

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 November 10, 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. Ten members of the public were present.

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

Regular Agenda

6 Grove Street (B. Georgi) – proposed boundary line fence

Ms. Drerup reviewed the proposed fence and its location. She stated that the grade of the property increases steeply and asked if the posts will accommodate the increase in grade as the fence height increases.

Mr. Georgi stated that he believes that the posts will accommodate the increase.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the trees along the boundary are on this property.

Ms. Georgi stated that the trees are on this property. He stated that they were planted to provide screening but did not grow successfully.

Ms. Drerup asked how far back the fence will extend along the property line once the grade gets steep.

Mr. Georgi stated that the fence would stop after one section of fence once it reaches the point where the grade gets steep.

Ms. Drerup asked if the fence would extend to the sidewalk.

Mr. Georgi stated that the fence would extend to the sidewalk and stop once it reaches the sidewalk.

Mr. Austin clarified that the applicant may install the fence up to the sidewalk as long as it does not interfere with the sidewalk. He clarified that the fence is 4 feet in height and therefore will not require a variance to be placed in the setbacks.

Dr. MacMillan asked what material the fence will be constructed from.

Mr. Georgi stated that the fence will be vinyl.

Ms. Drerup asked if the finish on the vinyl would be glossy.

Ms. Georgi stated that the finish would be more of a matte finish not glossy.

Ms. Drerup asked if the fence design was the same on both sides.

Mr. Georgi stated that the fence is the same on both sides.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the treads would be composite.

Ms. Geddes-Atwell stated she does not know the exact material for the treads but something synthetic.

Ms. Drerup asked if the stringers are still in good condition.

Ms. Geddes-Atwell stated that the contractor has informed them that the stringers are still in good condition.

Ms. Drerup asked if the contractor would just remove and replace the treads leaving the stringers in place.

Ms. Geddes-Atwell clarified that the stringers would be moved to increase the width of the steps by approximately 3 inches and placed to align correctly. She continued to state that in the future a removable railing may be placed down the center of the steps for additional safety due to health conditions.

Ms. Callahan 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: November 10, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed front step replacement at 24 Delaware 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 steps are not an original feature of the structure but the change can be seen from the street;*
- *The proposed work is in keeping with the neighborhood;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(a), (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 step replacement at 24 Delaware 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 10th day of November 2014, determine that the proposed work at 24 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.

Dr. MacMillan 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.

10 Hoffman Lane (Terry & Paula Wyckoff) – proposed patio rail/fence

Mr. Austin reviewed the application and explained that this previously enclosed area has been turned into a patio. He explained that the wall that was in this location was removed due to being declared unsafe. He stated that County Codes require a guard rail be installed due to the drop off but the proposed structure is a fence which will meet the county's guard rail requirement.

Ms. Drerup asked how big a drop off is in this location.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the drop off is approximately 4' 3".

Ms. Drerup asked if the fence is rated for the force that may be needed by a guard rail.

Mr. Wyckoff explained that he does not know what force the fence is rated for. He explained that the fence will be secured into the existing concrete through the aluminum posts which the vinyl fence is installed over.

Ms. Drerup asked if there would be a gate or doorway to access this area from the outside.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that there would be one section of fence which will be removable for snow removal.

Ms. Drerup asked if the fence will be located on the property line.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it would be on the property line in the same location as the wall which was removed.

Ms. Callahan asked if the fence would be approved by the County Codes office. She indicated that it seems that the codes office should weigh in on the acceptability of the fence as a guard rail.

Mr. Austin stated that all fences are reviewed by County Codes because they are considered a structure.

Ms. Callahan stated that this is more of a guard rail than a fence and it is in that use that she has concerns.

Mr. Austin stated that he would encourage Mr. Swatling to speak with County Codes prior to installing the fence.

Ms. Drerup asked what the use of this area will be.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that it would be for private family use only.

Ms. Drerup asked if there are any letters of acquiescence from the neighbors.

Mr. Austin stated that one letter of acquiescence has been received.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that they have spoken with both neighbors but were unable to get a letter from Mr. Torrance as he is currently out of town.

Mr. Austin stated that he believes Mr. Broe intends to live at this residence. He further stated that the foundation has been repaired and that a large amount of interior work has already been completed.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he is glad to see the structure being repaired.

Mr. Austin stated that Mr. Broe has included the footprint and a photo of the original porch. He further explained that he intends to replicate the porch to exactly match the photo. He further stated that it is his understanding that no newer or synthetic materials will be used. He explained that the only change from the photo is not to inset the front steps but rather make them proud of the porch.

Dr. Tripp stated that it is difficult to tell from the photo exactly what the porch will look like.

Ms. Drerup stated that elevation drawings are needed to clarify the details such as where the roof meets the residence.

Ms. Callahan concurred that they need more detail.

The board discussed whether or not there is enough detail to act on the project.

Ms. Drerup suggested that they hold any decision till the later in the meeting to allow Mr. Broe more time to arrive, in the event that he is running late.

79 Chestnut Street (Jeff Katz) – Proposed garage door replacement

The applicant was not present; Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and indicated that the replacement door is of the same material and size only with the lights in the top row rather than the second row.

Mr. 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: November 10, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed garage door replacement at 79 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;*
- *The requirements of SEQRA have been met for this action;*
- *The residential and garage structures are listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work does not change any original features and the structure will not be altered;*
- *The proposed work can be seen from the public way and is in keeping with the neighborhood;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(a), (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(c), (3)(d), and (3)(e).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the installation of a new garage door at 79 Chestnut Street;

The board further reviewed the application including the photos and text to try to clarify which windows the applicant is proposing to replace.

Ms. Drerup stated that she does not feel that there is enough information to make a decision.

Dr. MacMillan stated he is not sure that the windows necessarily need replacement. He continued to state that just because they have been painted shut or the sashes need repair does not mean the entire window needs to be replaced.

Ms. Callahan concurred that there was not enough information to make a decision.

Ms. Drerup stated that she does not feel that the board has enough information to approve or deny the application and suggested that it be tabled to allow the applicant to provide more information.

Dr. MacMillan stated that there is an informational sheet which gives guidelines for window repair and replacement. He further stated that the guidelines should be followed.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to table the application for 40 Elm Street until adequate information regarding the proposed window replacement has been provided. Ms. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

Motion carried.

171-173 Main Street (Ed Landers) – Proposed residing and installation of egress roof

The applicant was not present. Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and questioned whether or not the existing siding will be removed.

Mr. Sanford stated that the existing siding is novelty siding and is probably semi-structural. He stated that the new siding would probably need to be installed over the existing siding.

Ms. Drerup asked if there are any regulations regarding fire rating of the siding due to the proximity of the neighboring building.

The board reviewed the proposed siding replacement and the egress roof which has already been installed. They concurred that additional information is needed to make a decision regarding this application.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to table the application for 171-173 Main Street until adequate information regarding the siding and egress roof has been provided. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

Motion carried.

46 Chestnut Street (Ed Landers) – Proposed window replacement

The applicant was not present. Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and stated that the applicant proposes to replace three windows.

Ms. Callahan stated that this is a very prominent structure and the windows will be very visible from the public way.

Dr. MacMillan stated that it is a travesty to replace these windows.

Mr. Sanford stated that the original windows were 2 over 2. He pointed out that additional muntins are not original but rather lay on the glass.

Ms. Drerup asked when the structure was built.

Mr. Austin stated that the structure is circa 1830.

Mr. Sanford stated that the residence across the creek to the north has the same type of 2 over 2 windows as are original to this structure.

Ms. Drerup stated that it is apparent in the photos that the muntins are not original to the windows but rather installed on the glass.

Mr. Sanford stated that it is clear that the windows are not true divided lights as you can see the peeling paint. He further stated that the grids were probably added to make the residence look colonial in design.

Ms. Drerup stated that she does not find specs on what windows are proposed to replace the existing windows.

Mr. Austin stated that Mr. Landers provided a photo of the proposed replacement windows which are vinyl and have grills between the glass.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the board can require Mr. Landers to restore the windows to the original 2 over 2.

Ms. Drerup stated that if the board chooses to allow the replacement of the windows they could stipulate that they be two over two. She continued to state that the windows are not now and never have been nine over nine as show in the photo of the proposed windows.

Mr. Austin asked if the board felt that they have enough information to determine that the window condition warrant replacement.

The board discussed if they felt enough information had been provided.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to table the application for 46 Chestnut Street until adequate information regarding the condition of the existing windows and specs for the proposed windows has been provided. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

Motion carried.

8 Elk Street (Patrick Broe) – Proposed reconstruction of the original porch

Ms. Drerup made a motion to table the application for 8 Elk Street until adequate information and/or elevation drawings are provided. Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

Motion carried.

134 Main Street (Perry's 134 Main Street LLC – Altonview Architects) – Proposed egress stairs

Ms. Drerup recused herself at 6:10 p.m.

Dr. MacMillan reviewed the application.

Dr. Tripp stated that he visited the site and went around to the rear of the building but was unable to determine the location.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the plans and described the need for the egress stairs to access the upper level apartments. She further discussed plans to remodel the apartments and the use of the lower level for a business and restaurant.

Ms. Callahan 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: November 10, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed egress stairs at 134 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)(a), (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), and (3)(c).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the egress stairs at 134 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 10th day of November 2014, determine that the work at 134 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. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

Motion carried.

Other Business:

Ms. Drerup returned to the board at 6:22 p.m.

Mr. Austin reported that the rigid insulation installed over the windows at 99 Main Street is temporary for the winter. He explained that the building suffered water damage from frozen pipes over the last couple of winters and the insulation is an attempt to help control the

temperature and drafts. He stated that the insulation would be painted black to lessen the visual impact.

Minutes:

Ms. Callahan made a motion to approve the minutes of the October 14, 2014 meeting as submitted. Ms. Drerup seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 6:33 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Truax
Deputy Village Clerk