

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, August 11, 2015. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Roger MacMillan, David Sanford and Ralph Snell. Member Liz Callahan, and Alternate Brian Alexander were absent. Also in attendance was Zoning Enforcement Officer – Tavis Austin and Deputy Village Clerk – Jennifer Truax. Eleven members of the public were present.

Ms. Drerup called the meeting to order at 5:03 PM.

Public Hearing

42 Lakeview Drive South (John May) – Public hearing for a field change to demolish the structure

Mr. Snell recused himself at 5:04 PM.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and opened the public hearing at 5:04 PM. She asked for public comment. There was no public comment at this time.

Mr. Austin stated that one letter from a neighbor in support of the demolition was received and is in the file.

The board reviewed the letter of support.

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

42 Lakeview Drive South (John May) – Field change for a screened porch

Ms. Drerup reviewed the request for a field change and asked Mr. May if the porch would add length to the structure.

Mr. May explained that the screened porch would not add length but would replace the planned/existing porch.

Ms. Drerup stated that the letter provided for the demolition also supported the addition of the screen porch to the original design.

Dr. MacMillan made a motion to approve the field change for a screened porch on the south side of 42 Lakeview Drive South as submitted. Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and the following discussion was held.

Ms. Drerup asked if the materials would be the same as proposed for the structure.

Mr. May stated that it would be. He added that it would be trimmed with cedar to match the siding.

Ms. Drerup asked if the screen door would be cedar as well.

Mr. May stated that it would be.

A vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford

Motion carried.

12 Main Street (Mr. Tedesco, Contractor for Roger & Carla MacMillan) – Replacement of existing fence

Dr. MacMillan recused himself and Mr. Snell returned to the board at 5:08 PM.

Mr. Tedesco reviewed the application and provided an example of the material. He stated that the sample was not an exact match but was as close as he was able to obtain at this time. He continued to state that the material would be paintable.

Ms. Drerup stated that the sample was very glossy and asked if Dr. MacMillan was aware that the material was a gloss finish.

Mr. Snell stated that a flat version would be more aesthetically appropriate.

Ms. Drerup asked if the manufacturer chosen was because they make the same fence design as the fence which is currently in place.

Mr. Tedesco stated that Bruce Hall carries this manufacturer's products and the desired design was available. He continued to state that this may not be the best example as it is not the exact product. He stated that it was the closest sample that could be provided at this time.

Ms. Drerup stated that it was shinier than she has hoped and she does not believe it will hold paint. She asked about the gate replacement.

Mr. Tedesco stated that the gate would be replaced with a new gate which matched the design of the existing gate.

Ms. Drerup asked the location of the fence.

Mr. Tedesco stated that there would be 104 feet of fence along the River Street property line.

Ms. Drerup asked if the fence in the alley matched the new proposed fence.

Mr. Snell stated that it does match with the exception of the lattice.

Mr. Tedesco stated that the lattice will be painted a dark color.

Ms. Drerup asked about the finials.

Mr. Tedesco stated that they are trying to obtain the same finials as are on the existing fence. He continued to state if they cannot be purchased in composite they could use wood finials.

Ms. Drerup asked if the fence panels are tongue and groove.

Mr. Tedesco stated that they would be tight panels.

Ms. Drerup stated that the panels are shorter than the existing panels.

Mr. Tedesco stated that the panels would be installed with the top at the same height as the existing fence leaving 6 – 8 inches underneath which would be filled with a metal screening to keep animals out.

Ms. Drerup asked if the height would be 7 feet.

Mr. Tedesco stated that at the highest point, or top of the caps, the fence would be 7 feet high.

Ms. Drerup asked if the panels are custom or available for order.

Mr. Tedesco stated that they are available for order but are ordered in section lengths which are custom.

Mr. Snell asked if Dr. MacMillan realizes how shiny the proposed product is.

Mr. Tedesco stated that he is not sure if Dr. MacMillan realizes or if the product will actually be as shiny as this sample. He stated that he may be able to request a sample of the actual product from the company.

Ms. Drerup asked when the project is scheduled to be completed.

Mr. Tedesco stated that it is planned for installation before winter.

Ms. Drerup asked the board if they felt it was reasonable to ask for a material sample.

Mr. Snell stated that he would feel more comfortable with a decision if he was able to see the actual material.

Mr. Sanford concurred.

Mr. Tedesco stated that he did not realize that the finish would be an issue and has not looked into details regarding the finish.

Mr. Snell stated that a matte finish would be preferable.

Ms. Drerup stated that the fence design and location seem appropriate but the finish is the main concern. She asked Mr. Tedesco to confirm the gate design is available from the company as well.

The board tabled the proposed fence at 12 Main Street until receipt of additional information.

9 Pine Boulevard (Susan Snell, Architect for the Chrissmans) – Field change for design

Dr. MacMillan returned to the board and Mr. Snell recused himself at 5:17 PM.

Ms. Snell reviewed the field changes to include the change in the door and window location, the bracketed hood extension over the pass door, and the change in the roof from gable to hip.

Ms. Drerup asked about changes to the deck.

Ms. Snell explained that the design is simpler with a platform and stairs which lead to a patio. Ms. Snell asked if the trellises required approval.

Ms. Drerup asked how they would be held in place.

Ms. Snell stated that they would be anchored to posts.

Ms. Sanford suggested that they be installed in a tube similar to the basketball hoop which was reviewed last month. He stated that would definitely make it removable and not require review.

Ms. Snell stated that she reviewed the law and only found arbors and trellises mentioned in the section regarding items which are exempt from setback requirements.

The board reviewed the law.

Ms. Drerup stated that in her opinion the three arbors are part of the landscape and therefore would not require approval.

Dr. MacMillan asked if they would provide screening or if they were merely for aesthetic purposes.

Ms. Snell stated that they were for landscaping purposes and aesthetics.

Ms. Drerup stated that she does not feel the trellises require HPARB approval. She stated that the field changes to be approved include the roof change to the main entryway, the roof design for the backdoor being supported by brackets, and the slight change in the three ganged windows.

Mr. Sanford made a motion to approve the field changes for 9 Pine Boulevard as submitted in drawings dated 08/04/2015. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford Motion carried.

Continuation of the Public Hearing for 42 Lakeview Drive South (John May) – Public hearing for a field change to demolish the structure

Ms. Drerup asked if there are any comments regarding the proposed demolition at 42 Lakeview Drive South. There was not public comment and Ms. Drerup closed the public hearing at 5:32 PM.

Dr. MacMillan made a motion to declare HPARB lead agency for this action. Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford.

The board reviewed SEQRA.

Ms. Drerup questioned number nine which looks at aesthetic resources, explaining that during a recent review the Board of Trustees had made a positive declaration for number 9 for a project on Main Street.

Mr. Austin stated he is not sure why the BOT would have made a positive declaration for that item. He explained that there is not anything in the state, that he is aware of, that has been declared an aesthetic resource.

The board continued to review SEQRA.

Dr. MacMillan made a motion that for a Type 1 action at 42 Lakeview Drive South the Determination of Significance be letter A – “The Project will not result in any large and important impact(s) and, therefore, is one which will not have a significant impact on the environment, therefore, a negative declaration will be prepared.” Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford Motion carried.

Ms. Drerup and Mr. Austin explained to the public the SEQRA process and why it must be completed for this action.

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: August 11, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed demolition 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:

- *The public hearing was legally advertised and held on August 11, 2015;*
- *There was no public comment either adverse or positive regarding the proposed demolition;*
- *The requirements of SEQRA were met and a negative declaration was prepared;*
- *The structure is listed as non-contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The property owner has submitted a letter outlining the reasons for demolition;*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed demolition of the residential structure 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 11th day of August 2015, determine that the proposed demolition 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.

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

Ms. Drerup asked that at least one citation of the law be made as part of the motion. She suggested that 300-25.E(2)(a) might be appropriate.

Mr. Sanford suggested (2)(b).

Ms. Webster stated that there is an easement then the village park. She stated that the post and rope was a design that would help retain the natural and unobtrusive feel while still helping to prevent the public from wandering onto private property.

Ms. Drerup asked the height of the posts.

Ms. Webster stated that the posts would be 3 feet in height and placed every 10 feet. She stated that she has provided photos from different angles and that the neighbor from 13 River Street is in attendance and supports the project.

Ms. Drerup stated that the rope may be difficult to see in the dark.

Dr. MacMillan stated that the rope is ½ inch and is fairly visible even in the dark.

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: August 11, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed fence at 11 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 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).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to proposed fence at 11 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 11th day of August 2015, determine that the work at 11 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. Sanford seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

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

7 Pine Boulevard (Ted Lott, Redpoint Builders for Marc & Becky Mershon) – Proposed 6 foot fence

Mr. Lott reviewed the proposed fence and explained that the original plan has been modified to reduce the length of the fence.

The board reviewed the new plans and statements from the adjacent property owners.

Mr. Snell asked if any trees would be removed.

Mr. Lott stated that all of the trees are on the property owners land and he believes that they can all be retained.

Ms. Drerup stated that she feels that the reduction in the length of the fence is more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. Lott stated that the intention is to screen the rear yard and that is able to be accomplished with the shorter section of fence.

Ms. Drerup stated that the fence design is nice and asked how many sections it would include.

Mr. Lott stated that the fence would be cedar and there would be two sections of 24 foot fencing installed.

Dr. MacMillan asked the height of the fence.

Mr. Lott stated that the fence will be 6 feet in height.

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

Mr. Lott stated that the fence would be painted white.

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: August 11, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed fence 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 residential structure at this location 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).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to proposed fence 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 11th day of August 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.

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

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

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

15 South Avenue (Steven & Kate Resnick) – proposed siding replacement

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and asked what the width of the replacement siding would be.

Dr. Resnick stated that it would be similar to the neighboring property, a more standard size.

Ms. Drerup asked if it would have a 5 ½ inch exposure.

Dr. Resnick stated that to be the size he was planning. He stated that wider exposure can be obtained but it is more difficult to get.

Ms. Drerup stated that when installed the siding should be lined up with the head and sill of the window.

Mr. Snell stated that the Hardie board siding would require corner boards.

Dr. Resnick stated that he is aware of that and that there are currently aluminum pieces hanging from the siding or falling off onto the ground.

Ms. Drerup asked if the garage would be resided as well.

Dr. Resnick stated that they will be replacing the garage siding as well.

Ms. Drerup asked if the shutters would be reinstalled.

Dr. Resnick stated that they could be reinstalled or leave the structure shutter-less.

Mr. Snell stated that if the shutters are reinstalled they should be installed to look like functional shutters. He explained that they would need to be installed over the trim.

Dr. Resnick stated that he does not think he has ever seen shutters installed over the trim.

Mr. Snell stated that real shutters are installed that way to be able to functionally close over the window.

Ms. Drerup asked if the window trim would be replaced.

Dr. Resnick stated that the trim needs maintenance but would be retained.

Mr. Snell asked if the dentil work would be retained.

Dr. Resnick stated that they plan to retain the dentil work unless it becomes undoable.

Ms. Drerup asked what year the structure was built.

Dr. Resnick stated 1970.

Ms. Drerup explained that the Glimmerglass Historic Nomination Form oddly lists the home as circa 1971 – 1980.

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: August 11, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed siding replacement at 15 South 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 residential structure at this location 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), and (4)(f).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to proposed siding replacement at 15 South 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 11th day of August 2015, determine that the proposed work at 15 South 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.

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

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

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

97 Beaver Street (Terance Pugliese) – Proposed new fence and porch renovations

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application for a new fence on the rear property line. She asked Mr. Pugliese why he wanted to install a fence in front of this neighbor's existing fence.

Mr. Pugliese stated that the neighbor's fence is in poor condition, his dog is able to get through the fence, and that his neighbor has asked him not to lean items against the fence or place snow against it.

Mr. Austin stated that the existing fence of the neighbor was installed with the bad side towards Mr. Pugliese's property. He continued to state that he would recommend allowing Mr. Pugliese to install his fence with the good side facing his own property to allow him to make repairs as necessary since there will not be enough space between the two fences to allow repairs.

Mr. Pugliese stated that he reduced the height of the proposed fence from 6 feet to 4 feet as requested by the neighbor.

Dr. MacMillan asked how much space was between the two fences.

Mr. Pugliese stated that there will be approximately 1 foot.

Dr. MacMillan questioned how the fence would be maintained with such a small distance between the two fences.

Ms. Drerup explained that if the fence is installed with the good side facing Mr. Pugliese's property he will be able to remove panels to make repairs as necessary. She further stated that she thinks the footprint drawing is backwards.

Mr. Pugliese reviewed the drawing with Ms. Drerup and they determined that it was indeed drawn backwards on the map.

Ms. Drerup stated that the fence would only be installed on the west side of the property.

Mr. Pugliese stated that was correct. He continued to state that as a courtesy the fence will not cover the existing gate in the neighbor's fence.

The board reviewed the location of the proposed fence as well as an existing fence on the property.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the letters provided from neighboring properties.

Mr. Austin stated that acquiescence from the neighbors is not necessary as the fence has been reduced in height to 48".

Ms. Drerup asked how long the section of fence will be.

Mr. Pugliese stated that the fence will be 24 feet in length.

Ms. Drerup clarified that the fence will be 48" high and 24 feet long. She asked Mr. Pugliese to review the proposed porch renovations.

Mr. Pugliese reviewed photos of the existing porch and explained that they would like to remove the spindles and replace the railing with a solid siding at the same height as the spindles.

Dr. MacMillan asked why the change is being requested.

Mr. Pugliese stated that snow blows in against the door.

Mr. Snell stated that architecturally this would be a step backwards.

Dr. MacMillan concurred with Mr. Snell.

Ms. Drerup asked when the porch was completed.

Mr. Pugliese stated that it was when the addition was put on the residence.

Ms. Drerup asked what the railing was constructed from.

Mr. Pugliese stated that it was black wrought iron.

Ms. Drerup stated that the existing porch and step railings look very nice and suggested that something be placed on the inside of the railing during the winter months to prevent the snow from blowing in.

The board suggested items such as a heavy canvas or plywood.

Mr. Pugliese agreed not to replace the porch railing but stated that the hand rail will need to be repaired.

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: August 11, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed fence at 67 Beaver 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).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed fence at 67 Beaver 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 11th day of August 2015, determine that the work at 67 Beaver 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, Snell

Motion carried.

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

72 Fair Street (Fran & John LeRoux) – Proposed removal of front cupola

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application to remove the existing cupola.

Mr. Snell stated that the residence is listed as circa 1909.

Ms. Drerup stated that at some point changes have been made to the structure. She stated that there is a lot going on; on the roof, and that she does not feel that the cupola will be missed.

Dr. MacMillan stated that the structure was originally a carriage barn.

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: August 11, 2015

A resolution to approve the removal of the removal of the cupola at 72 Fair 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 cupola is not a historic feature in its own right;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (4)(d), and (4)(f).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed cupola removal at 72 Fair 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 11th day of August 2015, determine that the work at 72 Fair 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: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell Motion carried.

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

28 Pioneer Street (Martin Tillapaugh for Tillapaugh Funeral Home) – Proposed step replacement

Mr. Austin reviewed the application and explained that the design and size would remain the same but the brick would be replaced with stone. He stated that it is believed that the replacement will be closer to the original than the existing brick.

Mr. Tillapaugh stated that the steps at the funeral home were changed to brick in 1960 – 1961 and have been replaced several times. He continued to state that in the 1920s the stone steps were replaced with wood. Mr. Tillapaugh stated that the current rise is very uneven and the brick is deteriorating. He explained that 2 ½ inch blue stone treads are proposed on top of cobblestone risers. He further explained that during the replacement the rise would be evened out between steps and they feel that the solid treads will lead to less deterioration.

Ms. Drerup asked if the number of risers will change.

Mr. Tillapaugh stated that there are currently five risers and that there will be no change in the number of risers.

Ms. Drerup asked if the tread depth will change.

Mr. Tillapaugh stated that it may.

Ms. Drerup asked if it would be approximately 11 inches.

Mr. Tillapaugh stated that it may be greater than that.

Ms. Drerup asked if the railing will be reused.

DRAFT

Mr. Tillapaugh stated that it would be reused and affixed by drilling hole and securing it directly to into the treads and to the porch at the top of the rail.

Mr. Snell expressed a concern regarding a tripping hazard from the use of cobblestone.

Ms. Drerup stated that the depth of the nosing may affect the tripping hazard caused by use of cobblestone.

Mr. Tillapaugh stated that the contractor is very good and has done a lot of this type of work. He stated that he will mention the concern to the contractor.

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: August 11, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed step replacement at 28 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, NY

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

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

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed work at 28 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 11th day of August 2015, determine that the work at 28 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.

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

Ms. Drerup suggested that section 300-26.E(4)(f) would also be appropriate to cite for this project.

Mr. Snell amended his motion to read:

Action by the Village of Cooperstown, Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board

Resolution date: August 11, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed step replacement at 28 Pioneer Street, Cooperstown, NY

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

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

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed work at 28 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 11th day of August 2015, determine that the work at 28 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.

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

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

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

103 Main Street (Teresa Drerup, Altonview Architects for A. Ferrara) – Field change to relocate garage door

Ms. Drerup recused herself at 6:40 PM.

Mr. Austin reviewed the application and the action from the December meeting. He stated that the question arose in a recent ZBA meeting about the correct procedure to revisit an item that was denied.

Mr. Tillapaugh, Village Attorney, explained that Roberts Rules of Order were developed to prevent continually revisiting the same topics but they do not prohibit it. He stated that an individual on the prevailing side can bring a motion back to the floor.

The board discussed the process of bring a decision back to the floor and different situations where it might occur.

Mr. Tillapaugh stated that Mr. Ferrara was denied accessibility to the east side of the property by the Scriven Foundation and then requested permission from the Trustees to be able to access a garage door on the west side of the building by driving over the sidewalk in the Doubleday Field Parking lot. He reported that the BOT reviewed the request and based on the fact that most driveways are accessed over sidewalks they agreed to allow Mr. Ferrara the ability to access this location across the sidewalk in the parking lot. He summarized that Mr. Ferrara does have permission to access a garage door by driving over the sidewalk should HPARB give him a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Austin noted that the Village routinely closes the lot for special events and that could cause an issue for the applicant.

Mr. Tillapaugh stated that the Village also routinely closes Pioneer Street for such events and the residents are required to either not move their vehicles from their residential parking spaces or to move them to another location prior to the street closing.

Mr. Snell stated that it appears that there is nothing preventing HPARB from this action.

Mr. Tillapaugh stated that Roberts Rules of Order are not a mandate and as long as the members of the board agree to the revisiting of the action there is no complaint mechanism to bring against the action.

Dr. MacMillan asked the width of the entryway.

Ms. Drerup stated that it is 8'4" and will not be changing.

Mr. Snell asked Ms. Drerup to describe the proposed change.

Ms. Drerup stated that the existing storefront and canopy will be replaced with an custom built overhead garage door.

Mr. Snell stated that the existing windows are framed and have steel sashes. He asked if steel was the proposed material for the door.

Ms. Drerup stated that she is not sure it is still but that it would be metal.

Mr. Snell stated that if aluminum was used the framing would be heavier in appearance.

Ms. Drerup stated that they are not necessarily trying to duplicate the existing.

Mr. Snell asked about the retention of the arch.

Ms. Drerup stated that the arch would remain.

Mr. Sanford stated that he thought the arch had already been removed.

Ms. Drerup stated that it has been covered up but it is still there.

Mr. Snell asked if the only change is the proposed door.

Ms. Drerup stated that the door is the only change and would be glass with a solid panel at the bottom.

Mr. Snell asked what would happen to the proposed door on the east side of the structure which was previously approved.

Ms. Drerup stated that nothing would happen there.

Mr. Sanford asked if the existing door on the east side would remain.

Ms. Drerup stated that whatever is there currently will remain and no changes will be made to the east side of the building.

Dr. MacMillan made a motion to approve the field change for 103 Main Street for the installation of an overhead door on the west side of the building in lieu of the previously approved overhead door on the east side of the building with the removal of the canopy over the present structure as submitted in plans dated 12/12/2014. Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

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

Mr. Austin reviewed the application and stated that it poses an interesting question regarding the supplementary height limitations.

The board reviewed the section of the law regarding supplementary height limitations.

Mr. Austin stated that it is his recollection that when the Hospital Zoning Committee discussed this law the rooftop height exception and the required buffering was to occur once the height limit was reached. He stated that this project poses the question "does the law require mechanicals to be buffered when they do not exceed the height limit?"

Ms. Drerup stated that they are currently not screened and are located at the 2nd story level. She stated that they are being moved up two levels where they are still lower than the height limitation.

Mr. Snell stated that the previous vote of the board was not unanimous. He stated that he feels that the law requires buffering.

Ms. Drerup stated that the only place in the law where buffering is mentioned, besides the definitions, is under height exceptions.

Mr. Tillapaugh stated that HPARB can make a determination as to the interpretation of the law regarding buffering and then make a decision regarding the application or they may choose to just act on the application and let each member base their vote on their own interpretation of the law.

Mr. Austin stated that he was willing to write a determination as the Zoning Enforcement Officer and should someone have an issue with that decision it would be appealed to the Zoning Board of Appeals where they would be required to interpret and make a determination on the law. He explained that he feels that this application is similar to the previous application for 99 Main Street where the board could not deny based on the use of the structure regardless of their feelings about the use. He explained that the definition of buffer refers to items like headlights and glare and the relocation of the fans will actually reduce these items for the general public.

Mr. Snell stated if the law is addressed logically it is about the idea of hiding the equipment.

The board further discussed buffering and the purpose for buffering mechanicals.

Mr. Austin asked at what visual point are we looking at the mechanical in regarding the buffering, the street, neighboring buildings.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he believes it should be buffered.

Mr. Sanford stated that the bigger problem is how to screen these types of items without the screening being more offensive than the mechanical itself.

The board discussed whether or not they wanted to take action.

Mr. Snell recommended that the board table this item until the September meeting.

Dr. MacMillan made a motion to table the discussion regarding 134 Main Street until the September meeting. Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: MacMillan, Sanford, Snell Motion carried.

37 Nelson Avenue (Francesco Tenti)

Ms. Drerup returned to the board at 7:25 PM.

Mr. Austin reviewed the application to replace an existing 8'X5' Rubbermaid Shed with a 8'X12' Amish built shed.

The board reviewed the application, proposed materials and design.

Mr. Sanford asked if the setback requirements were met.

Mr. Austin stated that the setback requirement will be met.

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: August 11, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed the shed replacement at 37 Nelson 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 residential structure at this address is listed as 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 shed at 37 Nelson 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 11th day of August 2015, determine that the work at 37 Nelson 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: Drerup, 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) – Field change for front façade windows

Mr. Austin provided information provided by Mr. Edmonds for the project at 8 Walnut Street.

The board reviewed the information and stated that they did not feel they have enough information to know the intention or to act on these items. They asked Mr. Austin to have Mr. Edmonds attend September's meeting and/or provide specific information prior to the meeting for review.

Other Business

Ms. Drerup reported Dr. MacMillan brought to her attention that the garage at 31 River Street has been demolished. She explained that an application was received and a public hearing was held in October of 2011. She stated that although the public hearing was opened and closed there was no discussion recorded and no action taken and therefore the demolition was approved by default. She explained that she believes that the board may have been waiting for a decision by the ZBA regarding the setbacks prior to taking action.

Mr. Austin stated that the board has 62 days to act on an application once it is deemed complete. Since a public hearing was held the application would have been deemed complete. He further stated if no action is taken the application would be considered approved.

The board reviewed the status of work at 22 Eagle Street and 40 Elm street.

Minutes:

Ms. Drerup made a motion to approve the minutes of the special meeting held on July 31, 2015 as submitted. Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford

ABSTAIN: Snell

Motion carried.

Dr. MacMillan made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 14, 2015 meeting as submitted. Mr. Snell seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 7:42 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Truax
Deputy Village Clerk