

Village of Skaneateles  
Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission  
Work Session  
May 2, 2012

Present: Charles Williams, Chairman, HLPC  
Patricia Blackler, Member  
Katharine Dyson, Member  
Karlene Miller, Member  
Dave Neibert, Member  
Andrew Ramsgard, Member  
Mona Smalley, Member  
Beverly White, Member  
Carol Young, Member

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to the Historical Commission  
Adam D'Amico, Code Enforcement Officer (CEO)  
Riccardo Galbato, Special Counsel to the Village

Chairman Williams opened the meeting at 6:00 pm. CEO D'Amico was introduced to the Commission members. Member Young noted that she had a letter printed in the most recent issue of the *Skaneateles Journal* regarding the Lakeview House matter. The Commission also took note of the letter from George Nichols that was in the same issue. The Commission members asked some questions about the Village Operations Meeting held on April 24, 2012, and noted that there should have been a representative present from the HLPC. CEO D'Amico asked for the members' assistance in monitoring ongoing projects, since he cannot be everywhere at once.

Member Ramsgard took exception with the view stated in Mr. Eggleston's response to the list of items discussed at the April 11, 2012 meeting, suggesting that it is solely the Village's responsibility to monitor the project to catch someone else's mistakes. While the Commission approves what is to be done and the CEO may notice something amiss, the Applicant and retained professionals clearly have a duty and responsibility to communicate planned or necessary departures from what the Commission has approved and on which the CEO has issued the building permit.

The members decided to go through the Applicants' response dated April 27, 2012 on Mr. Eggleston's letterhead, point by point, in order to develop a position on each:

1. Regarding the cupola, it is not clear who or how the misplacement would have been discovered, other than visually. The CEO relies on a structural steel inspection provided by an expert, but that is more of a structural integrity determination, not a location

determination. The members acknowledged that the Commission had agreed, at its last meeting, not to pursue a requirement for this element to be moved. The members reaffirmed their consensus 6 to 3. However, Member Ramsgard moved that the Applicant be severely reprimanded, because it is the job of the Applicant and the builder to deliver what they said they were going to do. The Village does not need to improve its process; the mistake was made and the embarrassment is upon the Applicant. Adherence to the approved plan protects the integrity of the Commission's approval process. Member Dyson seconded. The motion passed 6 to 2 (White and Smalley) with Member Blackler abstaining.

2. Regarding the cupola roof, the Applicant has agreed to install the metal roof. The consensus of the members is that this issue is closed, but that compliance must be monitored.
3. Regarding the cupola side panels, the members believe by sense of the members 9 to 0 that the panel shape should be rebuilt to conform to the approved design. Further, the sense of the members was 7 to 2 that the painting of the cupola should be redone so as to not have the contrasting highlight trim on the panels, as was shown in the approved elevations. The sense from the discussion is that the Commission had permitted great latitude in the reconstruction, but had made clear that the replication of the details of the second and third-floor façade were of great importance to the members, in giving their Certificate of Approval.
4. Regarding the paint on the cupola being the same as the façade clapboard, the members feel that is correct. But the Commission had requested some color photo-renderings of color options at its last meeting and they have not yet been provided.
5. Regarding the weathervane, the Applicant has offered to paint it black. The consensus of the members is that black is fine.
6. Regarding the crown molding, the Applicant has agreed to install 6 inch crown molding. The commission by consensus of 9 to 0 requests that 8 inch crown molding be installed at the parapet and a minimum of 6 inch crown molding (8 inch if possible) at the second-level frieze, between the clapboard and the mansard roof.
7. Light blue slate is different from the original building design, but appears to have been installed in accordance with the approved elevation drawings. The Commission acknowledges that it missed the fact that the extra border and scallop design were not in the approved plans, which had the simple rosette in an eight-around-one pattern in a diamond. While not the same as what was there, the design was built as approved. The members, by consensus of 9 to 0, accept the slate roof as approved and built. Issue closed.
8. A. Regarding the color of the north face of the penthouse in order to diminish the visual impact of that wall, the Commission had requested photo-renderings of color options, since the approved plans had not indicated a color for that portion of the building. By consensus of the members 9 to 0, the Commission expects to receive renderings with suggested colors.  
B. With regard to the north face of the penthouse being asymmetrical, and having no windows on the right side, the members acknowledge that they did not insist on complete renderings at the time of approval, thus not catching this discrepancy. So, by consensus of 9 to 0, the members stand by their previous approval. Issue closed.

9. Regarding the open vent pipes, these were not proposed nor shown on the approved drawings. The applicant has offered to cut and cap the pipes and to paint them the color of the façade. It is not clear what the purpose of the vent pipes is. By consensus of the members 9 to 0, the Applicant will be required to supply cut-sheets showing precisely what they are proposing.
10. Regarding lamps over the doors at street-level, The Commission had previously approved (December 2011) two light fixtures, but the Applicant withdrew that proposal. The members by consensus of 9 to 0, agree that no light fixtures need be installed at this point. Issue closed.
11. Regarding the brackets on pilasters, there was some discussion about nominal versus actual dimensions for the materials used for the pilasters. Noting that while the original detail was considerably wider, the nominal 1x12 is what was specified on the approved drawings. The “custom” brackets currently installed are not the same as the original detail of the brackets that the Commission believed were being replicated by the Applicant by virtue of the proposal. Nonetheless, the consensus of the members 9 to 0 was to let this stand as built. Issue closed.
12. Regarding the scalloped brackets on the third-floor windows, the Applicant has proposed to install these ½ inch above the roof surface. Chairman Williams suggested that the Applicant might fill in behind the brackets to delay future maintenance. The Commission expects that these will be identical to those shown in the approved drawing. By consensus of the members 9 to 0, the Applicant’s offer is acceptable, with the Applicant to show the proposed color on the to-be-submitted color renderings.
13. Regarding the façade windows, the issue is not the shape, *per se*, but rather the detail of the trim surrounds for the third-floor windows, which appear to differ from the drawings that were approved by the commission. The Commission discussed the nature of the differences, noting that the assurances had been given that the original detail would be reproduced. The Commission estimates that the cost to redo the roof and trims could amount to \$2,000 per window, for the third floor windows. By consensus of the members 6 to 3, the Applicant should be required to make the changes necessary to produce what was approved. The second-floor trim surrounds are likewise different from the approved drawings. By consensus of the members 9 to 0, the Applicant should be required to make the changes necessary to produce what was approved. The proposed color treatment of the windows needs to be clarified.
14. Regarding the color of the railings on the south façade, the Commission acknowledges that the Garrison Red color was specified in the approved elevations, and the railings have been procured in that color. Issue closed.
15. Color of clapboard on north façade, had been approved as Stratton Blue. Member Ramsgard stated that he could test the color match using a laser to be sure it is the Stratton Blue color. If it is, it was approved, and the issue should be considered closed.

The members agreed that this completed the discussion of the Lakeview House, and that these points should be transmitted to the Applicant by the Chairman.

The Commission then began discussion on its internal administration. In Section 225-25.G.(3)(b), Applicants are instructed as to what is required to be submitted. Member Ramsgard suggested that the Commission might consider modeling its standards after those promulgated by

the Secretary of the Interior (Interior) regarding the preservation of historic landmarks. Member Blackler confirmed that the survey of the Village contemplated by Section 225-25.E.(1) was completed many years ago, and may need to be revisited. Member Ramsgard suggested that there are no more than 100 structures in the Historic District. He continued that Interior outlines four approaches or treatments: **preservation** with 7 standards; **rehabilitation** with 10 standards; **restoration** with 10 standards; and, **reconstruction**. He suggested that the Commission might provide Applicants with more guidelines as to its expectations.

Member Ramsgard cited several different preservation briefs (e.g., storefronts, additions, substitute materials, identifying visual aspects, historic & new signs, slate roofs, accessibility, windows) that go to the point of performing a balancing test for assessing preservation proposals. He suggests that a set of standards be provided to applicants and that HLPC hold pre-application meetings with the Applicant for mutual understanding. But it is important to decide beforehand what is important, in advance of considering specific designs. He noted that storefronts, typically, are not contributors to the historic significance since they have tended to change often over time.

Member Blackler suggested preparation of a manual on each house or building, with photographs, that could be reviewed with an Applicant. She also suggested that a manual be provided to each of the real estate companies active in the Village, that describes the historic district and specifies what that involves. Member Dyson suggested that each building have specific elements identified that are important. Member Ramsgard stated that it is unlikely, and probably not desirable, to consider every element of a structure important, even though multiple elements may be. Member Dyson suggested the possibility of producing examples of recently-approved acceptable signage.

Member Ramsgard indicated that he would forward summaries of these preservation briefs, so that the Commission, in another work session, could reach conclusions about what they want to include or not include in its standards. Member Dyson suggested that this would require some degree of self-study by each member. Member Ramsgard thinks that the Commission could get through 10 to 15 buildings in each work session, working from pictures to identify the important historical attributes of each. Member Blackler suggested that these work sessions could be part of the regularly-scheduled monthly meetings, whether or not there is a hearing on the agenda. Those meetings should be able to get the Commission to a level of comfort with its rules, guidelines and standards. Member Dyson suggested that a good starting point would be the Village Hall building.

Some discussion centered on how best to monitor and review projects after approval. One suggestion was to appoint a member of the HLPC to review, with the CEO, the detailed drawings for adherence with what HLPC approved, at the time of permit issuance.

Member White suggested that a mechanism be developed to be sure that Applicants know that changes, after approval, need to be brought back to the Commission. Such language could be added to both the application for a Certificate of Approval and to the Certificate itself. While the Commission has some leverage before the Approval is granted; afterward any enforcement is the purview of the CEO. The ability of the CEO to delay issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy

(CofO) because of HLPC conditions is presently unclear. The HLPC cannot dictate that the CofO be issued or not issued. The CEO is the enforcer of the HLPC Certificate of Approval. The HLPC itself has no enforcement power. The Zoning Law does not prescribe what remedies are available if the structure is not built according to the approved plan.

[At this point Members Miller and Smalley departed.] The Commission needs to ask the Board of Trustees for an explanation of what its authority is. It is important that the HLPC follow a defined structure for its hearings. Mr. Dundon indicated that he has given the Chairman a template for the conduct of a hearing.

Further, the Commission discussed the need to create rules and standards, methods and manners, by which the HLPC will conduct itself, and have those ratified in principal by the Trustees, so they have a comfort level in backing up the Commission in the case of a disagreement with an Applicant. If the HLPC follows a rigorous application of standards and rules, it increases its ability for public respect and Trustee support.

Member Ramsgard suggested that the HLPC has lost public support on Lakeview House. The HLPC needs to cut its losses, and regain the respect of the Board of Trustees.

The Commission can continue its discussions on administrative approaches after its meeting next Wednesday.

**Executive Session – Attorney/Client** -: At 8:22 p.m., the Board moved into Executive Session for an Attorney/Client discussion regarding potential legal matters.

The meeting was reconvened at 9: 18 pm and declared adjourned.