifer Truax. Four members of the public were present.

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

Regular Agenda

Lakeview Drive South Lot 10 (Judy Weinstock) – field change to previously approved new garage

Ms. Drerup reviewed the proposed field change to widen the garage and move the entire structure forward on the lot to accommodate the extra garage width while not encroaching on the required easements. She asked Ms. Weinstock if that was the only proposed change.

Ms. Weinstock stated that the garage width and slight relocation of the proposed structures are the only changes.

Mr. Austin stated that Ms. O'Neill-Keiler has also provided a complete material list as previously requested.

The board reviewed the material list.

Ms. Drerup inquired as to whether the material listed as fiberglass for the railings was actually a shiny vinyl material.

Ms. Weinstock stated that they do not like the look and feel of vinyl and that it would be a fiberglass material not vinyl.

Ms. Callahan asked Ms. Weinstock if there is a reason why the material list is not complete.

Ms. Weinstock stated that the material list is complete but that for some areas more than one material is listed. She explained that they are not completely sure of all materials because they want to have the opportunity to see, and evaluate each material to ensure it is the best for their home and personal preferences.

Ms. Callahan made a motion to approve the field change for Lakeview Drive South Lot 10 as proposed, increasing the footprint of the garage and moving the entire residential structure forward on the lot. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

Motion carried.

5 Susquehanna Avenue (Lee Malone) – Stop Work Order – Re-roof structure with a change in material

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and explained that it was her understanding that Ms. Malone did not realize a Certificate of Appropriateness was required prior to changing the

roofing material. She further stated that no work has commenced since the stop work order was issued.

The board reviewed the application to re-roof the main house.

Ms. Drerup asked Ms. Malone what material was being used for the new roof.

Ms. Malone stated that she does not know the details only that it is metal.

Ms. Drerup stated that the application indicates that snow guards will also be installed to prevent major snow slides off the roof.

Ms. Malone stated that to be correct.

Ms. Drerup stated that due to the orientation of the gable the roof is not as visible from the street as some residences.

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: October 14, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed new roofing material at 5 Susquehanna Avenue, 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 residential 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 re-roofing of the main residence at 5 Susquehanna Avenue;

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 14th day of October 2014, determine that the proposed work at 5 Susquehanna Avenue, 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: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

Motion carried.

The board determined this project to be a minor alteration.

40 Walnut Street (McManus Engineering for Matthew Barowski) – Proposed second floor breezeway addition

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and asked if the addition would serve as a second floor connector between the two structures.

Mr. Novak stated that he believes it may be storage but that he is not involved in this project. He further stated that Mr. McManus is out of town and asked him to attend the meeting in his absence.

The board reviewed the proposed addition and discussed the layout of the garage.

Mr. Austin provided the board with the file copy of the previously approved garage.

The board reviewed the garage plans and discussed the apparent lack of stairs to access the second floor.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Novak if there are stairs in the garage.

Mr. Novak apologized stating that he does not have knowledge of the details of the existing structures.

Ms. Drerup questioned the height of the proposed breezeway.

Mr. Novak stated that the total height would be nine feet.

Ms. Drerup stated that given the height, the photo mockup seems to be fairly accurate. She asked if there would be an additional window on the rear of the breezeway or just the one awning window as indicated in the photo mockup.

Mr. Novak stated that there would only be the one window as shown.

Ms. Drerup asked if the existing breezeway roof would protrude as depicted in the photo mockup.

Mr. Novak stated the roof will be as shown in the photo mockup.

Ms. Callahan asked why the proposed window is not a one over one to match the existing dormer windows in the garage.

Mr. Novak explained that the proposed awning window is the same proportions as one light of the double hung windows.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Novak to provide for the record a copy of the garage elevation as previously submitted with the breezeway addition indicated to include the correct dimensions.

Mr. Sanford asked if, given the total height of the breezeway, the addition only had knee walls.

Mr. Novak stated that he does not have those details.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the windows as installed in the garage and the proposed window for the breezeway. She pointed out that they are Anderson windows and that the original drawings for the garage indicated the 400 series but that appears to have been changed to the 200 series. She continued to state that the proposed window is listed as a 400 series.

The board discussed the neighboring properties in relation to Ms. Fines' property.

Dr. Tripp asked Ms. Fines if she would be utilizing the neighboring fences for her purpose.

Ms. Fines stated that the fences already exist and there is no need to add additional fencing in those areas.

Ms. Drerup asked what color the fence would be.

Ms. Fines stated that it is used fence which has already been stained a wood color and that she has no plans to change the color.

Ms. Drerup stated that the application indicates that the fence is 42 inches in height.

Ms. Fines stated that 42 inches in height is correct.

Ms. Drerup asked if the posts would be higher than the fence height of 42 inches.

Ms. Fines stated that the posts would not be higher than the fence. She stated that she would use pressure treated 4 X 4 posts which would be no higher than the fence.

Ms. Drerup asked which side would face the neighboring properties.

Ms. Fines stated that she thought that the good side needs to face the neighbor.

The board discussed the fence and which side would be considered the good side.

Ms. Drerup stated that with this style fence she does not feel there is a bad side.

Dr. MacMillan stated that the property is unique in its shape, open space in the rear yard, and the number of neighboring properties it touches. He stated that he hates to see the rear yard chopped up by fences.

Ms. Drerup stated that the only area which is blocked is where the gate will be installed; otherwise the fences will be on or near the property line.

Mr. Sanford asked if there was a significant elevation change between this property and 45 Susquehanna Avenue.

Ms. Fines stated that there is some elevation change and proceeded to describe the elevation around the property line for 43 Susquehanna Avenue. Ms. Fines asked if there were rules and regulations regarding the physical installation of fence which she should be aware.

Mr. Sanford stated that the good side must face the neighbor.

Dr. Tripp 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: October 14, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed fence at 43 Susquehanna Avenue, Cooperstown, NY

taken to protect the windows during the sidewalk construction but he has not been contacted by Mr. Ferrara.

Ms. Callahan asked if there was any course of action for 10 Linden Avenue, where a new window was installed after the board denied the application.

Ms. Drerup stated that she does not think that the window has been removed and replaced but rather a storm window placed over the original window.

Mr. Austin stated that he would check the status of the window at 10 Linden Avenue after the meeting this evening and if the window has been replaced a ticket will be issued.

The board asked the status of the application for 124 Main Street.

Ms. Drerup stated that after the September meeting her firm was approached by the owners of 124 Main Street about serving as design architect the proposed structure. She stated that she has since been hired to provide design services for the project but she wants the record to indicate that at the time of the September meeting she was in no way affiliated with the project.

The board discussed the rescheduling of the November meeting due to the regular meeting date falling on Veteran's Day.

The November meeting has been reschedule for Monday, November 10 at 5 PM.

The board discussed the need to review the new Model Law. It was agreed that the review of the Model Law should be placed on the November agenda to help remind the board members to review the law prior to the November meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 6:13 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Truax
Deputy Village Clerk