

**Village of Skaneateles
Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission
June 15, 2016**

Present: Chad Rogers, Chairman
Dave Birchenough, Member
Lisa Riordan, Member

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

William Gilbane, Applicant

Scott Spanfelner, Camillus, NY
Becky Coerper, 98 East Genesee St.
Marcia Watt, 72 Jordan St.
Virginia Searl, Rochester, NY
Mary Marshall, 43 State Street
John Havemeyer, 77 Onondaga Street

Absent: Kathy Dyson, Member
Ted Kinder, Member

At 7:30 pm, Chairman Rogers announced the Public Hearing for consideration of the application of William Gilbane for a Certificate of Approval for replacement of 14 windows at 85 East Genesee Street. Mr. Gilbane had brought a sample of the window construction that the Board examined.

Rogers – Can you just give us a quick summary?

Gilbane – Sure. Half of the windows in the house were replaced in the '90s. The other have weren't replaced and now they are starting to fail; a lot of the frames are rotting. So I have engaged Marvin Windows to come and do historical replica windows that also match the windows that were done in the '90s – meaning they are the same type as them.

Rogers – So the ones that were done in the '90s are the ones with the 6 over 6? Is that what we are seeing I these pictures?

Gilbane – So the sides of the house is 6 over 6 and the front of the house are clear pane [1 over 1].

Birchenough – The 6 over 6 are historical?

Gilbane – No they are both historical. The 6 over 6 on the first floor are original, these are replacement. These are the clear ones; I don't know why but the front of the house they don't have panes in them. These are all original.

Rogers – So are you going to be replacing all of the windows around or leaving the ones that are already done?

Gilbane – Leaving the ones that are already done.

Riordan – So you are changing the color?

Gilbane – So the color is going back to what would have been originally in period with this house. I asked the Creamery to do research on it. They know the windows and the house were changed in color in the '90s, but they don't know what the color was before. The research that I've done shows that the sashes were probably a dark color. So my intent is to go back to what was originally done.

Riordan – So what will you do with the ones that are already there?

Gilbane – They'll be painted to match. The person that's installing them is the one, he did the Chestnut Cottage; it's the same window type that was done there.

Riordan – So facing the road and inside?

Gilbane – Correct. No drafts and no rotting wood.

Rogers – I think it's great; I have one question and it's a detail question. The two at the third floor, it looks like on each side of the house have an arched brick top on them. The detail that was submitted has a flat top...

Gilbane – So that's exactly what's there now. The brick is arched but the window is square. It is an exact replica. Kind of a weird detail, but that's what's there now.

Rogers – OK.

Gilbane – Those are the ones that are in the worst disrepair. And then on his one which I not historic, we are going to make it look better. It won't be a crank-out; I think there's a drawing there, it's just a fixed window that looks more historic than that.

Rogers – I don't have any issues with it. Are there any other questions?

Hearing none, Chairman Rogers opened the public comment portion of the hearing. There was no one present desiring to be heard either in favor of or in opposition to the application. **Member Birchenough, "I move that we close the public hearing." Member Riordan seconded the motion. Upon a unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, it was carried 3 – 0. Member Birchenough, "I move that we approved this application as submitted." Member Riordan seconded the motion. Upon a unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, it was carried 3 – 0.**

This matter was concluded at 7:41 pm. Mr. Gilbane thanked the Commission.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission
June 15, 2016**

Present: Chad Rogers, Chairman
Dave Birchenough, Member
Lisa Riordan, Member

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Scott Spanfelner, on behalf of the applicant
Rev. Becky Coerper, on behalf of the applicant
Marcia Watt, on behalf of the applicant
Virginia Searl, architect, on behalf of the applicant

Mary Marshall, 43 State Street
John Havemeyer, 77 Onondaga Street

Absent: Kathy Dyson, Member
Ted Kinder, Member

At 7:30 pm, Chairman Rogers announced the continuation of the conceptual discussion and review of the site plan and elevations for a building addition necessary to establish a new accessible main entrance to the parish hall.

Mr. Spanfelner said that the applicant's team had taken thorough notes during the May discussion and had worked to address the Commission's key concerns, specifically (1) the southmost window, (2) the verticality of the parish hall, and (3) the distaste for fake windows. To support the revised drawings, Bero has also prepared some 3-D fly-throughs from the perspective of the street. In the revision, by shifting the entrance east and moving the rest room west, they are able to maintain a vestibule and eliminate the coverage of the southern-most stained glass window from the street and sidewalk perspective. Member Riordan noted that the width of the sloped sidewalk, shown as 6 feet in the 4/14/16 drawing, is now shown as 5 feet. That was acknowledged as correct in order to preserve parking space. Mr. Spanfelner stated that the restroom now gets a real window in its revised location. Member Riordan noting the single door, asked if it matches the other door. Ms. Searl said yes. Mr. Spanfelner indicated that the design maintains the flower boxes.

Member Birchenough called the changes a huge improvement. Member Riordan agreed that it is a great improvement and that pulling the gabled entrance further east from the main church is helpful. Chairman Rogers thinks it is an improvement as well and pulling the entrance away from the main church is the right move. He asked how far out it is projecting and is it further than the carriage entrance and the bump out on the main church? Ms. Searl said it was, though the exact dimension is not shown on the drawings. Chairman Rogers remarked on the length of the gable peak; he thinks it is overlong. He believes it may not establish the fact that the new entrance is taking a secondary seat to the historic church structure. Ms. Searl answered that the design incorporates good design principles and the desires of the client, also providing for screening and tracery on the side. It needs to appear "not pasted on". Member Riordan

remarked on the proposed entrance, she would like it to match the main church and questions the heavy timber. Ms. Searl said they are trying to differentiate the new construction from the old.

Mr. Spanfelner requested that the Commission give conceptual approval to the plan as presented tonight, given the number of changes that the applicant has done to address concerns. Chairman Rogers noted that while two members are not present, they did comment on the drawings by email to him. He said that Member Kinder had similar concerns about the length of the roof overhang, suggesting that it be reduced to the 3 foot range. He also suggested the use of brackets rather than columns to provide support. Chairman Rogers said that Member Dyson had expressed similar concerns about the projection of the entrance and roof. Ms. Searl countered that elimination of the columns would require the elimination of the screening and tracery that provides privacy for the rectory.

Chairman Rogers reiterated the need for the new entrance to appear secondary, deferring to the main church. Ms. Searl objected that it is secondary – it has been reduced in size and its location farther away makes it secondary to the church, as does its choice of materials. Member Riordan observed that the use of timber gives it solidity, strength and prominence. A brief discussion took place on the possible use of signage to make the purpose of the entrances clear. Rev. Coerper suggested that the design reflects the desire to make it easy for a visitor to understand the preferred weekday entrance.

The members summarized their feelings, with Chairman Rogers stating that the concept is great, but that the new covered entrance should be pulled back closer to the parish hall. Member Riordan thanks that the ramp is a good solution for a handicapped entrance. Ms. Searl objected to the use of ramp stating that the design has a “sloped sidewalk”. Member Riordan added that she would also like to see a shorter canopy. Member Birchenough stated that he doesn’t see the depth as a big deal, but that he would like to see it shortened up, with Member Riordan saying that pulling it out gives it prominence.

Mr. Spanfelner argued that the purpose of the Commission is to preserve historic buildings. The applicant has made significant changes already; the projection is identical to the projection of the current parish hall entrance. Member Riordan stated that this is a “dear building” whose significant features help create the character of the Village and reminded the applicant that the members were acquiescing to “covering up 200 feet of stonework” in order to provide a handicapped entrance – a significant compromise. Ms. Searl retorted that it was to provide site safety. Rev. Coerper said that this is not a handicapped entrance; the purpose of this work is to create the primary weekday entrance to both the parish hall and the church.

Ms. Watt said that the Commission is to follow the Secretary of the Interior standards for historic renovations and that the applicant has addressed the blockage of the windows. According to those standards, the new addition is to “stand on its own”. Chairman Rogers answered that we are down to a fairly small detail on a conceptual level. From the historic standards it comes down to what is primary and what is secondary. Ms. Searl said obviously the addition is secondary. Chairman Rogers said he would not want to request a change that made it look like it is too small or out of scale. He made the suggestion that the exact dimension can be worked through when the applicant and the Commission are discussing final approval. He indicated that he will address that detail with the other members as well.

Mr. Spanfelner asked if the members would take a vote on conceptual approval. Member Riordan said no. Chairman Rogers said he does not find that appropriate at this time. Ms. Searl stated that if there were another conceptual meeting she would expect comments from the Board on what makes this incompatible, inappropriate, how it doesn’t meet the standards. Applicant would need more official documentation. Chairman Rogers countered saying, “when it all comes down to it, we are judging appropriateness.” It is up to the Commission acting in concert, to decide what is appropriate in this case and in every case before this Commission.

Discussion ensued about the level of drawing detail necessary to support an application that the Commission could vote on. The requirements are all called out on the website. Applicant was advised to consult with CEO Crompt. Mr. Spanfelner and Ms. Searl stated that the minutes from the May meeting were not available on the Village website. Mr. Dundon said he would email them to Ms. Searl.

This matter was concluded at 8:30 pm.

The Board next undertook an informal discussion regarding the photographs provided by CEO Crompt showing new window coverings that are not in compliance with the sign ordinance at 9 East Genesee Street. The Commissioners felt that the signs not being compliant with zoning is not an issue for this Board. The Board feels that the signs are attractive and more pleasing than merely covering the windows with paper during construction of the new restaurant. Mr. Dundon was asked to convey these thoughts to CEO Crompt.

On motion of Chairman Rogers, seconded by Member Birchenough, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

