

## DRAFT

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 January 13, 2015. Members in attendance were Chair – Teresa Drerup, Liz Callahan, Roger MacMillan, Ralph Snell and alternate – Ann Stewart. Member David Sanford was 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 5:05 PM.

### Regular Agenda

Ms. Drerup noted that all of the members of the public present were high school students from the Participation in Government class. She explained to the students when and how the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board was created and the purpose of the board.

Ms. Stewart indicated as a new member of the board she does not feel comfortable voting this evening and is in attendance as an observer.

**103 Main Street (Altonview Architects for A. Ferrara)** – Proposed installation of a garage door

Ms. Drerup recused herself at 5:09 p.m.

Ms. Drerup presented the board with additional information for the record, a plan showing what appears to be an existing garage door opening. She stated that the document was from 2005.

Mr. Austin stated that according to DPW Superintendent, Brian Clancy, this building once housed the first aerial truck owned by the fire department in the very location currently proposed for the garage door.

Dr. MacMillan reviewed the location of the building and its relation to other buildings and businesses. He explained that at the December 2014 meeting he expressed concern over a garage door which would access an alleyway and increase traffic in an area which has a high pedestrian use. He further stated that after the meeting it was pointed out to him that it is not in this board's purview to review traffic flow and patterns and that the only portion of the project which may be reviewed is the proposed garage door and if or how it might affect the aesthetics of this historic building. Dr. MacMillan asked the members of the board if they had any comments or questions regarding the proposed project.

Ms. Drerup stated that Mr. Ferrara would ideally like approval to place the door either on the east or west façade which would allow him more latitude in determining the most effective placement.

Mr. Austin stated that recently the ZBA approached Village Attorney, Martin Tillapaugh, regarding an application which had failed with a vote of, two AYES, and two NAYES. He stated that Mr. Tillapaugh indicated that the application was technically denied and that the only way a new motion could be considered was if a new motion, distinctly different from the previous motion, was made by a member who had not voted in favor of the previous motion.

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: January 13, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed garage door on the east façade of 103 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)(b), (3)(a), (3)(b), and (3)(d).*

*Section 300-26 of the Zoning Law having been met with regards to the proposed garage door on the east façade at 103 Main Street;*

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 13<sup>th</sup> day of January 2015, determine that the work at 103 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.

Dr. MacMillan asked if there are any additional comments.

Ms. Callahan asked if it would be appropriate to add the statement from the December 2014 motion which indicated that it is the owner's responsibility, at his expense to obtain any necessary right of ways and permits necessary for the use of the door.

Mr. Snell stated that he does not feel that this is in the purview of the board. He indicated that his motion stands as presented and that he does not wish to make any changes to the motion.

Dr. MacMillan called for a vote and it had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, MacMillan, Snell

ABSTAIN: Stewart

Motion carried.

Ms. Drerup returned to the board at 5:18 PM

**8 Elk Street (Patrick Broe) – reconstruction of original porch, 171-173 Main Street (Ed Landers) – re-siding and egress roof, & 46 Chestnut Street (Ed Landers)**

Ms. Drerup stated that the other agenda items this evening, 8 Elk Street, 171-173 Main Street, and 46 Chestnut Street are all agenda items from the previous month which were carried over due to lack of information. She stated that no additional information has been submitted at this time and that no representatives for those properties are present. She asked the board how they would like to proceed.

Ms. Callahan made a motion to table the applications for 8 Elk Street, 171-173 Main Street, and 46 Chestnut Street until further information is provided and/or the applicants are able to be present at a meeting. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Snell  
ABSTAIN: Stewart

Motion carried.

### **Minutes:**

Dr. MacMillan made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 15, 2014 meeting as submitted. Ms. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan  
ABSTAIN: Snell, Stewart

Motion carried.

### **Continuation of Agenda Items**

Mr. Snell asked if the board would review the applications which have been tabled as he was absent during their initial review.

#### **8 Elk Street (Patrick Broe) – Proposed reconstruction of the original porch**

Mr. Snell stated that it is difficult to tell exactly what is being proposed from the information which has been provided.

Mr. Austin stated that Mr. Broe has indicated that he will provide additional information and details.

Mr. Snell stated that two “real” elevation drawings, drawn to scale are necessary. He stated that drawings of both the south and east elevations should be provided.

Ms. Callahan stated that all specific details of the plans should be called out in the drawings along with providing a list of materials.

Mr. Snell asked when the window was installed.

Mr. Austin stated that the window was installed previously but there is not information in the file regarding the window replacement.

Mr. Snell stated that it did not appear to be an original window.

Ms. Callahan stated that the columns and brackets as presented do not fit the period of the home. She suggested that Mr. Broe may want to reduce their prevalence.

Ms. Stewart asked what documentation was used to determine “original.”

Mr. Austin stated that no documentation has been found to know when the porch was added. He stated that the documentation submitted is a photo from the 1950s.

#### **171-173 Main Street (Ed Landers) – re-siding and egress roof**

Ms. Callahan stated that the application indicated that the roof would be “like” that at Mickey’s Place and The Pit but it is not at all similar to those entrances.

Mr. Austin stated that Mr. Landers has indicated that he would provide details regarding other elements including trim.

Mr. Snell stated that the roof has already been built prior to any review or approval. He asked what criteria is used to review an application where the proposed change is complete and/or begun.

Mr. Austin stated that all applications should be reviewed and required to meet the same standards regardless of whether or not the applicant has illegally begun or completed the work.

Ms. Drerup stated that the board could require the applicant to remove the structure which has been put in place at their own expense.

Mr. Snell concurred that the board should review the application as if it was never built using the same criteria that is established for all applications.

#### **46 Chestnut Street (Ed Landers) – proposed window replacement**

Ms. Callahan stated that after Mr. Tim Horvath indicated that the original windows would likely have been 6 over 6 she again visited the property. She noted that there is currently an attic window which appears original which is 6 over 6. She shared a photo on her phone of said window.

Mr. Snell stated that the original application indicated vinyl replacement windows. He asked if Mr. Landers would be returning with a different vinyl window proposal.

Ms. Drerup stated that she believes Mr. Landers will be coming back with information regarding a SDL replacement window which she does not believe comes in vinyl.

Mr. Snell asked if the application was for spot replacement and if that was appropriate.

Ms. Drerup stated that she asked Mr. Landers if he intended to replace all of the windows in the home and he has indicated that he did intend to do so over time. She continued to state that she had suggested that since a permit is good for two years it would make more sense to get approval for replacement of all of the windows at this time.

Mr. Snell asked if there is a plan as to how the windows would be replaced, for example one at a time, one façade at a time, etc.

Mr. Austin stated that it is his understanding that Mr. Landers would systematically replace the windows as he could afford to but that he would get approval for the replacement of all of the windows.

Mr. Snell asked if the board has any issues with partial replacement or if it would be more advisable to require it to be one façade at a time.

Ms. Callahan stated that although the situation of partial replacement is not ideal, if it is done with consistency it would be okay.

Mr. Snell pointed out that products change over time.

## DRAFT

Mr. Austin stated that he does not know Mr. Landers' situation but with the change from his proposed window to an SDL there would be a significant increase in price. He further stated that to then require an entire façade to be replaced at one time may be such a significant increase in cost that it makes the project a hardship.

Ms. Drerup stated that she got the impression from Mr. Landers that he would like to do the project right.

Mr. Snell stated that the structure was circa 1830.

**Other Business:**

Ms. Drerup asked the status of the residence on Chestnut and Walnut Street which was approved for window replacement using windows that had already been purchased and the installer was going to glue faux muntins in place. She indicated that she thinks that the permit may have expired and does not believe the work to have ever been done.

Mr. Austin stated that he is unsure of the status of this property. He further stated that the applicant was going to begin in the rear of the residence and that maybe it was unsuccessful and therefore not continued.

Mr. Snell asked if there were any setback issues for the egress roof at 171 Main Street.

Mr. Austin stated that the structure is one foot from the property line and is legally compliant.

Ms. Drerup asked if the windows had been replaced at 40 Elm Street as approved at the last meeting. She stated that she was unsure if the replacements were one over one as required.

Meeting adjourned at 5:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Jennifer Truax  
Deputy Village Clerk