

The regular meeting of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board (HARB) of the Village of Cooperstown was held in the Village Office Building, 22 Main Street, Cooperstown, New York on January 14, 2014. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Liz Callahan, Roger MacMillan, Ralph Snell, Wendell Tripp and alternate Hugh MacDougall. Also in attendance was Zoning Enforcement Officer – Tavis Austin and Deputy Village Clerk – Jennifer Truax. Seven members of the public were present.

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

Regular Agenda

36 Delaware Street (Joseph Wyckoff) – proposed rear addition, garage addition and windows

Mr. Wyckoff presented a model of the proposed work and described the addition and alterations to the residence.

Dr. MacMillan asked from what direction the garage would be accessed.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the garage would be accessed from Delaware Street using the existing driveway.

Dr. MacMillan asked the distance between the proposed garage and the neighboring residence.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that there is a span of 16' between the proposed garage and the neighbor's home. He stated that the neighbor's home is between 6 and 8 feet from the property line and the proposed garage will be approximately 9 feet from the property line. Mr. Wyckoff explained that the home is currently only two bedrooms and the addition to the rear of the home will allow for a third bedroom over the kitchen.

Dr. Tripp asked if the home has always been two bedrooms.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the home may have been three bedrooms at one time but currently has two bedrooms and a bathroom on the second floor. He stated that there were thirteen of these homes built in the Village all of which have been heavily modified except Jesse Ravage's home next door at 34 Delaware Street.

Dr. Tripp asked if the proposed garage projects towards the rear of the property.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the garage will project slightly towards the rear of the property to provide for symmetry of the roof lines.

Dr. MacMillan stated that the space between the garage dormer and the house is concerning as they may cause issues with snow and ice buildup.

Mr. Wyckoff concurred. He explained that he did not initially see this issue but once he built the model he realized this could be an issue and would like to extend the dormer on the garage to meet the house.

Ms. Drerup suggested that the dormer run the width of the garage.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he did not feel that it was necessary to run the dormer the entire width of the garage but that he could.

Ms. Drerup stated that she feels it would have a better aesthetic look to run the dormer the entire width of the garage rather than from one edge partway across the garage.

Ms. Callahan asked if the porch was going to remain an enclosed porch.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he has no plans to make any changes to the porch at this time. He continued to state that in the future they may decide to make it an open porch but until the family has the opportunity to live in the home for a period of time and determine how the space is best used it will remain an enclosed porch. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he has not found any historic photos to determine the original design of the residence and porch but believes that the porch was probably originally an open porch.

Ms. Drerup stated that the Kevlin's home (38 Delaware Street) which neighbor's the property has had a second story addition which extends all the way to the rear of the home.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the way the expansion of the Kevlin's home was built it takes on a strange salt box look which seems aesthetically rather odd.

Mr. Snell asked if the gables would be equal width.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that was correct.

Ms. Drerup stated that there are not many attached garages in the Village especially within this neighborhood.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that there are attached garages on Linden Avenue and that most homes have some kind of out building. He explained that the reason for the proposed attached garage versus a separate out building is to maintain the green space. He stated that if the garage was added to the rear of the property, not only would the space of the garage be lost but also the space to extend the driveway. In the proposed location as an attached garage it would just enclose the space currently occupied by a vehicle and would allow the rear yard to remain as usable green space.

Dr. Tripp stated that he is more concerned about the backyard. He explained that within the Village the rear yards provide informal living space. He stated that the front of the homes have a similarity and may be monotonous but the rear yards provide for open lateral views which he feels should be maintained whenever possible.

Mr. Snell stated that he does not feel that enough information has been provided to consider the application complete. He stated that the applicant needs to illustrate and or document the materials in order to provide an appropriate application for review.

Ms. Drerup stated that she feels that the applicant has indicated that he will build everything to match the existing including building his own windows.

Mr. Snell asked where the applicant has documented this.

Ms. Drerup read the written statement from Mr. Wyckoff regarding the fact that all features would be built to match the existing.

Mr. Snell asked what the siding would be.

Mr. Wyckoff stated it would be novelty siding to match the existing.

Mr. Snell asked if the siding would be horizontal or vertical.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that it would be horizontal to match the existing.

Mr. Snell stated that he is concerned that the board is approving on the "fly." He stated that he feels that the applicant should have to provide some kind of documentation as to exactly what materials will be used and that changes to the application should be limited, if allowed at all, within the meeting.

Ms. Drerup stated that the only change to the original application is the change to the dormer which will now carry all the way across the garage roof.

Mr. Snell stated that he does not feel that adequate information has been provided to act on this application.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Snell what specific information he would like added to the application.

Mr. Snell stated that the drawing needs to provide details and or a detailed description of the work and materials need to be provided.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that all siding will be milled in his shop to match the existing siding.

Mr. Snell asked if all the moldings would also be milled to match.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that every piece of trim and siding will be carried through and milled to match the existing. In addition the windows will be rebuilt with wood exactly as they were originally.

Ms. Callahan asked what would be used for doors.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he will make period correct doors. He stated that he has not been able to find a good sampling or photo of the home which provide details on the original doors for the residence so he will make doors that are period correct.

Ms. Drerup asked if the doors on Jesse Ravage's home are original.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he believes they are probably original but he cannot find a good indicator of the doors that are original to the house.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Wyckoff when he would like to start the work on the home.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that as soon as he has a decision from the Zoning Board of Appeals he will file with the County for the building permit and will start as soon as the building permit is received.

Ms. Drerup stated that her only concern with the application is the attached garage which is not typical to the neighborhood and the massing of the structure.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he is also concerned with the massing. He asked Mr. Wyckoff if the residence would be reroofed.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that at the completion of the project the roofing will be blended.

Ms. Callahan stated that she is concerned with the attached garage. She stated that attached garages are not "normal" for this period.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that adding an outbuilding to the rear of the property does not make the garage, residence or property any better or more accurate.

Dr. Tripp concurred with Mr. Wyckoff stating that disrupting the green space is not a better option.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that if the garage is relocated it will also affect the ability to see activity in the yard and may encourage teenagers at the park to use any outbuilding in the rear of the yard as a screen for undesirable activities.

Dr. Tripp stated that initially he was concerned with the second story addition as sometimes a second story addition has a negative impact on the neighborhood. He continued to state that after viewing the property and neighborhood he no longer feels that the second story addition will have a negative impact.

Ms Drerup asked Dr. Tripp how he feels about the garage addition.

Dr. Tripp stated that any addition to the bulk of a structure can be considered negative but he does not feel that the proposed additions have a notable effect on the neighborhood and in fact the placement of the garage in the rear yard would have a more negative impact than the proposed placement.

Mr. Austin stated that the ZBA will have a public hearing in February and the notices were mailed to the neighbors last week. At this time no inquires have been made regarding the project.

Mr. Snell asked Mr. Wyckoff to review the roof line explaining that the model and the drawings show different roof lines.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that in the drawing the corner of the roof is cut out to match the footprint of the residence, however while building the model he allowed the roof to continue across this area and meet. He stated that once the model was constructed it appeared aesthetically more appropriate to let the roof line extend and meet than to cut it out to follow the footprint as indicated in the drawing.

Mr. Snell stated that the west wall of the dormer should not align with the wall of the main structure.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he felt they should line up and that the siding would carry straight through.

Mr. Snell stated that aesthetically it should be pulled back or moved forward to change the visual lines.

Ms. Drerup stated that she is concerned with the attached garage but feels that a good job has been done in not changing the footprint of the residence. She further stated that she commends Mr. Wyckoff for restoring the rest of the residence including the windows and storms.

Ms. Callahan stated that she is concerned with the balance of the garage addition and that the aesthetics may change if the porch is opened up.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that until they have the opportunity to live in the home he does not know how the porch will best serve their needs.

Ms. Callahan stated that plans which included all pertinent measurements would be helpful.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Wyckoff to submit a copy of the plans which will be submitted to the county with his application for the building permit.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he will provide a copy of the plans.

Dr. Tripp stated that with the model and the dialog tonight he feels all of the questions regarding the project were cleared up.

Mr. MacDougall stated that the questions may have been answered but the details have not been placed with the application and put on file.

The board discussed what is meant by and how to accurately document "to match existing."

Dr. McMillan 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: January 14, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed residential expansion and garage addition at 36 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)(a), (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 residential expansion and garage addition at 36 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 14th day of January 2014,

Mr. Austin stated that the awning is coming from the same manufacturer as the previous two awnings and he believes it to be identical.

Ms. Callahan asked about the framework of the awnings being removed after the completion of the season.

Mr. Austin explained that Mr. Ferrara had questioned whether or not the framework needs to be removed in September of 2013 at which time HPARB gave permission for the framework to remain. In November of 2013 it was discovered that the original motion in 1996 by the Planning Board had conditioned that the framework be removed each season. Mr. Austin stated that he has spoken to Mr. Ferrara and he is willing to take the framework down each season but is not taking it down this year as all other components had already been dealt with. Mr. Austin stated that Mr. Ferrara anticipates that any approval of the requested third awning will come with the condition that all awnings and their framework must be removed at the end of the tourist season.

Dr. Tripp stated that he does feel that the framework is rather intrusive and should be removed each year.

Ms. Drerup stated that the original motion for the small awning indicated that the framework must be removed with the exception of the anchors which attach directly to the building.

Ms. Drerup asked Ms. Ellis if they would be adding additional items under the awning such as televisions.

Ms. Ellis stated that they would only be adding the awning. She explained that the awning was to provide additional protection from the elements for patrons as they walk to the restrooms.

Ms. Drerup asked whether the awning would project to the same location as the lattice wall.

Mr. Austin stated that the awning would come to the curb.

Mr. Snell stated that the illustration does not clearly indicate how the awning will relate to the other awnings.

Ms. Drerup stated that the drawing given at the time of the last awning approval was fairly sketchy.

The board reviewed and discussed the heights and pitch of each awning, their placement on the existing building and their appearance in relation to each other.

Mr. Snell stated that he does not feel that there is enough information to accurately understand the awning placement and relationship to other structures.

Ms. Drerup stated that elevation drawings which show the existing windows and awning attachments are necessary to make an informed decision.

Ms. Callahan stated that the drawing should also show the new awning in relation to the existing awnings.

Mr. Snell clarified that in order to provide a complete application Mr. Ferrara needs to provide an elevation drawing of the west side of the building from Main Street to the fire lane which indicates the new awning as well as existing awnings and all dimensions with the attachment bars and windows clearly indicated.

Ms. Callahan additionally requested a footprint drawing.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to table the application for 99 Main Street until the February 11, 2014 meeting to allow the applicant to provide additional details and accurate drawings. Ms. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

Minutes:

Mr. Snell made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 10, 2013 meeting as presented. Ms. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

Other Business:

Ms. Drerup reviewed the findings from the SHPO audit and stated that the board has 120 days to provide a written response. She reviewed the findings of the audit which indicated that the board has varying degrees of preservation experience and that additional training would be useful.

Ms. Drerup stated that she has found that there is very useful information in the Presentation Briefs from the National Park Service and suggested that board members take time to review these briefs in their spare time.

The board discussed reviewing the briefs monthly or quarterly as a group. The board also discussed other training opportunities which may be available.

The board reviewed the current zoning application and discussed how to help applicants understand the requirements of a complete application.

The board reviewed the CLG report for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 2012 and ending September 30, 2013. Members agreed to review their training records and provide Ms. Drerup with information on any pertinent training which they attended during that fiscal year.

Ms. Drerup stated that she and Trustee Falk are working on a possible CLG grant to update just the Village portion of the Glimmerglass Historic District Nominating Form. She added that SHPO has been very supportive of the idea of applying for this grant. She stated that the application is due by the end of January and in order to submit it the Board of Trustees will need to approve it at their January 27th meeting. She explained the details of the grant including the requirement that recipients must come up with a 40 % match. She explained that the match could include staff time, specifically Albert Keck, to link the tax map number of each property to the descriptions in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nominating Form.

DRAFT

Mr. Snell made a motion to recommend to the Board of Trustees that they pursue this grant to update the Glimmerglass Historic District Nominating Form. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

Meeting adjourned at 7:32 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Truax
Deputy Village Clerk