

Village of Skaneateles  
Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission  
October 16, 2013

Present: Chad Rogers, Chairman  
Dave Birchenough, Member  
Katherine Dyson, Member  
Ted Kinder, Member  
Lisa Riordan, Member

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Historical Commission

Mark Loftus, on behalf of the Applicant

At 7:37 pm Chairman Rogers opened the meeting in the matter of the application of Marian Loftus to replace the storefront window at 62 East Genesee Street. Mr. Loftus introduced himself and presented, "The window is just short of 10 feet wide by five feet tall. It is wooden with wooden mullions and individual pane glass. The mullions are now rotting out – the window is probably about 50 years old. The tenant is getting water into his space. We went to Erie Materials and they came back – this one seems the best for just the weather and everything. We are replacing the window with pretty much the exact same window. It is going to be 10 columns by 4 rows, which is what the existing is also. It is aluminum clad; they offer 20 to 50 colors – none of them are exactly the same, they are similar, so we would be painting it the existing color to match."

Member Kinder asked, "So you are going to be painting the aluminum cladding?" Mr. Loftus, "Yes. This window is double pane, where the current one is single pane." Mr. Kinder, "This is not a true divided light?" Mr. Loftus, "No it is not." Mr. Kinder, "Where are the mullions? Are they inside the glass or outside?" Mr. Loftus, "From what I have seen from previous windows like what I have put in my house – they have the fake mullion pattern on the outside, adhered to the outside; similar on the inside, and then they put a foam rubber between that creates that through-glass look." Chairman Rogers, "It looks like it is the 7/8 inch thickness." Mr. Loftus, "Right, I honestly didn't measure what the existing is." Member Kinder, "It looks pretty close. You have a couple heavier pieces that break it into 5 lights. Your mullions are probably going to all be the same, right?" Mr. Loftus, "Yes." Member Dyson, "Does anybody know what was there before? Somehow I don't think it was that." Mr. Loftus, "My father bought the building 50 years ago and it was replaced then. So prior to 50 years..." Member Birchenough, "That was the most scenic dental chair in the world right there; on the back looking down the lake. Dr. Loftus." Mr. Loftus, "And before that it was a bar."

Member Riordan asked, "How will the size be different than it is right now?" Mr. Loftus, "It will be within; the rough opening is going to be the same, so it's going to be pretty much exactly

the same – within an inch. The window that has been submitted is 160 inches by 60 inches tall. So it's pretty much the exact same window." Member Kinder asked, "Will you keep the same outside trim? Are you going to re-trim it?" Mr. Loftus, "Well that is, I believe, just brick molding." Member Kinder, "It looks like just brick molding; just the old residential standard." Mr. Loftus said, "And that is something that we could change, if that's what you want." Chairman Rogers, "They are going to need something there." Mr. Loftus, "They'll have to put molding up, because the newer windows have that aluminum wings or drip edge adhered to the window, so we would have to cover that." Chairman Rogers said, "I think something that's similar to what's there looks fine." Member Riordan, "I agree." Member Kinder, "It's what is there now. If you were going to change it it might be good to use something a little more historic than brick mold." Mr. Loftus, "That's kind of what I felt. Brick mold would not be my first choice."

Member Riordan said, "There is a 7/8 and 5/8 available?" Chairman Rogers said, "Lisa is talking about the mullion thickness. It looks like it on the web site." Member Kinder, "And they have the 7/8 submitted." Mr. Loftus, "The representative from Erie Materials did have an Anderson rep with him at the time, so I am assuming that they went with the 7/8 for a reason." Member Riordan, "Did they ask what is there? Are both sizes there now?" [Sidebar discussions regarding the probable size of the existing mullions.] Chairman Rogers, "I'm wondering if with this many panels if the 7/8 looks a little bit too heavy?" Member Kinder, "It would be interesting to measure what's here right now. It would give you a lot better idea." Member Riordan, "I think the thinner seem to look a little bit more historic. They have a nicer profile." Member Kinder asked, "Would you want to run down and measure those? Want to run down and see what the difference is between this and this? We're going to be here for a little while anyway. Just get a dimension of the heavier ones and then the narrower ones. I think we all kind of like the narrower ones. If that's 7/8 then that's fine. But maybe it's the 5/8."

Mr. Loftus agreed and departed the meeting at 7:45 pm to perform the requested measurement. At 7:55 pm Mr. Loftus returned and the Commission reverted to this previous discussion. Mr. Loftus said, "The smaller ones were 6/8 and 7/8. The bigger one was 1 1/4 inch." Member Kinder said, "So 7/8 is good." Chairman Rogers said he was willing to accept a motion.

**Member Birchenough said, "I move we approve this application." Member Kinder seconded the motion.** Upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, it was declared passed. Mr. Loftus thanked the Board.

After the Applicant's representative had left, the Commission reached a consensus opinion that the trim around the window could be changed from brick mold to a more appropriate molding. Chairman Rogers said that he would mention that to the Applicant. This matter was concluded at 7:58 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon  
Clerk to the Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission

Village of Skaneateles  
Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission  
October 16, 2013

Present: Chad Rogers, Chairman  
Dave Birchenough, Member  
Katherine Dyson, Member  
Ted Kinder, Member  
Lisa Riordan, Member

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Historical Commission

At 7:45, during the interruption of the Loftus matter, Chairman Rogers stated that he had sent a revised draft of the guideline standards. He said that it incorporated comments from Member Birchenough and from Member Dyson who suggested grammatical and editing changes. That was the substance of the revision. He brought up Member Dyson's suggested language regarding the applicability of HLPC review. Chairman Rogers noted that the Zoning Code does not list specifics about public visibility – rather it states 'any exterior changes'. Member Dyson said that it had come from somewhere; Member Kinder suggested maybe it was from the original state legislation? He also suggested that the portion dealing with applicability should be in the front – the very first thing that people read. The other members agreed.

Member Riordan suggested that a visibility test may be open to interpretation. Mr. Dundon suggested that the Commission could apply standards of significance during its considerations, but that the Code defines whether or not a matter must come before HLPC. Member Riordan said that she had reviewed the Downtown D Design Standards and found them comprehensive and good.

Member Dyson suggested that the document be simple in the front and explain what an Historic District is. That approach was included in her draft comments. Member Kinder suggested that a map of the District be part of the prologue. It needs to be really clear and just relate to the historic district itself. Member Dyson noted that the applicant is free to do interior changes and ordinary repairs without HLPC involvement. Chairman Rogers suggested that there be a one-pager that covers those items, as the first page of the guideline standards. Member Kinder questioned the applicability of the Downtown D design standards. All agreed that they apply more to redevelopment than renovation & renewal. At 7:55 pm Mr. Loftus returned and the Commission reverted to its previous topic.

At 7:59 pm the Commission resumed its work session discussions. With Chairman Rogers saying that he would redraft the first page. He asked if the members were in agreement with the content in the remainder of the document. All indicated that they were. Member Riordan objected to inclusion of a list of recommended materials insofar as it includes aluminum-clad

windows. She suggested the Commission remain silent on such a recommendation -- while acknowledging that even though the Commission has accepted the use of such materials, it is not the Commission's recommendation. Further discussion ensued on the topic of the repair of the original window being the preferred method. The Commission finally concluded that such a recommendation should not be made, and that the Commission should consider these on a case by case basis. The Commission also felt that the wording of 'appropriate materials' rather than 'recommended materials' would be better.

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 8:17 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon  
Clerk to the Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission