

## 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 Tuesday, April 14, 2015. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Liz Callahan, Roger MacMillan, Ralph Snell and alternate Brian Alexander. Member David Sanford and alternate Ann Stewart were absent. Also in attendance was Zoning Enforcement Officer – Tavis Austin and Deputy Village Clerk – Jennifer Truax. Twenty-four members of the public were present.

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

Mr. Alexander indicated that as a newly appointed member this evening he would be observing at tonight's meeting and not actively participating as a voting member.

### Public Hearing

**28 Railroad Avenue (Mike Manno/TMO Construction)** – public hearing for proposed demolition

Mr. Snell recused himself at 5:00 PM.

Ms. Drerup opened the public hearing at 5:01 PM and reviewed the application to demolish the newly restored historic building at 28 Railroad Avenue. She asked for public comment.

Ms. Ellen Pope spoke on behalf of Otsego 2000. She stated that as an environmental advocacy organization they have significant concerns over the proposed demolition. She explained that this is a prominent structure at the western entrance to the Village which has a strong connection to the history and culture of the Village and surrounding areas. She continued to provide the history of the structure which was built in 1890 as a warehouse for hops storage, and later used by Otsego Produce, as a grist mill prior to its most recent use as a feed store. Ms. Pope stated that the structure has been maintained remarkably well with much of its original design intact and the significant amount of recent work is to be commended. She further stated that to consider the demolition of this building is alarming and that Otsego 2000 would be glad to work with the current owner to find a common solution, which may not be the "most" profitable, would benefit all involved parties. Ms. Pope provided a written statement of her comments to the board for the record.

Mr. James Dean, Village Trustee, 15 Delaware Street, stated that he is opposed to the demolition of this building. He further stated that it is a great building with extreme potential and he does not understand why, after the significant amount of work done to restore the building, anyone would want to demolish it.

Ms. Drerup asked if there was any further public comment. There was no additional public comment at this time. Ms. Drerup stated that she would hold the public hearing open for a little longer before taking any action, and asked that the board move on to the next agenda item

### Regular Agenda

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

Mr. Snell returned to the board at 5:06 PM.

Mr. Broe provided elevation drawings of each side of the proposed porch.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the status the application and provided elevation drawings. She asked where the porch stairs are located on the side of the porch as they are not reflected in the side elevation drawing.

Mr. Broe stated that the stairs will be set into the porch due to the limited space and the existing driveway.

Ms. Drerup stated that the board previously reviewed the details of the proposed brackets and had indicated that the style as proposed was not appropriate to the character of the structure. She asked if any style changes had been made.

Mr. Broe stated that no change in the brackets have been shown in the application. He further stated that he was not sure what the board's preference was and that he is willing to consider a different bracket style.

Dr. MacMillan asked the distance between the fence and the proposed porch.

Ms. Drerup stated that the plans indicate 4'6". She asked Mr. Broe the height of the proposed railing.

Mr. Broe stated that the railing will be 36" high as measured from the porch floor.

The board further reviewed the proposed bracket and other style brackets available from the same manufacturer.

Mr. Broe and the members of the board agreed upon the style indicated as "Drury Lane Bracket".

The board reviewed the proposed material for the railings.

Ms. Drerup stated that the railing would be Perma Porch Railing System, Version 2 in a square stock and would not be shiny PVC.

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: April 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed front porch at 8 Elk 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 porch as indicated in the application and drawings labeled as Exhibit A dated 04/14/2015 at 8 Elk Street;*

## DRAFT

*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 14<sup>th</sup> day of April 2015, determine that the work at 8 Elk 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, Snell                      Motion carried.

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

**171-173 Main Street (Roberta O'Neill-Kieler for Ed Landers)** – Proposed shed roof over existing stairs

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application for the shed roof and windows. She asked that they review the roof first.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that it was her understanding that the board had requested that more detailed drawing be provided.

Ms. Drerup stated that the board had requested more information including detailed drawings of the proposed work.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler reviewed the drawings provided and the additional trim to be added to the existing structure.

Ms. Drerup asked if the engineer had reviewed the structure and determined it to be sufficient.

Mr. Landers stated that although he had not received the engineer's report, he has spoken with the engineer who has indicated that all of the rafters should be doubled, but that the rest of the structure is satisfactory.

Ms. Drerup asked if the ceiling of the structure would remain open.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that they could do a bead board ceiling.

Ms. Drerup asked if the posts would be trimmed out.

Mr. O'Neill-Kieler stated that they would finish them out in the same manner as the other trim work.

The board discussed concerns regarding the structural integrity of the structure as well as how the structure would be finished.

Ms. Callahan stated that she is not only concerned with the aesthetics but also the stability of the structure. She stated that the footing of the post is one area of concern and that is why she would like to see the engineer's report.

Mr. Snell asked if the plywood and 2" X 4" braces would be removed.

Mr. Landers stated that they would be removed.

Ms. Drerup expressed concern over the need for a railing.

Mr. Landers stated that they could include a railing.

Ms. Callahan stated that it is her understanding that the structure is intended to protect pedestrians from falling snow and ice. She further stated that being the winter season is over and we have some time before this threat returns, she would like to see more complete drawings including dimensions, railings, the engineer's report, and all other details prior to making any decision.

Dr. MacMillan concurred with Ms. Callahan.

Ms. Drerup stated that she feels that County code requirements will deem a railing necessary. She asked that Mr. Landers follow up with County code regarding the necessity for a railing and provide details of any proposed safety rails.

Mr. Landers stated that he would take the necessary action for safety rails as required.

Ms. Drerup stated that she feels that this application is on the right track but that it is not yet complete. She asked that additional information be provided so that an informed decision could be made by the board.

Mr. Landers stated that he would provide the additional necessary information.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the proposed windows on the west facade. She stated that there is approximately 4' 6" between the structure and the neighboring structure. She asked Mr. Landers where the property line is located.

Mr. Landers stated that he does not know exactly where the property line is but the neighbor has indicated that the building at 171-173 Main Street is located on the property line.

Ms. Drerup stated that she spoke with County code and was informed that a property owner may not put windows in an exterior wall which is within three feet of the property line. She stated that existing windows would be grandfathered but no new windows may be installed. She recommended that Mr. Landers determine where the property line is.

### **Continuation of Public Hearing**

**28 Railroad Avenue (Mike Manno/TMO Construction)** – public hearing for proposed demolition

Mr. Snell recused himself at 5:30 PM.

Ms. Drerup asked if there was any further public comment.

Ms. Pope asked if a decision would be made on the proposed demolition at tonight's meeting.

Ms. Drerup stated that she expects a decision to be made tonight.

Ms. Drerup again asked for public comment. There was no further comment and Ms. Drerup closed the public hearing at 5:31 PM.

Ms. Drerup asked if a SEQRA had been submitted.

Mr. Austin stated that the file contains part one of SEQRA but it has not been signed by Mr. Manno.

Ms. Drerup stated that Mr. Manno submitted only one comment regarding the proposed demolition and she read the statement for the record.

Village Attorney, Martin Tillapaugh advised the board that regardless of whether or not Mr. Manno has completed Part 1 of SEQRA it is necessary that the board complete Parts 2 & 3 to have the appropriate findings for any decision that may be made. He explained that any legal action by the applicant would be supported if the board did not take all necessary review prior to making any decision.

Mr. Austin stated that the board does have 30 days from the close of the public hearing to make any decision.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Austin to provide the board with the necessary document to complete SEQRA.

### **Continuation of Regular Agenda**

#### **8 Glen Avenue (Roberta O'Neill-Kieler for Ed Landers) – Proposed window additions**

Mr. Snell returned to the board at 5:37 PM.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and asked why the additional windows are necessary.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that the interior space is being reconfigured and the natural light is needed for this dark area.

Ms. Drerup stated that the proposed location of the new windows is not a common placement, for accent windows.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that the other choice for window design would be small rectangular windows like the one on the side of the home. She further stated that although the use of only one window had been considered she felt that that look was static and that she feels the best design is two oval windows as proposed.

Mr. Snell stated that you can "put on too much lipstick." He explained that he feels that the proposed change is too much for this structure. He stated that the structure is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form for its highly articulated character.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler asked Mr. Snell what he would recommend in place of the proposed windows.

Mr. Snell stated that sometimes there are things that just cannot be done. He explained that he feels that any addition of windows would disrupt the character of this structure.

Ms. Drerup asked if there is room on the side of the structure to add a window.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that adding a window in this area is not an option. She asked if the board would consider the addition of one window rather than two.

Ms. Callahan stated that she feels that the addition of any windows on the west façade of the structure as proposed will have a negative impact and would be regrettable.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler asked if the board would consider two smaller rectangular windows in place of the proposed windows.

Mr. Snell stated that because this is such a highly articulated surface, anything that interrupts it would be problematic.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that she disagrees. She explained that there are not really any rules to the placement of windows in a Victorian style structures. She further stated that if the structure was Federal or Greek revival she would agree that the windows may not be appropriate.

Mr. Landers asked the board if they would consider the addition of one window and he would open up the shutter on the other window to allow natural light into that room.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that she had proposed two windows for symmetry.

Ms. Callahan asked if it was truly necessary to have a window in the hallway.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that this is the main hallway and it is very dark. She further explained that the hallway, dead-ends in this area, and some type of natural light is really necessary.

Mr. Snell suggested that they install an "interior window" with a light behind or some other visual lightening décor to enhance the interior hallway.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that she does not feel a small window will be out of character or affect the aesthetic appeal of the structure.

Mr. Snell asked what materials would be used.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that they would be a wood window with simulated divided light.

The board reviewed the window specs.

Ms. Drerup stated that she does not feel two windows would be appropriate.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that if only one window is installed she feels it should be a small rectangular window. She explained that adding one oval window would become too much of a focal point and draw attention to that specific window.

Ms. Callahan suggested that they consider a small leaded window similar to the one on the side of the structure. She stated that although it would still be disruptive it would carry over a feature already existing in the structure.

Mr. Landers stated that he would be agreeable to this option. He reiterated that some natural light is needed in the hallway.

The board discussed the idea of a leaded window.

Ms. Drerup stated that review of the specific window would be necessary prior to a decision.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that they would do some research and determine what is available in this option and return to the board for approval.

Ms. Drerup stated that at least of a photo of the window should be provided.

Ms. Callahan stated that new drawings with the exact placement should also be provided.

**46 Chestnut Street (Roberta O'Neill-Kieler for Ed Landers) – Proposed window replacement**

Ms. Callahan asked Mr. Landers to identify exactly which windows would be replaced.

Mr. Landers stated that he would like to replace all of the windows on the first floor in order to be uniform in looks.

Ms. Callahan asked if any windows would be replaced on the north side of the structure.

Mr. Landers stated that the first floor windows on the side of the home would also be replaced.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that the goal is to eventually replace all of the windows with 6 over 6.

Ms. Callahan asked Mr. Landers if he intended to replace the windows in the new section of the structure as well.

Mr. Landers stated that he would only be replacing the windows in the older section of the home.

Ms. O'Neill-Kieler stated that the replacement windows will be Integrity SDL 6 over 6 as specified on the drawing.

Ms. Drerup asked if the proposed windows are inserts.

Mr. Landers stated that they are direct fit insert windows.

Ms. Drerup stated that at a previous review of the project the board had determined the existing windows to be deteriorated.

The board discussed the intention to replace all of the windows in the older portion of the structure over time and suggested that a permit be given which would allow replacement, as indicated, for all windows in the older portion of the residence over the next two years. The board further reviewed the windows to be replaced and determined that a total of 15 windows would be replaced on the north and east sides of the structure with a fiberglass, direct insert, simulated divided light replacement window.

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: April 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed window replacement at 46 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 structure is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The structure has been altered and the windows to be replaced are not original to the structure;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(d) and (4)(f).*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed replacement of 15 windows on the north and east sides of the residence at 46 Chestnut 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 14<sup>th</sup> day of April 2015, determine that the work at 46 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.*

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

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

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

### **Continuation of Public Hearing**

**28 Railroad Avenue (Mike Manno/TMO Construction)** – public hearing for proposed demolition

Mr. Snell recused himself at 5:55 PM.

The board reviewed and completed part two of SEQRA.

Mr. Tillapaugh, Village Attorney, advised the board that based on the findings of part two a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is necessary to proceed because the applicant has not provided an EIS and is not present at the meeting to provide additional information.

Ms. Drerup made a motion that for the Type 1 action at 28 Railroad Avenue, based on findings of significant impact in Part 2 of SEQRA, questions #10 - *Historic and Archeological Resources*; question # 17 – *Consistency with Community Plans* and question # 18 – *Consistency with Community Character*, the Determination of Significance is determined to be letter C – “This Project may result in one or more significant adverse impacts on the environment, and an environmental impact statement must be prepared to further assess the impact(s) and possible mitigation and to explore alternatives to avoid or reduce those impacts. Accordingly, this positive declaration is issued.” Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan                                      Motion carried.

Dr. MacMillan made the following motion:



*Resolution date: April 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed exterior changes at 108 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 relatively new and is not listed in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (3)(a), (3)(b), and, (3)(d).*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed exterior changes as submitted for 108 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 14<sup>th</sup> day of April 2015, determine that the work at 108 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, Snell                      Motion carried.

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

**8 Walnut Street (Simple Integrity/Josh Edmonds)** – Proposed exterior changes including insulating & parging foundation, chimney removal, increased height with new roof, window replacement, and new exterior siding

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and asked Mr. Edmonds to review the proposed window changes.

Mr. Edmonds reviewed the proposed window configuration and details, stating that the windows will either be Integrity or Marvin based on availability.

The board discussed the window placement and configuration.

Ms. Drerup suggested that three windows in the large front opening may have a more aesthetically pleasing feel than two windows, as the lite proportions would be similar to other windows in the structure.

Mr. Edmonds agreed to use three slightly narrower windows in the existing opening rather than the two as proposed.

Ms. Drerup asked about the changes to the roof.

Mr. Edmonds stated that due to the extent of the renovations building code requires the ceiling height be increased, therefore, the existing roof would be removed, a 3 foot knee wall will be added with new trusses and roofing materials.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Edmonds to review the proposed work to the foundation.

Mr. Edmonds explained that the existing foundation would be waterproofed and insulated then parged to look like a poured foundation.

Ms. Drerup asked what type of siding the cement board would replace.

Mr. Edmonds stated that it was replacing aluminum siding.

Mr. Snell asked the exposure of the siding reveal.

Mr. Edmonds stated that the reveal is approximately 5”.

Ms. Drerup asked if the reveal is narrower than the current reveal.

Mr. Edmonds stated that the reveal would be narrower than the current siding and be closer to the reveal of clapboard siding.

Mr. Snell asked if the garage door would be changed.

Mr. Edmonds stated that a new garage door will probably be necessary but he does not have details on that at this time as the home has not yet been purchased. He further explained that the buyer wanted to be sure the proposed work would be approved prior to finalizing the purchase of the home.

Mr. Austin stated that if approval is granted for the work a field change would be necessary for any additional changes such as the garage door.

Ms. Callahan asked what materials the entry door was constructed from.

Mr. Edmonds stated that it is a fiberglass door. He further stated that they are avoiding wood products on the exterior of the structure to help keep it low maintenance.

Ms. Drerup asked if the chimney would be completely removed.

Mr. Edmonds stated that the chimney would be removed.

Mr. Snell asked what materials would be used for the entry ceiling.

Mr. Edmonds stated that it would be a PVC bead board.

Mr. Snell asked if the existing railings would be changed.

Mr. Edmonds stated that there are no plans to change any part of the existing stoop at this time.

Ms. Drerup asked if full trim would be used between the windows.

Mr. Edmonds stated that it would.

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: April 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed exterior alterations at 8 Walnut 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 non-contributing 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 exterior alterations at 8 Walnut 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 14<sup>th</sup> day of April 2015, determine that the work at 8 Walnut 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, Snell                      Motion carried.

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

**46 Susquehanna Avenue (Simple Integrity/Josh Edmonds for Erik & Emily Riesenfeld) – Proposed window replacement**

Mr. Austin reviewed the applicant and informed the board that a permit for replacement windows is on file but expired in November of 2014. Since that time some windows have been replaced without a permit. He further explained that when Simple Integrity was hired Mr. Edmonds stopped any additional work from occurring and applied for the appropriate approvals.

Ms. Callahan asked if the proposed windows are two over two.

Mr. Edmonds stated that they are two over two. He explained that they would like to replace two windows in addition to the ones that were previously replaced. The two proposed to be replaced are on the second floor and there are issues with the storm windows at this location.

Ms. Callahan stated that the storms in question are contemporary and not more historic wooden storms.

Mr. Edmonds stated that in addition on the second floor there are shutters visible from the exterior of the structure but no window. He explained that at some time the window was removed and the opening was covered over.

Ms. Drerup asked if any windows on the first floor would be replaced.

Mr. Edmonds stated that no windows on the first floor would be replaced.

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: April 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed window replacement at 46 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 structure is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), and (3)(d).*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed window replacement at 46 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 14<sup>th</sup> day of April 2015, determine that the work at 46 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. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

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

## **22 Eagle Street (Susan Snell, Architect for Robin Lettis) – Proposed residential addition**

Mr. Snell recused himself at 6:36 PM.

Ms. Snell stated that Ms. Lettis has occupied the residence for over 40 years and at this time would like to add a first floor bedroom and bathroom. She stated that the home currently has aluminum siding which they hope to match but the backup plan would be to use fiber cement board. The home currently has a replacement window manufactured by Lockheed but should matching double hung windows not be available from this manufacturer they would use Integrity.

Ms. Drerup stated that the addition will require the removal of an existing tree. She asked how many trees are on the property.

Ms. Lettis stated that she is aware that the tree will have to be removed and indicated that there are two trees on the property. She stated that she would be willing to plant a new tree and has talked to the contractor about the possibility of moving the existing tree.

Mr. Austin stated that he would address the tree issue separately at a later date.

Ms. Drerup stated that the roof lines are quite unique.

Ms. Snell explained the reasons for the proposed roof line and its visual impacts.



Village Attorney, Martin Tillapaugh, stated that a board member only needs to recuse him or herself when there is a conflict. He further stated that generally that conflict is financial gain.

Ms. Drerup agreed not to recuse herself based on the fact that she was not involved in the application and did not have any real personal gain.

Mr. May reviewed the proposed application and stated that there is not much change to the profile. He further stated that the house, as it exists, is in need of basic cosmetic repair. He explained that the vinyl siding will be replaced with wood, larger windows and a sliding door will be added to enhance the view of the lake from the main living area and a deck will be added. The addition is not visible from the street and none of the additions will be in the setbacks.

Ms. Drerup asked if the proposed work meets the requirement of the Lakeland Shores Homeowners association and other deed restrictions.

Mr. Austin stated that not all properties within the development have the same regulations. He further stated that the proposed work meets the requirements for this lot.

Dr. MacMillan asked the number of stairs.

Mr. May stated that there would be one step at most. He further stated that it is almost at grade.

Ms. Drerup asked about the overhang on the roof.

Mr. May stated that there is no overhang as they are looking for a simple profile.

Ms. Drerup stated that the design is very modern. She continued to ask about the deck on the end of the structure.

Mr. May explained that there is a very small existing deck with a couple of steps.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. May to review the details of the roof.

Mr. May stated that the roof will have a wider batten to help minimize the length of the structure. The pitch is currently 7/12 and the proposed pitch at the west clerestory is 2/12. The front door will be from the Marvin Ultimate line and all the windows will be a Marvin clad.

Ms. Drerup suggested a wider roof panel with a narrower batten, to more closely resemble true standing seam.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the project had been approved by the Lakeland Shores Homeowner's Association.

Mr. Austin stated that the Homeowner's Association will be reviewing the project but that review is completely independent of this board.

Ms. Drerup asked what would be used for siding.

Mr. May stated that they are proposing a vertical tongue and groove siding.

Ms. Drerup asked about the gap for the siding.

Mr. May stated that they are leaning towards a tight seam.

Ms. Drerup asked if it would be prefinished.

Mr. May stated that it would not be prefinished. He stated that if it is installed and not finished it will weather to a gray color.

The board reviewed the deck and foundation work.

Ms. Callahan stated that the proposed project is bold and interesting. She further stated that Lakeland Shores has been experiencing much change, structure by structure, which is having a definite impact on the neighborhood.

Mr. May stated that in preparing the application they found it difficult to answer questions about the neighborhood and impact to it as the neighborhood is very unique and has been changing.

Ms. Drerup asked what would be used for a garage door.

Mr. May stated that the garage door would be wood and stained to match the structure.

Ms. Drerup stated that in general she feels the project is appropriate but that she would like additional details regarding the roof and the connection of the wall to the roof.

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: April 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed exterior renovation and residential addition at 42 Lakeview Drive South, 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 non-contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(c), (3)(a), and (3)(c).*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed exterior renovations and residential addition at 42 Lakeview Drive South;*

*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 14<sup>th</sup> day of April 2015, determine that the work at 42 Lakeview Drive South, 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. Drerup seconded the motion and the following discussion was held.

Ms. Drerup stated that this is a very significant change but she feels that it is allowable due to the fact that the entire neighborhood has been undergoing significant change.

A vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan Motion carried.

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

**21 Leatherstocking Street (Gary Kiss) – Proposed stairs to existing deck**

Mr. Snell returned to the board at 7:12 PM.

Ms. Callahan asked about the proposed material.

Mr. Kiss stated that the same materials as the porch would be carried through and used for the stairs.

Ms. Drerup asked if there were plans to replace the windows.

Mr. Kiss stated that the windows will not be replaced but they will be reglazed and painted.

Ms. Drerup asked if the windows were historic.

Mr. Kiss stated that they were original to the residence which was constructed in 1951. Mr. Kiss asked about the removal of an existing deteriorated shed for replacement with a one car garage.

Ms. Drerup stated that an application would need to be submitted and approved before he could proceed with the garage project.

Ms. Drerup 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 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed addition of stairs to an existing deck at 21 Leatherstocking 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 non-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)(c).*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed stairs at 21 Leatherstocking 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 14<sup>th</sup> day of April 2015, determine that the work at 21 Leatherstocking 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, Snell

Motion carried.

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

**Minutes:**

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

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Snell

Motion carried.

**124 Main Street (Altonview Architects for BTP)** – Proposed new four story structure and preliminary demolition

Ms. Drerup recused herself at 7:21 PM.

Dr. MacMillan took over as chair and asked the members of the board how they felt about a joint meeting of the boards involved in review of this project, including the Board of Trustees, Zoning Board of Appeals, and Planning Board. He stated that he feels that it would be helpful for all of the boards to meet and review the application as a group to review the process and the role of each board.

Ms. Callahan stated that she feels that this type of meeting could be useful.

Mr. Snell stated that he does not feel such a meeting is necessary.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he feels it would be helpful to help each board ascertain their specific focus and the concerns of each board, and member. He continued to state that he is aware that Planning Board Chair, Eugene Berman, is not in favor of this type of meeting.

Ms. Susan Snell, ZBA Chair, stated that she personally does not have any issue with this type of meeting. She further stated that if the meeting is going to be productive it would need to happen quickly as the ZBA has already begun their review and has set a public hearing for their May meeting.

Mr. Tillapaugh, Village Attorney, reviewed the responsibilities of HPARB for this project. He stated that the main objective for the meeting this evening is for the applicant to present the project, a determination to be made as to whether or not the application is complete and to determine if HPARB would like to declare themselves lead agency for the purposes of SEQRA. He further stated that the BOT has already indicated that they would like to be lead agency but any involved agency has the right to ask to be lead agency. Mr. Tillapaugh continued to state that once the board has determined if the application is complete and if they would like to be lead agency then they also will need to look at the need for public hearings. He stated that we know that a public hearing is required for the BOT's review of the Special Use Permit and by HPARB for the demolition. In addition a public hearing is required by ZBA for the area variance and a public hearing may be held by HPARB for the general project. Mr. Tillapaugh stated that holding joint public hearings can be beneficial and/or detrimental. He explained that a joint public hearing could make a decision more difficult as the board would need to sort through information that did not pertain to their specific decision. Mr. Tillapaugh pointed out that each board will need to make separate decisions based solely on the criteria in the law which pertains to the elements of the project governed by their specific board. Mr. Tillapaugh stated that due to both the special use permit and the demolition requiring public hearings and SEQRA these two



Mr. Snell asked why they choose to recess the east bay from the street line.

Mr. Ofer stated that originally there has been three separate structures at this address. He continued to explain that subtle differences had been worked into the proposed structure to break up the width of the structure and provide for more dimensionality and expression.

Mr. Snell asked if recessing the west bay rather than the east bay had been given any consideration.

Mr. Ofer explained that originally he had recessed the west bay. He used the model to show the difference in the design if they had recessed the west bay.

Mr. Snell asked if there would be any permanent fixtures in the rear outdoor terrace.

Ms. Drerup stated that there would not be any permanent fixtures. She explained that a few chairs may be placed on this terrace but that the area will overlook the parking lot.

Mr. Snell asked for details regarding the mechanical mezzanine.

Ms. Drerup explained the proposed mezzanine.

Mr. Snell stated that the details were not on the current elevation drawings. He asked if additional details regarding the material selections would be provided.

Ms. Drerup stated that complete material lists would be provided after receipt of the special use permit. She explained that in order to keep architectural cost down, for the property owner, some details will not be completed until a determination is made regarding the special use permit.

Mr. Snell asked if material samples and exact window details would be provided with the material list.

Ms. Drerup stated that they would.

Mr. Snell asked what type of glass would be used.

Ms. Drerup stated that the glass would be clear.

Mr. Snell asked for details regarding the paired windows on the Main Street façade.

Mr. Ofer reviewed the proposed windows, explaining the rain screen and trim details.

Mr. Snell asked what ceiling materials would be used in the overhang.

Mr. Ofer stated that an industrial waterproof sheetrock would be utilized.

Mr. Snell asked for details regarding the frieze and cornice.

Mr. Ofer stated that those particular details have not been completed at this time. He reviewed a possible option and stated that exact design would be provided after the special use permit was received.

## DRAFT

Mr. Snell asked where trash would be handled and if an enclosure would be necessary.

Ms. Drerup stated that all exterior space was needed for parking and other requirements and that the trash would be maintained in the basement of the building.

Mr. Snell stated that some elements are missing from the elevation drawings. He asked that all materials and pertinent information be included in the final drawings. He further asked about the air ventilation system.

Mr. Ofer explained the use of a hybrid ventilation system for the Main Street façade and explained that due to the significant cost of the system a traditional ventilation system would be utilized on the other facades.

Mr. Snell asked that these be shown in future drawings. Mr. Snell asked that additional details regarding the jointing and patterns be provided.

Mr. Ofer stated that he does not think the butt joints will be visible.

Mr. Snell stated that he was referring to the horizontals. Mr. Snell questioned east bay's window width.

Ms. Drerup stated that the east bay is narrower and will have slightly wider windows. She stated that the drawings will be updated to accurately reflect this feature once the exact window details are determined.

Mr. Snell asked about the notch in the corner of the front façade.

Mr. Ofer explained the aesthetics of this feature.

Mr. Snell asked about the mechanicals on the roof.

Mr. Ofer stated that they would not be seen.

Mr. Snell stated that it has been demonstrated that they would not be seen from the Main Street sidewalk. He asked if they would be seen from Doubleday Field or the Doubleday Field parking lot.

Mr. Ofer stated that some elements would be seen from that area, but the horizontal distance would mitigate its impact. He further noted that from upper Main Street one can easily view the rooftops of many Main Street buildings.

Mr. Snell stated that he appreciates the use of thirds in relation to the previous configuration of this lot as three separate buildings. He asked if they had considered joints to delineate that feature.

Mr. Ofer stated that they would consider that suggestion.

Mr. Snell asked about the windows for the west elevation.

Mr. Ofer stated that the exact windows have not been determined but that this area on the first floor will be for the reception area and large windows are intended to allow for staff to have a clear view of street traffic as well as traffic around the building.

Mr. Snell asked for details regarding the columns in the rear of the building.

Mr. Ofer stated that at this time valet parking is proposed which would limit the number of people driving in this area.

Mr. Snell stated that during the “off” season, September – May, he understands that valet parking would not be utilized.

Mr. Ofer stated that he is not sure what structural requirements will dictate, but he assumes at this time that the columns will be steel with clad. He stated that additional details will be sought and provided.

Mr. Snell asked if there would be windows on the west and north façade where the pool tank is located.

Ms. Drerup stated that there will be windows on the façade to keep the rhythm but that the windows will be blacked out.

Mr. Snell stated that he understands that a 5’ fence is necessary around the pool. He asked that those details be provided on the elevation drawings. He further requested that the north elevation include the details of the windows, pool and fence and that the east elevation show the projection of the bay.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he understands that air conditioning units would be in each unit and asked about the visual effect of these units.

Mr. Ofer stated that the use of a hybrid system on the front façade will spare any visual components in that location but that unit grilles will be visible on the other facades.

Ms. Callahan stated that she agrees with Mr. Snell in that this project has been put together with consideration of the historic structures and neighborhood of Main Street and that it will have much less of a 100 year impact than the structure it is replacing.

Mr. Snell stated that it will have a positive impact on the streetscape.

Ms. Callahan stated that it will have a unifying impact as well.

Dr. MacMillan stated that based on this evening’s review he does not feel that the application is complete.

Mr. Austin stated that Mr. Snell has pointed out a number of details that are necessary for consideration of a certificate of appropriateness. He continued to state that the board may want to entertain the idea of the demolition and proceed with that portion of the application.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he is reluctant to proceed with the demolition.

Mr. Austin stated that the board could proceed with the demolition application and condition any action on the receipt of a Certificate of Appropriateness as suggested by Mr. Tillapaugh.

Ms. Drerup stated that she is okay with no action being taken this evening towards either the demolition or the proposed structure while waiting for action on the Special Use Permit from the

