

## 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, July 14, 2015. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Liz Callahan, Roger MacMillan, David Sanford and Ralph Snell. Alternate Brian Alexander was absent. Also in attendance was Zoning Enforcement Officer – Tavis Austin and Deputy Village Clerk – Jennifer Truax. Nine members of the public were present.

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

### Regular Agenda

**12 Main Street (Mr. Tedesco, Contractor for Roger & Carla MacMillan)** – Field change for previously approved fence

Dr. MacMillan recused himself at 5:01 PM.

Mr. Tedesco reviewed the proposed field change for the fence and provided the board with a sample of the material to be used in the fence construction. He stated that the posts will be treated wood with a PVC sleeve.

Ms. Drerup asked if the material is paintable.

Mr. Tedesco stated that the material is paintable but would be installed in a white color which is the color the MacMillans desire.

Ms. Drerup stated that the location of the fence is often wet and this material may resist rot.

Mr. Sanford made a motion to approve the field change for 12 Main Street as submitted. Mr. Snell seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

**8 Walnut Street (Josh Edmonds for Simple Integrity)** – Field change for front façade windows

Dr. MacMillan returned to the board at 5:04 PM.

Ms. Drerup asked the members of the board if they had reviewed the letter submitted by the engineer as requested at the June meeting. The letter was provided for those who had not seen it and the board concurred that the letter satisfies the requirement as moved last month.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the proposed field change and stated that the openings for the windows have been framed out.

Mr. Sanford stated that the window placement is balanced.

Ms. Drerup concurred that the placement is balanced and further stated that it was not symmetrical. She asked Mr. Edmonds if there are any other proposed changes.

Mr. Edmonds stated that there will be changes to the front stoop and the garage door. He explained that the stone stoop is pitched into the residence and that they would like to replace it

## DRAFT

but do not have any details, at this time, for design. He continued to ask if they could remove the existing stoop in the immediate future while excavation work is being done and return at a later time for design approval for a new porch or stoop.

Ms. Callahan asked if there would be an overhang.

Mr. Edmonds stated that there will be an overhang.

Ms. Drerup stated that the existing stoop is not appropriate with the new design of the residence.

Mr. Austin suggested that a motion for the field change might also grant the applicant permission to remove the stoop with the condition that he return for design approval for the replacement.

Dr. MacMillan made a motion to approve the field change at 8 Walnut Street for windows on the front and west facades, and the removal of the existing front stoop with the understanding that the applicant will return in August with plans for the new stoop or porch. Ms. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried

### **43 Susquehanna Avenue (Mary Fines) – Field change for previously approved fence**

Mr. Austin explained that the original approval was for a picket fence with wood posts. He stated that during installation the applicant found that due to excessive gravel and stone it was extremely difficult to install wood post and used metal T-posts in place of the wood post. He further stated that the applicant proposes leaving the T-posts and fences as installed or with a wood picket installed over the T-posts on the neighbor's side of the fence.

Ms. Drerup asked how a picket would be installed on the T-posts.

Mr. Austin stated that other than with a zip tie he is not sure how this could be accomplished.

Mr. Sanford stated that he feels that the T-posts should be installed on the property owner's side of the fence.

Mr. Austin stated that is an option. He further stated that the neighbor has contacted him and informed him that she feels that the fence was installed on her side of the property line. Mr. Austin explained that location of the property line is a civil matter between the two parties.

Mr. Sanford stated that he understands that there are two conflicting surveys. He further stated that the fence was installed using the survey which favored the neighbor.

Mr. Snell asked if the fence has been installed. He stated that it does not appear to be secure.

Mr. Austin stated that due to the disagreement about the location of the property line Ms. Fines was served a cease and desist order for the fence.

Mr. Sanford stated that if the T-post is on the property owner's side he does not have an issue with the use of T-posts instead of wood posts in this situation.

Dr. MacMillan asked if HPARB need to be concerned with the conflict over the property lines.

Ms. Drerup stated that the property line location is not in the purview of HPARB and that the property owners would need to work that out through other sources.

Ms. Callahan stated that the use of recycled fencing may also create installation challenges.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the minutes from the October 2014 meeting regarding the approved fence.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to approve the field change for 43 Susquehanna Avenue to allow the use of metal posts in place of 4" X 4" wood posts as previously approved for the fence installation with the metal posts being on the property owner's side of the fence and installed with the posts aligned with the first and lasts picket of each section. The posts shall not be visible from the neighbor's side of the fence and shall not be higher than the pickets. Ms. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried

### **27 Eagle Street (Connor) – Proposed fence**

Mr. Austin reviewed the application for a fence which will be approximately 18" from the sidewalk and align with the neighboring fences.

Dr. MacMillan asked if there will be gates.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the location of the proposed fence and gates.

Mr. Austin stated that the fence will align with the stone wall on the neighbor's property on Beaver Street. He further clarified that the picket profile of the fence will match the Lambert's fence on Eagle Street.

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: July 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed fence at 27 Eagle Street, Cooperstown, NY*

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

- *A public hearing is not required;*
- *The requirements of SEQRA have been met for this action;*
- *The residential structure at this location is listed as contributing 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 proposed fence at 27 Eagle Street;*

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 14<sup>th</sup> day of July 2015, determine that the work at 27 Eagle Street, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and*



Ms. Drerup asked about the garage door replacement.

Mr. Rusk stated that one, four panel door, to match the existing would be used. He stated that the existing door bows so much in the middle that if put all the way up requires three people to put it back down.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Snell to again review his concerns with the porch.

Mr. Snell reviewed his concerns stating that the proposed structure will cover the existing shutter.

Mr. Rusk stated that it was designed to look like the other existing porch.

Mr. Snell stated that the proposed design will look awkward.

Mr. Rusk stated that the same thing happens on the front porch impeding the pediments.

Mr. Sanford stated that these features, on the front porch, cannot be seen from the street.

Ms. Callahan asked Mr. Rusk what areas of the residence have copper flashing.

Mr. Rusk reviewed those areas.

The board further discussed the side porch and possible solutions to prevent impeding the historic features including the shutter and window trim.

Ms. Callahan asked if the railings would be replaced.

Mr. Rusk stated that the railings would be repaired but not replaced.

Ms. Callahan asked when the structure was built.

Mr. Rusk stated that the residence is circa 1885 with an addition in the early 1970s.

Ms. Sanford stated that the structure was the NYS Trooper barracks at one time.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the details of the side porch. She stated that only the roof will be extended and it will not disturb the shutter or cornice.

Mr. Rusk stated that was correct.

Ms. Drerup asked if square posts would be used.

Mr. Rusk stated that a post would be turned to match the existing posts.

Ms. Drerup stated that due to there being no other feasible solution at this time she is willing to vote in favor of the work because it will not affect the trim or shutter and can be removed in the future to original.

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: July 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed exterior changes at 184 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)(b), (3)(a), (3)(b), and (3)(c).*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to exterior changes at 184 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 14<sup>th</sup> day of July 2015, determine that the work at 184 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: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan Sanford

NAYES: Snell

Motion carried.

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

**198-200 Main Street (Patricia Wilson) – proposed storage shed**

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and asked the applicant approximately how far the shed would be placed from the property line.

Ms. Wilson stated that it will be placed further from the property line than the existing garbage cans and she believes that will be approximately 20' from the property line.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the shed is moveable.

Ms. Wilson stated that it is moveable and will be placed on a bed of gravel.

Ms. Callahan asked if the shed is pre-fab.

Ms. Wilson stated that it will be constructed off site and delivered to the residence.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the shed materials.

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: July 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed shed at 198-200 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 residential structure at this location 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) and (3)(b).*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to proposed shed at 198-200 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 14<sup>th</sup> day of July 2015, determine that the proposed work at 198-200 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. 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.

### **12 Mill Street (Rowley) – Proposed window replacement**

Mr. Rowley stated that replacement of the windows in the residence began in 2006. He stated that none of the windows in the structure were original at that time and 16 out of 31 windows were replaced. He stated that the proposed windows will match the replacement windows from 2006.

Ms. Drerup stated that the residence was circa 1840.

Mr. Rowley stated that the oldest windows in the residence were determined to be approximately 100 years old but not original to the residence. He stated that more than 50% of the windows have been replaced with a window similar to the window being proposed for this replacement

The board reviewed which windows were replaced in 2006 and which windows are proposed to be replaced with this application.

Ms. Drerup asked if the muntins will be between the glass.

Mr. Rowley stated that the previously replaced windows have grilles between the glass and these windows will match the existing replacement windows.

Ms. Drerup asked the reason for replacing the windows.

Mr. Rowley stated that the windows will be replaced as part of residential upgrades.

## DRAFT

Ms. Drerup stated that the previous approval was from 2006. She continued to state that HPARB was created in 2009 and replacement now requires that the property owner show deterioration of the structure or feature to be replaced.

Mr. Rowley stated that most if not all of the windows to be replaced are damaged or have extensive wear. He stated that they do not have counter weights and some will not open.

Ms. Callahan asked if the proposed Monarch windows are vinyl. She stated that the application does not indicate what material the windows are constructed from.

Mr. Rowley stated that the proposed windows are vinyl and provided a sample with flat grilles between the glass. He stated that they are the same as the existing replacement windows.

Ms. Drerup stated that grilles between the glass can be seen from a great distance. She stated that one over one would be more desirable.

Mr. Rowley stated that one over one will not match the previous replacement windows.

Mr. Snell read the number 5 of the Window Guidelines which states "*Grids between the glass of a thermal pane window or "snap in" grills are generally not approved. The exceptions are for buildings of relatively new construction that were built with such windows or older buildings that already have replacement windows of this type in place in the majority of the building.....*" He continued to read number 7 of the Window Guidelines which states "*Synthetic materials that precisely replicate the pattern and finished appearance of historic windows are generally approved, provided that they are able to accept and hold paint. Applicants should provide specification sheets on all materials to be used. Vinyl is not acceptable in most cases, but may be considered in cases where the windows are located at or below ground level or in buildings built after World War II.*"

Ms. Drerup stated that the majority of the windows have already been replaced with the windows as proposed. She stated that although this is not her ideal choice she will vote in favor of the project.

Mr. Snell stated that due to the fact that the window guidelines clearly indicate that vinyl is not an acceptable material for a structure of this time period he will be voting against the project.

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: July 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed window replacement at 12 Mill Street, Cooperstown, NY*

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

- *A public hearing is not required;*
- *The requirements of SEQRA have been met for this action;*
- *The structure is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b), (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(d), (4)(f) and (5).*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed window replacement at 12 Mill Street;*

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 14<sup>th</sup> day of July 2015, determine that the work at 12 Mill Street, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.*

Dr. MacMillan 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 minor alteration for reporting purposes.

### **7 Pine Blvd (Tim Horvath for Redpoint Builders) – Proposed removal of front vestibule**

Mr. Horvath reviewed the application and stated that the structure is severely rotten at the bottom. He has also found that there are no rafters but just a plywood roof and that structurally the vestibule is not sound. He stated that it is not original to the structure. Mr. Horvath stated that the property owner would like to leave the front of the home clean with no structure to reveal its historic features.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the existing stoop will remain.

Mr. Horvath stated that for now the stoop will remain. He further stated that the property owner is currently doing landscaping which may provide some screening for the existing stoop.

Dr. MacMillan stated that due to the size of the stoop it may look awkward.

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: July 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the removal of the vestibule 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;*
- *No original features are being altered but the work will reveal additional original features of 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 vestibule removal 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 14<sup>th</sup> day of July 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.*



## DRAFT

Ms. Callahan stated that the exterior stairs are a great feature of industrial space of this building's time period.

Ms. Drerup asked the reason the insurance company was requiring them to be removed or replaced.

Mr. McManus stated that the rise, run and railings all do not meet code requirements.

Ms. Callahan stated that it was too bad that the insurance company would not allow the stairs to remain as long as they were blocked and any use was prevented and prohibited.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. McManus to explain the proposed windows.

Mr. McManus shared their location and explained that they would be Marvin Integrity.

Mr. Snell read the excerpt from the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form which indicated that the structure was a two story framed building circa 1875 with numerous additions.

Mr. McManus stated that the windows will be in the area of the kitchen and flooring showroom.

The board reviewed the existing windows and the proposed windows.

Mr. Snell asked if the siding would be infilled with siding to match.

Mr. McManus stated that it would.

Ms. Callahan stated that there is not a lot of historic integrity left in this structure as there have been so many changes already but the addition of these windows is a bold change.

Mr. McManus stated that he believes that the windows are to accentuate the showroom lighting.

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: July 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed shed addition, removal of the exterior stairs and addition of second floor windows at 206 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;*
- *One of the buildings on this site is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The warehouse 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), and (3)(b).*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed work at 206 Main 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 July 2015, determine that the work at 206 Main Street, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.*

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

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

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

**43 Delaware Street (Palmer) – Proposed exterior modifications**

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Palmer to review the proposed changes to the structure.

Mr. Palmer stated that the main changes are to the back third of the structure which was built in the 1960s and houses two apartments. He explained that during renovations to the interior it was determined that there was deterioration and the window was replaced due to the relocation of the kitchen. Mr. Palmer explained that a door and windows have been moved.

Ms. Drerup asked the number of new windows installed.

Mr. Palmer stated that one new window was installed.

Ms. Drerup questioned the other window.

Mr. Palmer explained that the other window was relocated.

Ms. Drerup asked how many windows the structure has.

Mr. Palmer stated that there are 26 two over two, original windows in the residence.

Ms. Drerup asked if they would be replaced.

Mr. Palmer stated that they would not. He further stated that most of them have recently been re-glazed.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Palmer to explain the changes made to the porch.

Mr. Palmer stated that the overhang was extended.

Mr. Snell asked Mr. Palmer if he understands that approval should be obtained prior to any work.

Mr. Palmer stated that he understand that now. He further stated that he assumed that it was non-contributing and in the rear of the structure so that no approval was necessary. He stated that he understands that was not his call to make and will be sure to apply prior to work in the future.

The board reviewed the proposed siding removal and restoration.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Palmer if the front porch would be replaced.

Mr. Palmer stated that he would not be undertaking work to the front porch at this time. He explained that he would like to find photos or documentation of the original porch so that it could be replicated.

Ms. Drerup asked about the replacement of the front door.

Mr. Palmer stated that the interior traffic flow seems to imply that the door should be outswing rather than an inswing. He stated that there would not be a storm door and that the proposed door, taken from another location on the structure, matches the interior doors.

The board reviewed the items to be acted on.

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: July 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed work at 43 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),(3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(c) and (3)(d).*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the replacement of the front door with an outswing door moved from another location in the structure, the removal of the asphalt siding and the restoration of the original clapboard siding, a new window and door on the rear of the structure, and the extension of the porch roof on the rear of the structure at 43 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 14<sup>th</sup> day of July 2015, determine that the work at 43 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.*

Mr. Sanford 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.

**134 Main Street (Perry's 134 Main, LLC /Altonview Architects)** – Proposed exterior renovations/addition

Ms. Drerup recused herself at 6:39 PM.

Mr. Austin stated that the application as submitted only requires approval from HPARB.

Ms. Drerup asked if that was his decision as ZEO.

Mr. Austin stated that he has conferred with Village Attorney, Martin Tillapaugh and the Board of Trustees and the decision is that only HPARB will need to act on this application.

Dr. MacMillan asked Ms. Drerup about the egress stairs.

Ms. Drerup stated that the stairs are already in place and that there will be no changes to the first floor.

Dr. MacMillan stated that that means there will not be any changes to the footprint.

Ms. Drerup stated that was correct there will not be any changes to the footprint.

Dr. MacMillan questioned the number of new units.

Ms. Drerup stated that there would be a total of eight units which would be an increase of three units from the original five units.

Mr. Snell asked if the new interior staircase would mean a new door and outside exit.

Ms. Drerup stated that the stairs will go into the basement and would exit the building from there.

Mr. Snell asked if there would be any offset from the existing building to the addition.

Ms. Drerup stated that the offset would be 1 – 2 inches. She stated that there is currently a corner board which will need to be replaced as it is pieced together.

Mr. Snell stated that the shadow line should be retained.

Ms. Drerup stated that it would.

Mr. Snell asked about the windows on the rear of the structure and the exhaust fans located directly below them.

Ms. Drerup stated that the windows will be operable but she would expect that they may not be opened due to the exhaust fans and odors that may be coming from the restaurant. Ms. Drerup stated that the design was complete prior to exhaust fans being installed.

Mr. Snell asked what would happen at the edge of the roof as there is no parapet.

Ms. Drerup stated that it would probably have flashing.

Mr. Snell asked Ms. Drerup if she had considered the use of a parapet which would still allow drainage off the rear of the building.

Ms. Drerup stated that she had not yet gotten to that level of detail.

Mr. Snell stated that a parapet might also provide screening for the rooftop mechanicals.

## DRAFT

Ms. Drerup stated that screening was not required for the previous approval when the makeup air unit was installed on the roof of a single story, and it will be even less visible when it is moved to the roof over the third story.

Mr. Snell stated that maybe the wrong decision was made at that time. He further stated that the law requires rooftop screening of mechanicals and he wants to be sure that he is following the requirements of the law.

Ms. Callahan stated that she feels the design is a good vision for the building.

Mr. Sanford stated that he understands Mr. Snell's concerns regarding the roof details.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he is concerned about the exhaust fans on the rear of the building in relation to the windows.

Ms. Drerup explained that the windows are not needed for egress but are needed to provide natural light.

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: July 14, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed exterior renovation/addition at 134 Main Street, Cooperstown, NY*

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

- A public hearing is not required;*
- The requirements of SEQRA have been met for this action;*
- The structure is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(c) and (4)(f).*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed exterior renovations at 134 Main Street;*

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 14<sup>th</sup> day of July 2015, determine that the work at 134 Main Street, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.*

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

Mr. Snell stated that he will vote against the project because he believes the law requires the rooftop mechanicals to be screened.

Mr. Austin stated that the law is not clear on what the mechanicals need to be screened from.

The board reviewed the law regarding screening and buffering roof top mechanicals.

A vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, MacMillan, Sanford

NAYES: Snell

Motion carried.

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

### **Other Business**

Ms. Drerup returned to the board at 7:03 PM.

Ms. Callahan asked if HPARB needed to take any action on the hotel application.

Mr. Austin stated that the last action the board took was to deem the application incomplete. No further action is needed unless the applicant submits additional information which would complete the file but since the Board of Trustees has denied the Special Use Permit he does not foresee the application as submitted moving forward.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he had a conversation with Mr. Craig Phillips regarding building materials, specifically the low quality of wood products today. He stated that Mr. Phillips has recommended that the board not be insistent on wood products and be open to alternatives. Dr. MacMillan stated that he agrees with Mr. Phillips. He shared with the board a piece of wood fence from his property which was in place for less than 10 years but already has significant rot.

Ms. Drerup stated that she feels that the board does consider other materials when appropriate.

Mr. Snell stated that the Board is not in the business of endorsing any particular product.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he is just suggesting that the board consider other materials and possibly create a list of suggested acceptable alternatives.

Ms. Callahan stated that there could be a hierarchy of materials when looking at specific features.

Ms. Drerup again stated that she feels that the board is open to other building materials when appropriate and when they meet the standard of the law. She stated that she feels it is up to the applicant to present the option they feel is appropriate and the board will work from there.

Mr. Austin stated that the new owners at 1 Fernleigh Drive would like to install a basketball hoop at the house end of their driveway. The proposed hoop would not be portable but a 8" pipe installed in the ground with a height of 18 – 20 feet with a backboard mounted to it. Mr. Austin stated that this could be considered a permanent structure and asked the board if it was something they would like to review.

Mr. Sanford suggested that if the pipe is put into a sleeve which is in the ground it would not be permanent.

The board discussed the proposed project and determined that a basketball hoop was not something that required review.

## DRAFT

Mr. Austin stated that the last house on the right at the north end of River Street currently has an area with 4" X 4" posts with rope as part of a "fence." In addition they have snow fence installed in another area to indicate a steep area of the property. Mr. Austin stated that they would like to install posts and ropes like the existing "fence" in place of the snow fence. He asked if that would require an application.

Ms. Drerup stated that an application would be appropriate as it is technically a fence, and it is prominently visible from the public way.

The board concurred.

**Minutes:**

Ms Callahan made a motion to approve the minutes of the special meeting held on May 26, 2015 as submitted. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan

ABSTAIN: Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

Mr. Snell made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 9, 2015 meeting as submitted. Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 7:12 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Jennifer Truax  
Deputy Village Clerk