

The regular meeting of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board (HARB) of the Village of Cooperstown was held in the Village Office Building, 22 Main Street, Cooperstown, New York on March 11, 2014. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Liz Callahan, Roger MacMillan, Wendell Tripp and alternates Hugh MacDougall and David Sanford. Also in attendance was Zoning Enforcement Officer – Tavis Austin and Deputy Village Clerk – Jennifer Truax. Eleven members of the public were present.

Ms. Drerup called the meeting to order at 5:02 PM.

Regular Agenda

16 Lakeland Drive North (Cheryl Wright/Marley Wright) – field change for roofing material

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and stated that neither Ms. Wright nor her representative was able to attend and therefore Ms. Wright was here by phone. Ms. Drerup shared the sample of the proposed roofing material and the color sample. She asked Ms. Wright which product identification number.

Ms. Wright stated that the product number is ML200.

Ms. Drerup asked if this product would work with the roof pitch.

Ms. Wright stated that ML200 will be mechanically seamed. She stated that this is the only way that the warranty will remain in effect.

Ms. Drerup stated that the seams will be two inches high and therefore will be seen.

Ms. Callahan asked if the sample had the correct profile.

Ms. Drerup stated that the seam will be a little taller than it appears on the sample. She continued to state that the ridges and their shadow will be able to be seen.

Ms. Wright stated that the color choice of charcoal was to try to reduce the visibility of the seams.

Ms. Drerup stated that there are two color sample sheets. She asked if the charcoal being used is the one with the more matte finish.

Ms. Wright stated that was correct the finish would be more matte.

Ms. Drerup stated that this is a field change from the previously approved monolithic roofing to standing seam. She stated that she would have preferred a lower seam but given the pitch that is not an option. She further stated that the color choice will minimize the visibility of the seam and the roof orientation is not very visible from any public way.

Dr. MacMillan made a motion to approve the field change for 16 Lakeview Drive North to allow a standing seam roof, ASP product number ML200 in the color Charcoal product number SR.27/TE.87 as indicated in the application. Mr. Sanford seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

Motion carried.

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

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application for the proposed porch.

Dr. MacMillan asked if any changes have been made to the application since last month.

Mr. McManus stated that no changes had been made. He explained that there is a need for a loading area to serve the food bank deliveries. He further explained that they are trying to duplicate the existing porch in style with this new porch. Mr. McManus stated that no railing would be installed as the porch floor is less than 30 inches in height.

Ms. Drerup asked if the stairs would have a railing. She stated that by County Code a railing is required if there are more than two risers.

Mr. McManus stated that railing would be needed for the stairs. He continued to state that the contractor had examined the existing porch and made a material list from his findings. Mr. McManus stated that the material list is included and that all materials will be the same as used on the existing porch.

The board reviewed the location of the proposed porch.

Ms. Drerup asked if the roof pitch would need to change.

Mr. McManus stated that it would not change and further explained the roof design and pitch.

Dr. MacMillan asked if snow would cause a problem with this roof design and pitch.

Mr. McManus stated that it should not be a problem and that the pitch does meet county standards.

The board reviewed the details of the porch roof and ceiling.

Mr. McManus stated that the ceiling will be tongue and groove and will be horizontal.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. McManus about the roof design on the side. She explained that it does not appear complete but rather just “cut” off.

Mr. McManus stated that the roof did not continue as he did not want to create a valley.

Ms. Drerup suggested wrapping this edge to give it a more finished look.

Mr. McManus agreed to this change in design.

Mr. Sanford stated that the roof would then have a 12” or so return.

Ms. Drerup stated that to be correct.

Mr. McManus asked if the return matched that of the main roof would it be appropriate.

Ms. Drerup stated that it would. She asked if this porch and entrance would be used by clients.

DRAFT

Mr. McManus stated that it would not be used for any purpose other than as a loading area for food deliveries. He continued to state that he feels that he can remove one of the stair treads to eliminate the need for a railing.

Ms. Drerup asked if there would be any changes to the doors or windows.

Mr. McManus stated that the only work to be done to the doors and windows was minor repairs.

Dr. Tripp stated that this is not truly a porch addition but rather the addition of a loading dock.

Mr. McManus stated that it is a porch in appearance but structurally has been designed to handle the work of a loading dock.

Ms. Drerup asked if vehicles would be driven up to the porch to unload.

Mr. McManus stated that vehicles would not be driven up to the porch. He explained that the deliveries would be carried or hand trucked to the porch.

Ms. Drerup asked if the existing fence would remain.

Mr. McManus stated that there are no proposed changes to the fence and that it would remain in place.

Ms. Drerup asked if a sidewalk would be installed.

Ms. Sharon Oberriter, representative from the food pantry, stated that they have discussed the use of paver stone but no decision was made. She further explained that it is the desire of the church to retain as much of the side yard as possible.

Ms. Drerup stated that the location of the gate in the existing fence will make carrying items to the new porch more difficult. She suggested that a gate to match the existing fence, located in a more convenient location, may be appropriate.

Ms. Oberriter asked if they could possibly just switch the existing gate and one section of the fence.

Mr. McManus stated that that could probably be easily done but if not then it would not be a big deal to build a gate to match.

Dr. Tripp stated that he had taken much consideration into whether or not he should recuse himself. He explained that he is a member of the Presbyterian Church and as a member of the church strongly opposes the change to the building. He stated that he believes that over time the carrying of food deliveries to the loading dock will become cumbersome and undesirable. Due to this effort he feels that in time the fence will come down to facilitate the installation of a driveway. These changes will in turn take what has been an attractive area and make it almost semi-commercial. Dr. Tripp stated that with that being said he is not here tonight as a member of the Presbyterian Church but rather a member of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board and must act as such making a decision based only on the criteria which pertains to HPARB.

Ms. Oberriter stated that she understands the concerns but there is no plan to develop the property further. She stated that the food deliveries are received once per month and take approximately one and a half hours to complete.

Mr. Tom Heitz, introduced himself as clerk of session for the Presbyterian Church. He stated that as clerk he is authorized to speak on behalf of the church. He stated that the session has reviewed and considered all of the factors related to the proposed work and the church has given full support for this project as presented.

Dr. Tripp stated that he was not a member of session and does not assume to speak on their behalf but only for himself.

Ms. Drerup asked Dr. Tripp if he would be recusing himself.

Dr. Tripp stated that he would not be recusing himself but would act as a member of HPARB without considering his personal concerns as a member of the church.

Mr. 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: March 11, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed loading platform at 25 Church Street, Cooperstown, NY

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

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

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed loading platform at 25 Church Street;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 11th day of March 2014, determine that the proposed work at 25 Church 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:

- A return be added to the roof as discussed*
- The stairs will be reduced to two treads from the proposed three treads;*
- If necessary a gate to match the existing fence may be installed or the existing gate can be switched with another panel.*

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

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

Motion carried.

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

46 Elm Street (Matt & Kara Grady) – Proposed chicken coop

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and asked Ms. Grady if she understands that roosters are not allowed, due to potential for noise

Ms. Grady stated that she is aware of that. She explained that the family currently has two hens at their other property which they intend to move to their home at 46 Elm Street. She stated that they have no intentions of obtaining any additional chickens.

Mr. MacDougall asked if there were any Village ordinances which preclude having chickens or livestock within the Village.

Ms. Drerup explained that the definition of agriculture within the Zoning law was changed at some point and there is now nothing that precludes livestock. She stated that roosters would be a violation of the noise ordinance not the zoning law.

Ms. Drerup stated that given the existing six foot fence the proposed chicken coop cannot be seen.

Mr. Austin stated that the board should note that the location of the proposed coop is within the buildable area of the lot and not within any setbacks.

Ms. Grady shared the proposed location of the coop using materials provided.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the coop would hold more than two chickens.

Ms. Grady stated that she believes that this coop is designed for two to four chickens and that they never plan to have more chickens than that.

Dr. MacMillan asked if the chickens would be outside.

Ms. Drerup shared the plans and indicated that they will have a fenced in outdoor area as part of the coop but the chickens would not run free.

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: March 11, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed chicken coop at 46 Elm 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;*
- *Both the residential and garage structures on this property are listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed work meets the criteria under Section 300-26.E.(3)(c).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed chicken coop at 46 Elm Street;

Ms. Lewis stated that the lower section of fencing faces the residence and provides more visibility to the pool from the yard and residence.

Mr. MacDougall asked if there was anything to prevent people from being in the pool when no one was around.

Mr. Austin stated that by law the gate will be self-closing and self-latching.

Mr. Sanford asked if there would be a pool cover.

Ms. Lewis stated that there would be a pool cover installed when the pool is installed.

Mr. Sanford stated that the pool cover is secure and can hold a significant amount of weight.

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: March 11, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed pool fence at 41 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;*
- Both the residential and garage structures on this property are 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), and (3)(c).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed fence at 41 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 11th day of March 2014, determine that the proposed work at 30 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 with the following conditions:

- A letter of acquiescence be submitted from the Rollins Estate prior to the installation of the pool and fence.*

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

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

Motion carried.

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

109 Pioneer Street (Susan Snell for Komron Ostovar) – proposed basement window replacement

5 Pioneer Street (Susan Snell for Alan Leist) – proposed addition of shutters and modifications to the fence

Ms. Snell reviewed the application and indicated that the new owners intend to repaint the house a light color such as white or cream and would like to add decorative shutters to add color to the structure. She stated that she has addressed with the owners appropriate size and location of shutters but due to the flat trim on the windows hardware will not work for the shutters.

Ms. Drerup expressed that she is not in favor of installing nonfunctional shutters.

Ms. Snell stated that although the shutters will not be functional they will generally appear as if they would be functional. She explained that the shutters would be installed so that they overlapped the flat trim on the windows as much as possible. She further explained that the proposed shutters are a paintable composite material that comes in three different widths and the height can be requested in one inch intervals.

Ms. Drerup stated that if they appear functional she is not as opposed as if they are purely decorative.

Ms. Snell pointed out that the bay window in the rear of the home would not have shutters but the home owners would like to place shutters on the ganged windows on the north side of the home.

Dr. MacMillan asked if there were any interior changes.

Ms. Snell stated that she is not aware of any proposed interior changes at this time.

Ms. Drerup stated that the house was built in 1985 and therefore is noncontributing.

Ms. Snell stated that she believes that the construction date was closer to 1990 as it was constructed after she had moved into the Village.

Mr. Sanford asked if the shutters were paint grade.

Ms. Snell stated that the shutters are paint grade.

Ms. Drerup stated that she is not in favor of the placement of shutters on the ganged windows, however she is okay with the other proposed shutters as long as they are close to the correct size and installed so that they lap the window trim.

Ms. Drerup asked Ms. Snell to provided details on the proposed fence.

Ms. Snell stated that the owners would like a picket style fence. She provided photos of possible styling. She explained that the slat spacing would be as indicated in the photos but the profile and saw curve may change. She continued to state that the fence would probably not be painted but allowed to weather similar to the stockade fence in the rear of the property. She explained the location of the fence explaining that it will either be in the same location as the existing fence or moved slightly to be on the property line which would require the installation to leave openings for the existing trees.

Ms. Drerup asked the height of the proposed fence.

Ms. Snell stated that the fence would be no more than four feet in height but she expects it to be closer to three feet.

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: March 11, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed shutters and fence modifications at 5 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 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)(b), and (3)(c).*

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed shutter installation as indicated in the application and to include the ganged windows and fence modifications at 5 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 11th day of March 2014, determine that the proposed work at 5 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.

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

AYES: Callahan, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

NAYES: Drerup

Motion carried.

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

64 Chestnut Street (Susan Snell for Robin & Fred Schneider) – Field change for deck

Ms. Snell reviewed the application indicating the change in the deck location and size as well as the relocation of some windows.

Ms. Drerup stated that the proposed work is not seen from any public way.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to approve the field change for 64 Chestnut Street as submitted.

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

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

Motion carried.

24 Delaware Street (Jon McManus for Anne Geddes-Atwell) – proposed 4' X 4' addition

Mr. McManus reviewed the application indicating that the residence does not have any bathing facilities in the downstairs and the addition is to accommodate a shower.

Dr. Tripp asked the height of the proposed addition.

Mr. McManus stated that it was eight feet in height. He continued to state that this was the only location that would accommodate the shower without major alterations. He stated that they will use the same materials, siding reveal, etc. to include matching the shingles to the existing as well. Mr. McManus stated that he has also considered matching the main structure's roof pitch.

Ms. Drerup stated that matching the pitch would be more aesthetically pleasing. She further stated that increasing the east-west dimension of the addition from 4 feet to approximately 6 feet would also be more aesthetically pleasing.

Mr. McManus stated that the extra length could probably be accommodated. He explained that he had tried to minimize the modification.

Ms. Drerup stated that even if the added area is not needed in the interior it would make the exterior more proportionate. She further noted that the siding should not extend down to grad, as indicated on the drawings.

Mr. McManus agreed, stating that the addition is on piers and he does not want to block up the whole addition if it is not necessary. He stated that it is possible to lay stone facing to cover the block, but structurally it is not necessary.

Ms. Drerup asked if the shrubs would remain.

Mr. McManus stated that he believes that the shrubs will remain.

Ms. Drerup stated that the shrubs will help cover the exposed foundation block under the addition but facing it with stone, to match the existing foundation, is a more pleasing solution.

Mr. McManus stated that he would discuss with the contractor the possibility of laying stone or block.

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: March 11, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed addition at 24 Delaware Street, Cooperstown, NY

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

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

Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed addition at 24 Delaware Street;

Resolution date: March 11, 2014

A resolution to approve the proposed awning at 99 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. (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 awning at 99 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 11th day of March 2014, determine that the proposed work at 99 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 condition:

- All three awnings and their associated framework, except the anchor plates which are attached to the building, be removed from the exterior of the premises from October 15 through May 15 annually.*

A vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Tripp

Motion carried.

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

Minutes:

Ms. Callahan made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 11, 2014 meeting as presented. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Tripp

ABSTAIN: Sanford

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 7:08 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Truax
Deputy Village Clerk