

/Village of Skaneateles  
Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission  
April 11, 2012

---

Continued discussions of issues and questions regarding prior Certificates of Approval from the Commission, provided to Lakeview House LLC, at the premises addressed as 4 East Genesee Street in the Village of Skaneateles.

---

Present: Charles Williams, Chairman  
Patricia Blackler, Member  
Katharine Dyson, Member  
Karlene Miller, Member  
Andrew Ramsgard, Member  
Mona Smalley, Member  
Carol Young, Member

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Historical Commission  
Riccardo Galbato, Special Counsel to the Village

Robert Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant

Trustee Lanning, Skaneateles  
Jessica Soule, *Skaneateles Journal*  
Patty Curtis, Skaneateles  
Robert Honcharski, Skaneateles  
Barbara Honcharski, Skaneateles  
Valerie Jerabeck, Skaneateles  
John Crompt, Skaneateles  
Cate & Jeff Davis, Skaneateles  
Cynthia & Bill McCauley, Skaneateles  
Patty & Bo Torrey, Skaneateles  
Jim Williams, Skaneateles  
Peter Wiles, Skaneateles  
Julie Sharpe, Skaneateles  
Sally Mason, Skaneateles  
Sam Mason, Skaneateles  
Steve White, Skaneateles  
Jorge Batlle, Skaneateles  
Bill Marquardt, Skaneateles

Absent: David Neibert, Member  
Beverly White, Member

Chairman Williams opened the meeting at 7:38 pm announcing the continuation of Lakeview House LLC for 4 East Genesee Street.

The Chairman read the following statement, “Although there have been many good comments from the street about how the reconstruction at 4 East Genesee Street has been done, I, for one, am very disappointed in how our Applicant has altered the Genesee Street façade knowing what is desired in historic preservation, not following entries on the blueprints, and having large color pictures provided – as well as their own – and the old façade itself, to work from. I guess it is my fault, on this job, deemed to be one held to higher standards than others, for not overseeing the draftsmen at their boards and not being a daily ‘clerk of the works’ on site. In any event, the old building is gone, as we know it, and we shall have to live with what has replaced it, for the most part. My many pictures will be made available, and there are still a few items to be resolved before completion of the exterior.”

The Chairman also read an email from Trustee Jones, “Since I will miss the meeting this week, and sat on the Board when approval was granted for the new building, I wanted to weigh in. The new building is wider than the old one. We knew that from the very beginning. There is no way that the new building will look exactly the same as the old one. In my opinion the developer did everything possible to line up the architectural features, and I think that the new building is beautiful. The cupola has been in place for months and anyone with concerns about its placement should have spoken up sooner than now, when it is nearly finished. The developer went to considerable expense to save the old cupola and reuse it. I think we should celebrate his work and the building, not hassle him. If I was in town on Wednesday night, I would attend the meeting to make this same statement to the Historical Preservation Board.”

The Chairman read an email from Sue Dove, Executive Director, Skaneateles Area Chamber of Commerce, “Dear Chuck, Mrs. Blackler and Commission. I understand that you are meeting tonight to discuss the Lakeview House. As a director of the Chamber of Commerce and a local Village resident, I just wanted you to know that we are very pleased with the level of effort into restoring this building, and the fact that it will have a great retail store on the first level and residences on the upper floors. This is the model for the downtown area. The building looks great and has incorporated so many of the details of its historic predecessor. We are so lucky to have a member of our community that is willing to spend several million dollars in restoring a downtown building. This is what will make our Village unique and strong for many years to come. I understand that every detail may not be exactly the way it used to be, but it certainly is very close. In restoring buildings, cost is a factor. And if we make it difficult for investors to restore buildings in our Village, they will not, and the buildings will become dilapidated. I think we should rejoice in the fact that the Lakeview House is now a viable and contributing source for decades to come. Thank you for working with investors and contractors in making reasonable decisions to keep our Village viable and historic in nature.”

Chairman Williams stated that Member Young and a couple of other members had composed a list of discussion topics for the meeting. That list is Attachment 1. Member Young offered copies to the audience. She read the preamble statement, “Thank you everyone for attending the HLPC meeting. The following list of items is meant to guide us through this evening’s meeting.

The Lakeview House is a unique historic building, which is not only visible from Genesee Street, but also from Jordan Street. Jordan Street is an important residential and commercial street. Many visitors and residents enter the Village by driving down Jordan. Thus we should keep in mind the view of the façade from both areas. Our goal is to keep this building's unique Second Empire style, which has been a beloved Village landmark for over a century." She went on to note that there was only a brief ten-year period in which the Second Empire style was built. And this Village has five such examples. She explained that that's why the building is considered unique and why the Commission was looking to restore it or replicate its look in the community.

Member Young continued, citing the first item for discussion [#1 on the list] as the fact that the cupola is off-center by 18 inches, which she characterized as "a lot". The Commission is not requesting any further action on this item because of the high cost to remediate. She noted the need for the Village to improve monitoring of future projects so that similar situations do not recur and to protect the integrity of the approval process.

Likewise the fourth floor dormer is off-center [#8 on the list], Member Young pointed out with a photograph taken from Paris Flea. She raised a distinction regarding the current use of the cupola, stating that a true cupola has all four sides exposed, while on Lakeview House, the back side of the cupola was merged in with the fourth floor addition.

Member Young continued to the topic of the cupola roof materials [#2 on the list], stating that the Commission had approved a standing-seam metal roof. At the last meeting, it was noted that the roof had not yet been installed, and asked for the current status.

Mr. Eggleston indicated that he would prefer to discuss the items as they are introduced. Member Dyson stated, "No matter what went before, no matter what the building looked like before, we are only interested in one thing – and that was the approved building, as approved by the Planning and Zoning and by the Historic Commission..." She indicated that Mr. Eggleston had reviewed the plans with some of the Commission members before the meeting was called to order. She wishes to focus on what were the plans and how were the plans deviated from, while noting that there are some beautiful things about this building.

Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and apologized for Mr. Kinder's absence, noting that he is out of state attending a previously-arranged wedding. Mr. Eggleston noted the letter dated March 28, 2012 that Mr. Kinder had written, expressing his response to Chairman Williams' email of March 22, 2012 bringing up a list of items to be addressed. Mr. Eggleston acknowledged that the cupola location was a mistake made by his office – noting that the drawings showed that the intent was to line up the cupola with the center, as well as to line up the spacing of the windows on the façade, even though the spacing was not even on the original building, and thus not symmetrical. When they went to working drawings, it was overlooked that they had incorporated the three foot section on the west side, and the cupola got centered on the entire building rather than on the replicated façade. Mr. Eggleston noted that his interns, himself, Mr. Kinder and the Building Inspector had all missed it, until it was brought up at the March HLPC meeting, at which point everything had been finished.

Mr. Eggleston referred to Chairman Williams' 2009 photograph of the original building noting that the cupola was not centered, and certain windows were not centered. He asserted that since the cupola sits back 15 or so feet, it has a dynamic relationship with the front façade. He illustrated this by showing a series of 8 pictures, taken about every six to ten feet while walking down the north side of Genesee Street, showing the changing relationship between the front façade and the cupola. Mr. Eggleston argued that as a result, the cupola location is apparent only if you are looking for it, and it is not as glaring as, for example, the use of an odd number of columns on Roosevelt Hall, breaking every rule in the book.

Chairman Williams noted that due to the differing spacing of the windows, that the cupola may well have been centered originally. Member Young added that on this style of home, you expect the cupola to be in the center, while noting that the Commission is not requesting that any changes be made to the cupola location. She further noted that the addition on the south side, behind the cupola is likewise off-center. Mr. Eggleston noted [referring to #8] that even if off-center, the cupola was always presented to be attached to the addition that was in the background, and was built according to plan. Member Young questioned the elevation drawings, stating that you really don't see the addition behind the cupola, that it is merely denoted by lines. Mr. Eggleston noted that there were floor plans submitted. It is now a room, and was quite evident in the plans.

Member Ramsgard agreed that the Commission did know that there was an addition, but disagreed with Mr. Eggleston saying "The idea that it's quite evident from the plans is a misnomer." He went on to explain that most people when presented with a set of plans – calling architectural drawings a language onto themselves – that unless you are well-versed in exactly what those lines mean, it is difficult to understand. The characterization from the color rendering does not lead one to notice that there is a building in the background, because it is very carefully rendered out of the elevation so it doesn't show. He noted that there had been discussion about the positioning of the cupola in the foreground so it had the original relationship with the façade. Mr. Ramsgard stated that the Commission still does not know from the color drawings or anything else provided, what color the background building is to be. If it is painted the same as the face of the building, it will show up as a foreground color and will "pop out in your field of vision more dramatically than it does right now." It can be confusing, since looking at a simple drawing, one doesn't fully realize what's going on. While the Commission did know what was to be done, how does it get the building to look like everyone thought it was going to look, and to get the feeling shown on the rendering – so that the addition does not take on an order of magnitude that's different from the drawing? How do you do that, he asked.

Mr. Eggleston said that in the March 28 letter, it was suggested that it be painted a different color. On the approval drawings of April 8, 2011 all of the colors are noted, the color of the penthouse elevation was proposed to be the trim color, Philadelphia Cream. He said that looking at it now, he suggests painting the entire penthouse façade Woodstock Tan, a darker color, that would allow the cupola to stand out, and that it would work well with the Philadelphia Cream, Stratton Blue and Garrison Red colors. Member Young asked if painting it the blue color would allow it to fade into the sky. Mr. Eggleston felt that would stand out and compete with the cupola. He suggests that that penthouse façade not make a strong statement, rather let it fade away and put it in shadow.

Mr. Ramsgard said that while he tends to agree with Mr. Eggleston, he does not feel that the commission has enough information to make the decision on that. Had the north elevation been rendered with the same roofing and siding material, as proposed, the Commission would have realized more intuitively that the addition is apparent. There are better rendering techniques that could give a representation of what the colors are going to look like. He indicated that, "Shame on the board for not picking up on it more fully, but also shame on the Applicant for not rendering it better, so it could be more clear to the uneducated eye what's really going on." He suggested that a picture be taken of the building, and that the exact colors be photo-rendered on it, in order to show the Commission the alternatives that lead to the most appropriate thing to do – demonstrating what the color should be to make it go away, visually disappear. Mr. Eggleston did not respond.

Member Miller asked if the Commission should ask that the colors be as they were in the 1870s. Mr. Eggleston noted that the colors used were approved by the Commission, and thinks that everyone is satisfied with the selection of colors. Member Young said that she had heard a lot of complaints from people around the Village about the color of blue used, and acknowledged the attempt to blend it in with the patterned slate [#15 on the list]. In that era, the slate was a neutral, people did not worry about trying to tie it in. She suggested that, "The aqua color, the blue, be grayed a little bit so it wasn't quite as bright." Chairman Williams, using a color photo, observed that the color of the slate in the medallions is much more muted than the color paint chip, acknowledging that the final appearance of a paint color often depends on the surface being painted. Mr. Eggleston responded that the Chairman had selected some daring pinks for his own house, a controversial choice, but people got used to it and the sun faded it, bringing it to a very acceptable patina. He suggests that the Stratton Blue will do the same thing. Member Young suggested that it is not a large area to tone down, while noting that typically cupolas are painted the same color as the building. Mr. Eggleston stated that the panels on the cupola had not yet been painted, and will be the Stratton Blue color.

Chairman Williams moved to address the cupola panels [#3 on the list] noting that not only was there the issue of color, but also an issue with the shape of the panels differing from the elevation drawing. Mr. Eggleston noted that at some point the panels had been filled, but during restoration the original panels were exposed, and those are now in place. Member Young reasserted her opinions regarding the cupola colors, that the cupola should be the color of the structure and only the trim should be the color of the trim [#4 on the list]. Member Dyson suggested that the Commission get a rendering of what it would look like in a couple of different ways. Mr. Eggleston reminded the Commission that it was painted as it was approved. Member Ramsgard suggested that the Applicant render in the north elevation of the penthouse and then show the colors, as approved, on that rendering. Member Dyson agreed with Member Ramsgard, saying that she had tried to use different colors on a copy, and that it was difficult to avoid the feeling of mass; to find a way to minimize that part of the building.

Chairman Williams returned to the cupola panels, saying, "What we approved is not what you have put on the cupola though." Mr. Eggleston clarified that the Chair was referring to the shape of the panels; he was. He repeated that in working on the cupola, the panels were not altered, the Applicant merely exposed the panels that had been flushed over. While they may resemble the

adjacent windows, Mr. Eggleston said the panels have not yet been painted Stratton Blue. Chairman Williams said that they appeared painted to him. Mr. Eggleston suggested it was merely a reflection of the sky on the primed panels. Member Young asked if the Applicant could come back with a couple of variations for the Commission to vote on. Mr. Eggleston said, "I'll see if Ted is agreeable to that."

Member Young directed the discussion back to the cupola roof materials [#2 on the list]. Mr. Eggleston repeated that the roof has not been finished and he believes the Applicant still plans to install the metal roof. Chairman Williams asked if it currently has the old architectural shingles on it. Mr. Eggleston said yes, or it might be ice & water shield. The Chair said it is shingles currently.

Member Ramsgard questioned Mr. Eggleston's having to check with Mr. Kinder before providing renderings. Mr. Eggleston said he was not in a position to speak for Mr. Kinder on that matter.

Member Young moved on to the weathervane, saying that it appeared to have been painted white [#5 on the list]. She believes it should be black or copper. Mr. Eggleston said that he had been informed that the original weathervane had been restored at a cost of \$1,000, and he thought it had been done in stainless steel. Chairman Williams questioned the orientation of N/S/E/W.

Member Young moved on to the crown molding on the main façade being missing [#6 on list]. Mr. Eggleston repeated Mr. Kinder's letter explanation (item 7) that the original building did not have crown molding at that level, but rather an ogee gutter, and that the building, as built, is similar to what the trim was originally. Member Ramsgard and Chairman Williams, in looking at photographs of the original building continue to disagree, as the photos show both crown molding and a gutter. Mr. Eggleston said that he'd have to check.

Member Ramsgard referred to Mr. Kinder's 2008 letter in which he appreciated the Commission's input and was willing to accommodate the Commission's concerns about the front façade of the building as it is now, and actually go to the considerable expense of removing the façade and saving all the appropriate members and re-installing the facade on the completed new structure. Member Ramsgard feels that that was what the Commission was told, and that forms the basis for its expectation that the façade would look the same. He further referred to the March 28 letter in which Mr. Kinder characterized the removal and restoration of the cupola as "voluntary", stating that rather it was a condition for approval. Member Ramsgard quoted from the ending of the March 28 letter where Mr. Kinder suggested that the Commission was being mean-spirited, arbitrary and capricious and suggesting that the *Post Standard* would run another story about the wacky people of Skaneateles. Member Ramsgard called it "infuriating" to have an Applicant tell the Commission one thing and then come back, when there are differences, to tell the Commission something else, after the Commission has approved a set of drawings that has the idea of recreating what was original, and when the Commission has been told that the intent is to recreate what was there.

Member Ramsgard went on to discuss the Applicant's assertions that other projects were not held to the same level saying, "We are the Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission and

we have reviewed all these other projects he talked about and we have allowed enormous liberties with buildings to allow for details to deviate from exact reproductions. That is true and we have done that. And we allowed this building [Lakeview House] to be completely torn down and the back façade to be completely different than what it was. And it was everybody's understanding. But it was clear that what we were getting back for that, was that we were going to get all the existing façade pieces saved and that we were going to get a re-creation of what was there. It might have been a lot easier to deal with it in pieces and parts, if the Commission was made fully aware of it as it went through, but his second-to-last sentence, 'Please do not cross that line and erode the credibility of the Commission.' That's the hardest one to swallow in his whole letter. And frankly it's pretty infuriating. Because, if we are told one thing and shown one thing, and another thing comes there, that completely ruins our credibility, regardless of the *Post Standard* running another article about, as he says, 'the wacky people of Skaneateles.'"

Member Young suggested that maybe the Commission is "too easy". She has talked to people on other historic boards in the Finger Lakes, and Skaneateles has a reputation of being too easy.

Chairman Williams stated that the approved plans state "repair existing dormers to match existing" on the second and third floors [#13 on list]. That corresponds to the two lower frontal façade pictures. The finished building has a flattened triangle, not as heavy, above the windows. Member Ramsgard agreed, stating that the approved drawing was based on what was there. Chairman Williams stated that the curvature of the second floor windows does not conform to the original. Member Ramsgard explained, they did not bring the soffit out on the sides, they didn't slope; the roof pitch as Bob drew it originally had a sweep return, which the new dormers don't have. The original drawing shows the side brackets which are not installed. The trim for the lower windows was drawn correctly based on the photographs, but built differently. Mr. Eggleston said that the original intent was to try to take off those dormers and restore them. When they got into them, the rot in the wood precluded that approach. The plan was to replace the windows with the Pella windows that the Commission approved. They substituted the window with the standard arched top, which does differ in the top-line shape, and then built the trim accordingly. The windows are correct for the period, being spring-lined, double-hung windows. Without the photo, any differences would not be apparent.

Member Ramsgard disagreed, because the Commission has the photo, it has the drawing and it had the verbal presentation and a written letter that led the Commission to expect the building to replicate the original. But that's not what was built. The building "cheapened out on a lot of the details." Member Dyson stated that the beauty of these old houses is in the detail, in the proportions. This building was one of the oldest in the District. When one buys into an historic district, it is expected that replacement or repair will have to adhere to certain standards. The Commission's job is to oversee these. She was upset by the Applicant's use of "harass" and using some pretty strong language, when essentially the Commission was expecting what it approved, and what the Applicant agreed to do. And that's not what the Commission got. The little details are very important to the character of an historic building. Member Ramsgard agreed that "God is in the details". While being asked to not erode the credibility of the Commission, we are talking about the credibility of the Applicant. The Commission is asking that the building be what the Commission was told would be there.

Member Young introduced the light blue slate [#7 on the list]. Chairman Williams said the patterns on the slate are completely different. Mr. Eggleston stated that the approved drawing had the single row of diamonds with the red in center. Chairman Williams disagreed, saying that the Applicant should have been working from the photographs. Member Ramsgard felt that the photos matched the approved rendering. Mr. Eggleston believes the rendering matches what was built. There are lighter colors and scalloped slates, rendered in pattern, not in color. Member Young thinks they need to be changed. Chairman Williams said there has been an offer to apply epoxy paint. The Commission did not form an opinion on that offer. Chairman Williams then proceeded to discuss the distance between the tops and bottoms of the windows. Mr. Eggleston said that resulted from the decision to add the parapet to stop water from coming down onto the street. The Chairman admitted that it would be very expensive to change the locations of the windows. He believed that the changes may have been dictated by the interior positioning of the windows. Mr. Eggleston admitted that might have some impact, but also to have handicapped accessibility, the entire building was lowered. Mr. Eggleston recapped that for #7, the Commission would like to see one or two rows of the light blue added to the slate.

Mr. Eggleston addressed the open vent pipes [#9 on the list] by stating that they will be capped flush and painted the same color as the stucco to be applied to that area.

Member Young moved on to the lamps over the doors [#10 on the list]. The Commission feels the proposed lamps are not appropriate to the style, and suggests that no lamps be installed. Considerable discussion ensued on whether lamps were an original part of Village buildings and the necessity to supplement the street lighting.

Moving to the brackets on pilasters [#11 on the list] the Commission feels that they should be centered, even though the Commission understands why they were installed as they are. Chairman Williams and Mr. Eggleston went on to explain why the width of the pilasters changed.

Moving to the scalloped brackets at the windows [#12 on the list] is a detail that is on the approved drawings at each of the windows. The Commission wants them installed. Mr. Eggleston believes the Applicant is willing to concede that item. Member Ramsgard thinks that the lack of projection for the dormers may foreshorten the detail of the bracket.

Moving to the maroon color for the rails on the south elevation [#14 on the list], Member Young thinks the rails should be black, a typical color for historic homes. Mr. Eggleston pointed out that the Garrison Red color is what was approved, and the Commission is requesting that Applicant depart from the approved plan.

Some sidebar discussion took place on the way to accommodate the window brackets. The Applicant will have to come up with a solution.

Chairman Williams indicated that the review of the Commission's discussion points had been completed.

Mr. Eggleston returned to #15. He pointed out that the Commission had approved the use of Stratton Blue and may now be asking for it to be toned down. He asked if the Applicant “was required to follow what the Commission had agreed-to on some things, but not on others.” Member Ramsgard stated that it is not that difficult to render color accurately, but was willing to concede that the Commission had approved the Stratton Blue, as long as the Applicant accommodated the remainder of the Commission’s requirements. Member Young disagreed, saying that it should be changed, due to resident dissatisfaction. Member Blackler asked Mr. Eggleston for his opinion of the color as it is today. He responded that he has no problem with it; it may be a little bright today, but will settle in to an appropriate color.

Mr. Eggleston attempted to sum up. He stated this is not a designated historic building, it is a building in an historic district. The intent is not to reproduce everything to a Williamsburg fault, but rather to make sure that the character of the building is appropriate for the district as a whole. He believes the Applicant has been reasonably successful in replacing a dilapidated building with a Second Empire building that mimics the original building to a reasonable degree, and is appropriate in the historic district. For instance, the weathervane is the original item that has been restored. Regardless of the correctness of its orientation, it is what it is. He needs to consult with the Applicant on what is do-able and what’s not do-able. So he will get back to the Commission. He asked if this list is the definitive list of the Commission’s concerns? He believes the Commission is requesting a photo-rendering of the building experimenting with a couple of different colors for the penthouse area, and the way that the cupola is to be painted, as approved or with the body color in parts. Member Ramsgard included, “and the detail to be as represented in the original drawings.”

Member Ramsgard disagreed with Mr. Eggleston’s characterization of the Interior Department’s historic standards, saying they do not want to see mimicry – if you are rebuilding, rebuild it; if you’re not, build something new. Chairman Williams pointed to the Shannon building built as a modern in-fill.

Member Ramsgard summarized his view that there was much discussion on this project on what should be kept and what could be changed. There were a few simple things that the Commission was looking for. We allowed the storefront to be completely changed, we were told and shown what details would remain, and now are left with making it right or compromising; either erode the credibility of the Commission or erode the credibility of the applicant. The Commission should be willing to stand by what it approved, and the Applicant should be expected to deliver what was promised.

Chairman Williams announced that there was another letter which he read for the record, “I am Beverly White and a member of the Historic Landmarks Preservation Commission. I also own property in the historic district. I agree with letters of March 28, 2012 by Bob Eggleston and Ted Kinder. I think that though the Lake House is not an exact replica of the original building, it is, as Bob says, a reasonable facsimile. The changing of the windows, cupola and slate roof would present an undue hardship for the builder. I feel the Lakeview House project is one of which the Village will be proud. I was not a member of HLPC when the original drawings were approved. It is important that, if changes are to be made to the original approved application, the Applicant must come back to the Commission for approval.”

Chairman Williams said that he toured the building before demolition and there were many support posts in the basement.

Chairman Williams opened the meeting for public comment.

Jorge Battle said that he had been a tenant in that building, and he does not believe that it was historically accurate in 1960s. The Building Inspector may or may not have picked up on the cupola, since he does not inspect structural steel, which is usually done by an outside agency; that agency should have picked up the discrepancy. While he lived there, he watched the building deteriorate. It was not touching the bank when he moved in but was by the time he moved out. As CEO, he had to cite some of the structural deficiencies in that building. "There are probably a few little things that you brought up that is good", but overall, "what you have now, is much better than what was there before." He said he is "pleased with the results." He added later that there were four operational gas lamps on the front of the building.

Julie Sharpe disagreed with the statement made previously about buying in to an historic district. Many owners acquired their properties before an historic district was formed, and "we have been hung with some decisions that I find very offensive and some remarks that are very offensive too."

Jeff Davis asked whether these issues will impede the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the use of the first-floor retail space by Cate & Sally. They are ready next week. The preliminary review of non-residential requirements will be conducted based on floor plans that were supplied and to ensure that all safety issues are in place. This Board will need to determine if any issues affect the occupancy or if they are merely cosmetic. The final determination will be made by the Codes Enforcement Officer, in consultation with the Chairman, the attorneys and the Applicant. Mr. Eggleston stated that most of the changes discussed are surface related, changing slate tiles, adding detail, etc. As expressed in the March 28 letter, the Applicant will not replace windows or change window locations, defending or appealing that position if necessary. More discussion took place about the schedule for the Keady residence, potentially ready 5/1/12. Further discussion revolved around the separation of occupancy certificates to meet to varied completion dates.

Steve White indicated that he is speaking for himself, not his wife whose letter was read earlier. He stated that in his opinion the historic district has had a beneficial impact on the Village. He thanked the members for their service. In his opinion, in some instances you may be crossing the line with your requirements. "There are places to pick your wars and places to leave them alone." The Commission wanted to extend the historic district to West Lake Street, a good idea, but ran into fierce opposition. Just say there are some odds and ends to be fixed and get them done. Leave the cupola alone. As far as the color – he remarked about the public outcry when the Sherwood Inn was painted blue; and now everyone thinks it's neat. The color will dull down. Most of what has been brought up are things that you wouldn't know about if you'd never seen the building before. They are not significant to what the Historic Commission is supposed to do – which is to make sure that something doesn't get really messed up. The

Applicant did a pretty good job; let's take it as it is. A lot of bad publicity for nit-picking will get the Commission voted out of business, because there are enough people who disagree.

Peter Wiles said that he recalls that everyone at the meetings was enthusiastic that something be done with this building and recognized its importance and its value and wanted to do the best job they could with it. To sit here months later and take the position that what somebody said that night has to be exact, or was not done is not due to bad intentions or bad faith. They were dealing with a 100+ year old building and no one could have predicted what they were going to be faced with. He thinks the Applicant "did a good job of balancing the historic detail and their desire to do the best they can with their need to make the economics work." This project got done with minimal disruption to the Village and is now economically viable; it is not an empty shell. They did not "cheap-out or cut corners" and he applauds their efforts to provide the building they built and applauds your efforts for making them do it the way that they did. Bottom line is that it is an incredible asset to the Village and a well-done project. Work with them to see what they can do to improve it farther and move on.

Chairman Williams noted that one of the major accomplishments was transferring the 3 foot walkway into the building in cooperation with the Rubenstein family, and moving the building back 18 inches to meet the State ROW requirements.

Mr. Eggleston said he values the process, and this represents maybe 5% of what has to be addressed in a project of this magnitude. There was no intent to "pull one over on the Historic Commission. Things have happened, things that we could not control... Ted has tried to do as good a job as he could." He further stated that he agreed with the concept of extending the historic district to West Lake Street. Chairman Williams said the Commission suggested that expansion, but tried to pursue it at a bad time.

Sally Mason said that she has received several unsolicited positive comments about the color. None have been negative. They are very happy with how things have worked out.

Bill McCauley said that what he has heard this evening is a perfect example of why he wishes that the historical society was merely an advisory body. "I think you are way over the line, 95% of the time."

Bob Honcharski said he respects the difficult job done by the Commission to maintain the historic character. But "the improvement to this building is significant, no matter how you look at it. The basic character of the building is maintained." There are some details that need to be worked out. But what Ted has done with that building is a tremendous asset to the community and he should be congratulated.

The Commission discussed the requirements of signing off on the Certificate of Occupancy for the retail space. Jorge Batlle noted that the Planning Board approved subdivision, the ZBA who granted Variances for the project, the HLPC who imposed conditions on the building, and the Trustees who approved the Critical Impact Permit. Since this Commission imposed conditions, it is reasonable for the CEO to ask that the Chairman sign off before any C of O is issued, and that any remaining issues do not affect occupancy.

Mr. Eggleston suggested that the issues do not involve the first-floor retail space (no suggested changes to first-floor façade) or Jackie Keady's apartment (railing color only).

**Member Miller offered the following resolution: Resolved that none of the Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission issues that have been discussed tonight will affect the occupancy of the first floor retail space and Jackie Keady's apartment. The resolution was seconded by Member Dyson.**

Upon unanimous vote of the members present in favor of the resolution, Chairman Williams declared the resolution passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 pm.

**LAKEVIEW HOUSE**  
**Discussion Agenda**  
**April 11, 2012**

**Thank you everyone for attending this HLPC meeting.**

**The following list of items is meant to guide us through this evening's meeting. The Lakeview House is a unique historic building which is not only visible from Genesee Street but also from Jordan Street. Jordan Street is an important residential and commercial street. Many visitors and residents enter the Village by driving down Jordan. Thus, we should keep in mind the view of the façade from both areas. Our goal is to keep this building's unique Second Empire style which has been a beloved Village Landmark for over a century.**

1. Cupola Off-Center -- Due to high cost of remediation at this stage, no further action is requested on this item. On future projects, Village needs to improve monitoring of ongoing construction against approved drawings, to avoid embarrassing mistakes of this type and to protect integrity of approval process.
2. Cupola Roof Materials – Approved material was standing seam metal. Not yet installed. Action: Install as approved.
3. Cupola Side “Window” Panels – Action: Color of panels should be same as clapboard facade color, not contrasting color.
4. Paint on Cupola and First Floor– Action: Paint on cupola, except wood trim, should be same color as façade clapboard color. Paint on street floor panels should be color of wood trim.
5. Weather Vane Color – black or copper?
6. Crown Moulding on Main Façade – Crown moulding is missing. Action: Should be installed per approved drawings.
7. Light Blue Slates on Mansard – As built does not conform to approved plan. Need to discuss.
8. Color of North Face of Fourth Floor Dormer – Current color, or darker shade, makes dormer dominate against cupola. Use same color as cupola siding, as less contrast should lessen negative visual impact of dormer. Discuss.

Fourth Floor Dormer Off-Center----Does not conform to approved plan. Also, back wall of cupola seems to have been removed and attached to fourth floor dormer addition. This means the cupola is no longer a cupola but merely an

add-on living space on the roof of Lakeview House. In addition, the former cupola can no longer be seen from the lake. How did this happen?  
Windows on north face of fourth floor dormer – Built as approved?

9. Open plastic pipes between street level of Lakeview House and 2 East Genesee Street. Discuss.
10. Lamps Over Doors, Street Level – Proposed replacements for approved style not appropriate. Action: Delete lamps, cover and paint boxes.
11. Brackets on Pilasters – Action: Should be centered on pilasters, even if custom fabrication of brackets required.
12. Scalloped Brackets, Third Floor Windows – Brackets on approved plan are missing. Action: Install per approved façade design. Builder's objection to these raises a maintenance issue, which can be addressed by better materials and proper installation.
13. Façade Window Shapes – Not the same as approved plans. Discuss alternatives.
14. Maroon Rails on South Side of Building -- Historic iron rails would have been black, a neutral color which goes with all colors. Action: Paint rails black.
15. Color of Clapboard Façade --Does not need to match pattern slate as this slate is meant to be neutral on Second Empire homes. Action: Change color to be a gray-aqua shade or deeper color. Need to discuss.