

DRAFT

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 March 10, 2015. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Liz Callahan, Roger MacMillan, David Sanford, Ralph Snell. Alternates Brian Alexander and Ann Stewart were absent. Also in attendance was Zoning Enforcement Officer – Tavis Austin and Deputy Village Clerk – Jennifer Truax. Eleven members of the public were present.

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

Regular Agenda

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

Ms. Drerup reviewed the status of the application explaining that it was originally reviewed at the November 2014 meeting and at that time additional information regarding materials and elevation drawings were requested.

Mr. Broe stated that he has since provided a materials list and additional information regarding the proposed construction. He reviewed this information with the board.

Ms. Drerup stated that the board previously discussed the brackets and noted that there is a more appropriate design for the style of the porch, from the same manufacturer, which the board feels would be more appropriate.

Ms. Callahan stated that in reviewing the photos provided it appears that the chosen Sunray bracket does not fit the original design.

The board reviewed the brackets available from the proposed manufacturer and indicated the bracket which is more appropriate for the porch design. The board reviewed the column design and found them appropriate.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the setbacks have been approved.

Mr. Broe stated that he has received variances as necessary for the setbacks.

Ms. Drerup asked if the porch would have handrails.

Mr. Broe stated that the porch would have handrails as they are required due to the porch height.

Ms. Drerup asked if the material is plastic.

Mr. Broe stated that the material is a composite.

Ms. Drerup asked if the composite material is paintable.

Mr. Broe stated that the material is paintable.

Ms. Drerup stated that the board has approved composite materials in the past, when the site is in proximity to grade level.

Ms. Callahan asked Mr. Broe for details regarding the lattice work.

Mr. Broe stated that the lattice will be a square configuration (orthogonal) and will be boxed in when installed.

Ms. Drerup clarified that the lattice will have a frame around it.

Mr. Broe stated that was correct.

Ms. Callahan asked if the lattice would be made from wood.

Mr. Broe stated that the lattice material would be wood.

Mr. Snell asked for the details of the porch ceiling.

Mr. Broe stated that the ceiling will be 4' X 8' sheets of bead board which will have a boxed frame all the way around it.

Mr. Snell asked if the ceiling would be flat or angled with the rafters.

Mr. Broe stated that the ceiling would be flat.

Mr. Snell stated that he still does not feel adequate information has been provided to make a decision on this project. He stated that elevation drawings, which are drawn to scale, have been requested but not provided.

Mr. Sanford stated that the current drawings do not provide details regarding things such as how the porch marries to the residence.

Mr. Broe asked if he could create those drawings during the meeting and present them tonight.

Ms. Drerup stated that if the drawings were complete and to scale that they could be presented tonight. She asked Mr. Broe when he planned to start the project and if he had enough detail to produce those drawings tonight with accuracy.

Mr. Broe stated that he feels he could be fairly accurate on graph paper which he has with him and that he had hoped to begin the project within the next month.

Mr. Snell stated that three elevation drawings should be provided.

Mr. Sanford stated that a south, east, and west elevation are necessary to accurately evaluate the project.

Ms. Drerup asked if all of the required variances have been obtained.

Mr. Austin stated that all required variances have been received.

Ms. Drerup asked if there would be any window replacement or changes.

Mr. Broe stated that there would not be any changes to the windows.

Mr. Snell asked about the window on the east side of the residence and if it would be affected by the porch.

Mr. Broe stated that the windows on the east side have already been replaced.

Ms. Drerup asked when the windows were replaced and with what.

Mr. Broe stated that the windows were replaced last year with an Anderson double hung window.

Ms. Drerup asked if the windows were one over one.

Mr. Broe stated that they are two over two.

Ms. Drerup asked if the front door would be replaced.

Ms. Broe stated that it would be replaced.

Mr. Snell stated that details regarding the proposed door replacement must be provided.

Ms. Callahan asked if there are any other proposed exterior changes to the residence.

Mr. Broe stated that there are no other exterior changes.

Ms. Drerup informed Mr. Broe that he should provide a product sheet for the proposed door.

Dr. MacMillan made a motion to continue Mr. Broe's application for 8 Elk Street until receipt of the necessary additional information including elevation drawings and details regarding the door replacement. Ms. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell Motion carried.

22 Pioneer Street (Tim Horvath, Redpoint Builders for Helene Bonier) – Proposed window relocation, new chimney and single story wing rebuild

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Horvath for details regarding the proposed door.

Mr. Horvath stated that the diagram provided is a fairly accurate example but that the door would have smaller muntins as the ones shown are too thick.

Ms. Callahan clarified that the door shown was just a sample but not the actual door.

Mr. Horvath stated that that was correct. He continued to review the proposed chimney explaining the height, width and the need for two hood vents.

Ms. Drerup asked if the hood vents will affect the width of the chimney.

Mr. Horvath explained that the hood vents will be on both sides of the flue and will affect the width but he is not sure of the exact measurements as the parts are not American standard measurements. He further explained that the hearth is about three feet in height and will affect the width of the chimney.

Ms. Callahan stated that the height of the hearth is why the shoulder of the chimney is so high.

Mr. Horvath stated that it is.

Ms. Callahan asked if Redpoint is doing the masonry work or subcontracting it.

Mr. Horvath stated that they will be subcontracting the masonry work.

Dr. MacMillan asked what the brick is.

Mr. Horvath provided a printed copy of the proposed brick. He stated that he does not currently have an actual sample as they are not available due to weather conditions. He continued to state that the proposed brick has a nice historic look with highs and lows in color variation.

Ms. Drerup stated that the board needs actual dimensions and material specifics before granting approval.

Mr. Horvath stated that the chimney will not be installed for another three to four months and that there is time to wait for that approval. He further stated that approval for the windows and door is needed as soon as possible but the other details can wait. Mr. Horvath asked for clarification on what changes need HPARB approval.

Ms. Drerup explained that any exterior change requires approval.

Mr. Horvath reviewed the proposed door. He explained that the existing door may be original to the home but he is not sure. He continued to state that the new door would be built to match the existing door. He shared the location of the proposed door.

Ms. Callahan clarified that the existing door would not be replaced but its design would be duplicated for the addition of a second door.

Mr. Horvath stated that was correct.

Ms. Drerup stated that the existing door has 12 lights. She asked if the new door would have 12 lights.

Mr. Horvath stated that the new door may only have 8 lights as 12 is more difficult to build and is not as aesthetically pleasing.

Ms. Drerup asked if the door would be constructed of wood.

Mr. Horvath stated that it would be made of wood.

The board further reviewed the door and its placement. It was noted that the door will not be visible from any public way.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the proposed window changes. She asked Mr. Horvath to clarify that the windows would just be relocated and not replaced.

Mr. Horvath stated that that was correct. He explained that the original sills, frames, sashes, etc. would all be moved as necessary to the locations indicated on the drawings.

Mr. Sanford asked what would happen should any part of the window not be reusable.

DRAFT

Mr. Horvath stated that there is no rot on the windows and he feels that they are in good condition. He explained that should they find disrepair he will replicate any necessary components.

The board reviewed the placement of each window.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Horvath about the use of shutters.

Mr. Horvath stated that he is not sure if shutters will be used.

Ms. Drerup stated that when a decision is made regarding the shutters it should be reviewed by this board.

Mr. Horvath stated that he would provide information on the shutters when a decision is made.

Mr. Snell asked about drawings for the addition.

Mr. Horvath stated that he is working on complete drawings and will provide them as soon as possible.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Horvath if he is just looking for a decision on the windows and door this evening.

He concurred that he was only looking for a decision on the windows and doors tonight.

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: March 10, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed relocation of the windows and installation of a new door at 22 Pioneer 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), (3)(b), (3)(c), and (3)(d).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the relocation of existing windows and the installation of a new door at 22 Pioneer 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 March 2015, determine that the work at 22 Pioneer 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.

Ms. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

DRAFT

The board determined this action to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes.

19 Elm Street (Cynthia Falk for the First Baptist Church) – Proposed garage door replacement in the parsonage

Dr. Falk reviewed the application for a new garage door. She explained that the garage at the parsonage is listed as non-contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form. She continued to state that the pastor has recently retired and had been using the garage area as storage. Now that the new pastor and his family have moved in they have discovered that the existing garage door is not operable. She explained that the current door is a very heavy wood door with windows and they would like to replace the door with an insulated steel door with no lights.

Ms. Drerup asked if there were other windows in the garage which would provide some natural light.

Dr. Falk explained the location of other windows in the garage. She explained that due to the proximity of the garage to the driveway used by the church it was felt that a solid door would be more appropriate.

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: March 10, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed replacement garage door at 19 Elm 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 garage is listed as non-contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(c), and (3)(b).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed garage door at 19 Elm 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 March 2015, determine that the work at 19 Elm Street, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.

Ms. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

The board determined this action to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes.

17 Eagle Street (CR Jones) – Proposed installation of three windows

Mr. Jones reviewed his application to place three small windows, where a bathroom is being located inside the residence.

Ms. Drerup asked what material the windows would be constructed from.

Mr. Jones stated that the windows would be wood framed thermal-glass windows.

The board reviewed the location and the width of the trim.

Ms. Drerup recommended that the casings around the windows not be made too small as it would look out of proportion. She recommended that it not be less than 4 inches.

Mr. Snell concurred.

Mr. Jones stated that they may also need to replace some clapboard when the windows are installed due to poor condition.

Ms. Drerup asked what it would be replaced with.

Mr. Jones stated that it would be replacement in-kind with wood clapboard siding.

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: March 10, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed windows at 17 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), (3)(a), (3)(b), and (3)(d).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed windows at 17 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 10th day of March 2015, determine that the work at 17 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.

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

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

The board determined this action to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes.

22 Mill Street (Simple Integrity/Josh Edmonds) – Proposed windows and door replacement

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and asked if just the first floor windows would be replaced.

Mr. Edmonds stated that they would only like to replace the three windows on the first floor.

Ms. Drerup asked why they were proposing replacement of just those three windows.

Mr. Edmonds stated that due to the aluminum storm windows the fire code requires replacement for egress. He explained that interior changes are being made to the home to accommodate the elderly couple who resides there. He further stated that the windows are necessary for bedroom egress.

Ms. Drerup asked if the windows open and if they are in poor repair.

Mr. Edmonds stated that they are not rotten but are single pane windows with storms. He further stated that he does not believe they are original to the residence but they are not newer replacements. Mr. Edmonds stated that the front room has very large windows with no lights but the storms placed over the windows have lights. He explained that the goal in this area is to eliminate the storms.

Ms. Callahan stated that with the storm windows in place it is difficult to determine if the windows are original.

Ms. Drerup asked if the proposed windows are inserts.

Mr. Edmonds stated that they are Marvin Integrity, fiberglass exterior and wood interior, insert windows.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the proposed front door replacement.

Mr. Edmonds stated that the door and side lights would be replaced as a whole unit but with a Therma-tru fiberglass unit.

Ms. Drerup asked if the replacement would be the same design.

Mr. Edmonds stated that it would be the same design with the same light configuration and other details such as wood grain.

Ms. Drerup asked if the unit can be obtained in a smooth finish rather than wood grain.

Mr. Edmonds stated that he does not know.

Mr. Snell agreed that a smooth finish would be more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Edmonds asked if he understands correctly that the board would like a smooth finish on the door.

Ms. Drerup stated that was correct.

Mr. Edmonds asked if a wood grain could be used if he is unable to get a smooth finish.

Mr. Snell stated that it would be okay but the preference is a smooth finish.

Ms. Drerup asked if the door replacement is just to upgrade the door.

Mr. Edmonds stated that the existing door locks with a wooden spoon, and must be forced open and closed. He stated that the residence is being retrofitted to allow the aging residents to remain in the home.

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: March 10, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed replacement windows and door at 22 Mill 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)(d), and (5).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed replacement windows and door as submitted for 22 Mill 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 March 2015, determine that the work at 22 Mill 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.

Ms. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

The board determined this action to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes.

83 Pioneer Street (Mike Richtsmeier) – Proposed fence in rear yard

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application for a fence in the rear yard and asked if the existing steps would be swapped.

Mr. Richtsmeier stated that the steps would be swapped.

Ms. Drerup asked if a gate would be installed.

Mr. Richtsmeier stated that there is one gate proposed on the entry side of the property which would be made of the same material.

Ms. Drerup asked if the fence would be painted or left natural to weather.

Mr. Richtsmeier stated that they intend to leave it natural and allow it to weather.

Ms. Drerup asked what material the fence was made from.

Mr. Richtsmeier stated that he does not know the exact material but it is a standard Home Depot product.

Mr. Snell asked if any trees would be removed.

Mr. Richtsmeier stated that no trees would be removed.

Mr. Snell asked about the pine trees on the back of the property.

Mr. Richtsmeier stated that he has not walked the property line but would adjust the location of the fence if necessary to avoid the trees.

Mr. Austin stated that according to the Home Depot website the product is a treated pine.

Ms. Drerup stated that the fence is well off the property line and under four feet in height so would not require any variances. She stated that the "good" side would need to face the neighbors.

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: March 10, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed fence at 83 Pioneer 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 residence at this location is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- The proposed work is in keeping with the neighborhood;*
- The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), and (3)(b).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed fence at 83 Pioneer 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 March 2015, determine that the work at 83 Pioneer 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 the following discussion was held.

Ms. Snell asked that the gate be reflected on the plans or in the motion.

Mr. Richtsmeier added the gate to the plans.

Ms. Drerup asked if the fence would require posts.

Mr. Richtsmeier stated that 4" X 4" posts would be used.

DRAFT

Ms. Drerup stated that the caps on the posts should not extend over 4' in height. She also noted that when installing the fence sections, the applicant may wish to raise the sections off the ground to enable grass trimming.

Mr. Richtsmeier agreed, and stated he would be sure the fence and posts were not over 4' high.

Ms. Drerup asked if there was a specific fence name or model number which could be referenced in the application or motion.

Mr. Austin stated that according to the website it is a 3 ½ foot high by 8 foot long pressure treated pine gothic fence model number 0360850.

Ms. Drerup referenced the model number on the application.

Mr. Richtsmeier asked if he would need to come back before the board to change the location of the rear of the fence.

Ms. Drerup stated that he would only need to come back for a design change or if there was a major change in the location but an adjustment to the exact rear placement would not require further review.

A vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

The board determined this action to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes.

60 Lake Street (John McManus – McManus Engineering for Leatherstocking Corp) –
Proposed installation of PODs with a roof to be in place for a period of more than six months

Mr. McManus reviewed the application and provided new plans which indicate two rather than three pods. He explained the location where the pods will be placed and that they will be custom built with doors in the side rather than the ends.

Ms. Callahan asked if the storage containers will be temporary or seasonal.

Mr. McManus stated that at this time they are not proposed as temporary or seasonal but as permanent structures.

Mr. Snell asked if there was any determined length of time that they might be in place.

Mr. McManus stated that they are to be in place for an undetermined amount of time.

The board discussed the location and design of the storage pods.

Ms. Drerup asked if the units will cover the windows.

Mr. McManus stated that the units will obstruct the first floor windows. He explained that the rooms in which the windows are covered are only used for incidentals. Mr. McManus stated that the units will be installed approximately three feet from the building to allow for water and ice to fall from the main roof without falling on the units.

Ms. Drerup asked the height of the units.

Mr. McManus stated that the units are 8 ½ feet tall and come just below the window header. He further stated that with the roof the entire window will be covered.

Ms. Drerup asked if the units are freestanding.

Mr. McManus stated that they are and will not be attached to anything. He further stated that the roof is for visual aesthetics, specifically for those looking out the windows and the reduction of noise. He pointed out that the units are not visible except from the upper story windows, and not from any point as you drive around.

The board discussed the roof design and color of the units and roof.

Ms. Drerup asked if there would be signage on the units.

Mr. McManus stated that they come with signage on them but since they are being custom designed and owned by Leatherstocking Corporation he does not see why they cannot paint over the signage.

Ms. Drerup stated that although she does not like the units she does not feel that there is anything in the law which would allow denial.

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: March 10, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed POD storage units at 60 Lake 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 structures at this location are listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b), and (3)(b).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed storage units at 60 Lake 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 March 2015, determine that the work at 60 Lake 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.

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

Ms. Drerup stated that she is only voting for this project due to it not being visible from a public way.

A vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford

NAYES: Snell Motion carried.

The board determined this action to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes.

Mr. Snell recused himself at 6:12 PM.

9 Pine Blvd (Susan Snell, Architect) – Proposed field change to approved plans

Ms. Snell reviewed the proposed field changes, explaining the details of the stone facing and parged foundation, the removal of the proposed Bilco door, the new pass door to the basement, and details of the deck on the rear of the residence.

The board reviewed the proposed changes, clarified the details regarding the finishing of the basement walls, grading on the rear of the property, and details of the door and deck.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to approve the field changes as noted on the drawings dated 03-10-2015 and highlighted with asterisks. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford Motion carried.

18 Elm Street (Susan Snell, Architect) – Proposed exterior modifications to door, windows and dormer

Ms. Snell reviewed the application stating that most of the work on the residence is interior changes. She reviewed the drawings which indicate the exterior changes. She explained that there is an icing problem over the doorway, therefore, the proposed hood. She continued to explain that the existing dormer will be raised to allow the ceiling be raised to help insulate the roof and a new window added to the west elevation.

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: March 10, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed exterior modifications to the door, windows and dormer at 18 Elm 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 features being altered were original to the residence but some alterations have been made previously;*
- Although some of the changes can be seen from the public way the changes are in keeping with the character of 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 exterior modifications at 18 Elm 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 March 2015, determine that the work at 18 Elm Street, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.

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

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford Motion carried.

The board determined this action to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes.

Mr. Snell returned to the Board and Ms. Callahan recused herself at 6:31 PM.

12 Maple Street (Liz Callahan) – Proposed replacement/repair rock face block

Ms. Callahan reviewed the application and condition of the existing foundation block. She explained that the driveway side is severely deteriorated due to weather and moisture. She continued to state that in the 1970s the siding was placed on the residence which had protected the block but in 2008 during renovations the siding was removed to help maintain the historic façade. Ms. Callahan stated that estimates have been obtained to replace the existing block in-kind but the labor costs are extremely extensive. In addition the work to replace the block could compromise the foundation and create other structural issues.

The board reviewed the proposal to use lath to repair the compromised area.

Mr. Snell stated that he is concerned that this process may make this area stand proud.

The board reviewed the process and shared questions with Ms. Callahan.

Ms. Callahan stated that she is not looking for approval at this meeting and will try to obtain additional information prior to the April meeting. She asked that the members of the board forward any additional questions to her so that she can seek answers prior to the next meeting.

Ms. Callahan returned to the board and Mr. Snell recused himself at 6:50

28 Railroad Avenue (Mike Manno/TMO Construction) – Proposed demolition

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application to demolish the newly restored historic building at 28 Railroad Avenue.

Mr. Austin stated that he does not feel that the board will be able to permit the demolition based on the context of the law.

The board reviewed the law and determined that a public hearing is required for any demolition. They asked that Mr. Manno be encouraged to attend to provide clarification as to the reasons behind the request to demolish the structure.

DRAFT

Mr. Austin stated that Mr. Manno is aware that he is not required to attend any meeting but he will extend him the invitation. He further stated that he believes that Mr. Manno may be applying for the demolition as he is aware he needs a denial before he can proceed with a hardship application.

Ms. Drerup set a public hearing for the proposed demolition of the structure at 28 Railroad Avenue for 5 PM on Tuesday, April 14, 2015.

Other Business

Mr. Austin stated that he is anticipating application for the three empty lots in Lakeland Shores to submit applications for proposed homes in the next couple of months.

Minutes:

Mr. Snell made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 10, 2015 meeting as submitted. Ms. Drerup seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 7:01 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Truax
Deputy Village Clerk