

**Village of Skaneateles
Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission
August 17, 2016**

Present: Chad Rogers, Chairman
Kathie Dyson, Member
Ted Kinder, Member

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Scott Spanfelner, on behalf of the applicant
Rev. Becky Coerper, on behalf of the applicant
Tom Schneider, on behalf of the applicant
Jennifer Ahrens, architect, on behalf of the applicant

Sam Mason, State Street
Kathy Kinder, Skaneateles

Absent: Dave Birchenough, Member
Lisa Riordan, Member

At 7:34 pm, Chairman Rogers announced the continuation of the conceptual discussion and review of the site plan and elevations for building additions necessary to establish a new accessible main entrance to the parish hall. He noted that the Board had just received the plans dated August 17th.

Mr. Spanfelner said that the applicant's team has put together the presentation for tonight's meeting. Technical issues cropped up in putting the presentation up on the screen. He said that the Church had received an award for the roof; won an architectural award. Ms. Ahrens said that she had nominated the Church for the stewardship award – showing continual effort to improve & maintain the building, based primarily on the roofing project. The long-range planning, development of a condition report on the building and following up with a master plan supported the qualification for the award. The Board congratulated the Church.

Continuing technical issues plagued the presentation, leading to a brief suspension of this matter so that another agenda item could be considered at 7:39 pm.

At 7:45 pm this matter was resumed. Mr. Spanfelner recapped the change of design shown at the last meeting to provide more visibility for the stained glass windows. He will show the 'fly-thru' that illustrates the areas visible as one walks past the church from the rectory to the main church entrance, and displays the parish hall entry area, the visibility of the church's east elevation, and the appearance of the new retaining wall and sidewalk area. Also at the June meeting, the Board asked for a study to illustrate the massing of the new parish hall entry in the

context of other entry points to the structure. Also tonight, the Board will get to see the types of materials proposed to be used in this project.

Dyson – Before we get to materials, don't we have to agree in principle on what the design is going to be? I kept going back and seeing that the main thing – I was glad someone sent us the historic picture of the building showing where the old entrance was. I thought initially; I think this could have been done and over with if that canopy had not come out as far as it did. I wasn't here last time, but after looking at the notes, has the overall idea changed from simply a way for handicapped access, changed to now a workplace entrance? That is a preferred weekday entrance. I am wondering where we are on this, that's all.

Spanfelner – We have actually had this discussion each time.

Dyson -- ...we don't get it back...

Spanfelner – Yeah, so the purpose of this is to provide our parishioners a means to enter into the parish hall in a safe way whether they're handicapped or not. I think everybody is familiar with the grade we have here. It is certainly most amenable to handicapped for obvious reasons – if you are in a wheelchair or crutches or whatever. But really, any parishioner or anybody visiting, quite frankly, the facility this was a means to get them into the parish hall and then that lulu lift that's in the inside is really more geared toward the handicapped accessibility. That's really always been the main purpose of this. In general, our plan for the entire program, though, has also been to have a more welcoming as well as special-needs-friendly; the interior space when we redid that, there's a lot more room for handicapped spaces – a lot bigger aisles for people to migrate through. The issue we always had, whether we did that work or not – is during church services we still have a lot of occupancy in and out of the church. As we have articulated before, that's really what we are trying to solve here. It's a combination of a very identifiable parish hall entrance; one that's a safer entrance than what we have now for anybody, but it's also true that it is most beneficial to those that are handicapped. This fly-through is, not everybody was here last time to see it – what this is intended to do...

Kinder – Going back to the entrance, do you expect that most people will now use this rather than the other?

Spanfelner – Absolutely – for sure. This corner represents the corner of the rectory, so this would be kind of like if you are walking or driving by. I can play this multiple times. That was the view to that window that was the original objection. You can also get a feel for; we're going to talk about some of these architectural details and how they tie in as well as the accessibility through there for any parishioner as well as handicapped.

Ahrens – Can I speak a little more to Ted's question? That's basically the program. The use of the parish hall is all day every day. It's not just on days when there's church service. There's yoga, there's community events in there, there's night time meetings, people are coming to see the rector. Upstairs is where all the real events are –you've got the rector's office and the parish office secretary, you have the parish hall space; a big gathering space with a kitchen. You have access to the main worship space and the sacristy. The upstairs is where everybody goes and

congregates. Then if there's meetings they might go downstairs to rooms. I think the primary program goal of this addition is to have people come into the building, not at that half-level space but at the main floor space, that's directly adjacent to the worship space. And I'll tell you I have come here three years in a row; it's very tricky getting down that – and I hike, I run, I do everything athletic. It is very treacherous sometimes. So this is addressing the need to get everyone in on the first floor.

Spanfelner – And you have this in front of you, but the first thing we are going to go through is the entry itself. The main considerations we had for this design; there's real purpose behind the design, both architecturally and practically. First of all we did want to make sure that as you come up to this entrance – if you're in a wheelchair you can have the appropriate turning radius and access through there as well as if we have multiple people coming in and out of those doors at the same time. We'd like to provide reasonable weather protection because we anticipate that people will come out of that door, wait for their ride to show up at the end of the walkway and then progress to the end of the walkway to get in the vehicle. The massing we totally agree, we want that to be complimentary to the building. It should not overwhelm the building, but it should be an identifiable entrance that we can point to as the parish hall entrance. But it should absolutely be coordinated with the rest of the designs. The architectural tie-in we will explain a little more than we did last time about why the design is what it is. Part of that is we are actually tying into the interior and the exterior. So some of the design elements; from an architectural design approach, when you are approaching a building you subconsciously create that connection between exterior and interior by taking some of those elements and using them in both spaces. So we have some pictures to show you that represent that better. Like we have addressed in previous meetings and shown in the fly-through, we are really maintaining that viewpoint that you felt was important to the east façade and those stained glass windows, OK? So there is a lot of careful thought put into where this all comes from. If you look at where the support posts are and where a wheelchair would be able to go this way or this way, especially if someone were coming out of the door – getting some reasonable space around there to migrate around this corner or this way without being too exhaustively large. That's how that from a practical spatial perspective is where those dimensions came from.

Ahrens – We did pull the cover about 6 inches back.

Spanfelner – We did pull that back. You had requested how much could we pull that back and still achieve what we are looking to achieve. So that was pulled back 6 inches. From what it was last time.

Ahrens – So before the overhang was; it covered up the outside of that dotted line; it came out another 6 inches; we pulled it back 6 inches. To still maximize the amount of the covering but to still address that concern. I realize that it is a minimal change.

Spanfelner – What we didn't explain last time is how we are mimicking the window design in this panel. In the size of that panel and the shape of that panel somewhat dictates that width as well. So one of the advantages we get from that distance is being able to do just that – so we are complimenting the exterior of the building. So those are both architectural and practical reasons why that resulted in what you are seeing. Also we are bringing in parts of the design that bring

in the archways, quatrefoils; those are mimicked here. You're really getting a connection between the interior space and the exterior by using that kind of a design approach. So that was the thinking behind that. When we started it was way out here. Hopefully we are creating a reasonable weather protection there, as well.

Kinder – So you don't want it to look like an afterthought second door.

Spanfelner – This is the parish hall entrance. We have a massing study which will show more scale-wise how this compares to the other entrances.

Ahrens – From the beginning when we were approached with this program of first floor entry – the idea that has been behind all of this work is the mission of providing a welcome, open place for the whole community, not just for the church. All that has been thought of as we have made decisions. Obviously we know what the design challenges are – and the idea of creating a nice ceremonial walk into the building and an outdoor space that might be a gathering place. You get to walk next to the beautiful windows, you get to look at the entry canopy as a focal point. You are going from the street where it is noisy and going into a sacred space. So this is a gathering space for the church community; for the community that's going to use the church that you are going to be welcomed into the church. This canopy tries to be a symbol for that. We don't want to minimize it; we want it to be respectful and appropriate, and not overwhelm the church – or the historic character-defining qualities of the church.

Spanfelner – I wanted to show you the massing study. Last time we met we wanted to come up with a comparison to the other entrances. You'll see the main church entry, you'll see the carriage door, not an entry but an architectural detail at this point. Then here's the parish hall entrance here and finally the entry that we are talking to you about. This is the best way to represent how when you look at the scale of that as not being too overwhelming but also having architectural features that are complementary to the building and the walkway itself. From our opinion, it feels appropriate to the church and respectful to its design.

Kinder – This whole thing looks so much better than the last time I saw it. It looks really good now. There were other windows in here; you have really cleaned it up.

Rogers – That was our consensus at the last meeting as well. By moving that entrance out, the view; the 3D helps illustrate the view. I think the massing study, which I appreciate you guys taking the time to do is also helpful for me. I was struggling with that ridgeline in the overall. Having some time to think about it, considering the massing, having that be shorter than the others and the lowest ridge of the four I'm coming around to that as far as it fitting.

Kinder – When you are doing this there's always a dichotomy. You want to make it look like it has been there all the time, but from an historic standpoint we are supposed to be able to identify something that's new. I think this looks like it has been there forever, which I think in this case is probably best. But you can still see the entire original church. What does this line represent? Is this concrete? What's the material in here?

Ms. Ahrens, “We are going to talk a little bit about the materials that we are planning. This will be a new poured concrete sidewalk, probably with a granite curb. This will be some low ivies or gravel, we really haven’t gotten to that stage. This is the limestone capstone, this is a planter here and here.” She continued to discuss plantings likely required to deal with grade issues. It will be the same team, Bero and Hayner Hoyt.

Ms. Ahrens continued with projected materials choices. The limestone retaining wall will reflect the church architecture by using Onondaga limestone. It will be bed finish with face forward, similar to what is shown there. The mortar and joint sizes will be the similar to the church. It will be a standard mortar joint. The water table, which is at the lower planter level, and the cap to that is a coping stone that will also serve as a watertable. She showed a detail of all the lintel stones and sills that have a chiseled margin around the whole thing – a rock face finish and then a hand-tooled side. The watertable itself has a chamfer and then a rock finish and some sort of chiseled margin. She explained that the supplier does not do the hand work. She showed samples of a textured stone for a flatter, smoother look. A toothed finish is also available. These are the general design ideas; final designs will be shown to the Board. All are natural stone. The limestone will be laid in the Ashlar pattern and the bed finish with the fossils and imperfections seen. The retaining wall color will match the church as will the planters.

The parish hall addition is to match the character and detailing of the existing parish hall. This will be lenroc or sandstone (portage bluestone). It will be laid in the Ashlar pattern in a coursed random range, in the varied color range that you see. It will be matching the parish hall not the church, to feel part of the original parish hall.

While the final canopy design is not complete, the heavy timbers are intended to draw your eye upward and to make you think of the worship spaces inside. The general direction is a vertical grain Douglas fir, which is burned and then stained solid color – in this case a dark brown with chamfered edges. The interior woods were chestnut originally with two kinds of oak added in the 20s. The pews all have an arch that shows up in the tracery pattern outside, and are made variously of American chestnut, oak and pine. These pieces would be a semi-transparent stain in dark brown as well.

The roof will match the parish hall using an asphalt shingle in Tamko Virginia slate. It has some reds in it. The church plans to use stamped concrete for the sloped sidewalk and would like to equip it with a snowmelt system. They have not yet selected a pattern. As the church moves along they will be focusing on the windows. Right now they are metal windows, using leaded glass in a diamond pattern. They will also be presenting the door and transom design. The door is a panel design; a half light with two lower panels. It will match exactly the parish hall doors; color, proportion, everything. The transom is going to be very similar – and the reason is that all the doors and transoms are very similar to one another. They have the armature, a 1-2 inch border and diamond pattern in the middle. They have not worked out final detail on that. That will be a future discussion with the Board as will the guardrail design. The church does know that it will be metal and probably painted black. Ms. Ahrens, “We really want the character of the existing church, the craftsmanship of our new stone wall and the existing windows. We want those elements to be the focal points and everything else to recede. We will plant the retaining

wall with soft greenery so it softens the edge of the building. We want the church to be the focal point in our entry; the canopy to be a very special place to be and a special focal point to enter.”

Rogers – Do you have any space that you can steal down at the lowest level of the parking for planting? Or is it too difficult?

Ahrens – Exactly. That’s why that planter is so skinny. It’s only 22 feet. Because this is the rectory, this is her main entrance and exit, this is her garage, this is her door. So we want to have a nice little sidewalk there. This will be a retaining wall; we are pricing out options but it looks like a Keystone; manufactured, nothing fancy, but not like poured concrete.

Kinder – Very impressive. I guess we would have expected that given your attention to detail and quality of materials on the roof.

Rogers – I agree with Ted. I don’t have any suggestions on what was presented from a materials standpoint. The key will be trying to get those matches right. The only thing I was a little hung up on last time was that projection of the roof. I think from the massing perspective it is a little clearer to me now that it is subordinate to the others. The ridge line being long, the longest ridge line on the property still bugs me a little bit, but I don’t think there’s any way around that. You have that roof to deal with. Even pulling that overhang in isn’t going to affect that substantially enough to make it meaningful.

Ahrens – I understand your thoughts, but that’s the only one that is open underneath.

Rogers – So it’s mostly negative space versus mass.

Dyson – The only comment I have is I was troubled by the extent of the original, but by opening it up and pulling it away it is given a lot more air, which it didn’t have before. I think it has gotten to be a lot more than handicapped access; it’s a very substantial entryway.

Kinder – It is, but I think that’s OK. If it is going to be the primary access, then it should be substantial.

Dyson – I think heating the walk is going to be a great idea, if you can do that.

Chairman Rogers, “So I would suggest, as far as next steps, that we would have a full submission of all details, materials, and colors. And that we attempt to get to a full approval.” Mr. Spanfelner, “We want to put ourselves in the best position for Spring.” Chairman Rogers, “From a timing perspective this would require a public hearing so it’s just a timing factor as to the deadline for each meeting and getting the materials.” Comm. Dyson, “Just one thing I wanted to be clear. On the stone walls and piers; the color of the stone – it’s going to match this?” Ms. Ahrens, “This retaining wall is supposed to feel like the church building.”

Ms. Ahrens, “We need the HLPC approval, I believe, before we go before the zoning board; we have to get a variance because we are already above percentage of building on lot. We are adding 0.2%. We will need approval from this Board first before it can go to the other Boards.

We already have a preliminary approval from the Planning Board already, but then it will have to go to Onondaga County.”

Mr. Dundon and Chairman Rogers felt that the application should be able to move simultaneously for the HLPC and ZBA. This matter was concluded at 8:32 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission
August 17, 2016**

Present: Chad Rogers, Chairman
Kathie Dyson, Member
Ted Kinder, Member (*recused*)

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Sam Mason, on behalf of the applicant
Ted Kinder, Member, applicant

Scott Spanfelner, Camillus
Becky Coerper, Skaneateles
Tom Schneider, Marcellus
Jennifer Ahrens, Rochester
Kathy Kinder, Skaneateles

Absent: Dave Birchenough, Member
Lisa Riordan, Member

In the interim at 7:39 pm, Chairman Rogers announced the consideration of the application by Ted Kinder to add handrails at the entrance to Gilda's restaurant at 10 West Genesee Street. Chairman Rogers noted that three votes are required for a quorum and because Member Kinder is the applicant, there will be only two voting members. Consequently, the Board will not be able to take action at this meeting. Sam Mason, owner of Gilda's elected to present some details for the Board's consideration.

Mason – We can bring it up and talk about it; we don't have to vote on it. It's something that's not an emergency.

Rogers – In an extreme case we can do a special meeting, before the next one; the next one will be in about a month [September 14, 2016].

Kinder – Do you want to explain it right now?

Mason – I can explain it to you. You are familiar with the building; there's steps up and there's... This is the front of the building right here. And you see these steps; the entry is stepped back into it. We are having problems with people; I'm afraid someone's going to get hurt. We have no handrails, we have elderly people coming in and out and they are really struggling. So what we want to do is put a railing in – and there are some drawings that we have here I believe. It will be this material and this is what it is going to look like. This actually happens to be my house, but I hired the same guy who built this one.

Kinder – Raulli Ironworks will be doing the work; they are really good.

Mason – Out of Rome, New York. So this is kind of black, nice heavy duty iron rail. It's going to kind of curve a little bit as you see from this; it'll curve a little bit to invite people in. And it is not going to go out into the sidewalk at all. Just a handrail so that people can safely enter and exit.

Kinder – Where is attached to on the building?

Mason – It will come; it'll attach to the side walls and it will attach down on the ground here. They'll drill a hole into the...

Dyson – Is it granite?

Mason – Part of it is concrete and part of it is stone. There's two different steps there. One's an old, probably original stone, and one's just concrete that somebody put a concrete step in there sometime over the years.

Rogers – And this is just a concrete pad out in the front?

Mason – That's correct.

Rogers – I don't know where your property is, is the face of the building? Would we be better off going into the concrete pad instead of the antique stone?

Kinder – This is the plan view; it looks like he's not even getting down to the stone. It would be pretty far out there. This is going to narrow it down quite a bit.

Mason – Not really; because this as you see kind of angles out.

Kinder – You are saying that this is going to tie back into the building here.

Mason – Yes.

Dyson – I like that actually

Kinder – It's really nice.

Mason – It's not too bad in the summer, but once the winter comes and there's snow and ice...

Rogers – You're just going to paint it black?

Mason – Black. It will look just like this.

Dyson – I'm good with it.

Rogers – Yeah; I don't think I have any other suggestions.

Mason – I can forward these photos off to someone...

Rogers – That would be good. [Dundon gave him CEO Crompt's card]

At 7:44 pm, this matter was tabled and continued to the Board's next meeting on September 21, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

**Village of Skaneateles
Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission
August 17, 2016**

Present: Chad Rogers, Chairman
Kathie Dyson, Member
Ted Kinder, Member

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards

Kathy Kinder, Skaneateles

Absent: Dave Birchenough, Member
Lisa Riordan, Member

At 8:34 pm, Mr. Dundon stated that the Board had received an application for consideration at its September meeting from Lisa Dietz, owner of Emma James Boutique, who is proposing to relocate her business signage from 46 East Genesee Street to 3 East Genesee Street. All members are familiar with the sign and the location. Chairman Rogers agreed to take it under consideration at this meeting since a Public Hearing is not required and even though the applicant is not present.

Member Dyson said as long as it is just moving the sign, she does not have a problem with the application. Chairman Rogers confirmed that the location is the store known as Kindergarden. Member Kinder confirmed that it is exactly the same sign she already has. Chairman Rogers confirmed that she is moving it and that this Board had already approved the sign previously. It is to be mounted in a flat yellow panel. After some discussion, the Board agreed that the sign should be centered in the panel, similar to the adjacent SJ Moore sign.

Chairman Rogers, "I'll make a motion that we approve the application as submitted with two conditions, (1) that the existing Kindergarden sign is removed , and (2) that the Emma James Boutique sign is centered vertically and horizontally in that yellow panel." Member Kinder seconded the motion. After some additional discussion and upon the unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the motion, the motion was carried 3 – 0.

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 8:42 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Boards