

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 May 13, 2014. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Roger MacMillan, Wendell Tripp and alternates Hugh MacDougall and David Sanford. Also in attendance was Zoning Enforcement Officer – Tavis Austin and Deputy Village Clerk – Jennifer Truax. Four members of the public were present.

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

### **Regular Agenda**

#### **25 Mill Street (Joseph Senchyshyn) – proposed shed**

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application for a new shed. She stated that only the roof would be visible from Estli Avenue.

Dr. Tripp asked if there was a shed on this property in the past.

Mr. Senchyshyn stated that there was not a shed on the property previously.

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: May 13, 2014*

*A resolution to approve the proposed shed at 25 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 residential structure at this address is listed as noncontributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;
- The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), and (3)(d).

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed shed at 25 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 13<sup>th</sup> day of May 2014, determine that the proposed work at 25 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. Tripp seconded the motion and the following discussion was held.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Austin if the side of the property facing Estli Avenue is considered the rear.

Mr. Austin reviewed the Coordinated Development zoning for this property and stated that the setback is 10'.

Ms. Drerup stated that it is strange that the setback in the Coordinated Development is 10' when all of the surrounding properties are R-1A, where the rear setback is 50'.

Mr. Austin stated that the Coordinated Development was established in the 1970s but it is unknown what the purpose was.

The board discussed the regulations of a Coordinated Development.

A vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacDougall, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp      Motion carried.

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

**114 Pioneer Street (Bud Tabor for Brenda Ayers) – Proposed new deck**

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application for the new deck on the rear of the residence.

Dr. MacMillan asked the exact location of the deck.

Mr. Tabor explained the location of the proposed deck on the rear of the residence where the existing steps are located. He stated that the deck will extend six feet from the residence.

Ms. Drerup asked if the existing rail fence would be affected by the addition of the deck.

Mr. Tabor stated that the fence would not be affected. He explained that the deck will be on the house side of the fence and will not be large enough to disturb the fence.

Ms. Drerup asked if the height of the deck would be greater than 30" off of the ground, specifically where the grade of the property drops significantly.

Mr. Tabor stated that the deck would not be greater than 30" off the ground. He explained that there are several feet between the end of the deck and the drop off on the rear of the property.

Dr. MacMillan asked what materials would be used.

Mr. Tabor stated that the deck would be constructed of pressure treated wood.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Tabor to explain the baluster location.

Mr. Tabor stated that the balusters would be installed on the outside of the rail as the deck is only 6' deep and this would provide a few extra inches of usable deck.

Dr. MacMillan asked about the steps for the proposed deck.

Mr. Tabor stated that the existing steps are nonconforming. He explained that the bottom two steps have a 6" rise but the top step has a 12" rise. He stated that he is surprised that the insurance company has not required a change prior to this. He continued to stated that with the new deck the steps will come off the side of the porch and will be the same elevation but the rise will be the same for all of the steps.

Ms. Drerup stated that she feels that the railing is problematic. She suggested that the balusters terminate at the bottom rail to facilitate cleaning and maintenance.

Mr. Tabor stated that he will make the suggested change to the railing.

Dr. Tripp stated that he feels that the proposed deck fits the character of the surrounding properties.

Ms. Drerup stated that the new deck will also improve the safety of the rear exit.

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: May 13, 2014*

*A resolution to approve the proposed deck at 114 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 residential structure at this address is listed as noncontributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;
  - The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), and (3)(c).

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed deck at 114 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 13<sup>th</sup> day of May 2014, determine that the proposed work at 114 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 with the following recommendation:

- The spindles terminate at the bottom rail and before reaching the porch decking to facilitate cleaning and maintenance of the deck.

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

AYES: Drenup, MacDougall, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp Motion carried.

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

## **5 Pioneer Street (Susan Snell for the Leist Family) – Proposed field change to fence design**

Ms. Snell reviewed the proposed design change for the previously approved fence. She explained that there is currently a split rail fence on the property and at a previous meeting HPARB had approved a picket fence. She stated that the property owner recently saw this design and had something similar created as a mock up. Ms. Snell explained that the property owner likes the uniqueness and character of the proposed fence.

Ms. Drerup asked Ms. Snell to review the location of the fence.

Ms. Snell stated that 2/3 of the east property line currently has a stockade fence which will remain. She stated that the site plan indicates in green the area where the new proposed fence would replace existing split rail fence.

Dr. Tripp asked if there are two proposed field changes, the fence design and location.

Ms. Snell stated that there is a minor location change and the design change.

Ms. Drerup asked what material will be used for the fence.

Ms. Snell stated that the property owners have indicated pressure treated golden pine, which will weather to a gray look.

Ms. Drerup stated that it is difficult to tell which side of the fence is the good side.

Ms. Snell stated that effort was made to make both sides a pleasant appearance.

Ms. Drerup stated that the posts should be to the owner's side of the fence.

Dr. Tripp asked the height of the proposed fence.

Ms. Snell explained that in no location will the height be over 4 feet but the fence design allows for a variation in height.

Ms. Drerup asked if all the vertical elements will touch the ground.

Ms. Snell stated that she is unsure but from the mock up photo it does appear that way. She stated that they may hold them off the ground slightly, to facilitate mowing.

Ms. Drerup stated that although the residence is noncontributing the property is very public as it borders the park. She stated that the property owners may want to consider landscaping to help the property and fence not feel and look as stark.

Dr. Tripp made a motion to approve the field change for 5 Pioneer Street to replace the existing split rail fence with the one show in the mock up labeled Exhibit A dated 05/13/2014 and having a maximum height of 4 feet. The western portion of the fence on the Southern property line will be along the side of the garage and include two gates for equipment access. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacDougall, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp Motion carried.

### **32 Fair Street (Susan Snell for the Wittstein Family) – Proposed mudroom addition**

Mr. Austin informed the board that a variance is required for the separation distance between the proposed addition and the accessory garage. He stated that the ZBA has had a preliminary review and will hold a public hearing in June.

Ms. Snell reviewed the drawings and explained the proposed addition. She continued to state that the property owner would also like to remove the vinyl siding on the existing addition and repair the clapboard siding which is underneath. She stated that the new addition would also have clapboard siding with the same reveal as the existing addition.

Dr. MacMillan asked for clarification as to what vinyl siding would be removed.

Ms. Snell stated that all of the vinyl siding would be removed.

Ms. Drerup asked what would be used for the door.

Ms. Snell stated that new door would be used but would have a similar look to the existing door.

Ms. Drerup asked if the door would be of wood construction.

Ms. Snell stated that the door would be either wood or fiberglass.

Ms. Drerup asked for clarification as to the requested alternate material of PVC.

Ms. Snell stated that PVC is listed as an alternate material to be used on the lower courses.

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: May 13, 2014*

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

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed addition at 32 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 13<sup>th</sup> day of May 2014, determine that the proposed work at 32 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.

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

AYES: Drerup, MacDougall, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp Motion carried.

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

**124 Main Street (Jon McManus for Tom Lagan) – Proposed replacement of window with entry door**

Mr. McManus explained that the current building has two businesses which are not operated by the same individual and which are not open during the same hours. He stated that in order to accommodate the difference in hours the property owner is proposing the replacement of one window with an entry door. Mr. McManus stated that Mr. Lagan is working on additional plans for the building but is not ready to proceed and needs to provide a separate entrance for the second business. He further stated that one picture window would be removed, the ledge cut out and an entry door put in place. The remaining open space would be framed in.

Ms. Drerup clarified that the center window would be removed but the window on either side would remain.

Mr. McManus stated that to be correct.

Dr. Tripp stated that it is an application for a temporary door to facilitate a separate entrance.

Mr. Sanford asked if the law has any provisions for temporary access to a building.

Ms. Drerup stated that she does not know of any provisions.

Mr. McManus stated that he would be okay with a temporary approval for 18 months which should allow enough time for Mr. Lagan to proceed with plans for renovations and know whether or not approval to proceed will happen. He further stated that if after the 18 months there are no firm plans to proceed with renovations the area would be faced in with brick.

Ms. Drerup asked if she understood that Mr. Lagan did not want to spend much money at this time to make this change due to plans for renovations in the near future.

Mr. McManus stated that was correct.

Ms. Drerup asked how wide the center window to be removed is.

Mr. McManus stated that he is not sure, 6 or 8 feet. He continued to state that the door would be placed in the center of the area and pressure treated sheathing, painted to match the existing trim, would be used to fill in the rest of the area.

Dr. MacMillan asked what renovations may be proposed.

Mr. McManus stated that they are considering a 2 ½ story addition. He stated that an application has already been made to DEC and the Army Corp of Engineers for permission to span the creek with parking.

The board reviewed the style and size of the door and how it would be framed into the space.

Ms. Drerup stated that the area around the door should be framed in to look consistent with three panels, each with molding around them; one over the door which spans the entire opening and two down the sides of the door which go from the top panel to the bottom of the open area.

Mr. McManus agreed.

Mr. Sanford made a motion to adopt the following resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness:

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

*Resolution date: May 13, 2014*

*A resolution to approve the proposed door at 124 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 at this address is listed as noncontributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;
- Although the proposed change can be seen from the street it is not a significant alteration and is to scale with the building;
- The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(c), and (3)(d).

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed replacement of a picture window with an entry door at 124 Main Street;*

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 13<sup>th</sup> day of May 2014, determine that the proposed work at 124 Main Street, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.*

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

AYES: Drerup, MacDougall, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp Motion carried.

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

**32 Delaware Street (Erin McKay) – Proposed installation of a new window on the rear of the residence**

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application to place a new window on the rear of the home. She explained that it is not visible from a public way and will match the existing windows.

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: May 13, 2014*

*A resolution to approve the proposed new window at 32 Delaware Street, Cooperstown, NY*

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

- A public hearing is not required;
  - The requirements of SEQRA have been met for this action;
  - The 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. (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), and (3)(b).

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed window addition at 32 Delaware Street;*

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 13<sup>th</sup> day of May 2014, determine that the proposed work at 32 Delaware Street, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.*

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

AYES: Drerup, MacDougall, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp Motion carried.

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

## **Other Business:**

Dr. MacMillan stated that he is looking to replace the existing aluminum storm door on the second floor of his home at 12 Main Street. He explained that there is evidence of a wood storm once

being in place there and that they would like to have Mr. Jeff Foster build a new wood storm door to fit but did not know if approval would be necessary.

Ms. Drerup stated that if the main door is not being changed nor any of the trim or other components of the home there is no approval needed as HPARB decided previously not to review storm doors.

Mr. Austin asked the board if air conditioner units, specifically ground mounted ones, require review and approval.

The board discussed whether or not these units would be considered a structure and if they fit the parameters of the law which requires review.

Ms. Drerup stated that after reviewing the law she feels that these types of units should be treated like any other larger structure.

Dr. Tripp made a motion that HPARB consider fixed air conditioning units structures similar to new construction which would require review. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacDougall, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp Motion carried.

Mr. Austin updated the board on the Smithy Property. He stated that he has been in contact with the property owner and did refer the concerns to the County Code office. No response was made by the code office but the property owner has contact the engineer who did the previous structural report and requested that the review be updated. Mr. Austin stated that a copy of the report will be forwarded to the Village when it is available.

Not all members had the opportunity to review the NPS Preservation Briefs e-mail to them by Ms. Drerup; therefore the same briefs will be held for review in June.

## **Minutes:**

Dr. Tripp made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 8, 2014 meeting as presented. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

ABSTAIN: MacDougall

## Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 6:42 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Jennifer Truax  
Deputy Village Clerk