

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 June 10, 2014. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Roger MacMillan, Ralph Snell, Wendell Tripp and alternate David Sanford. Also in attendance was Zoning Enforcement Officer – Tavis Austin and Deputy Village Clerk – Jennifer Truax. Ten members of the public were present.

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

### **Regular Agenda**

#### **17 Eagle Street (C.R. Jones) – proposed window modifications**

Mr. Jones reviewed the details of his application. He stated that the residence is circa 1880 with an addition and several remodels to the kitchen. He explained that they are again remodeling the kitchen and adding countertop which will affect the existing windows. He stated that they propose to replace the existing windows with casement windows for ease of operation and although not identical will be similar in that they will be two lights. He further stated that there will be no exterior changes other than the need to “black” out or place shutters over the lower sash of the window being affected by the installation of the countertop.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Jones to explain how the sash would be covered.

Mr. Jones stated that he proposes to either place shutters over the sash or just “black” it out. He explained that he does not want to make any exterior changes or get into construction around the windows.

Mr. Sanford stated that he prefers blacking out the sash over using half shutters to cover the area of the lower sash.

Mr. Jones stated that the windows will be aluminum clad with the sash being dark in color.

Mr. Snell stated that the window modifications were to the rear of the residence and would not be seen from a public way.

Ms. Drerup concurred that the windows will not be visible from a public way. She asked Mr. Jones to clarify the color of the sash as the brochure provided indicates “stone white”.

Mr. Jones stated that the windows can be purchased with a dark color sash and he will install the windows indicated but with the dark colored sash.

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: June 10, 2014*

*A resolution to approve the proposed window modifications at 17 Eagle Street, Cooperstown, NY*

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

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

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed window modifications at 17 Eagle Street;*

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 10<sup>th</sup> day of June 2014, determine that the proposed work at 17 Eagle 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, Tripp                      Motion carried.

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

**8 Chestnut Street (David & Marjorie Dennin)** – Proposed replacement of metal roof with asphalt shingles

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and stated that it is her understanding that Ms. Dennin has found some historic photos of the property.

Ms. Dennin stated that she did locate a historic photo and shared that photo with the board.

The board examined the photo and discussed whether or not the structure had a shingled roof in the photo.

Ms. Drerup asked Ms. Dennin if the existing roof was problematic.

Ms. Dennin stated that the flashing is not installed correctly and the existing drip edge was not extended far enough and is causing damage to the structure. She continued to state that with the metal roof there is significant snow slide which lands in the neighbor's driveway.

Mr. Drerup asked Ms. Dennin if she planned to extend the eaves.

Ms. Dennin stated that they are not planning to extend the eaves but do plan to install gutters, and address drainage issues on the property which should help alleviate the moisture problem effecting the condition of the residence. She continued to state that the asphalt shingles should reduce or eliminate the snow slide and will also help reduce the moisture around the home's foundation.

Dr. MacMillan stated that it is difficult to determine the roof material from the photograph.

Ms. Drerup asked when the roof was last replaced.

Ms. Dennin stated that according to the previous owner the metal part of the existing roof was replaced in the 1990s.

Ms. Drerup asked Ms. Dennin the condition of the other portion of the roof which currently has shingles and if they proposed to replace this section of roof also.

Ms. Dennin stated that at the time of purchase the inspector indicated that that portion of the roof had plus or minus five years of life span remaining. She continued to state that they it would make more sense to replace the entire roof during this project.

Dr. MacMillan asked Ms. Dennin if she had considered the tax credits offered for maintaining historic homes.

Ms. Dennin stated that she has already filed an application to be considered for the tax credit.

Dr. MacMillan asked what shingle color would be used.

Ms. Dennin stated that the shingle would be the dark dual black color but she is unsure of the official name.

Mr. Sanford stated that even with the dark color the shadow lines will be visible.

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: June 10, 2014*

*A resolution to approve the proposed roof replacement at 8 Chestnut 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;*
- *A thesis from 1970 which included photos and is part of the Ward files was reviewed;*
- *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 roof replacement with asphalt shingles at 8 Chestnut 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 10<sup>th</sup> day of June 2014, determine that the proposed work at 8 Chestnut 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 the following discussion was held.

Ms. Drerup asked Ms. Dennin if she had considered installing ice slides or installing additional insulation to help prevent the ice buildup.

Ms. Dennin stated that they would be installing additional insulation in the attic.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the roof would have a rubber membrane.

Ms. Dennin stated that it would have a rubber membrane.

Ms. Drerup stated that due to the fact that the roof is made up of several small sections she does not feel that there will be a significant problem with snow slides with the asphalt roof.

A vote had the following results:

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

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

#### **4 Grove Street (Glenn Falk) – Proposed new shed on the rear of the property**

Mr. Falk reviewed the details of the proposed shed, sharing a sample piece of the proposed siding. He stated that the siding width and color would match the residence. He further reviewed the project stating that the roof pitch is eight over twelve to facilitate easier snow removal and that the entry doors would be fiberglass.

Mr. Drerup stated that the shed is not visible from a public way due to the shed being located on the rear of the property.

Mr. Snell stated that the proposed shed is bigger than originally proposed.

Ms. Drerup stated that the new drawings indicate that the structure is taller than originally proposed.

Mr. Snell stated that it also has a larger footprint.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the drawings and concurred that the footprint has been enlarged and indicated that even with the increase in size it would not be visible from a public way. She asked Mr. Falk if the building would be pre-fab or stick built.

Mr. Falk stated that he would construct the building.

Mr. Sanford asked if the building would have electrical service.

Mr. Falk stated that it would not have electrical service.

Mr. Snell asked if the siding would continue up the gable ends.

Mr. Falk stated that the siding would continue up the ends.

Ms. Drerup asked if the shed would be placed on a foundation or have posts secured in the ground.

Mr. Falk stated that the floor would be framed with pressure treated lumber and set on a gravel pad.

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: June 10, 2014*

*A resolution to approve the proposed shed at 4 Grove 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 non-contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(c) and (3)(d).*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed shed at 4 Grove 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 10<sup>th</sup> day of June 2014, determine that the proposed work at 4 Grove 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 the following discussion was held.

Ms. Drerup asked Dr. Tripp his reasons behind citing section 300-26.E.(3)(d), “*visual compatibility with surrounding buildings, structures, and properties, including proportion of the property’s front façade, proportion and arrangement of windows and other openings within the facade, roof shape and rhythm of spacing of properties on streets, including setbacks.*”

Dr. Tripp stated that he feels that the proposed structure is visually compatible with the property and neighborhood.

Ms. Drerup stated that she feels that this portion of the law is referring to how the structure or change fits into the existing street scape and that due to the location of this structure it is not impacting the streetscape at all.

Dr. Tripp stated that although he believes that the proposed work does meet this section of the law he is willing to withdraw the reference to section 300-26.E.(3)(d).

Dr. Tripp withdrew his initial resolution and modified it to read: 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: June 10, 2014*

*A resolution to approve the proposed shed at 4 Grove 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 non-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 shed at 4 Grove 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 10<sup>th</sup> day of June 2014, determine that the proposed work at 4 Grove 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, Tripp                      Motion carried.

The board determined this project to be new construction.

**106 Main Street (Mark Wolpert, Todd and Jennifer Howard)** – Proposed retractable awning to each of the two storefronts at 106 Main Street

Ms. Drerup reviewed the separate applications of Mr. Wolpert and the Howards. She noted that the applications differ only in the fabric design and that both proposed awnings are for the same structure. Ms. Drerup asked Mr. & Mrs. Howard which storefront was their store located in.

Mr. Howard stated that their storefront is the one on the left as you look at the building. He explained that in addition to the needed shade provided by the awning, the different fabrics were chosen to help the public recognize that these are two separate businesses. He stated that the entry way on this building has the doors to each store facing each other leading the public to believe that the stores are connected as one.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the awning would be retracted at the end of each day and if the awning would remain in place year round.

Mrs. Howard stated that the existing plan is to retract the awning at the end of each day and that it would be retracted or removed for the winter.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the request for the awning was all due to the loss of the tree.

Mrs. Howard stated that it was and explained that due to the amount of sun received on this side of the street the building can become extremely hot and the reduction of the amount of sun coming through the window will help with the energy use.

Ms. Drerup asked if the awning would project farther than the façade at CVS.

Mr. Howard stated that he is not completely sure but he believes that it may protrude slightly more than the CVS façade.

Ms. Drerup asked if they had done any research to ensure that the angle of the awning would provide the appropriate shade.

Mr. Howard stated that although they had not done any "official" research they had used cardboard at the proposed angle to judge the amount of benefit that would be gained to help determine if the gain would be worth the expense.

Dr. MacMillan stated that any blocking of the sun would help reduce the added heat to the building.

Mr. Snell asked the height from the sidewalk to the lowest part of the awning.

Ms. Drerup stated that the window is indicated, on Mr. Wolpert's application, as 9' 4".

Mr. Snell stated that the sign law requires that a projecting sign be at least 8' above the sidewalk at its lowest point.

Ms. Drerup stated that a shallower pitch may be necessary to allow for the 8' clearance.

The board reviewed the proposed fabrics for the awning, how the awning operates and how much of the building it will cover as well as if it will affect the existing signage.

Mr. Snell asked if the awning would have any lettering on it.

Mr. Howard stated that it would not.

Mr. Snell stated that he would like confirmation as to the height from the sidewalk to the lowest portion of the awning.

Mr. Sanford stated that the resolution could include a condition that the awning be installed so that the lowest portion is not less than 8 feet from the sidewalk.

Dr. Tripp stated that this board does not deal with public safety.

Ms. Drerup stated that the board should at least consider the effect on public safety and take into consideration similar parts of the zoning law.

Ms. Snell stated that he is concerned with the two storefronts using different fabric designs.

Ms. Drerup stated that she too feels that the different fabric designs are problematic specifically with the visual compatibility. She noted that the historic photograph provided by both applicants shows matching awnings for three different businesses at this address.

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: June 10, 2014*

*A resolution to approve the proposed awning at 106 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;*

## DRAFT

- *The structure is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *Historic photographs were submitted and referred to;*
- *The structure will not be altered and the view from the street is in keeping with the neighboring buildings;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(a), (2)(b), (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 awnings at 106 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 10<sup>th</sup> day of June 2014, determine that the proposed work at 106 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 with the following conditions:*

- *The awnings do not extend below the acceptable eight foot clearance above the sidewalk;*
- *The fabric for both storefront awnings will be #4989 (colors being black, gray and burgundy).*

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

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

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

**1 Atwell Road / 7 Elk Street (Russ Tilley for Bassett Healthcare)** – Proposed new patio rail; fence changes and addition of an ATS

Mr. Tilley stated that there are a few proposed changes or additions.

Mr. Austin informed the board that the proposed fence changes are due to the addition of a taller generator. He explained that the initial approval was for a 10 foot fence to screen a 10 foot generator. He stated that the current request is to increase the fence height to 12 feet to screen the taller generator.

Mr. Tilley concurred with Mr. Austin stating that the new generators will require a 12 foot fence for screening.

Ms. Drerup asked if the proposed screening fence would be in the same location as the existing fence.

Mr. Tilley stated that to be correct.

Dr. Tripp asked if he understood correctly that Bassett is installing a new generator.

Mr. Tilley stated that Bassett is installing a second generator in the same location and is requesting approval for a taller fence to screen the generators.

Dr. Tripp asked if this generator would increase the noise level in the community.

Mr. Tilley stated that he does not believe that the noise level will increase. He explained that they are emergency generators and will only run during a power outage and during the monthly tests.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Tilley to explain the other area where the fencing is proposed to be increased.

Mr. Tilley stated that the fence currently screens three cooling units, similar to air conditioners, which service the data center. He explained that they will be adding two additional units to ensure the appropriate air flow and temperature for the data storage equipment.

Dr. Tripp asked if these units would increase the noise level and run continually.

Mr. Tilley stated that they will run continually but not all units will necessarily run at the same time.

Dr. Tripp asked the height of the units.

Mr. Tilley stated that the units are 10 feet in height.

Ms. Drerup stated that she does not feel this request is problematic. She continued to state that they are adjacent to a parking lot.

Dr. Tripp asked Mr. Tilley if anyone from Bassett has spoken to the neighbors regarding the proposed changes.

Mr. Tilley stated that he is not aware of anyone speaking with the neighbors.

Dr. Tripp stated that he realizes it is not in HPARB's jurisdiction to monitor noise and other impacts on the neighbors but he feels it should be considered as there have been ongoing concerns.

Ms. Drerup asked if the screening fences would be of the same material and design.

Mr. Tilley stated that they would.

Mr. Snell stated that he feels that the requests are acceptable.

Dr. Tripp asked if the units will run 24 hours per day – 7 days per week.

Ms. Drerup stated that the existing units are already on 24/7.

Mr. Tilley stated that these units are not like generators. He explained that they are basically fans.

Mr. Sanford stated that he parked in front of the units and did not hear them.

Mr. Tilley stated that they will not necessarily all run at the same time.

Dr. Tripp stated that Mr. Summers, neighbor of the property, has expressed concern over excessive noise created by Bassett.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the request for the ATS. She asked if there were any other feasible locations where the switch would not be so visible from the street.

Mr. Tilley stated that this was the most suitable location.

Mr. Austin stated that the ATS is very similar to an electrical panel.

Mr. Snell stated that a more concealed location would be preferable.

Mr. Tilley explained that the proposed location is in proximity to the equipment it is required for. He further stated relocation to another area would be extremely cost prohibitive.

Mr. Snell stated that he assumes that the ivy will need to be kept trimmed away from the ATS.

Mr. Tilley stated that the ivy would need to be kept trimmed away from the unit. He continued to state that they would also like permission to add a couple of bollards in front of the unit to help avoid a vehicle from backing into it.

Ms. Drerup asked if the bollards are a code requirement.

Mr. Tilley stated he is unsure if the bollards are a code requirement but that it would increase the safety level. He pointed out that this is the area where the dumpsters are located and deliveries happen regularly.

Mr. Snell suggested painting the ATS.

The board discussed painting the ATS to make it blend into its surroundings.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the request for a rail on the patio. She stated that it appears to be a safety issue.

Mr. Tilley stated that there are currently unhealthy shrubs which will be removed and there is a fall hazard in this area. He stated that they are proposing the installation of a five foot fence all the way across this area.

Mr. Snell asked if the proposed fence will be black.

Mr. Tilley stated that it would be black.

Mr. Austin stated that the fence would be similar to the fence on the south end.

The board discussed the fence design, location and height.

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: June 10, 2014*

*A resolution to approve the proposed patio rail at 1 Atwell Road, Cooperstown, NY*

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



Ms. Drerup asked Dr. Tripp if he would mind sharing why he was choosing to abstain.

Dr. Tripp stated that although he realizes that this board does not regulate noise and other factors related to the neighborhood those factors do have an effect on the character of the neighborhood. Given that neighbors have expressed concern regarding the noise and other issues brought about by Bassett he does not feel he can objectively make a determination without considering the other effects on the neighborhood.

The board determined these projects to be a minor alteration to the property.

**79 Chestnut Street (Bennett Sandler of Equity Energy for Jeff Katz) – Proposed installation of air source heat pumps**

Mr. Sandler stated that after the completion of an energy audit to help the Katz family develop a plan to lower their energy footprint Mr. & Mrs. Katz decided that the addition of four air source heat pump units would be appropriate.

Ms. Drerup asked if each unit heats and cools a single room.

Mr. Sandler stated that was correct and explained that the new model is very efficient and will reduce the family's energy footprint.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Sandler to review the location of each unit and any other visual components.

Mr. Sandler explained the location of each proposed unit and the exterior lines from the units to the subsequent room.

The board reviewed the location, visual components and size of the units and lines.

Dr. Tripp asked if the units create noise.

Ms. Drerup stated that the literature states that the maximum decibel level is 51 which is similar to the operation of a dishwasher.

Mr. Snell stated that he would like to know the exact location of each unit as well as any necessary airlines.

Dr. MacMillan concurred, stating that he has trouble visualizing the appearance of these items. He further stated that he also has similar concerns to Dr. Tripp regarding the noise and its impact on the neighbors.

Mr. Sandler stated that there are units throughout the Village currently including at NY Pizzeria and at the Allstadt residence. He asked what perspectives the board would like to see of the units at this residence.

Mr. Snell suggested elevation drawings and/or the footprint of the property.

Mr. Austin asked if the board also would like the airline indicated on the drawings.

Mr. Snell stated that all details should be reflected.

Mr. Sanford stated that the inside units are mounted at ceiling height or approximately seven feet and therefore would also have airlines from the units running up the exterior of the residence although not as high.

Mr. Sandler stated that to be correct.

Mr. Snell stated that he does not have any problem with the concept or the noise level but is concerned about the visual impact and would like to see more exact renderings prior to making a decision.

Mr. Sandler asked if the board their feelings on screening the units with landscaping, or enclosures, such as fencing.

Mr. Snell stated that enclosures make the units more noticeable and does not recommend that option.

#### **Other Business:**

Mr. Chris Grady addressed the board. He stated that he would like to replace the windows at 25 Pioneer Street. He explained that he had missed the application deadline but would really like to proceed with the work.

Ms. Drerup stated that the board would not review the application without having the opportunity to visit the site. She continued to state that replacement of windows is discouraged unless they are deteriorated beyond repair.

#### **22 Main Street (Trustees Cynthia Falk & Louis Allstadt) – Review of proposed repair, maintenance, and physical changes to rehabilitate the historic building which is currently the site of the Village offices, the Village Library and the Village Art Association**

Trustee Allstadt stated that the Board of Trustees has been working on a plan for the rehabilitation of the 22 Main Street building. He explained that they are currently seeking a grant to help fund the necessary infrastructure problems and would like to share the proposed work with the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board for their support in receiving the grant.

Trustee Allstadt stated that an overall evaluation of the building has been done and information has been sought from both staff and the public regarding the needs and effective use of the building. He stated that the goal is to make the building a more usable community space while retaining the historic look and value of the structure. Trustee Allstadt stated that the estimate for the complete project is two million dollars and this grant provides the opportunity to receive five hundred thousand with a matching portion from the Village of one hundred and sixty thousand. He stated that the Trustees have agreed that in applying for the grant they should focus on the infrastructure problems as it will be more difficult to raise funds for “unseen” repairs.

Trustee Allstadt stated that other than the proposed removal of a small shed on the rear of the building and eventually the new Fair Street entrance all other exterior work will simply be repairs.

The board reviewed with Trustees Falk and Allstadt the proposed infrastructure work including restoration of the porch columns, soffits, windows and siding as well as interior work to bring the restrooms up to ADA compliance, interior storm windows to increase energy efficiency, and work to the electrical and plumbing systems.

Dr. MacMillan made a motion to support the removal of the exterior shed attached to the east side of 22 Main Street as it serves little purpose at this time and is deteriorated beyond repair. Mr. Snell seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

Dr. MacMillan made a motion that, after reviewing the preliminary plans for the rehabilitation of the entire building at 22 Main Street and finding that the plans are in keeping with HPARB's expectation of historic preservation within the Village, that HPARB supports the plans, and the consolidated funding application which addresses a significant portion of the necessary restoration and will facilitate the future rehabilitation. Mr. Snell seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

#### **Minutes:**

Ms. Drerup made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 13, 2014 meeting as presented. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

#### **Other Business:**

The board reviewed the Presentation Briefs sent previously by email and agreed to review the Brief regarding exterior additions to historic structures for discussion at the July meeting.

Mr. Snell reported on a seminar he attended about Historic Streetscape lighting.

Meeting adjourned at 7:18 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Jennifer Truax  
Deputy Village Clerk