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, June 9, 2015. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Liz Callahan, Roger MacMillan, David Sanford, Ralph Snell and alternate Brian Alexander. 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

13 Lakeview Drive South (Paula Wyckoff) – Proposed siding replacement and new deck railings

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and the additional information which was provided for the file. She asked the board if they felt that the application was now complete.

Mr. Snell stated that the additional information provided helped to make a complete application.

Ms. Drerup stated that there could be an argument that a Swiss Chalet should not have been built in this location as it was not appropriate for the character of the neighborhood. She continued to state that there has been a lot of new construction in the Lakeland Shores Development as well as many changes to existing structures. She explained that her concern for proposed work is the appearance of the faux stone and the replacement of the railing. Ms. Drerup further explained that the railing does not fit the character of the structure, once the other elements of the Swiss Chalet have been removed.

Dr. MacMillan arrived at 5:10 PM.

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: June 9, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed exterior changes at 13 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 features to be altered, although visible from the public way, are not significant to the character of the neighborhood;
- The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(d), and (5).

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed exterior changes, to exclude the proposed front railing but include the replacement of the front doors, stone and vertical siding treatment and garage door replacement at 13 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 9th day of June 2015, determine

that the work at 13 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.

Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford

NAYES: Snell Motion carried.

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

14 Lake Street (Shelby Cooper) - Proposed roof structure over the east door

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and asked Mr. Cooper the dimensions of the proposed roof.

Mr. Cooper explained that the roof structure would be centered over the door and have a profile of 3' and be 6' in width.

Mr. Snell asked if he understood correctly that the roof would project 3' from the residence.

Mr. Cooper stated that to be correct. He explained that the original application indicated a 2' projection but in order to ensure the protection of the door and moldings from moisture as intended he felt that 3' would do a better job.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the sample photos provided with Mr. Cooper.

Mr. Snell asked what material would be used for the ceiling of the structure.

Ms. Drerup clarified the question asking it the ceiling would be finished or left with open joist.

Mr. Cooper stated that he would like it to be similar to the front porch which is bead board.

Ms. Drerup asked if the roof material would match the residence.

Mr. Cooper stated that it would.

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: June 9, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed roof over the east door at 14 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 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), (3)(a), (3)(b), and (3)(d).

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed roof over the east door at 14 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 9th day of June 2015, determine that the work at 14 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.

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.

Mr. Alexander arrived at 5:21 PM.

22 Pioneer Street (Tim Horvath, Redpoint Builders) – proposed rebuild of existing mud room and chimney

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and asked if they knew when the mud room was added to the original structure.

Mr. Horvath stated that it appears to have been constructed shortly after the original structure.

Dr. MacMillan asked what the purpose of the structure had been.

Mr. Horvath stated that he believes it may have been a woodshed. He explained that one of the issues with the structure is that the road has been built up by approximately 1' over the years which has caused moisture problems. He stated that the sills are rotten and the building has a double roof for some reason.

Ms. Drerup asked about the proposed door and the number of lights.

Mr. Horvath stated that the door would have 15 lights and pointed out that the property owners are from Sweden which is where the drawings were produced. He further explained that all measurements are in centimeters.

Ms. Drerup asked if the fence would be retained.

Mr. Horvath stated that it would be retained at this time but may be removed in the future.

Ms. Drerup questioned the French door and other window details.

Mr. Horvath reviewed the proposed replacement of doors and windows as well as the ones that would be retained.

Ms. Drerup asked if the 9-over-6 window would be custom built.

Mr. Horvath stated that it would be rebuilt.

Mr. Snell stated that the structure is circa 1810.

- Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Horvath to review the details of the chimney.
- Mr. Horvath reviewed the plans for the chimney and provided a brick sample.
- Mr. Drerup asked if the middle chimney would be removed.
- Mr. Horvath stated that it would be removed as it is not needed and was not constructed soundly.
- Mr. Snell asked Ms. Drerup why a demolition permit was not required for this work.
- Ms. Drerup stated that the board has not required a demolition permit for a partial demolition or rebuild.
- Mr. Horvath stated that the structure would be rebuilt in the same footprint with the same materials.
- Mr. Snell stated that he feels that the board should discuss exactly what types of items require a demotion permit.
- Ms. Drerup read the definition of demolition from the law and stated that if taking the definition literally it would require a demolition permit for almost all work including window replacement. She stated that it is difficult to know where to draw the line.
- Mr. Sanford stated that the determination is subjective and that the main house is the most historic piece of this property.
- Ms. Drerup stated that, other than raising the roof 20 CM, the structure was being rebuilt as is and therefore she did not feel it made sense to require a demolition permit.
- Ms. Callahan stated that she understands Mr. Snell's view on this matter as original fabric of the structure would be lost.
- Mr. Horvath stated that he went to great lengths to show that the structure was not built well. He stated that it is not post and beam, the rafters barely sit on anything, many of the rafters are cracked and the sills are rotten.
- Ms. Drerup asked if the structure has a foundation.
- Mr. Horvath stated that a foundation cannot be seen. He pointed out that the sills were probably 8" X 8" but are underground and deteriorating.
- Ms. Callahan asked if the roof line's increase of 20 CM is the only change.
- Mr. Horvath stated that the whole building would be elevated 20 CM to bring it above grade. He further explained that the replacement will better match the residence as the siding will line up with the residence when replaced.
- Mr. Snell stated that he is not saying that this is a bad addition but he feels that, procedurally, it may not be being handled correctly.

Ms. Drerup stated that each application has been handled on a case by case basis. She pointed out that the board also has discretion when reviewing applications to require a public hearing for any project they deem it to be beneficial to. Ms. Drerup stated that she does not feel that this project requires a demolition permit. She asked each board member their feelings on requiring a demolition permit.

Dr. MacMillan and Mr. Sanford stated that they do not feel a demolition permit is necessary for this application.

Mr. Snell stated that he does feel a demolition permit should be obtained.

Ms. Callahan stated that she has concerns about the loss of historic fabric. She explained that once the structure is demolished there is potential for it not to be replaced or for the plans to be modified.

Mr. Horvath stated that the plans provided were drawn by the property owner and that would be what is constructed.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Horvath if he could provide additional photo documentation of the structure and foundation, once exposed, for the file.

Mr. Horvath agreed.

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: June 9, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed work 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:

- The requirement for a public hearing was discussed and the majority of the board agreed that 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 of the original structure will be replaced with minor alterations;
- The proposed work is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood;
- 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 proposed addition rebuild and chimney 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 9th day of June 2015, determine that the proposed 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.

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

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford

NAYES: Callahan, Snell Motion carried.

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

31 River Street (Tim Horvath, Redpoint Builders) – Proposed installation of a new chimney

Ms. Drerup asked if the address given is correct.

Mr. Horvath stated that he believes it to be correct. He explained that at one time it was two properties and since it has been combined a Main Street address may have been assigned.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the proposed chimney would be in the same location as a previous chimney.

Mr. Horvath stated that it would. He explained that the interior of the home, including the roof, have distinct indications of a chimney running through the middle of the residence.

The board reviewed the location of the chimney in relation to the dormers. They further reviewed the materials and the dimensions of the chimney.

Ms. Drerup asked the height of the chimney above the roof.

Mr. Horvath stated that they will keep the chimney at the lowest legally allowed height which is 2' higher than any structure within 10'.

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: June 9, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed chimney at 31 River Street, Cooperstown, NY

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

- A public hearing is not required;
- The requirements of SEQRA have been met for this action:
- The structure is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;
- The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(c), and (3)(d).

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed chimney at 31 River 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 9th day of June 2015, determine that the work at 31 River 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. Snell 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.

7 Pine Blvd (Tim Horvath for Redpoint Builders) – Proposed deck removal, exterior wall restoration, window replacement, and door addition

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and stated that the work will not be visible from any public way. She asked Mr. Horvath if the windows would be 8 over 8 or 6 over 6, explaining that there was contradictory information in the application.

Mr. Horvath stated the windows would be 6 over 6 and the application was corrected.

Ms. Drerup stated that the structure was built in 1951 and is non-contributing. She asked if the deck was original to the residence.

Mr. Horvath stated that he does not believe it is original as it is constructed on Sonotubes.

The board reviewed the details of the window and door changes.

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: June 9, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed work at 7 Pine Blvd, 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 features being altered are not original to the structure;
- 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 work at 7 Pine Blvd;

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 9th day of June 2015, determine that the work at 7 Pine Blvd, 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.

8 Beech Street (Greg Hardy, Contractor for Sheila Hill) – Proposed vinyl siding, window, door and railing replacement

Mr. Hardy reviewed the proposed work stating that the residence was built in 2001 but was never completely sided. He stated that Ms. Hill would like to place vinyl siding over the existing siding and replace the spindles on the railing with vinyl spindles due to their condition. He pointed out the doors and windows to be replaced.

Ms. Callahan asked if the uprights on the deck would be replaced or just the spindles.

Mr. Hardy stated just the spindles. He stated that the posts were still solid but if the board would like he could wrap them with vinyl. He continued to state that the two windows would be replaced with double hung windows to allow for air circulation as the existing windows are fixed.

The board reviewed the proposed door and window replacement.

Ms. Drerup asked if the windows would have grills.

Mr. Hardy stated that they would not. Mr. Hardy stated that beaded vinyl soffit would be used under the full length of the porch.

Ms. Drerup stated that she feels that the white vinyl spindles might look inappropriate with the darker, natural treated wood of the remainder of the deck.

Ms. Callahan concurred, stating that the wood and vinyl will have an extremely different visual look.

Mr. Hardy stated that he could wrap the posts but that the posts are structural and need to remain.

Ms. Drerup asked what the existing spindles are made of.

Mr. Hardy stated that they are natural pressure treated wood but are in very poor condition.

Ms. Drerup asked the condition of the decking.

Mr. Hardy stated that the decking is in good condition but that it is under cover.

Dr. MacMillan stated that vinyl often looks stark when compared to wood.

Mr. Hardy showed the siding explaining that they are trying to avoid that look.

Dr. MacMillan stated that the siding is okay but he is concerned about the railing.

Ms. Drerup stated that she would like to see something more wood like in color.

Dr. MacMillan concurred and added a matte finish should be used.

Mr. Hardy stated that he could find something more like in color or replace the railings with a pressure treated lumber.

Ms. Drerup stated that the railing can be replaced with pressure treated lumber without any additional review but if they choose to replace the existing railing with a product other than

pressure treated lumber or something approved tonight they will need to return for review. Ms. Drerup asked why the residence was being resided.

Mr. Hardy stated that it is generally cosmetic. He shared photos of the existing siding condition.

Mr. Snell stated that he does not feel that the application is complete. He explained that in two years he is not sure if someone looking at the file would be able to tell what was approved. He suggested that photos of all visible sides of the structure, labeled with what work is to be done on each area be provided for the file.

Ms. Drerup stated that some of the photos provided tonight might work for this but would need to be labeled with the details. She explained that a physical record should be provided.

Ms. Callahan asked what the windows would be.

Mr. Hardy stated that the windows would be vinyl with vinyl trim.

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: June 9, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed residing, window and door replacement and porch railing replacement at 8 Beech 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 at this location is not listed 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 work at 8 Beech 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 9th day of June 2015, determine that the work at 8 Beech Street, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown with the following conditions:

• The applicant will provide additional documentary evidence of all work to be completed prior to commencement of said work.

Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford

NAYES: Snell Motion carried.

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

73 Main Street (Susan Snell, Architect) – Proposed transom glass and awning removal

DRAFT

Mr. Snell recused himself at 6:09 PM.

Ms. Snell reviewed the application and explained that although the property can lend itself to two businesses only one business will occupy this space and they would like to make a few changes to give a more unified look to the property and business. She stated that the removal of the awning and the replacement of the transom glass will help with the unified look of the store fronts.

The board reviewed the existing transoms and storefront glass.

Ms. Drerup asked if the transom glass is original.

Ms. Snell stated that she is not sure if it is original. She explained that she does not think it looks as old as the building. She continued to state that she looked up prism glass and found it to be glass reflect light to bring more light into a space.

Ms. Drerup asked about the columns seen in the display windows.

Ms. Snell stated that they are a gold cast iron.

Ms. Drerup asked if the glass would be a plain, clear glass.

Ms. Snell stated that it would be.

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: June 9, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed awning removal and transom glass replacement at 73 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), (3)(c) and (3)(d).

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed work at 73 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 9th day of June 2015, determine that the work at 73 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: Alexander, Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford Motion carried. The board determined this action to be a minor alteration for reporting purposes.

32 Delaware Street (Susan Snell, Architect) – Proposed residential addition and new garage

Ms. Snell reviewed her application for a residential addition and garage. She stated that although the property owner would like to retain original materials and go back to original materials where possible some of these items may be cost prohibitive. She reviewed the three siding options explaining that wood is preferred if the property owner feels it is not too cost prohibitive. Ms. Snell reviewed the existing windows, pointing out that original wood windows and storms have been retained on the front of the residence.

Ms. Drerup asked if there are currently vinyl windows in the home.

Ms. Snell stated that there are vinyl windows on the rear of the structure. Ms. Snell continued to review the proposed garage on the rear of the property and stated that no driveway will extend to the garage as it will be used for storage of lawn and garden equipment.

Ms. Drerup asked if there would be windows on the property line.

Ms. Snell stated that no windows would be on the side of the garage facing the property line.

Ms. Drerup asked if a variance is required for the outdoor shower as it is in the required setback and over 4' in height.

Ms. Snell stated that the property owner has written acquiescence of the neighboring property owner.

The board reviewed the material list and discussed when the vinyl siding was placed on the residence.

Ms. Drerup stated that the addition will not be very visible from any public way. She asked if the roof of the addition would have the same pitch as the residence.

Ms. Snell stated that it would.

Ms. Drerup asked for details of the garage door.

Ms. Snell stated that the doors will be swinging rather than an overhead door and will be custom built locally.

Mr. Sanford asked how the addition of the shower was allowed without a special permit for a tourist accommodation. He explained that when he wanted to put a sink in his garage a previous zoning officer had informed him that running water to the garage would constitute an apartment and therefore require a permit.

Mr. Austin stated that there is nothing in the law which prohibits running water in a garage and nothing that would say that running water in a garage requires a special permit for use as an apartment or tourist accommodation.

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: June 9, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed residential addition and new garage at 32 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 proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b) and (3)(d).

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed residential addition and new garage as shown in drawings dated 06-01-2015 for 32 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 9th day of June 2015, determine that the work at 32 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: Alexander, Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford

Motion carried.

The board determined this action to be a new construction for reporting purposes.

2 Lake Street (Phillips Construction) – Proposed window replacement

- Mr. Snell returned to the board at 6:33 PM.
- Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and stated that the structure was built in 1980.
- Mr. Phillips stated that he had built the residence in 1982. He explained that the windows were considered top of the line at the time and are a combination of wood, aluminum and vinyl. He stated that the seals have failed and that the balances are bad. Mr. Phillips stated that he would like to replace all the windows on the front and one on the side of the residence for a total of eight windows to be replaced. He stated that they would be replaced with Marvin windows.
- Mr. Snell asked if the eight to be replaced included the one in the garage.
- Mr. Phillips stated that the one on the side is the garage window.
- Dr. MacMillan asked about the windows facing the lake.
- Mr. Phillips stated that he thinks that the windows facing the lake have been previously replaced and do not require replacement at this time.
- Ms. Drerup asked about the trim to be used.
- Mr. Phillips stated that the trim will be the same as the existing trim.

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: June 9, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed window replacement at 2 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 structure is listed as non-contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;
- The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(d), and (5).

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed window replacement at 2 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 9th day of June 2015, determine that the work at 2 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.

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.

124 Main Street (Bob Hurley for BTP Cooperstown) - Proposed 4' wood fence

Ms. Drerup recused herself at 6:37 PM.

Mr. Hurley reviewed the application to place a 4' pressure treated wood fence on the property line between 118 and 124 Main Street. He stated that the original application was for a wood fence, then an email was submitted to change to a chain-link fence but they have decided a wood fence is the best option and would like to return to the original application for the wood fence.

- Dr. MacMillan asked why they wanted to install a fence.
- Mr. Hurley stated that the fence was for safety and security of the property.
- Mr. Snell asked if the fence would be painted.

Mr. Hurley stated that it is not proposed to be painted but they are willing to paint it if the board feels that would be best.

- Mr. Snell asked if the rails would be installed toward the 124 Main Street property.
- Mr. Hurley stated that they would be installed toward their property.

Ms. Callahan made the following 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: June 9, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed 4' wood fence at 124 Main Street 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 proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b), (3)(a), and (3)(b).

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed 4' wood fence at 124 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 9th day of June 2015, determine that the work at 124 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.

Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Alexander, Callahan, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

99 Main Street (Perry Ferrara) – Proposed awning addition

Mr. Austin reviewed the application to place an additional awning over the eating area which was previously parking stalls. He explained that Mr. Ferrara has received approval from the Planning Board to move the required parking stalls for the Wax Museum to an offsite location and has expanded the eating area to include six additional tables. He stated that this area will have temporary fence to indicate the area and that Mr. Ferrara would like to install a new awning over the additional seating area. The awning will match the existing awnings and be custom made to fit the designated area.

Dr. MacMillan asked if Mr. Ferrara understood that all framing would need to be removed seasonally.

Mr. Austin stated that Mr. Ferrara does understand that all framing has to be removed, with the exception of the pieces which are attached to the building. He further stated that Mr. Ferrara was in compliance during the 2014 season and did remove all structures as required.

Mr. Snell suggested that a single slope might be more favorable.

Ms. Drerup stated that Mr. Ferrara preferred the aesthetics of the gable.

The board reviewed and discussed the proposed awning and other possible configurations.

Mr. Austin stated that the board could choose to approve as submitted, approve with a recommendation to change to a single slope, deny, or deny and approve an alternative.

Ms. Drerup stated that if the board feels that an awning is acceptable in this location then some kind of approval should be granted tonight. She explained that if the application is denied and the applicant needs to reapply the season will be almost half over prior to a decision.

The board discussed the options for approval of an awning.

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: June 9, 2015

A resolution to approve a single slope awning at 99 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;
- Similar awnings are already in use at this location;
- The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b), (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(c) and (3)(d).

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to a single sloped awning addition to the rear of the existing awnings, with the same pitch as the front awning, and as sketched by the board in exhibit #1 for 99 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 9th day of June 2015, determine that the single slope awning at 99 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.

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

AYES: Alexander, Callahan, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

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

8 Walnut Street (Josh Edmonds for Simple Integrity) – Unplanned demolition

Ms. Drerup returned to the chair.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the unexpected demolition of the residence at 8 Walnut Street and read the letter submitted regarding this situation. She stated that County Code Enforcement Officer, Neal McManus declared the structure unsafe but due to no demolition permit being issued Mr. Austin had placed a stop work order on the property. She stated that the question for HPARB is what is necessary from Mr. Edmonds to move forward.

Mr. Edmonds stated that the intention was to leave the first floor walls attached but the remaining house, including all interior walls were being replaced. He stated that once the "outer shell" was removed it was discovered that the floors were extremely out of level and that although there were ways to level the floor, they also found massive cracks throughout the cinder block walls, specifically at doorways.

- Ms. Drerup asked if the foundation and walls were fixable.
- Mr. Edmonds stated that they were not fixable. He stated that the cinderblock walls were not durable and had not been properly reinforced.
- Ms. Callahan stated that the original application had indicated that the structure was built in 1949 with concrete block.
- Mr. Edmonds stated that they believed that the foundation was concrete block and the walls were cinderblock.
- Ms. Callahan asked what permits had been required from the County.
- Mr. Edmonds stated that a building permit was required but that all County permits include demolition. He continued to state that Mr. Jim Forbes, was the engineer on the project and had reviewed the project prior to the work commencing. Prior to the removal of the "skins" the problems were not visible.
- Ms. Drerup stated that these were hidden conditions.
- Mr. Austin stated that the original permit was to raise the roof but the work also included completely gutting of the residence and removing the exterior skin. He stated that short of demolition the only remaining piece to this structure would have been the block. The difference now will be that the original cinderblock which was not seen prior to the work and which would not be seen after the completion of the work would be study rather than block.
- Ms. Callahan stated that she was just wondering how this issue was missed by an engineer and not addressed prior to commencement of the work.
- Mr. Snell stated that he feels that it would be appropriate for the applicant to submit a statement or letter from the engineer for the record. He asked Mr. Austin if there is any form of regular established communication between him as ZEO and the Code Enforcement Officer.
- Mr. Austin stated that Mr. McManus regularly communicates with him via email or text regarding properties in the Village as well as municipalities he is employed by. He further stated that he does not know why communication regarding this property did not happen prior to the demolition unless it was to the point that it was a health or safety issue.
- Mr. Snell stated that he just wanted to ensure that there was a proactive approach to communication between the two entities.
- Mr. Austin stated that the last time an unapproved demolition occurred in the Village it was Lakefront Hotel. He explained that when he arrived on site Mr. McManus informed him not to stop the demolition as it was a major safety issue.
- Mr. Snell asked if the intent now was to rebuild exactly as shown in the application.
- Mr. Edmonds stated that they intend to build exactly what was approved in the previous application.

Ms. Drerup asked for clarifications as to the structure being wood studs or block.

Mr. Edmonds stated that it would be wood studs. He continued to state that one change he would like to make would be to change the size of the front windows which included three ganged windows. He stated that given the demolition he now has the ability to install three windows the same size as the other windows in the residence which would provide more uniformity.

Mr. Austin stated that this was an unforeseen issue.

Mr. Snell stated that he feels that as long as an engineer report or statement is placed in the file with regards to that effect he does not have a problem with the results and allowing the applicant to move forward.

Mr. Austin asked how the board wanted to proceed with the garage. He pointed out that it would probably also require demolition.

Mr. Edmonds stated that in order to make the roof pitch match they will either need to raise the roof and add a knee wall or tear it down and start fresh.

The board discussed whether or not the garage was reviewed previously and if approval was granted for the raising of the garage roof.

Mr. Austin stated that it was part of the application. He explained that do to the design of the structures raising the roof on the residence would require raising the roof on the garage.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the minutes from the April meeting and stated that the minutes do not reflect any discussion or approval of raising the garage roof.

Ms. Callahan left the meeting at 7:18 PM.

The board further discussed the status of the application and how Mr. Edmonds needed to proceed. They agreed that no public hearing was necessary at this time but that a statement or report from the engineer, citing the discovery of inadequate existing structure, was necessary to complete the file.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to approve the field change to widen the window opening for the three front windows of 8 Walnut Street to enable the use of the same windows throughout the structure; to allow the existing garage to be rebuilt according to plans submitted in the same footprint thus enabling the walls to be raised for the roof pitch to meet the roof of the residence with the condition that a letter from the engineer be submitted for the record. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Alexander, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

Mr. Sanford left the meeting at 7:23 PM.

27 Eagle Street (Connor) - Proposed 4' fence

Mr. Austin reviewed the application and stated that the applicant currently resides in Florida and plans to retire to this residence. He reviewed the fence design and location as submitted.

Ms. Drerup stated that the fence will be visible from the public way.

Mr. Snell asked if the fence would extend to the sidewalk.

Mr. Austin stated that the applicant has indicated that it will be placed 1' from the sidewalk.

Mr. Snell stated that he feels the fence should be placed at least as far back as the retaining wall on the neighboring property.

Ms. Drerup stated that she does not feel enough information has been provided for the board to act on the application. She stated that specific information regarding the location of the fence and any proposed gates needs to be submitted.

184 Main Street (T. Rusk) - Proposed exterior changes including roofing, doors, trim

Ms. Drerup stated that she has several questions regarding the proposed work.

Mr. Snell stated that he also has questions about the work and does not feel he could act on the application tonight without the applicant present to answer those questions.

Mr. Austin stated that he would request Mr. Rusk's attendance at the July meeting.

Minutes:

Mr. Snell made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 12, 2015 meeting as submitted. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Snell

ABSTAIN: Alexander

Motion carried.

The minutes of the special meeting held on May 26, 2015 were held over for approval at the July meeting due to not enough present members to take action.

Meeting adjourned at 7:33 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Truax
Deputy Village Clerk