

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, September 8, 2015. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Liz Callahan, Roger MacMillan, and Ralph Snell. Member David Sanford and Alternate Brian Alexander were absent. Also in attendance was Zoning Enforcement Officer – Tavis Austin and Deputy Village Clerk – Jennifer Truax. Eleven members of the public were present.

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

Regular Agenda

12 Main Street (Mr. Tedesco, Contractor for Roger & Carla MacMillan) – Replacement of existing fence

Dr. MacMillan recused himself at 5:01 PM.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the change in fence material from vinyl to cedar.

Mr. Snell stated that he feels that with the change in material the fence would simply be replacement in kind and not require board approval.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Tedesco if there are any proposed design changes for the new fence.

Mr. Tedesco stated that there would not be any design changes but that the fence would be raised off the ground slightly to help prevent rot.

Ms. Drerup asked if the gates would be replaced.

Mr. Tedesco stated that the gates are problematic as after a short time they do not open properly but he is not sure if the MacMillans plan to install gates as currently exist.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Tedesco to clarify that the fence would just be along the River Street side of the property.

Mr. Tedesco confirmed that it would just be along the River Street property line.

Mr. Drerup stated that she too feels that this is replacement in kind and no action from the board is necessary.

Ms. Callahan concurred.

180 Main Street (Marc Kingsley) – Proposed replacement of front steps

Dr. MacMillan returned to the board at 5:04 PM.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and stated that the existing stair treads seem to be okay but the risers are in poor condition.

Mr. Kingsley reviewed the condition of the existing steps and stated that the mortar is crumbling and the stones are falling off. He stated that he feels that wood steps would be a better option for this location.

Ms. Drerup asked if the proposed steps would mimic the existing steps of the side of the structure.

Mr. Kingsley stated that he is unsure about the side steps but that the proposed steps would have the same specs as the existing steps but would be constructed of wood. He further stated that he hopes to reuse the existing railing.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he understands that there have been issues with ice on the stone steps.

Mr. Kingsley stated that was correct. He further stated that a large amount of salt is used to control the ice which in turn damages the steps.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the replacement would be with treated wood.

Mr. Kingsley stated that his contractor would use whatever is appropriate and the steps will be painted.

Ms. Drerup asked what railing style would be used if the existing railing is not reusable. She suggested that railing to match the side steps be used.

Mr. Kingsley concurred.

Mr. Snell stated that he does not feel that a complete application has been provided and that he will be abstaining from any vote on 180 Main Street tonight.

Ms. Callahan asked if wood would be used or if Trex is being considered.

Mr. Kingsley stated that the materials would be wood.

Ms. Drerup stated that she is comfortable approving the application as long as the new steps will match the existing side steps.

Mr. Kingsley stated that he will look at and match the side steps. He continued to state that he did not plan any changes to the footprint or size of the existing steps.

Ms. Drerup asked if lattice would be installed at the sides, under the stairs.

Mr. Kingsley confirmed that framed in lattice, to match the existing porch, would be installed.

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: September 9, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed step replacement at 180 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 requirement of SEQRA have been met for this action;
- was legally advertised and held on August 11, 20015;
- 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)(c);

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed front step replacement at 180 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 8th day of September 2015, determine that the proposed work at 180 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

ABSTAIN: Snell

Motion carried.

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

Old School Court (Kyle Fabiano, Martha Grossi, Sara Stewart) – Proposed siding and window replacement on garage and weatherproofing to prevent further decay

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and asked if only the south side of the garage is problematic and needs repair.

Ms. Grossi stated that the rear of the structure is problematic. She explained that the property behind the structure is filled with dense growth. She stated that the garage was close to collapse in the mid-1990s due to poor drainage and vegetation in this area. She explained that proposed use of vinyl is to help protect the structure from continued high moisture levels which contribute to decay.

Ms. Drerup asked if she was correct in understanding it took three days to clear the brush and growth to access the rear of the garage.

Ms. Grossi stated that was correct. She continued to explain that Old School Court only owns about 3' of land behind the garage and that they had to obtain permission from the neighboring property owners to clear the brush and access the property.

Ms. Drerup asked about the proposed extension of the roof overhang and how that would wrap around the structure.

The board and applicants reviewed the proposed overhang.

Ms. Grossi confirmed that only the south or rear of the garage is problematic.

Dr. MacMillan asked about the window replacement.

Ms. Grossi stated that the windows are rotten and will be replaced.

Ms. Drerup stated that the application indicates that vinyl windows will be used. She continued to state that it seems that the big issue is drainage and that she is not sure that the addition of an overhang will prevent the moisture issue.

Ms. Grossi stated that they do not have anywhere to drain the water to. She again stated that they only own three feet between the rear property line and the garage.

Mr. Austin stated that he informed the applicants that they could apply for all possible options on one application. He explained that they may not need all of the options being applied for.

Ms. Drerup stated that even with the addition of a 12" overhang the water is still going to come back to the building unless another drainage option is created.

Ms. Callahan stated that it does not appear that gutters are an option for this location either. She explained that due to the drainage gutters will not rectify the situation.

The board and applicants discussed options for increased drainage.

Ms. Callahan asked if the roof would be replaced with the addition of the overhang.

Ms. Grossi stated that the roof needs replacement as it is leaking but that work will probably not be completed till next year.

Ms. Callahan asked if the roof was metal.

Ms. Grossi stated that it is asphalt shingles.

Ms. Stewart stated that the overhang extension would be done when the roof is repaired.

Ms. Drerup suggested that the windows and siding be replaced at this time and that the overhang be left until after the winter giving the applicants the opportunity to see whether those measures will solve the problem.

Dr. MacMillan asked what needs approval at this time, the siding and what else.

Ms. Drerup stated that the siding and three windows would need approval at this time. She asked the applicants if the siding would be stepped down with the parged foundation.

Mr. Fabiano stated that it would follow the existing proposed parged foundation.

Mr. Snell stated that the board does not normally approve the use of vinyl siding and windows. He continued to state that due to the hidden nature of this project he does not have a problem with their use.

Ms. Callahan concurred and added that the environmental conditions may also warrant the use of these products.

Ms. Stewart questioned why gutters are not an option.

Mr. Austin explained that a property owner may not drain onto another property. He stated that unless the gutters could be directed to drain out to the front of the garage this would not be an option.

The board and applicants discussed the use of gutters.

Mr. Snell stated that no work should have begun prior to the approval of the board. He asked the applicants to inform the contractor of this requirement.

Ms. Stewart apologized and stated that the contractor has been made aware of the required approvals.

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: September 8, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed garage siding and window replacement at Old School Court, 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), and (3)(b).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to proposed garage siding and window replacement at Old School Court;

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 8th day of September 2015, determine that the work on the garage at Old School Court, 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, Snell Motion carried.

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

184 Main Street (Thomas Rusk) – Proposed field change for porch light and roofing material

Mr. Rusk stated that the originally proposed light was not repairable and provided the board with a photo of the newly proposed antique light fixture. He then stated that in addition to the proposed light fixture change he has found a roofing material that is guaranteed when applied to a flat roof. He shared a sample with the board and discussed how it is installed and that it is made from recycled tires.

Ms. Drerup asked if the roof is seen from a public way.

Mr. Rusk stated that it is not but that they are considering its use on the entire roof.

Ms. Drerup stated that she is unfamiliar with this product and asked if any literature is available.

Mr. Rusk stated that he forgot to bring the literature he has on the product but it is a Canadian company and the product is "Euro Slate."

Mr. Snell stated that he needs more information regarding the product before considering it for the main roof.

Ms. Drerup asked when they anticipate beginning the roofing project.

Mr. Rusk stated that they would like to do the porch roof now but that due to shipping cost would like to order the product in one shipment for both roofs.

Ms. Drerup stated that since the board did not have any information prior to the meeting she would like additional time to review the product information.

Mr. Snell stated that he is surprised that they are using a shingle on a flat roof and offering a guarantee.

Mr. Rusk stated that it will have a full membrane and water shield.

Ms. Callahan asked if the existing roofing material is slate.

Mr. Rusk stated that it is a rolled membrane.

Mr. Snell stated that another option, which may be cheaper and as effective, would be to install rubber roofing and top with concrete pavers.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to approve the field change for the light fixture, as submitted in a photo dated 09/08/2015, for the front porch of 184 Main Street. Mr. Snell seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

171 – 173 Main Street (Ed Landers) – proposed stair roof details

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application. She stated that the drawing indicates that the concrete piers will be removed and a new whole footing or mat would be installed. She stated that the plans do not indicate any other changes and asked about trim work and railings.

Mr. Landers stated that the railings that have already been installed will remain.

Ms. Drerup questioned the railings which include plywood being retained.

The board and Mr. Landers reviewed the existing structures and the pieces to be replaced and retained.

Mr. Landers stated that the railings along the stairs will be retained as they are sturdy. He further stated that additional railings will be installed as needed which are sturdy and look good.

Ms. Drerup asked what exactly would be installed. She stated that details of the materials and what the finished product will look like are necessary.

Mr. Landers stated that he would have 2 X 4 railings installed.

Mr. Snell stated that the application is inadequate. He explained that the board does not know what is being proposed. He further explained that details regarding materials as well as height and location of railings, spindles, etc. are necessary prior to the board taking any action.

Mr. Landers stated that he would use 2 X 4 lumber.

The board discussed the details for the location of the pad and code requirements for a guard rail. They discussed materials and where these items would be installed.

Mr. Landers stated that he would install a 2 X 4 rail on top and bottom with spindles as necessary between them.

Mr. Snell asked Mr. Landers if it would be okay if he helped him draw in the proposed rail on the provided photos in the application. Mr. Snell worked with Mr. Landers to draw in the guard rail.

Ms. Drerup asked if the materials would be wood.

Mr. Landers concurred.

Mr. Snell stated that the application does not indicate trim work but at a previous meeting it was agreed that the 4" X 4" posts would be trimmed out, the roof edge would be trimmed out, and the ceiling would be bead board.

Mr. Landers agreed that those things would be completed as indicated.

Ms. Drerup asked if the mat would be flush with the adjacent grade and that all risers will have the same rise.

Mr. Landers stated that to be correct.

Ms. 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: September 8, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed shed roof over the existing stairs at 171-173 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)(b).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to proposed shed roof at 171-173 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 8th day of September 2015,

determine that the proposed work at 171-173 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 columns be trimmed out as discussed at the April 14, 2015 meeting;

- The roof edges be trimmed out as discussed at the April 14, 2015 meeting;
- Bead Board be installed on the ceiling as discussed at the April 14, 2015 meeting;
- A wood, code complying, railing be provided generally consisting of a top and bottom rail with 2 X 2 spindles constructed of wood.

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

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Snell

Motion carried.

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

8 Glen Avenue (Ed Landers) – Proposed windows

Mr. Austin stated that this item may be removed from the agenda as he misunderstood Mr. Landers when he provided information. He explained that details regarding the windows were for 46 Chestnut Street which were approved on April 14, 2015.

Mr. Landers stated that after the April meeting and discussion of the addition of a window in the second floor they chose to open up the existing shutter to try to add more natural light. He explained that once the shutters were opened they found that although there were two openings one window was gone and the other was deteriorated. He stated that they will be replacing these windows with the exact same window in wood.

Ms. Callahan clarified that the two windows would be replaced with the same size, one over one window in wood.

Mr. Landers concurred.

Ms. Landers stated that it was their understanding that the board recommended and it was acceptable to open the shutters up and expose the existing window. She explained that when this was done they discovered that the one window was completely missing and the other was in a state of disrepair.

Ms. Drerup asked if the window has been walled over on the inside of the residence.

Ms. Landers stated that was correct.

Mr. Snell asked if a certificate of appropriateness was necessary.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he feels this would be replacement in kind and not require a COA.

Ms. Drerup concurred with Dr. MacMillan stating that the replacement was wood for wood in the same style.

46 Chestnut Street (Ed Landers) – Previously approved windows

Mr. Landers stated that he went to great lengths to find 9 over 9 windows in wood as approved.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Landers if he means 6 over 6 as that was what was approved for 46 Chestnut Street.

The board reviewed the application and minutes from April 14, 2015 and the certificate of appropriateness for 46 Chestnut Street which clearly indicated 6 over 6, SDL, Integrity windows.

Ms. Drerup stated that the original application which was not approved included a photo of 9 over 9 windows.

Mr. Landers stated that he would try to return the 9 over 9 windows and the approved windows would be installed.

The board reviewed the previously approved windows for 46 Chestnut Street.

Ms. Drerup stated that the windows indicated on the Lowes order form provided by Mr. Landers and placed in the wrong file were not for simulated divided lights as approved.

Mr. Snell reviewed the approval and stated that SDL, 6 over 6, Integrity windows were approved.

Ms. Drerup informed Mr. Landers that he can get SDL, 6 over 6 windows in another brand but that they must be 6 over 6 SDL. She stated that if he needs assistance insuring that the windows are as approved he may contact her.

2 Chestnut Street (Jon McManus for Harris Family) – Proposed siding removal and replacement to insulate

Mr. McManus reviewed the application and stated that it is clear that not all of the siding is original. He explained that there are old and new patches, some is hand nailed, other portions were installed with a nail gun, etc. He stated that the siding will be removed to insulate and since the siding is not original to the structure he does not feel it is economical to try to retain and reuse the existing siding. Mr. McManus stated that they are proposing the use of Allura, fiber cement board in Costal Blue.

Ms. Drerup asked if it comes in a smooth finish.

Mr. McManus stated that it does but that he would like approval for either wood-grain or smooth as his client has not yet made a decision as to their preference.

Mr. Snell stated that wood-grain is not appropriate.

The board concurred.

Ms. Callahan stated that she walked around the building and did not feel that the siding was in a state of disrepair.

Mr. McManus stated that it is not in terrible shape but a lot of it has been replaced. He further stated that, given the amount of work already done to the interior of the structure, the only way to effectively insulate is to remove the siding and insulate from the exterior.

Ms. Callahan stated that this approach is very aggressive and that there are other ways to insulate.

Mr. McManus stated that he is not willing to use blown-in insulation. He stated that they will be using spray foam and feel that this is the best option for the structure.

Ms. Drerup question whether or not the trim would be retained.

Mr. McManus stated that the windows and trim would be retained.

Mr. Snell asked if the shutters will be reinstalled.

Mr. McManus stated that he does not know. He explained that they were removed prior to him being retained by the Harris family.

Mr. Snell stated that the shutters should not have been removed without approval. He stated that he recommends that approval be granted with the stipulation that the shutters be returned.

Ms. Drerup asked if sheathing would be installed. She explained that she is worried that the siding will stand proud of the windows and trim.

Mr. McManus stated that they will do whatever is appropriate to ensure that the new siding is relatively the same depth as the existing siding and does not stand proud of the trim and windows.

Mr. Snell asked what reveal the new siding would have.

Mr. McManus stated that the reveal would be 6".

Ms. Drerup stated that the siding should align with the window heads and sills.

Ms. Callahan stated that she feels that the change in siding is a dramatic change for the structure. She stated that although the clapboard itself may not be historic it could be replaced with wood, therefore, having less effect on this historic feature. She asked why clapboard was not being used.

Mr. McManus stated that maintenance was a big issue in the choice of materials.

Ms. Callahan stated that this is a very prominent structure and that she cannot buy the argument that the clapboard is not original.

Mr. McManus stated that the clapboard has to be removed to insulate and that the cost to retain and maintain the clapboard is not appropriate especially since the clapboard is not original.

Ms. Callahan stated that although all of the clapboard may not be original, a good job has been done to make the new and old materials blend. She stated that she feels that the board may be going down a slippery slope.

Ms. Drerup asked if the garage has been resided.

Mr. McManus stated that it was not resided just repainted and the owners would like the siding to match the garage.

Mr. Snell stated that he understands where Ms. Callahan is coming from but he feels that the shutters are a bigger issue. He continued to state that he does not feel that the siding will be too noticeable once complete with the shutters reinstalled.

The board reviewed other residences in the village which have used a cement board siding.

Ms. Drerup stated that the hardware for the shutters is still in place. She stated that the hardware should be retained and that the shutters should be reinstalled upon completion of the siding project. She continued to state that the siding should not stand proud of the window trim.

Mr. McManus stated that he would do his best to maintain the existing reveal.

Ms. Drerup asked what would be done to the water table.

Mr. McManus stated that no work would be done to this area.

Mr. Snell asked the width of the corner boards.

Mr. McManus provided the board with a copy of the brochure for Allura.

Ms. Drerup stated that the round trim on the bay window corners should be retained.

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: September 8, 2015

A resolution to approve the siding replacement at 2 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;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(a), (2)(b), (2)(c), (3)(a), (3)(b), (3)(c), (3)(e), and (5).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed siding replacement at 2 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 8th day of September 2015, determine that the work at 2 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 with the following conditions:

- *The replacement siding be installed smooth side out with the exposure to match the original and aligning with the window heads and sills;*
- *The existing trim reveal to be maintained as closely as possible;*
- *The existing shutters with original hardware to be reinstalled;*
- *The bay window corner trim to be retained.*

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

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

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

5 Walnut Street (Susan Snell for Betsey Jay) – Proposed deck and vestibule enclosure

Mr. Snell recused himself at 6:22 PM.

Ms. Snell reviewed the application for this non-contributing structure. She stated that the project would be to enclose the front landing and add a deck to the rear of the residence which will wrap around the side of the residence.

Ms. Drerup asked if the existing driveway length to the rear of the residence will be retained.

Ms. Snell stated that it would be retained. She explained that it has not been used for vehicles but it does access a rear garage door which is currently used for storage.

The board reviewed the proposed work and materials list.

Ms. Snell stated that she would like to make two changes to the application. The first is to remove the support posts and utilize brackets to give Ms. Jay more useable space on the deck, and the second would be to have the option of using a Craftsman door with glass at the top and one or two panels at the bottom. She penciled in the revisions on the submitted plans.

Ms. Drerup asked if the required parking is still met with the reduction in the useable length of the driveway.

Ms. Snell stated that the driveway will still accommodate two stacked vehicles.

Dr. MacMillan thanked Ms. Snell for provided a detail drawing and complete plans.

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: September 8, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed deck and vestibule enclosure at 5 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 features being altered are not significant in their own right;*
- *The proposed work is in keeping with the character of the structure and neighborhood;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (2)(c), (3)(a),(3)(b), (3)(c), (3)(d) and (4)(i).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed work at 5 Walnut 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 8th day of September 2015, determine that the work at 5 Walnut 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: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan Motion carried.

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

51 Pioneer Street (Olson) – Proposed roof replacement

Mr. Snell returned to the board at 6:36 PM.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application.

Dr. MacMillan stated that he feels the work is appropriate as it will match the "twin building" it is connected to.

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: September 8, 2015

A resolution to approve the proposed the roof replacement at 51 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 structure is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;
 - The feature to be replaced is not mentioned in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;
 - The feature is difficult to see from any public way;
 - The work is in keeping with the neighborhood;
 - The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E. (3)(c), and (4)(f).

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed roof replacement at 51 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 8th day of September 2015, determine that the work at 51 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 condition that:

- The asphalt shingle color matches that of the roof adjoining structure at 53 Pioneer Street.

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

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

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

11 Cooper Lane (John Sansevere) – Proposed garage demolition and replacement

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application as submitted.

The board discussed the application and items necessary to consider the application complete.

Mr. Snell stated that scaled elevation drawings of all four sides of the proposed structure, and a to scale site plan would be necessary to consider the application complete.

Ms. Callahan suggested that if Mr. Sansevere could stake out the proposed new garage location it would be helpful.

Ms. Drerup made a motion that the board determine that the application for 11 Cooper Lane is incomplete. Mr. Snell seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

134 Main Street (BTP / Altonview) – Field change

This application was held over till the October meeting.

Other Business

Ms. Drerup stated that she would not be in attendance for the October meeting.

Mr. Snell stated that he has two questions regarding the law. The first is what constitutes a demolition and therefore would require a public hearing, and the second is regarding roof top buffering. He explained that he feels these areas are subject to too much interpretation. He continued to state that he feels that the intent of the law needs to be clarified by the elected officials.

Ms. Drerup stated that she would bring these concerns to the attention of the Trustees.

Minutes:

Dr. MacMillan made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 11, 2015 meeting held as submitted. Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

Meeting adjourned at 7:12 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Truax
Deputy Village Clerk