

## 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 Tuesday, November 10, 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. Eight members of the public were present.

Ms. Drerup called the meeting to order at 5:03 PM.

### Public Hearing

#### **11 Cooper Lane (John Sansevere) – Proposed garage demolition and new garage**

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application and opened the public hearing at 5:04 PM. She asked for public comment. There was no public comment at this time.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Sansevere about the proposed fence replacement indicated on the application.

Mr. Sansevere stated that he has withdrawn the proposed fence at this time and is just looking to demolish the existing garage and build the proposed new garage.

Ms. Drerup asked what materials are proposed for the new garage.

Mr. Sansevere stated that he believes all required information including drawings and materials are provided in the file.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Sansevere why he is proposing the new garage.

Mr. Sansevere stated that the existing garage is too small. He stated that he would like to place a two car garage on the property as most families have two vehicles.

Ms. Drerup asked if the intent of the garage was for use by the residents of the home on the property.

Mr. Sansevere stated that it is.

Dr. MacMillan questioned the location of the proposed garage.

The board reviewed the proposed location.

Ms. Drerup stated that she is not sure if the proposed location is acceptable by county building code. She explained that she does not feel that the separation distance between the two structures is adequate.

Ms. Sansevere stated that he could push the location back, farther from the residence.

Ms. Drerup stated that the size of the proposed garage is proportionately large in relationship to the residence and even if code allows the closeness to the residence makes the garage seem even more out of proportion.





## DRAFT

baked onto the material the board does have the right to review the color. She asked the members of the board for their feeling on the proposed roofing color.

The members of the board stated that they do not have an issue with the proposed color of the roof, (green).

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Sansevere what metal roofing profile will be used.

Mr. Sansevere stated that he wants the same as on his garage and indicated the dutchlap design.

Ms. Callahan stated that a demolition permit has been granted. She stated that maybe the new garage application should be carried over until the next meeting as it takes too much of the Board's time to have an applicant design their project on the fly at the meeting. She continued to state that a complete application should be submitted prior to the meeting so that the board has time to completely review an application prior to the meeting. This allows for the process to be completed in a more timely fashion.

Ms. Sansevere stated that he thought everything necessary was provided prior to the meeting. He continued to state that he thought that the board was there to help the applicant ensure that their building was compatible with the village. He stated that he is not an expert and that he thought that the board would help him with their expertise.

Mr. Snell stated that the board is not advisory. He stated the board is, under section 300-26.C(5)(i), required to approve or disapprove applications for certificates of appropriateness.

Mr. Sansevere stated that the proposed materials and colors were chosen to match the other structures on his property. He stated that he felt this would make the new garage compatible.

Ms. Drerup stated that there is no reason to "match" the surrounding structures. This is a new structure and can reflect that but should be compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Sansevere stated that he just tried to design something that the board would be happy with but if the board says asphalt shingles then he will use asphalt shingles. He stated he thought that this board was advisory and would help him create something that was appropriate.

Ms. Drerup stated that the structure's size is large and has a heavy and bulky look when compared to the residential structure on the property. She further stated that the dark roof also contributes to this look and that the color of the siding can also contribute or lessen this look.

Mr. Sansevere stated that he thought the relocation of the proposed garage helps to reduce this heavy look.

The board reviewed the elevation drawings and relabeled them based on the new location. The Holmes garage door, silver series 5500 with short plan windows was reviewed and stated as appropriate.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the proposed windows sizes and design.

Ms. Sansevere stated that the windows are proposed to allow for natural light and are 6 over 6 to match the cottage.

Ms. Drerup asked if they are doublehung or casement windows.

Mr. Sansevere stated that they are doublehung, of the same design just different sizes.

Ms. Drerup stated that one over one would be more appropriate as new construction. She further stated that if six over six are used, in different sizes, the grids will be different sizes and call additional attention to the structure.

The board concurred and Mr. Sansevere agreed that one over one is acceptable.

Ms. Drerup asked for details regarding the siding.

Mr. Sansevere indicated 4 1/2 " dutchlap siding in red.

Ms. Drerup stated that a lighter color would make the structure look less heavy and intrusive.

Mr. Sansevere stated that light maple would be acceptable.

Mr. Snell stated that was a good choice.

Ms. Drerup asked if the garage doors would be white.

Mr. Snell stated that white would be appropriate as it would match the window trim.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the details of the pass door.

Mr. Snell pointed out that the garage would be virtually invisible from the public way.

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: November 10, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed garage at 11 Cooper Lane, 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 garage is new construction;*
- *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 proposed garage at 11 Cooper Lane;*

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 10<sup>th</sup> day of November 2015, determine that the proposed work at 11 Cooper Lane, Cooperstown, NY meets the criteria for work within the Historic and Architectural Control Overlay District as set forth in the Zoning Law of the Village of Cooperstown.*

Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and the following discussion was held:

## DRAFT

Ms. Drerup suggested that it might be appropriate to add conditions and include the details of the materials as they are not part of the original application.

Mr. Sanford amended his motion to read:

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

*Resolution date: November 10, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed garage at 11 Cooper Lane, 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 garage is new construction;*
- *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 proposed garage at 11 Cooper Lane;*

- *NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 10<sup>th</sup> day of November 2015, determine that the proposed work at 11 Cooper Lane, 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 3 feet of property be added to the rear property line from the current owner's adjacent property to allow for the new proposed location;*
- *The materials be as follows: Windows be Ecoshield 200 series one over one white vinyl, the garage door be Holmes silver series 5500 with short plain windows, the roofing be American Building Components "Monarch Rib" style in ivy green, siding be American Legend siding 4 ½" dutchlap in light maple, and the pass door be Thermatru S262.*

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

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

The board determined this action to be a new construction for reporting purposes.

**55 River Street (Bob Sutherland Clark Foundation) – proposed fence**

Ms. Drerup reviewed the application for an 8' high fence around the garden approximately 300' from the public way. She asked Mr. Sutherland the purpose for the fence.

Mr. Sutherland stated that fence is to deter animals, specifically deer from the vegetable garden.

Ms. Drerup asked if it would be painted white.

Mr. Sutherland stated that it would be painted white.

Mr. Snell asked Mr. Sutherland to state the differences between the proposed fence and the illustrated fence as the proposed fence will be taller than the fence in the illustration.

Mr. Sutherland stated that 8' high posts would be used and that all the dimensions of the fence will change proportionally.

Ms. Drerup asked what the materials were.

Mr. Sutherland stated that the fence will be white cedar. He further stated that there are two fences of the same style currently on this property.

Mr. Sanford asked about gates.

Mr. Sutherland stated that there are two gates, a pass gate on one end and a double gate on the other end to allow for equipment entry.

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: November 10, 2015*

*A resolution to approve the proposed fence at 55 River 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 address is listed as contributing in the Glimmerglass Historic District Nomination Form;*
- *The proposed fence will be difficult to see from any public way;*
- *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 proposed fence at 55 River Street;*

*NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the duly appointed members of the Historic Preservation and Architectural Review Board of the Village of Cooperstown do this 10<sup>th</sup> day of November 2015, determine that the proposed work at 55 River 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 fence be proportionate to the illustration submitted based on the change in height.*

Mr. Snell 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.

### **36 Delaware Street (Luke Wyckoff) – Field change for porch**

Mr. Wyckoff explained that he has nearly completed the previously approved exterior work on the residence and would like to restore the existing porch. He explained that the porch will be restored in kind from the window sills up. From the window sills down his is proposing flat panels with a molding, a fir door and stone foundation.

Ms. Callahan asked if it would be laid stone.

Mr. Wyckoff stated it would be a block foundation with faux stone. He stated that there is really no way to match the house foundation as it has been parged.

Ms. Drerup asked what type of stone.

Mr. Wyckoff stated it would have a typical field stone look but would be faux stone.

Ms. Drerup asked if the windows will be changed.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the windows will be rebuilt in kind.

Ms. Drerup asked if the windows are casement style.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that they are casement windows but are not operational at this time. He further stated that they will be one over one as they are too narrow to use two over two like the rest of the residence.

Ms. Drerup asked if there are changes to the roof or eaves.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that no changes to design will occur above the level of the window sills only replacement in kind.

Mr. Snell asked if there would be a landing for the steps.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the door will swing in and that no landing will be put in place.

Mr. Snell asked about the installation of a handrail.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that a handrail is not required by code and he does not intend to install a rail.

Ms. Drerup asked what material would be used for the steps.

Mr. Wyckoff stated that the steps would be natural wood in the same width as the existing.

Ms. Drerup made a motion to approve the field change for porch renovations at 36 Delaware Street as submitted on drawings dated November 10, 2015. Mr. Snell seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

**184 Main Street (Tim Horvath for Thomas Rusk)** – Field change for roof material, skylight, and dormer addition

Mr. Horvath stated that there are three items to be addressed tonight, the addition of a dormer, the addition of a skylight and the proposed roofing material.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Horvath to start with review of the proposed dormer.

Mr. Horvath stated that the proposed dormer will allow access to the attic with appropriate headroom. He explained that there are existing stairs in the residence which lead up to the attic towards the outside of the residence. He stated that this creates an issue where there is not enough headroom for entry into the attic. He further explained that they have looked at options to relocate the stairs but that is not feasible.

The Board and Mr. Horvath reviewed the design of the dormer.

Mr. Snell stated that scale drawings would have been very helpful. He further stated that even as an architect it is difficult to understand exactly what is being proposed and how it will come together.

Ms. Drerup asked if the original dormer is larger than the proposed dormer.

Mr. Horvath stated that both dormers will be equal in height.

Ms. Drerup asked if the proposed dormer will be equal at the face to the existing dormer.

Mr. Horvath stated that the proposed dormer will be stepped back 1 to 2 feet.

Ms. Drerup asked what the window trim would be.

Mr. Horvath stated that the casing will be similar to the existing trim but a bit less intricate.

Ms. Drerup asked if the ridge on the proposed dormer will be the same height as the ridge on the existing dormer.

Mr. Horvath stated that it would be.

Ms. Drerup stated that the dormer would only be seen from the east side yard and would not be visible from a public way.

Mr. Horvath concurred.

Ms. Drerup reviewed the request for a skylight.

Mr. Horvath stated that the skylight would be visible from the center of Pine Blvd.

Ms. Drerup asked what the dimension of the skylight would be.

Mr. Horvath stated that it would be no larger than 30" X 54" and would fit between the rafters.

Ms. Drerup asked what the size of the proposed window would be.

Mr. Horvath stated that it would be 30" X 40".

Ms. Drerup asked if the window would be custom made or ordered.

Mr. Horvath stated that he would be making the window to match the existing window.

Ms. Drerup asked Mr. Horvath to review the request for a change in roofing material.

Mr. Horvath stated that the owner would like to use the rubber roofing approved for the porch roof on the entire structure. He stated that the rubber "slate" roofing has a 50 year warranty and cost about three times as much as asphalt shingles. Mr. Horvath stated that he has surveyed the village and found that there are many roofing materials in use including metal, asphalt, slate,

## DRAFT

rubberized slate. He explained that he does not feel that the roofing material is out of character with the neighborhood.

Ms. Drerup stated that she is concerned with the transition areas as it is not clear how the rubber shingle proposed will appear in these areas.

Mr. Snell asked if the shingles have equal splits giving the appearance of each "slate" being the same size.

Mr. Horvath stated that they would be equal in size.

Ms. Callahan asked what the current roofing is.

Mr. Horvath stated that it is asphalt.

Ms. Drerup asked why the property owner wants to replace the existing roofing with the proposed rubber shingle.

Mr. Horvath stated that the roof is in need of repair, the product is certified against ice which has been problematic at this residence and the owner does not want to have to deal with roofing the residence again in the future.

Ms. Drerup stated that the use of this shingle has been approved for the porch.

Mr. Horvath stated that he understands that but the owner would like to use this material for the entire roof. He continued to state that they would like to install the roof for the whole structure by the end of the month. He explained that the proposed roofing may be less obtrusive than replacement with an asphalt shingle with a red or white color.

Ms. Sanford stated that the roof is almost invisible from any public way.

Ms. Callahan stated that her concern is with the dimensionality of the shingle. She stated that this very thick product is replacing asphalt, not slate.

Mr. Snell stated that the proposed shingle is really commercial in look and scale. He stated that the shingles are not as big a concern for him as the dormer.

Ms. Drerup stated that she is concerned with the regularity of the appearance of the shingle as well as how it will come together in transition areas.

Mr. Horvath stated that some slate roofs use a uniform slate rather than random sized slate.

Mr. Snell stated that in his opinion he feels this material is not problematic for this property. He continued to state that he does not have an issue with the skylight but that he does not feel he has enough information to make an informed decision regarding the dormer.

Mr. Horvath stated that he is willing to provide drawings but is not sure what he will be able to show that would provide additional information helpful to a decision.

Mr. Snell stated that a roof plan would be very helpful.

## DRAFT

Ms. Callahan stated that the auditor from NYS who evaluates the board found that this board was acting without complete applications and cited the board for helping to design projects.

Mr. Snell stated that the applicant has not really told the board exactly what is proposed.

Mr. Horvath stated that the addition of the dormer is very complex and that it will require cutting into the roof to know exactly how the dormer will need to be constructed.

The board continued to discuss the proposed dormer.

Ms. Drerup stated that the plans indicate that the skylight will be 23" X 46".

Mr. Horvath stated that those measurements should be accurate.

Ms. Drerup questioned the chimney seen in a photo provided.

Mr. Horvath stated that he does not believe that the chimney still projects from the roof. He stated that it is not in use and he believes it has been covered over.

Ms. Drerup questioned the drip edge.

Mr. Horvath stated that it would be removed.

Mr. Snell made a motion to approve the field change for 184 Main Street to install "Euro Slate" rubber shingles on the entire roof structure and to install a skylight as proposed. Ms. Drerup seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

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

Mr. Sanford made a motion to approve the field changes for 184 Main Street for a dormer to allow attic access with 6' of headroom and to be of the same appearance as the existing dormer. The dormer is to be located adjacent to the existing dormer but set back 1 ½' from the existing dormer, with the ridge to be no higher than the existing dormer with roof pitch and window to match the existing dormer. Dr. MacMillan seconded the motion and the following discussion was held.

Ms. Drerup noted that the dormer will not be seen from a public way. She requested that more complete drawings be submitted for the record.

Mr. Sanford stated that he realizes that it is a complicated project but that additional information could supplement the file.

Mr. Horvath stated that he would provide additional drawings.

Ms. Callahan asked that for future projects Mr. Horvath provide all details at least one week prior to the meeting as required so that the board can get a better sense of the project prior to the meeting.

A vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford

NAYES: Snell

Motion carried.





DRAFT

AYES: Callahan, Drerup, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

Motion carried.

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

**Minutes:**

Dr. MacMillan made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 8, 2015 meeting as submitted. Ms. Callahan seconded the motion and a vote had the following results:

AYES: Callahan, MacMillan, Sanford, Snell

ABSTAIN: Drerup

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 6:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Jennifer Truax  
Deputy Village Clerk