

**Village of Skaneateles**  
**Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission Hearing**  
**April 14, 2010**

---

Modifications to the application for 42 East Genesee Street, Dr. Robert Kiltz project

---

Present: Charles Williams, Chairman  
Pat Blackler, Member  
Beverly White, Member  
David Neibert, Member  
Mona Smalley, Member  
Kihm Winship, Member  
Katharine Dyson, Member  
Karlene Miller, Member

Jorge Batlle, Clerk to the Historical Commission

Andrew Ramsgard, Architect for the applicant

W. Mahood, West Lake Street  
Robert Eggleston, Rickard Road

Chairman Williams opened the meeting at 8:12pm. Andrew Ramsgard, Architect for the project said, “there are a two things we wanted to talk about tonight for revisions to the project at 42 East Genesee Street.

The first piece is the renovation of the store front. The existing store front that was there was built in the late 40s early 50s, Waterbury Design. It was what The Historic Preservation Brief #11, would call a carpenter colonial. It was a design – 2 colonial doors, very small panes, store front. It was not in the character of the commercial store fronts of the period of Skaneateles, which is more to the major section of prosperity in Skaneateles which was about 1840s or so, in that sort of period of time, which has much larger panes of glass, much more bigger openings. So, we are looking at adjacent store fronts as the Preservation Brief #11 suggests in the design guidelines to create something that’s historically appropriate. Looking towards Legg Hall as kind of an example of store front where actually Legg Hall, when you look at it, you think that they are all the same. But there is really 4 store fronts in there that are completely different across the face. The closest one to the west side has 2 small arches and one big arch, side lights and a 4 panel door series. Then as you move on, the store fronts have changed over time and it sort of tells a history about Legg Hall as well as a lot of the store fronts around. But, the store front that was put in by Waterbury didn’t really relate to anything that goes on (cell phone interference) ...

The scheme of 3 windows is to do 3 sets of doors. They will be metal bronze that align with the 3 different window openings across the face. It is set back – all the way back – the 6 feet in the store front to allow the doors to swing open to the exterior.

There is not a need in the store front, like the old one, to have separate entrances. The old one has sort of a awkward entrance on the right where you came through a hallway, bent around and went down stairs and then went upstairs. The Fur Exchange sort of had the door on the left that came in. The store front sort of bent all the way around. The design is not to have that one big open store front in there - and have a lobby space where you can enter the residence inside the building, rather than interrupt the façade with multiple entries.

So, what we are proposing is 3 sets of doors with transoms above and 3 arches that go across. The ceiling inside the main archway – you can call it a proscenium arch in the front – there's a big elliptical arch – the façade once you get back past that arch, the other 6 feet, it's square on the top. So, the transom units would go all the way up and they would have 3 distinct arches aligning with each one of the doors. Any questions?"

Member Winship asked, "I'm not being critical, just curious. You are talking about 3 sets of doors? Those doors open up into one space?" Ramsgard replied, "the 2 sets on the other side are fixed panels, so there's only one set that opens." Member Winship said, "sort of like a French window. They are called doors but they are actually windows."

Member Neibert said, "my only comment is – I'm not so sure I like all of that filigree, what is that?" Member Dyson asked, "what is that, etched glass?" Ramsgard said, "cast iron." Member Neibert asked, "all of this decorative stuff is cast iron?" Ramsgard said, "yes." Member Neibert asked, "is that in keeping with the historical value of the Village? That sort of looks like Tuscan to me." Member Miller said, "I wanted to know the same thing." Ramsgard said, "that's open for discussions. Robert has thought that he wanted to present a façade that takes a little creativity from some of the other facades around. Also, create something that's an interesting take on the design. He's open to suggestions for the grille work, if that's too heavy." Member Neibert said, "my opinion it's too much. It's overkill." Member Miller asked, "is it consistent with the other buildings in the era of the 1840s to do that?" The Chairman said, "only in New Orleans." Member Neibert said, "that's what I mean. It's more of a French Quarter or Tuscan."

Member Dyson said, "keep in mind that that big building that you are talking about, Legg Hall, actually was a theater. That wasn't historic." Member Winship said, "it even had a marquee on it." Member Miller said, "they didn't have all this iron work." Ramsgard said, "no, they didn't have the iron work. But they have all different sets of grille patterns and lights. There are divided light fans. One of them has divided light fans. One has single panes. One has large picture windows. Two sets of the facades have 6 over 6 large rectangular pieces. That's open for discussion. He was really asking for reactions and opinions."

Member Dyson said, "it would be helpful to have the way it is now." Ramsgard said, "we haven't found any pictures." Member Blackler presents two photos. Ramsgard said, "that's the Waterbury one." Member Blackler asked, "you want one older?" Ramsgard said, "yes." Member Blackler said, "I don't have a straight on older." Ramsgard said, "this was the Waterbury design

but that's not the original." Member Blackler using the older photo said, "it's 3 over from the alley." Discussion.

Member Neibert asked, "if you have double doors here, they would only be using one door. So, one door would be the proper width to get a wheelchair in?" Ramsgard said, "yes a 3 foot door." Member Neibert asked, "so this whole door would be 6 foot, 3 and 3? So a wheelchair could get in there." More multiple conversations.

Ramsgard said, "so those comments I can take back to Robert." Member Neibert said, "I think it fine. I just don't like all of that filigree work. I don't think it's in keeping with the character of the Village." Member Dyson said, "I doesn't relate to anything else on the street. Not that it has to match it. Seems like it is a different element entirely."

Chairman Williams said, "you mentioned the ceiling in that recessed entry way area. What is the ceiling in there?" Ramsgard said, "the ceiling in there used to be wood, and it would be wood – not bead board. It would be a plank board, tongue in groove."

Member Neibert said, "a nice beveled glass with just maybe some etching on it would be better." Member Miller said, "even without the etching." Member Dyson said, "I actually think having some interest there is a good thing. We don't want to get so homogenous that every window looks alike." Multiple conversations. Ramsgard said, "we could definitely play that down." Member Neibert said, "etched glass instead of the iron work."

Member Winship said, "it is one of the first things – if you come in from Route 321, it's the first thing you see of the Village. As you come to Genesee Street and stop at the light, you are looking straight ahead at it." Member White said, "even if this was just simplified. Not so much Rococo." (cell phone interference) The Chairman said, "people might see the brass handles ... people looking at the front might have a problem of where is the door?" Ramsgard said, "we can do a slightly different detailing of the grille patterns. That's a good point to make the middle door a little bit dominant. (cell phone interference) ... highlighting the center section." The Chairman asked, "how do you wash that window behind all that grille work?" Ramsgard said, "they are hinged. We'll go back and talk about that and bring something back." Member Blackler asked the members, "how do you like the 3 rounded tops? Do you like that?" Member Dyson said, "yes." Member Neibert said, "I'm not crazy about it." Multiple conversations.

Ramsgard said, "the second change that we want to talk about tonight has to do with the rear façade of the building. Relative to the access of how he thinks he wants to use it. Since I know we are going to come back next month, I would love to have a time when we could go out and look at the back of the building and sort of see it. What he's proposing - the way the building stratifies from the elevation – lakeside is the lowest level. Street side is one level up. So, the living level where the kitchen is is actually the 3<sup>rd</sup> level on the back side. it is kind of the way it was. There are balconies which are the ones that we had approved previously. Then on the 4<sup>th</sup> level there is a deck that was there. We'd like to access – the 4<sup>th</sup> level is set way back from the edge of the building. Way back is about 15 feet. When you are down at the lower level, you can only really see the edge of the handrail at that point. The 4<sup>th</sup> level and the 5<sup>th</sup> level, 5<sup>th</sup> level is also set back – when you are at the ground you can't see it. When you are out on the pier or out

on the water, of course you can see it. The further you get away you can see it. So, functional-wise, what he would like to do is to be able to have a spiral stair from the deck off of the 3<sup>rd</sup> level up to the deck off the 4<sup>th</sup> level, because the way you live in the house, the kitchen level is there at the 3<sup>rd</sup> level, but outdoor, summertime, nice weather you want to be able to get up to the deck. There's a bedroom up there and it doesn't make sense to put the kitchen all the way up on the 4<sup>th</sup> level. And have the living spaces up there. There is a bed room and bedroom on the 4<sup>th</sup> level and 5<sup>th</sup> level. He'd also like to have – the master bedroom is the 5<sup>th</sup> level – have a spiral stair from the 5<sup>th</sup> level, down to the 4<sup>th</sup> level. That one you can only see in straight elevations. Only in this drawing can you see it. That's one of the reasons why I think we need to go back there and kind of look at the elevations. What he's proposing is those two additions to the façade.”

Member Winship asked, “you said that the 4<sup>th</sup> level is set back 15 feet. Now is the 5<sup>th</sup> level set back ever farther or is it just flush with the 4<sup>th</sup>?” Ramsgard said, “it's flush with the 4<sup>th</sup>.”

Ramsgard said, “the historic impact of those sort of things on the lakeside, which is very different in all these properties, than the street side. because from the historical integrity, there was never any importance given to the lake front elevations. That's good and bad. Good, that it allows for the changes that happened over time, and for people to come and appreciate the Lake for what it is. When the primary purpose of these buildings were built, the Lake was basically just a big water tank to create the power and the mills and the pumping for the Erie Canal, and to create commerce to come and sell the goods on the street side. The esthetic appreciation of the Lake was minimal. The couple of time that we have old historic documents which are Barrow's paintings – the 2 times that he painted the lake side, one was the *Great Fire* and it just sort of blurred all the backgrounds, because they were ugly back then too. The other painting that he had still really didn't identify the back side of the buildings as being of anything important.” The Chairman said, “a place to hang the laundry.” Ramsgard said, “the openings that we had approved previously, all those are in.”

Member Neibert asked, “there's a deck on each level?” Ramsgard said, “yes, there's a deck on each level.” Member Neibert asked, “how wide is the deck on the second and 3<sup>rd</sup> floor?” Ramsgard said, “4 feet.” Member Neibert asked, “there is no deck on the...” “...there is another deck up there of 4 feet,” said Ramsgard.

Cell phone interference. Member Dyson said, “.....that seems to have been in the past what's happened. They look like 2 different buildings. The fact that she pulled them together with the design...” Member Winship asked. “what would you like us to do?” Ramsgard said, “I'd like to have the 2 spiral staircases approved, so we can go forward and proceed with that piece. But if we need to go out and look at it, it would be fine to wait until next month, because we are going to come back and talk about this anyway. We can do the redesign of this piece and I can bring you some more information about the materials.”

Member Winship asked, “the spiral staircases, you are talking about like dark iron, and it's going to be seen against dark brick? And it's set back 15 feet?” Ramsgard said, “yes.” Member Miller said, “I'd like to go out and look at it next time.” Member Ramsgard said, “so then we will be back again next month.”

Member Blackler said, "I'm opposed to the spiral stair cases. The way I feel about my obligation on this Commission is to preserve the historic integrity. I don't like to see spiral stair cases there. That's my comment. It is the same one I made in 2008. I'm reading it from what I said. You have to convince me that this is good."

Ramsgard said, "I will try to do that next month." The meeting was closed at 8:32pm.

*email: to all HLPC & Ramsgard 4/19*