

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 February 11, 2014. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Liz Callahan, Roger MacMillan, Ralph Snell, Wendell Tripp and proposed alternate David Sanford. Also in attendance was Zoning Enforcement Officer – Tavis Austin and Deputy Village Clerk – Jennifer Truax. Twelve members of the public were present.

Ms. Drerup called the meeting to order at 5:01 PM.

Public Hearing

10 Chestnut Street (JGB Properties) – Request to demolish the single story masonry structure at 10 Chestnut Street and the 1.5 story wooden structure on parcel number 115.18-2-49.00. A demolition permit was previously granted but permit has expired.

Mr. Snell recused himself.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the proposed application to renew the previously issued demolition permit and opened the public hearing at 5:02 PM. She asked for public comment. There was no comment at this time. Ms. Drerup stated that the public hearing would remain open for a period of time. She asked the board to review the next agenda item.

Mr. Snell returned to the board.

Regular Agenda

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

Ms. Drerup stated that this application was continued from the January 14, 2014 meeting to allow Mr. Wyckoff to submit additional information. She stated that the requested documents have been received and asked the board if they have any comments or questions.

Mr. Snell thanked Mr. Wyckoff for the submissions and stated that the information provided makes the details of the project clear.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he feels that the drawings are fabulous and if okay with Mr. Wyckoff could be used as an example for individuals looking for guidance in developing drawings for a proposed project.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Wyckoff what the source of the garage door would be.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he intends to make the door himself to mimic the style presented.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the garage dormer would be carried to the residence as suggested at the previous meeting to reduce the impact from snow.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that he did make the proposed change to the dormer. He shared a model of the structure which showed the change to the dormer.

Ms. Drerup asked if the dormer roof and house roof would touch, as they appear to do in the model, adding that, if so, it would trap snow.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that they would not. He explained that he was unable to show the proposed changes with 100% accuracy due to the materials used for the model.

Mr. Drerup stated that the drawings indicate one foot between the two roofs.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that to be correct.

Mr. Snell stated that he appreciates the level of craftsmanship being used to duplicate the features of this historic home. He stated that he originally had trepidations regarding the attached garage. He continued to state that after much consideration he feels the conditions of this site are unique and that the proposed location of the garage pushed back toward the rear of the residence helps minimize the impact making the proposed attached garage acceptable.

Ms. Callahan stated that she also had been concerned about the proposed attached garage; however, she feels that the project has been addressed with as much sensitivity as possible while maintaining the needs and desires of the family.

Ms. Drerup stated that she feels that the applicant has worked to minimize the impact of the proposed changes on the original structure. She stated that if the proposed garage was any smaller a vehicle may not fit within its footprint.

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: February 11, 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 as proposed in drawings dated 02/11/2014 for 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 11th day of February 2014, determine that the proposed work at 36 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. Snell seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Snell, Tripp

Motion carried.

The board determined this project to be a major alteration to the property.

Continuation of the Public Hearing for 10 Chestnut Street (JGB Properties) – Request to demolish the single story masonry structure at 10 Chestnut Street and the 1.5 story wooden structure on parcel number 115.18-2-49.00. A demolition permit was previously granted but permit has expired.

Mr. Snell recused himself.

Mr. Austin reviewed the history of this application. He stated that the demolition was previously approved but the existing permit expired in part due to a lawsuit regarding the Village Street which allows access to the property. He stated that the Planning Board's action indicated that the Planning Board's permit would expire two years from the court decision regarding the property. He explained that there is some indications that discussion of the same expiration extension was applied to the demolition permit as well; however, no minutes have been located which support this. Given all of this the applicant has asked for a full review including public hearing and issuance of a new demolition permit to ensure that they have all the legally required permits to proceed.

Ms. Drerup stated that no comments have been received and there has not been any public comment this evening. She further stated that during the initial review of the project she had contacted Mr. Julian Adams from SHPO for assistance in how to review demolitions within the historic district as this was one of the first demolition applications received under the new law. She stated that he had advised her that when reviewing historic structures, especially for demolition, one of the most important aspects is whether or not it can be seen from a public way. Ms. Drerup stated that rear structure is not listed in the Glimmerglass Historic District nominating form and cannot be seen from a public way. She further stated that the structure at 10 Chestnut Street is in a state of disrepair. Ms. Drerup explained that she is not changed her opinion and is in favor of allowing the demolition.

Dr. MacMillan concurred.

Dr. Tripp stated that he does not have any strong opposition to the demolition but feels any demolition should be reviewed thoroughly as it is a final act.

Ms. Callahan stated that she feels similarly to Dr. Tripp in that a thorough review should happen with any proposed demolition as it is a final and non-reversible act. She stated that she did not remember these structures ever having an active use during her residency within the Village.

Ms. Drerup stated that the existing building at 10 Chestnut would be nearly impossible to renovate into housing units, due to the internal structure, and therefore does not meet the needs of the owner.

Ms. Callahan stated that the structures are difficult to sustain and would be prohibitively expensive for most businesses.

Ms. Drerup asked again for public comment.

There was no additional public comment and the public hearing was closed at 5:17 PM.

Dr. Tripp asked if the applicant was present.

Ms. Christine Stevens stood and introduced herself as the representative from JGB.

Ms. Callahan made a motion to approve the renewal of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition for 10 Chestnut Street and the 1.5 story wooden structure on parcel number 115.18-2-49.00 as per the permit dated 08/09/2009 for a period of two years from 02/11/2014. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

Mr. Snell returned to the board.

25 Church Street (Cooperstown Food Pantry/McManus Engineering) – proposed new porch

Applicant asked that the item be removed from the agenda for this evening

19 Beech Street (Philip Heavner & Marielle Ainsworth) – proposed window replacement

Ms. Drerup asked the applicants to explain the proposed window replacement.

Ms. Ainsworth explained that they purchased this property in mid-December. It is a two family residence that is used as a rental property. She explained that they have noted and the renters have expressed concerns with the unsafe and inefficient windows. She stated that they do not believe any of the windows to be original to the structure.

Mr. Heavner stated that not only are the windows probably not original they are a piecemeal of various styles. Similarly there are very few elements within the structure that match.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that two of the windows in the downstairs apartment are only single pane storm windows. She stated that there are no other windows in this area just the two permanently affixed single pane storm windows. Ms. Ainsworth stated that they have had an energy audit completed and have begun work to fully insulate the residence. She further stated that the windows are not only inefficient but dangerous; requiring mallets to open, prop sticks to keep open and no safety features. In addition some have broken panes of glass.

Ms. Drerup stated that she believes the 6 over 6 windows may be original to the residence.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that it is difficult to tell what is original in the home as it has been a rental and maintained minimally.

Ms. Drerup asked if it has been a rental for a long period of time.

Mr. Heavner stated that it has potentially been a rental for over a century. He explained that it was built by the builder of the Irish Hill rental properties and is believed to have been built as a rental.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that they intend to enhance the beauty of the property and neighborhood through improvements. She pointed out that within the neighborhood there is a new modular home as well as a newly built home, in addition throughout the neighborhood there are varying ages and styles of structures including some with replacement windows.

Ms. Drerup stated that the residential structure on this property is fairly original.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that the house has not been maintained as original. It is obvious on the interior that major alterations have been made.

Mr. Heavner stated that the home has been functionally maintained but not in its original state.

Ms. Drerup asked if the proposed replacement windows are vinyl.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that they got information and estimates on wood and aluminum clad but found them cost prohibitive. She stated that they cost nearly three times as much as the vinyl.

Ms. Drerup stated that HPARB generally does not approve vinyl windows, especially those with grilles between the glass. She asked the applicants if they had ever looked at the windows on the Agway building, which she believes are fiberglass replacement windows with simulated divided lights.

Ms. Callahan stated that she applauds the efforts of the applicants in having an energy audit done. She asked if they would consider waiting until they are done insulating to see if there is enough of a change in the energy efficiency of the home to consider leaving the existing windows.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that safety is also an issue with the existing windows and that they want to ensure not only energy efficiency, aesthetics, and comfort but also know that they are providing a safe environment for the families who rent these apartments.

Dr. MacMillan noted that when viewing the property he noticed that the caulking on the downstairs front windows is gone.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that they realize there are areas like this that could help improve the condition but are difficult or impossible to do during the winter months and do not address the overall concerns.

Ms. Drerup referred to section 300-26.E(4)(f) which states *"Deteriorated historic features should be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of the deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature and/or material, the new feature and/or material should match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials..."* Ms. Drerup added that HPARB generally considers windows a distinctive feature. She asked if they had had any experts examine the windows.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that their contractor has stated that the windows are in poor condition and should be replaced.

Ms. Drerup stated that most contractors will say that replacement windows are the best option but they are not experts in the maintenance and repair of historic windows. She further stated that in general vinyl replacement windows do not pay for themselves before they wear out.

Mr. Heavner stated that with the current windows there is no way to ensure that they are locked at a certain level, they do not open easily creating an emergency escape issue, they do not stay open without a prop which may cause a potential crushing hazard etc.

Ms. Callahan stated that the removal of the existing windows will take away from the original fabric of the structure.

Ms. Drerup stated that the members of the board are not window experts; therefore, cannot determine the safety of the existing windows. She pointed out that the board recently approved a fiberglass replacement window which may be an option for the applicant.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that fiberglass windows are very cost prohibitive according to local building centers.

Ms. Drerup stated that it is her understanding that the fiberglass replacement windows are less expensive than the wood replacements.

Mr. Heavner stated that they did cost out fiberglass replacements as well.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that they want to increase the value of the home, make it a safe place to live as well as increase the value of the neighborhood and that replacement windows are a good place to start.

Dr. MacMillan stated that generally HPARB does not approve vinyl windows.

Ms. Drerup stated that many of the homes in that area of the Village which have replacement windows were replaced prior to the implementation of this law.

A discussion was held regarding other residences with replacement windows and circumstances where vinyl replacement windows have been approved.

Mr. Heavner stated that given the neighborhood it is not fair to hold this home to a higher standard.

Dr. MacMillan stated that not only does the board need to look at the neighborhood but also the home in its own right as well as the Village as a whole.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that they have vinyl windows in their own home with wood trim which look clean and are easy to maintain.

Dr. Tripp stated that he has nothing against vinyl or PVC replacement windows, this is a rental property and he does not see anything in the law which prohibits vinyl replacements. He explained that he is not sure about considering the structure in the same context as the entire Village. He stated this is a very mixed neighborhood. He stated that he understands both positions but in this case is more sympathetic to maintaining health and safety, unless the proposed alteration is grotesque.

Mr. Snell asked if the replacement windows would fit in the current window opening without any additional changes.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that they would.

Mr. Snell asked if they were custom sized for each opening.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that each window is individually measured for a window replacement.

Mr. Snell stated that generally vinyl replacement windows are heavier in appearance than wood windows. Given that the proposed windows will be custom made to fit the existing opening they will probably have a smaller viewing area. In addition vinyl does not last forever, is not paintable and will yellow over time. The window guidelines also indicate that vinyl windows are not acceptable.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that there is precedent for vinyl replacement windows. In addition other similar products which are not paintable are regularly approved such as Trex decking.

Ms. Callahan suggested that the applicants take another look at fiberglass replacement windows. She stated that she does not think they are as cost prohibitive as wood and are significantly better than vinyl. She stated that she understands why an applicant would feel that precedence has been set. She explained that the Village did not want to continue down the same slippery slope that they had been on and that is why this law was developed. She further explained that HPARB must be concerned with each home and maintaining each home's unique historic characteristics. She stated that HPARB must review each application on its own merit and uphold the law as it pertains to each application.

Ms. Ainsworth stated that the proposed windows have been approved by the Washington Historic Commission. She explained that these are vinyl inserts which will not change the opening or the trim. She further stated that they are installed from the inside.

The board discussed the proposed 6 over 6 versus 1 over 1 and the use of grilles on the glass.

Mr. Heavner stated that although their personal preference is for the 6 over 6 with grilles they would not object to 1 over 1.

Dr. Tripp 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: February 11, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed window replacement at 19 Beech Street, Cooperstown, NY

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

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

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed window replacement at 19 Beech Street;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 11th day of February 2014, determine that the proposed work at 19 Beech Street, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.

Ms. Drerup seconded the motion and the following discussion was held.

Ms. Callahan stated that she would be more comfortable approving a 1 over 1 replacement window than a 6 over 6. She explained that she feels they are less visually intrusive.

Ms. Drerup concurred.

Dr. Tripp agreed to modify the motion to condition that the replacement windows be 1 over 1.

Dr. MacMillan stated that it is clear based on the window guidelines that the proposed change does not meet the guidelines.

Dr. Tripp stated that although he sees the point those are just "guidelines". He stated that the guidelines are not law. He further stated that he respects the opinion of others who do not like vinyl but given the neighborhood as well as safety issues he does not feel they are inappropriate for this property.

Ms. Drerup stated that although the applicants have shown some deterioration on some of the windows as well as shared safety concerns the law clearly says that materials used for replacement of a historic feature should whenever possible match the original. She continued to state that she would have an easier time approving a fiberglass replacement window, as it more closely resembles wood.

Ms. Callahan suggested that the applicants consider using fiberglass replacement windows even if the replacement had to be over a period of time rather than all at once. She stated that she feels in the long run the fiberglass windows will be more likely to pay for themselves and create a more original feel.

Dr. Tripp revised his motion to read as follows:

Dr. Tripp 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: February 11, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed window replacement at 19 Beech Street, Cooperstown, NY

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

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

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed Interstate, 4200 series, one-over-one, insert window replacements at 19 Beech Street;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 11th day of February 2014, determine that the proposed work at 19 Beech Street, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within

the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.

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

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, Tripp

NAYS: MacMillan, Snell

Motion carried.

The board determined this project to be a major alteration to the property.

16 Lakeview Drive North (Sam Ayers for Cheryl Wright) – appeal of previous roofing material approval

Mr. Ayers stated that Ms. Wright would like to install a standing seam roof on the home as originally proposed by the architect rather than the monolithic roofing material which was approved by HPARB previously. He further stated that he would not use monolithic roofing on this project due to its aesthetics.

Ms. Drerup stated that the aesthetics of the structure were the main reason the board required a monolithic roofing.

The board reviewed the proposed standing seam roof and the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Ayers stated that the photo of a corrugated metal roof which was provided is not accurate for what would be placed on this structure. He explained that it would be a residential standing seam roof not one that appears to be appropriate for agricultural or commercial structures.

Mr. Austin provided the board with a digital picture of a residential style standing seam roof.

Mr. Ayers stated that originally the roof was tar and stone.

Mr. Snell stated that is exactly the type or style of monolithic roofing that the board approved.

Mr. Ayers stated that it does not make sense to use this style roofing given that the home owner is completely redoing the residence.

Mr. Snell stated that he understands that the residence is having major work completed but that the work is bringing the structure back to original therefore even more of an argument for a monolithic roofing.

The board further discussed the appropriateness of a standing seam roof.

Ms. Callahan stated that without specific details of what materials are being proposed she is not prepared to vote in favor of this material change.

Dr. MacMillan stated that the applicant clearly wants standing seam roofing and therefore he may be in favor of this proposal.

Ms. Drerup stated that she understands and has similar feelings to Mr. Snell regarding the aesthetics and style, and she is also concerned with safety hazards caused by snow sliding off this metal roofing.

Mr. Ayers stated that this is not a location which is normally inhabitable, and would especially not be in the winter months.

Dr. MacMillan asked Mr. Ayers to explain exactly what the home owner is requesting.

Mr. Ayers stated that the original approval only allowed the applicant to use a monolithic roofing material unlike the originally proposed standing seam roof. He stated that he understands there is a difference in opinion between the home owner's architect and the architects on this board. He pointed out that the roof will not have a visual impact from a public way.

Ms. Drerup asked what color roofing would be used if standing seam was approved.

Mr. Ayers stated that he did not know.

Ms. Callahan stated that she feels that more information about the specifics regarding materials, design and color of the roofing are necessary in order to make an informed decision.

Dr. MacMillan questioned the right of the board to restrict color.

Mr. Snell clarified that in the case of a permanent finish such as would be on this type of roofing color can be restricted.

Mr. Sanford stated that he believes that the applicant is looking at a dark gray finish for the roofing.

Ms. Callahan stated that on several occasions HPARB has asked an applicant to return the following month with additional details. She stated that she feels that this applicant should also be required to do so prior to a decision.

HPARB further discussed the approved monolithic roofing versus the proposed standing seam and details of the standing seam which may impact the visual aesthetics of the structure and ultimately the decision of the board.

HPARB determined that without further details the material change would probably not be approved, although a majority of the board remained open to considering additional details of the proposed material.

Mr. Ayers agreed to provide additional details of the proposed material at least one week prior to the March meeting.

9 Pine Blvd (Susan Snell) – proposed field Change to 09/2013 conceptual approval

Mr. Snell recused himself.

Ms. Snell reviewed her application explaining that previously the front elevation had been reviewed and now she has provided side and rear elevation drawings. She stated that this structure is set back on property that has only a small amount of street frontage. She explained that this structure was originally part of a larger mansion which sat on this and adjoining properties. She stated that this wing of the mansion is on its original foundation. Ms. Snell continued to review the proposed addition and other element changes.

Ms. Drerup stated that the structure is not visible from the street.

Ms. Snell concurred that the existing structure is not visible; however, the expansion is significant and may be more visible.

Ms. Drerup asked if a material list has been provided.

Ms. Snell stated that the material list has been provided on the elevation drawings.

Dr. MacMillan asked what the foundation for the addition would be.

Ms. Snell stated that the original foundation will remain. She explained and shared on the drawings the areas of the addition which will have a full foundation, a crawl space or be on piers.

Dr. MacMillan asked if this property was visible from the potential new development between Pine Blvd and Chestnut Street.

Ms. Snell stated that the water line comes from that direction but it is a considerable distance. She stated that it may be visible.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the material list and asked Ms. Snell what the reveal of the fiber cement board would be.

Ms. Snell stated that the reveal would be in the neighborhood of 5 inches.

HPARB discussed with Ms. Snell the material list and use throughout the project.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to approve a field change to the Certificate of Appropriateness issued on 09/10/2013 for conceptual approval for 9 Pine Blvd and approve the elevation drawings dated 02/05/2014 with the condition that the PVC trim is only to be used on the new addition at or below the water table, corner boards, and window trim and at or below the water table of the existing structure unless it is determined that there is severe deterioration caused by moisture in other areas; in the addition flat fiberglass casing with a maximum width of 4 inches may be used. Ms. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Tripp

Motion carried.

The board determined this project to be a major alteration to the property.

Mr. Snell returned to the board.

99 Main Street (Debbie Ellis for Perry Ferrara) – proposed new awning

Mr. Austin explained that the day following the January meeting he met with Ms. Ellis and went over the measurements and drawings requested by HPARB. The drawings as submitted were not received until mid to late afternoon today, February 11, 2014.

HPARB reviewed the drawings as submitted as well as the minutes from the January meeting and found that the information requested was not provided. They agreed to table any

discussion until the first meeting following receipt of the requested material; as long as the materials are complete and received at least one week prior to the meeting.

Minutes:

Mr. Snell made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 14, 2014 meeting as presented. Ms. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

Ms. Callahan made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 28, 2014 meeting as presented. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

Meeting adjourned at 7:18 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Truax
Deputy Village Clerk