

The regular meeting of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board (HPARB) of the Village of Cooperstown was held in the Village Office Building, 22 Main Street, Cooperstown, New York on Tuesday, May 12, 2015. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Liz Callahan, Roger MacMillan, David Sanford, and Ralph Snell. Alternates Brian Alexander, and Ann Stewart were absent. Also in attendance was Zoning Enforcement Officer – Tavis Austin and Deputy Village Clerk – Jennifer Truax. Fourteen members of the public were present.

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

Regular Agenda

1 Atwell Road (Russ Tilley for MIBH) – Proposed building connector

Mr. Tilley reviewed the application and provided full size drawings and photos for the board's review.

Ms. Drerup stated that she does not believe that the connector will be visible from most public ways. She further stated that she feels that it will probably be visible from the Elk Street parking lot. She asked Mr. Tilley the purpose for the connector.

Mr. Tilley stated that there is currently only one elevator that runs to the fourth floor of the hospital building. He explained that this elevator is often out of service and the connector would allow for the use of the elevators in the connecting building as an alternative means to access the upper floors.

The board reviewed the drawings and discussed the location of the connector and the visibility from public ways.

Mr. Snell stated that he does not see any issues with the proposed connector.

Mr. Sanford stated that the public would have to consciously look for the connector to even notice it.

Ms. Drerup asked if the brick would match that of the existing buildings.

Mr. Tilley stated that it would.

Ms. Drerup stated that the connector would be minimally visible from any public way.

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: May 12, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed building connector for MIBH 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:

- *A public hearing is not required;*

DRAFT

- *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. (3)(a), (3)(b), and (3)(c).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed building connector at 1 Atwell Road;

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 12th day of May 2015, determine that the work at 1 Atwell Road, 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. Callahan seconded the motion and the following discussion was held:

Ms. Drerup asked that the motion indicate that the proposed work meets the criteria under section 300-26.E(5) which includes accessibility considerations and health and safety code considerations.

Mr. Snell amended his motion to read:

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

Resolution date: May 12, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed building connector for MIBH 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:

- *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. (3)(a), (3)(b),(3)(c) and (5).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed building connector at 1 Atwell Road;

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 12th day of May 2015, determine that the work at 1 Atwell Road, 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. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, Sanford, Snell Motion carried.

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

207 Main Street (Carol and William Waller) – Proposed window replacement

Mr. Waller explained that they would like to replace three existing windows with new energy efficient windows. He stated that two of the windows are deteriorated and although the third window is in fair shape they would like to replace at this time. Mr. Waller further stated that the property currently has eight replacement windows which were installed in the past.

Ms. Drerup asked for details regarding the proposed replacement windows.

Mr. Waller stated that they would be replacement inserts exactly like the eight that were previously replaced.

Ms. Drerup asked if they would be the same color as the other windows.

Mr. Waller stated that they would be painted to match as they are wood windows.

Ms. Drerup asked if the replacement windows would have grilles.

Mr. Waller stated that they would not have grilles to match the existing windows.

Ms. Drerup asked about the repair of the check rail on the broken second story window.

Mr. Waller explained the proposed repair of this window.

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 12, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed window replacement at 207 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 is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(c), (3)(d), (4)(f), and (5).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed replacement of 3 windows at 207 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 12th day of May 2015, determine that the work at 207 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.

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

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, Sanford, Snell Motion carried.

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

25 Lakeview Drive South (Susan Snell, Architect) – proposed new single family residence

Mr. Snell recused himself at 5:13 PM.

DRAFT

Ms. Snell reviewed the plans for the new single family residence. She stated that two members of the audience are from Lakeland Shores and it is her understanding that they have some questions regarding the project. She further stated that she is aware that HPARB does not have to take public comment but understands that there is some concern over the height of the project.

Ms. Drerup asked if the proposed project exceed the allowable height under the Village Zoning law.

Ms. Snell stated that the proposed height is below what is allowed by the Village Zoning law.

Ms. Drerup stated that the Village Boards can only control the height under the Zoning laws of the Village. She further explained that if there are concerns about the height they should be addressed with the Lakeland Shores Homeowner's Association as this board has no jurisdiction over height in this situation as the proposed structure is within the limits of the Village law.

Ms. Diana Cesta, 12 Lakeview Drive South, representative of the Lakeland Shores Homeowner's Association stated that they are trying to determine the height of the proposed structure in relation to the residence on Lot 18. She explained that due to the property topography, the limited information on the plans for Lot 18 and other factors it is difficult to determine the height of the proposed structure and its effect on the view shed.

Ms. Drerup stated that the formula specified by the Village Zoning Law is fairly complex. She referred to section 300-84 and read the definition of height "*Vertical distance between the bottom and top points of a building, measured on the side(s) of the building corresponding to the lot frontage. The bottom point shall be the mean elevation at finished grade as measured at the face of the building on the side corresponding to the lot frontage. The top point shall be a) the highest point of a flat or mansard roof; or b) the average height of the highest pitched, gabled, hip, shed, or gambrel roof.*" Ms. Drerup stated that she does not know how this regulation in the Village law compares to the regulations of the Homeowner's Association.

Ms. Cesta stated that the fact that Lot 18's plans had limited information and that it was not built to the plans creates more difficulty in comparing the properties.

Ms. Drerup stated that the Village law holds the property to a height limit of 30'. She stated that the proposed structure is well under that limit and encouraged Ms. Cesta to speak with the property owner about the concerns.

Ms. Cesta stated that she has had correspondence with the property owner.

Ms. Drerup asked Ms. Snell to review the window details.

Ms. Snell stated that they would be SDL (simulated divided light).

Ms. Drerup reviewed the stone veneer and asked Ms. Snell to explain the proposed location and why it was not used for all of the areas under the deck.

Ms. Snell reviewed the proposed use of the stone veneer and indicated that cost was one of the factors in not using it for the entire foundation.

The board further reviewed the foundation materials as well as that of the garage. The board reviewed the use of fiber cement board and stone veneer.

Ms. Drerup asked what the reveal for the siding would be.

Ms. Snell stated that the reveal would be 5 inches.

Ms. Drerup asked about the trim and why fiber cement board trim was not being utilized.

Ms. Snell stated that the use of fiber cement board trim is not common locally and that wood trim would be utilized.

Mr. Sanford stated that fiber cement board trim is difficult to work with.

Ms. Drerup asked for details regarding the railings. She stated that it appears that several options are being proposed.

Ms. Snell explained that the hope is to maximize the view. She stated that the railing may be mixed in design but will have consistency in framing. She stated that one area may have glass panels while the other area may have spindles but all will have the same framing.

Ms. Drerup asked about the bay window on the rear of the structure and it overhanging the setback.

Ms. Snell stated that it is legal to overhang by up to 2'.

Ms. Drerup asked Ms. Snell to review the back door and details of any stairs or stoop for this entrance.

Ms. Snell stated that the landing will be minimized and may include a step.

Ms. Drerup asked if it would infringe on the setback.

Ms. Snell stated that items less than four feet in height do not cause a setback infringement.

Ms. Callahan stated that she is concerned about granting a certificate of appropriateness with so many areas with a multitude of possible options.

Ms. Snell stated that once a building permit is received she will have more precise details. She asked if there were specific areas where specific detail is necessary prior to the COA. She stated if the COA is granted she would be glad to bring specific details back to the board once decisions are made and prior to installation.

Ms. Callahan stated that she understands the situation Ms. Snell is in and that the client and their budget have an impact on design but she is concerned that there is potential for conflict in design.

Ms. Snell stated that she understands Ms. Callahan's concerns and that she will ensure that the materials used throughout the structure are appropriate to each other.

Ms. Drerup asked if all of the windows are casements.

Ms. Snell reviewed the window design and style indicating that the windows are all casements or fixed. She stated that there are enough operable windows to allow for ventilation.

Ms. Drerup requested that if a COA is granted prior to the specific details regarding the items questioned this evening that Ms. Snell provide those details for the file once decisions are made.

Ms. Snell agreed to provide those details once they are available.

Ms. Callahan made the following motion:

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

Resolution date: May 12, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed new construction at 25 Lakeview Drive South, 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;*
- *This is new construction with information provided by an architect and is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(a), (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), and, (3)(d).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to proposed new construction of a single family residence at 25 Lakeview Drive South;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 12th day of May 2015, determine that the proposed work at 25 Lakeview Drive South, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.

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

Ms. Drerup asked Ms. Callahan why she chose (2)(a) and (2)(b) as factors for approving the COA. She stated that she feels that these items apply only to structures which are already built.

Ms. Callahan reviewed those items and agreed that they are not appropriate for this project and stated that they should be removed from her motion.

Ms. Drerup asked that a condition be added to the motion which requires the submission of details regarding building materials once a decision has been made as to the materials by the applicant and prior to use on the structure.

Ms. Callahan amended her motion to read:

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

Resolution date: May 12, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed new construction at 25 Lakeview Drive South, 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;*
- *This is new construction with information provided by an architect and is in keeping with the character of the neighborhood;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), and, (3)(d).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to proposed new construction of a single family residence at 25 Lakeview Drive South;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 12th day of May 2015, determine that the proposed work at 25 Lakeview Drive South, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown with the following condition:

- *Details regarding all materials to be utilized for the construction of this structure be submitted for the record prior to their installation.*

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

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, Sanford

Motion carried.

13 Lakeview Drive South (Paula Wyckoff) – Proposed siding replacement and new deck railings

Mr. Snell returned to the board at 5:34 PM.

Ms. Wyckoff reviewed her application explaining that all siding would be removed to allow for insulating of the home and new vertical siding would be installed.

Ms. Drerup asked if the entire façade would be changed.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that the entire façade would be replaced. She explained the use of faux stone for the foundation area and a vertical siding (LP SmartSide) in a wheat color for the entire residence.

Mr. Snell asked if the existing siding is vertical.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that it is not. She continued to state that while the siding is off the home would be insulated. She further explained that she would like to remove the existing overhead garage door and pass door next to the overhead door and install a new wider overhead door. She stated that the garage has an additional pass door on the side.

Ms. Drerup asked the dimensions of the proposed garage door.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that the garage door would be 18' 1" wide X 7' high.

Mr. Sanford asked if the garage door would have lights.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that there would not be any windows in the garage door. She added that the front door of the residence would be replaced with a new door. She provided details of the proposed wood and art glass door.

Ms. Callahan asked if the new front door would be the same dimensions as the existing front door.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that it would be the same.

Ms. Drerup questioned the reference to black vinyl in application.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that those details have changed and the only possible use of black would be for shutters and she is not ready to make any decision regarding shutters until the other work is completed.

The board reviewed the use of the faux stone and areas where it is proposed.

Ms. Drerup asked if the windows would be replaced.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that they would not be replaced.

Ms. Drerup asked if they are thermal pane.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that they are not but they are a high quality Anderson window that are in very good condition. She stated that they are in better condition than newer windows in her current residence.

Dr. MacMillan arrived at 5:41 PM.

Mr. Snell asked the size of the faux stone panels.

Mr. Tom Swatling, contractor for Ms. Wyckoff, stated that the panels are not square and are interlocking.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that the panels do not make straight lines and give the stone a random look.

Mr. Snell asked if the joints are caulked.

Mr. Swatling stated that he has not worked with this material and does not know if the joints will need to be caulked.

Ms. Callahan visited the website for the manufacturer and stated that she did not see any photos of finished work.

Ms. Drerup stated that she would like to see how the material wraps around the corners and ends. She asked if the Swiss railing would be removed.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that it would be removed.

Ms. Drerup stated that this is a very distinctive home which is still all intact.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that in addition to the removal of the siding to allow for insulation she wants to make the residence her home for her and her husband rather than the home of her parents. She stated that her husband is reluctant to move into his in-laws, home.

The board reviewed the removal and replacement of deck railings, use of the faux stone for the chimney treatment, and the details of the siding replacement.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that the red roof is very bold and the use of the wheat colored vertical siding will help calm the roof appearance and give the residence a look of having more height.

Ms. Derurp asked what the roof material is.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that it is a steel roof and is not proposed to be replaced.

Ms. Callahan asked the age of the roof.

Ms. Wyckoff stated that the roof is about 20 years old.

The board reviewed the plans for the garage including residing and new doors. They noted that it is an attached garage.

Mr. Snell stated that it was helpful to have the samples of the actual materials but that he still feels that the application is incomplete. He stated that the application does not delineate what materials are proposed to be used in what locations. He continued to explain that this is a unique structure and although built in 1961 and listed as non-contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form it is described in that form and comments on the residence's unique character. He stated that he feels that the law does allow for the discretion of the board, when there are non-contributing homes which have a value to the community and neighborhood, to retain those important structures.

Ms. Sanford stated that in order to effectively evaluate the project a rendering of the complete project is necessary. He stated that based on the information provided he is not sure how the project all fits together.

Ms. Callahan concurred with Mr. Sanford about the need for a complete application. She further stated that she is also concerned with the dramatic change to the character of the residence.

Ms. Drerup asked Ms. Wyckoff to provide pictures of the faux stone on finished homes and provide a complete application, with renderings and/or photos which indicate exactly where all changes are to be made in order for the board to be able to make an informed decision regarding the proposed changes.

The application was tabled and held over until a complete application is received.

12 Main Street (Mr. Tedesco, Contractor for Roger & Carla MacMillan) – Proposed new fence

Dr. MacMillan recused himself at 6:01 PM.

Mr. Tedesco reviewed the application for a fence at 12 Main Street. He provided a photo of the proposed 3.5' high fence, a survey map indicating the fence location and reviewed the design details.

Mr. Sanford asked if it would be installed like railing.

Mr. Tedesco stated that it would be installed with a top and bottom rail between posts.

Mr. Snell asked how it would be finished.

Mr. Tedesco stated that it would be painted white.

Ms. Drerup stated that there is currently another style fence on the property which uses lattice. She asked if that style had been considered over the proposed fence which has the appearance of porch railing.

Mr. Tedesco stated that he prepared what the applicant asked him to.

Ms. Drerup stated that she is just concerned that it looks like a railing rather than a fence.

Mr. Sanford stated that he did see the fence panels with the lattice but that there are currently only two or three sections.

Ms. Drerup asked if the fence would have a top rail similar to a porch rail.

Mr. Tedesco stated that it would as that is what the applicant requested.

Mr. Snell asked if the post would be in line with the sections similar to the construction of a porch railing.

Mr. Tedesco stated that it would.

Ms. Drerup stated that with the sections in line with the post both sides would look identical.

Mr. Tedesco stated that was correct.

Mr. Snell asked if the height of the fence would exceed 4' once the finials were added.

Mr. Tedesco stated that he would ensure that the fence did not exceed 4'.

Mr. Snell stated that he understands Ms. Drerup's concerns about the proposed fence design but he thinks it will work in this situation. He asked Mr. Tedesco if the posts would be 6' on center

Mr. Tedesco stated that he will place the posts in a manner which will create a stable fence. He continued to state that based on the length of the area where the fence is to be installed 6' lengths would make sense and evenly space the posts along the property.

Ms. Callahan stated that the design was unique for a fence.

Ms. Callahan 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 12, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed fence at 12 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 is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (3)(a), (3)(b), and (3)(c).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed fence at 12 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 12th day of May 2015, determine that the work at 12 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.

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

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, Sanford, Snell Motion carried.

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

14 Main Street (Michael Miller) – Proposed grape arbor

Dr. MacMillan returned to the board.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and asked Dr. Miller what materials would be used.

Dr. Miller stated that the grape arbor would be constructed with treated lumber and painted white. He explained that although it will be a grape arbor it will also serve as a gate.

Ms. Drerup asked how it would be used as a gate.

Dr. Miller shared the area of the existing fence and explained the use of the arbor as a gate.

The board discussed other arbors in the area and the construction of the arbor..

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: May 12, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed grape arbor at 14 Main Street, Cooperstown, NY

DRAFT

Mr. Austin stated that the ZBA has set a public hearing for the variance. He stated that ZBA Chair, Susan Snell, indicated that due to not knowing the exact location of the property line she would like to see the structure moved into the property approximately 3'. He continued to state that Mr. Clancy one of the neighboring property owners has indicated that he would like the garage located as far from the street as possible and can advise the board of the location of the survey pins.

Ms. Drerup stated that if placed on the property line fiber cement board would be a good option to meet code requirements.

Ms. Callahan asked what the roof of the residence was.

Mr. Kiss stated that it is galvanized steel and that they are not going to use the same material for the garage as it is too costly.

Ms. Drerup asked if the color of the garage roofing would match the roof on the residence.

Mr. Kiss stated that it would match as closely as possible.

Ms. Drerup asked if the garage door would be like the one indicated in the spec sheet but without lights.

Mr. Kiss concurred.

Ms. Drerup asked if the pass door would have any lights.

Mr. Kiss stated that it would not.

Mr. Snell asked if the window is double hung.

Mr. Kiss stated that it is double hung, one over one.

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 12, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed garage at 21 Leatherstocking 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. (3)(a), (3)(b), and (3)(c).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed garage at 21 Leatherstocking Street;

DRAFT

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 12th day of May 2015, determine that the work at 21 Leatherstocking 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. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

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

15 Chestnut Street (James Miles for Leatherstocking Corporation) – Proposed fence

Mr. Austin reviewed the application and pointed out minor changes to the site plan and fence location due to the neighboring property, Mohican Club, giving permission to install fence on their property as well.

Mr. Miles stated that Leatherstocking Corporation is looking at this fence installation as a temporary fence to remain in place during construction of the neighboring properties at 124 & 134 Main Street, to help avoid damage to the existing wooden fence and prevent debris from coming on to their property. He stated that upon completion of the construction the chain link fence would be removed and if the owner felt that a fence was still desired a new application would be submitted. Mr. Miles shared photos of the property line indicating the location of the proposed fence.

Ms. Drerup asked if the fence would be installed right on the property line.

Mr. Mices stated that it would be on the property line.

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: May 12, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed chain link fence as indicated on the Lawson Survey including 15 Chestnut Street and neighboring properties, 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 structures at this location are listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(c), and (3)(b).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed chain link fence as indicated in the Lawson Survey;

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 12th day of May 2015, determine that the work as indicated in the Lawson Survey including 15 Chestnut Street and neighboring properties,

DRAFT

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: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Snell

ABSTAIN: Sanford

Motion carried.

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

69 Main Street (James Florczak) – Proposed awning

Ms. Drerup stated that the application was not in prior to the deadline but that it is a fairly simple project. She asked if the board would entertain the application this evening.

The board agreed to review the application.

Ms. Callahan asked if the structure is permanent.

Ms. Dereup stated that it would be permanent but that it has the ability to fold back up against the building. She further stated that the application indicated that the height would be 7'8" from the ground but due to sign regulations it would have to be 8' from the ground.

The board reviewed the design, location, and visual appearance.

Ms. Callahan asked if the change in height would change the angle of the awning.

Mr. Florczak stated that it might change by approximately 1".

Ms. Drerup stated that the pitch would remain approximately the same and not have a large visual impact.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to adopt the following resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness:

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

Resolution date: May 12, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed awning at 69 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 is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (3)(a), (3)(d) and (3)(e).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed awning at 69 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 12th day of May 2015, determine

DRAFT

that the work at 69 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.

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

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

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

124 Main Street (Teresa Drerup – Altonview for BTP) – Proposed new hotel/preliminary demolition

Ms. Drerup recused herself at 6:39 PM.

Mr. Austin stated that no new information has been submitted for this application. He explained that the BTP has requested a temporary fence, similar to snow fence, on both sides of Willow Brook to keep people and debris out of the brook. He stated that no Village permits for work have been issued at this time but he understands that the Army Corp of Engineers has issued a permit to do underground work near or around the brook.

Mr. Snell stated that he does not feel that temporary construction fence is in the purview of the board.

Ms. Callahan asked if the fence was going to be temporary and exactly what temporary would mean.

Mr. Austin stated that the board could choose to act on the fence and apply conditions they feel are necessary or they could say no action is necessary and he would advise the applicant.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he is not sure if action is necessary for the temporary fence but as far as any other proposed work at 124 Main Street he feels all review should be held off until after the BOT holds their public hearing and makes a decision on the Special Use Permit. Once that has occurred the applicant will need to ensure the remaining necessary information has been submitted and then HPARB will be able to proceed and the 62 day time limit would begin. Dr. MacMillan reiterated that until all of that has occurred he does not feel it is necessary to consider the application.

Ms. Drerup stated that the applicant is also okay with HPARB not taking any further action until those things have all occurred.

Mr. Sanford suggested that it might be appropriate for a motion to be made to indicate that no action is necessary from HPARB on the proposed fence due to it being temporary and therefore, not in the board's purview.

Ms. Callahan suggested that a time limit might be appropriate on the length of time the temporary fence may be left in place.

The board discussed what constitutes a temporary safety fence and reviewed the application for the fence.

Mr. Austin stated that if no determination is made than the applicant will have the right to install the temporary fence.

The board asked Mr. Tillapaugh, Village Attorney, if action was necessary.

Mr. Tillapaugh stated that if the fence is temporary he does not feel that HPARB needs to weigh in. He continued to state that he does not believe that the board wants every construction job to have to apply for a permit for a temporary fence. He continued to state that at the most the board could make a resolution that "temporary" not be more than "X" amount of time but there is no need to weigh in at all.

Mr. Snell stated that he does not believe any action is necessary.

Mr. Austin stated that if no action is taken the fence will most likely go up.

Mr. Tillapaugh stated that the fence may cause issues with the neighbors and if the Village has not taken any action than it becomes a private matter between the property owners.

Mr. Snell asked Mr. Tillapaugh if any action was necessary on the hotel project since no new information has been submitted.

Mr. Tillapaugh stated that no action is necessary but the board may discuss the project if they are inclined to do so. He further explained that until all necessary information is submitted and the application is complete HPARB does not have to take any action.

134 Main Street (Teresa Drerup – Altonview for BTP) – Field change for exterior venting and air handlers

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and stated that her client is requesting a field change to install required air handlers to accommodate the required ventilation for the first floor restaurant. She stated that after the application was submitted Mr. Ferrara indicated that he does not want the unit placed on the roof but would like it placed on the back of the structure.

Mr. Snell asked to see the application.

Mr. Austin stated that the application was originally for the modifications to the building which included the exterior stairways. He stated that the air handlers are a field change to that original application. He asked the board if they felt the application was complete. He stated that if the board felt the application was complete they could act on it tonight, or if it is incomplete they can kick it back to the applicant for further clarification. He further stated that they might find that the application is complete enough to allow the roof installation but not the rear installation.

Ms. Callahan stated that the mechanicals are necessary for the operation of the restaurant and she feels that they are a health and safety concern due to the required air circulation.

Mr. Snell asked if screening is necessary.

Mr. Austin asked where the unit is being installed and if the height would warrant screening.

Ms. Drerup stated that it was proposed to be installed on the lower rear roof.

Mr. Austin pointed out that it will not be visible from Main Street.

Ms. Drerup stated that it would be visible from Chestnut Street.

Dr. MacMillan questioned the need to screen due to noise.

Mr. Austin stated that the operation of the air handlers would be quieter than the generator at the Cooper Inn.

Ms. Callahan stated that the location of installation will have a large impact on the necessary screening.

Ms. Drerup stated that she does not feel that the unit can be placed anywhere except on the roof. She explained how the air handler works and that she does not believe appropriate air flow can be obtained in the rear of the building.

The board reviewed the proposed roof location of the unit and if screening is required.

Ms. Drerup stated that the law no longer requires screening but it may require buffering.

Mr. Austin asked how this type of mechanical, on a roof, could be buffered without causing a greater impact than the unit itself.

Ms. Drerup read the definition of buffering from the Zoning law which reads *"To provide a natural or landscaped area or screening device designed to mitigate visual and auditory impacts, including headlights, glare and lighting, between different incompatible uses when those uses are in effect."*

Mr. Austin asked if they would require a rooftop fence. He continued ask if the use is incompatible with the neighboring properties.

Ms. Drerup stated that she does not know how other properties have buffered this type of mechanical. She stated that maybe sound panels and/or railings may be appropriate.

Mr. Austin stated that Pioneer Alley might be the closest comparison, other than that the only other place in the village with those types of mechanicals would be MIBH. He stated that everything is always visible from somewhere. He asked if the proposed work will in some way effect or ruin a visually historic property or view.

Dr. MacMillan stated that the guests of the Cooper Inn would be looking out at the unit.

Ms. Drerup stated that they are also looking out over the Cooper Inn's generator.

Ms. Callahan stated that the unit would be more disruptive and problematic visually if placed on the side of the building.

Mr. Sanford concurred with Ms. Callahan and pointed out that it is designed to function on a rooftop.

Mr. Austin asked the board if they felt it was appropriate to act and grant a field change or ask the applicant to return with proposed buffering.

DRAFT

The board discussed the definition of buffering, how to require buffering and the character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Callahan made a motion to grant a field change for 134 Main Street for two fans and one rooftop ventilation unit to be installed as indicated in the field change documents dated 05/11/2015. Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and the following discussion was held:

Dr. MacMillan asked if no buffering was going to be required.

Mr. Austin stated that he does not see the proposed use as being incompatible with the neighborhood/district.

Dr. MacMillan again reviewed the definition of buffer and the board discussed the use and compatibility with the neighborhood/district.

Mr. Sanford stated that he feels that the use is compatible with the district.

A vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, MacMillan, Sanford

ABSTAIN: Snell

Motion carried.

12 Maple Street (Liz Callahan) – Proposed stone façade work

Ms. Drerup returned to the board and Ms. Callahan recused herself at 7:09 PM.

Ms. Callahan reviewed her application to repair the deteriorating foundation with mesh and cement. She stated that the mason has stated that Portland Cement is a poor choice for this work and has proposed the use of mesh and S cement to repair the deterioration and stabilize the foundation and remaining block. She explained that the wall has been repaired twice since they purchased the home and that deterioration had accelerated over this past winter.

The board reviewed the process which would be used to repair the wall and noted that this area of the wall will have the look of being parged or of stucco. They noted that this type of repair will retain the remaining foundation and allow for repair with the same material in the future. The sealing of the foundation and other measures to prevent further damage was also discussed.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to adopt the following resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness:

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

Resolution date: May 12, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed foundation repair at 12 Maple 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 property owner is making an attempt to retain as much of the historic fabric of the residence as possible;*

- *The proposed work will allow for restoration in the future;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(a), and (4)(e).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed foundation work at 12 Maple 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 12th day of May 2015, determine that the work at 12 Maple Street, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.

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

AYES: Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

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

157 Main Street (Hubbell) – Proposed door replacement

Ms. Callahan returned to the board.

Mr. Austin reviewed the application and stated that that he has asked the applicant for additional information including details and/or a photo of the proposed door. He stated that the applicant has stated that the replacement door is a typical steel door with nine lights.

Ms. Callahan stated that she does not feel that the door is the issue but rather there is an issue with the floor heaving.

Mr. Austin stated that he also asked the applicant to provide justification as to why the door needs to be replaced but it was not received. He further stated that DPW Superintendent, Brian Clancy, indicated that the sill is bad and needs replacement.

Ms. Drerup stated that without details of the proposed door she is not in favor of approving this application. She stated that since the property has matching doors on Main and Chestnut Streets the aesthetics of both need to be considered.

Ms. Sanford stated that he feels that the sill is the issue and that the door could be retained.

Dr. MacMillan made the following motion.

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

Resolution date: May 12, 2015

A resolution to deny the proposed Main Street door replacement at 157 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 is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work having not met the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (4)(f).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having not been met with regards to the proposed door replacement at 157 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 12th day of May 2015, determine that the work at 157 Main Street, Cooperstown, NY does not meet 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, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

6 Walnut Street (Scalici for Viek) – Proposed front step replacement

Mr. Austin reviewed the application to replace the existing front steps with steps that include a landing to increase safety for the home owner.

Dr. MacMillan stated that Ms. Viek is disabled and needs an area to be able to stand to reach her mailbox.

Ms. Drerup questioned whether or not the proposed landing and rail would interfere with the basement window.

Mr. Austin stated that he does not believe that basement window is a required window and it should not be problematic to be covered by the proposed work.

Ms. Callahan stated that the proposal makes sense but the appearance should be a bit simpler to be in keeping with the building. She stated that the drawing shows a simple design that is in keeping with the residence but the photos provided are more ornamental.

Ms. Drerup questioned whether lattice would be used under the landing.

The board discussed the design of the proposed work and the ability to retain the existing steps for future use if a new property owner wanted to return the residence to the original steps.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to adopt the following resolution for a Certificate of Appropriateness:

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

Resolution date: May 12, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed front step replacement at 6 Walnut Street, Cooperstown, NY

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

- *A public hearing is not required;*
- *The requirements of SEQRA have been met for this action;*
- *The structure is listed as non-contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (3)(b) and (5).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed front step replacement at 6 Walnut Street;

