

Village of Skaneateles  
Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission  
October 10, 2012

Present: Patricia Blackler, Chairman, HLPC  
Katharine Dyson, Member  
Ted Kinder, 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

Bob Eggleston, Architect, on behalf of the Applicant

James Lanning, Village Trustee  
Chad Rogers, Skaneateles  
Doug Sutherland, Skaneateles, Village Planning Board

At 7:45 pm Chairman Blackler opened the Public Hearing in the matter of Finger Lakes Luxury Homes, Inc. application to make changes to the front and rear facades as part of a redevelopment for 46 East Genesee Street. In the recitation of the application it was noted that the plan is to add a 4.5 story addition. Member Dyson asked, "You are actually adding a 5<sup>th</sup> story, correct?" Mr. Eggleston responded, "I think it all depends on whether you are talking state law, whether you are talking the Zoning law. Some question was this a 4.5 story building or whether it was a 5 story building; it is what it is. There are 5 levels to the building." Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and presented: "As you know they've [Moscaritos] purchased this building and in June they plan on starting work on the change of use. Basically what they will do is change it from Municipal Office to 3 residential units plus a retail unit. We will have a garage off the south access right-of-way, which gives them 3 inside parking spaces and 2 outside parking spaces. So we are going before the Planning Board for a Change of Use, there will be a Special Permit use from the ZBA, a variance from the ZBA, and there will be Site Plan Review because we are within 300 feet of the lake. And also go to Critical Impact with the Village Trustees once we are all done."

Mr. Eggleston continued, "Basically what we are doing is adding on about 30-some feet in the back of the building to align with 52 East Genesee Street. We are then going to develop the attic level with a dormer on the front, with space in the back, so it will be a total of 5 levels. What we are here for is the historic, in that we are in the historic district, the changes to the exterior. So

I'll go through those changes to the exterior. With the Planning Board, before they went further, they wanted to get some ideas of where the Historic Landmark Preservation fell on some of the things that we are doing. So they have tabled their meeting to 'til next month to get back your initial response – not that you'll have a final response. And what we are looking for in this application is the conceptual alterations of the attic level, the back elevation and those things. We will come back later, once we have gotten through the Zoning process, and we'll talk about colors and the finer details. So I think right now what we want to do is focus on the big picture of what the volume changes will be to the building. What I presented to the Planning Board – there are actually 3 major areas. First we'll start on the back. Because we have the addition we have a new back elevation. It will be 5 levels. There will be a railing that goes across. There will be a combination of sliding doors, windows. We will put in an overhead door and an access door for people to be able to go from the parking lot up to the stairs or out to Genesee Street and up to their residences. So that's one piece that we will talk about as a whole."

Mr. Eggleston continued, "The second is we are going to maintain the façade from the cornice down, except we do have one little change, in that we are pushing this entrance back 3, 3.5 feet so that we can accommodate a separate entrance into the retail that will be just around the corner, which is seen over on the Section here – very similar to what we did to Green Mountain's – and then the residential entrance is straight in. We are going to actually reuse this door and transom, just push it back. And the side will have a similar door/transom on the recessed portion. The third item is to talk about the roof alterations in putting a dormer on the front. We wanted to get a bedroom in the top level that would have light coming out to the front. Set back about 25 feet is an elevator shaft. Because Rick Moscarito's mother just recently had a stroke, and they see her using; Moscaritos will occupy the top two levels, they wanted to make both accessible, not just the one level. And that requires that we have four feet of height above the elevator cab, so we have to raise this up a little bit. And there will be a large skylight that brings light into the middle of the building. So those will be up there. I had some initial conversations with Pat Blackler, and she suggested that I possibly look at some alternatives on the dormer. And I think also, the Planning Board seemed to be focused; that was the part that they kind of focused on. And I think that's really the major issue. I have several copies here that you can share [he handed out new elevation drawings showing alternative designs for the dormer] these are dated today. What we proposed in September is now one of five options."

Mr. Eggleston said, "Would you like to first talk about the back elevation? I think that's a little bit simpler. One of the things that I did change from what I presented is the style of the overhead door. It is a 16 foot by 7 foot door. I changed it to a carriage house style door, so it will have – and to make it look like two doors next to each other from a scale proportion – there will be a row of lights in the upper panel divided as shown and then there will be four panels below each door. It's probably a very typical kind of restoration door that is used, which I think is probably more appropriate than what was originally proposed. There will be just a solid six-panel door as the entrance door; we haven't discussed whether we want the top two panes of glass, but we were not looking for a lot of light in that space. The first floor (the second level let's say) will have a French door that comes out flush with the end of the building. It will have a faux balcony; just a railing in front of the doors itself to allow the sliding doors to open, but not to actually go out on. And then there will be an 8 foot deep balcony in front of the 9 foot slider door. These will be 8 foot sliding doors on this level and they will be divided into 6 grids. What

I did – I took the scale off from the front of the building that had the 2 over 2 grid pattern in the double-hung, so I wanted a similar proportion, so we made 6 panes in each panel to give it a similar proportion. Up on the next level, which is the second floor, we will have a 12 foot slider in line with the 6 foot slider. It will set back 6 feet. Again there will be railing. I'm seeing that being a metal railing across with wood posts in between, which will be consistent in the back. Up on the third floor, will be the same pattern with the two-size doors, the railing. This actually sits back 12 feet, so the building progresses back further. And up on the top level there will be a 12 foot slider door with double-hung windows. Again that also sits back about 12 feet. And this will be a deck in that it is not covered. The others because it has the deck above it will be actual porches that are covered and this will be an open deck on this level."

Member Kinder asked, "Bob, did you say on the first set of windows that this is actually a faux railing? But this is not?" Mr. Eggleston, "Correct. That's a real railing with an 8 foot porch." Member Kinder, "What's the reason for that?" Mr. Eggleston, "If you look on the plan, and again I didn't want to get into a lot of extraneous stuff; your original package had the floor plans, you see this is a bedroom that comes right out, and this stays back." Member Neibert asked, "But can't you have the deck come all the way across anyway?" Mr. Eggleston, "We could, but we wanted the space. We're trying to make that a two bedroom space, it's only a 1,000 SF space." Chairman Blackler asked, "Can you tell me again how far back this comes?" Mr. Eggleston said, "This goes back 8 feet. This is 8 feet and these two are 12. In the section that was provided in your original package it kind of shows..." Member Kinder said, "There's a door so you can enter straight from the bedroom out onto the deck." [Multiple simultaneous conversations]

Mr. Eggleston continued, "In your original package it shows how the bedroom comes back..." [Multiple simultaneous conversations] he continued, "There will be wood posts 4 to 6 feet apart and then the metal railings." Member Young said, "What color is it?" Mr. Eggleston, "We're not talking about colors yet. Right now it's black versus white." Member Young, "So you have black and white?" Chairman Blackler said, "He is coming back later for colors." Member White asked, "Bob, this is one condo?" Mr. Eggleston, "Correct. The top two levels are one dwelling unit." [Background noise unintelligible] Member Young, "Is there a reason why you chose metal and wood? I don't think I've ever seen it." Mr. Eggleston, "What we wanted was the wood for the stability and visual mass." Member Young, "I'd rather see it all metal or all wood." Mr. Eggleston, "And we'll take that under advisement." Mr. Eggleston confirmed that the building would be flush with #52, building to building. Member Ramsgard asked, "But it is only flush at one spot. Because it goes in and goes out and goes in, goes out." Mr. Eggleston, "At the first floor level, it is flush." [Significant background noise] Mr. Eggleston, "At the basement level we are in 3 foot 6 inches for 52 and behind 44. On the first floor, the bedroom in the back aligns with 52, the railing sticks out the thickness of the railing. The porch railing aligns with the end of the building which aligns with 52, and that's a couple of feet in front of the building for 44, but 44 has a deck that sticks out 3 feet, and the deck above sticks out 5 feet."

Member Neibert said, "All of the decks above are all going to align straight up?" Mr. Eggleston said, "Correct. All of the decks above align straight up." Member Ramsgard asked, "So which one is wrong? Is the section wrong or the floor plan wrong or what? Because the section shows everything lining up exactly, but the site plan shows the porch sticking out." Mr. Eggleston

said, "That is an older site plan before we got the Olswieski survey. So the plans are correct, your site plan is not. The buildings and the decks line up with the first two floors of 52 East Genesee Street." Chairman Blackler said, "The Planning Board wanted to have us mention about the roof line." Mr. Eggleston said, "I think they were more concerned about the Genesee Street side. Right now what I wanted to do was to limit the conversation to the south elevation."

Mr. Eggleston said, "So I guess the next thing I'd like to talk about is the door, in that we're going to push that door back approximately 3 feet so that as you can see, so you can get access into the retail separate. As shown in the section, it will be a similar door going into the retail space, with a transom above it. There will be a side panel on it, similar to the solid panel. Member Kinder asked, "So does it push that whole stairway back or is there enough room?" Mr. Eggleston, "It's a whole new stair." Member Young asked, "Is there no other way to do that, to leave the recess there?" Mr. Eggleston, "Well what it means is that everyone comes into an inside vestibule, so you have to go 2 doors into the retail instead of 1 door." Member Young said, "You mean with the recess." Mr. Eggleston, "If we didn't recess it. In other words you said is there another way to do it." Member Young, "It's recessed now." Mr. Eggleston, "It's recessed only about two feet or so." Member Young, "Oh, you're going back farther?" Mr. Eggleston, "We're going another 3 feet, 3.5 feet back." Member Young, "Do you even need to do that?" Mr. Eggleston, "Part of the reason we need to do it, is when we restored this front back in the early 90s we actually beveled this stone to make the transition for the accessibility. So this is sloped, and we want to be past the slope, so that the door coming into the retail is not half on the slope and half not on the slope. The other thing would be to disturb this façade and this is based on the early 1900 façade. It's all original steel that we found when we took off the 1950 makeover. And I think we did a good job of it and we should keep it."

Member Ramsgard said, "Is the side panel, on the north elevation, is that glass or wood?" Mr. Eggleston, "It was shown incorrectly on that floor plan. It's glass. It will be glass the same height as the door itself." Member Ramsgard, "And so then the one on the west elevation is solid?" Mr. Eggleston, "Correct, the one on the west is solid."

Mr. Eggleston said, "So now we're going to come up to the upper level. When you look at what's happening above the cornice line, the original buildings were built without anything up there. Over the years dormers have been put in as the attics have been developed. And there's been a number of things – in fact I gave Pat Blackler a photo that showed all the buildings along there and all the various things. It's interesting that this seems to be the heart of where things are happening. On 44 East Genesee Street there's probably, like dating back to the 60s, a reverse gable dormer that's in there with a picture window and two side windows. The Kiltz building at 42 put a large shed dormer clad in copper and then put three appliques like doghouse dormers on and they put the copper in between. It's sloped from zero to 6 inches or something of that nature in that area. What we initially did was to bring out an 18 foot-wide dormer, put 4 windows in it; we have 4 windows on our façade, where Rob Kiltz has 3 and Eloise Luchsinger has 3. And kind of marrying a little bit of the reverse gable over that to give it a sense of composition under a low pitched shed that goes back to the ridge. Other elements, there's a relatively flat metal skylight that sits back some distance and then there's also the tower for the elevator. On drawing 8 we just gave you, I have actually drawn a profile from across the street on the sidewalk – a person looking up, these are not visible from the street from a normal six-foot person standing on

the other side. So they are low to the ridgeline and pushed back. So we feel that they won't have too much visual impact from Genesee Street. Granted as you go down State Street, the farther down you go you'll begin to see them, just like you'll begin to see air conditioners up there."

Chairman Blackler said, "The one you've got your finger on that's 2a." Mr. Eggleston, "2a is the one we originally submitted." Member Dyson, "Bob, it seems to me that just because two buildings – and I took a good look at them – some of those shed dormers are really not doing us any favors. Is there any reason, if you want that extra floor, if you look at the Fleur de Lis building which is built straight up and matches the brick. That is a much more handsome building. These look almost like pigeon coops or chicken coops on top of the building. And I don't think they are very attractive and I don't think they add to the – I don't see any historic merit in them." Mr. Eggleston, "So if it's going to be a 4 story façade, make it a 4 story façade." Member Dyson, "Yes. With a good match on the brick." Member Young, "I think, when I went down today and looked around I was surprised that there weren't more of these horrible monstrosities on the top of these buildings – these fourth stories that they are called. Because there's really only a handful of buildings that, to me, have been ruined by these fourth stories. And I think in an historic district when you have 3 story buildings they should stay 3 story buildings. The worst that should happen is that a dormer would be so far back that you couldn't see it from the street. But even that isn't really, I don't think, is acceptable. And I think that if we don't stop, every single building... Our standard is the last worst fourth story. And that's what's happening. Each one gets worse, and gets bigger, and gets uglier and higher for various reasons. But it's usually because the developer wants to make more money with a larger condo. They'd go 12 stories if they could."

Mr. Eggleston said, "What I did in response to Pat Blackler's thought about are there other options, and yes, there are other options. What I have done on the 2a is shown a profile looking at the side of this dormer, so you can understand that. If we look at 2b, 2b is basically the similar dormer, but without the reverse gable on it, so it just simplified that." Member Young, "Can we talk about the shaded part here on the side?" Mr. Eggleston, "Sure." Member Young, "Because to me it looks like that comes out fairly flush with the cornice, and it doesn't in these other buildings." Mr. Eggleston, "What you are looking at is the original – although it has been rebuilt – basically the original sloped roof. Just like this was done over here. That was the original sloped roof. So that maintains..." Member Young, "I'm talking about this portion. This comes out further than here and here." Mr. Eggleston, "No. I think they are coming out almost identical to those. They are in line." Member Dyson, "It will be the tallest." Mr. Eggleston, "I guess it depends what you are looking at. If you are looking at the heights of the 3 dormers on the Kiltz building is obviously higher than what we talked about." Member Young, "The elevator. You have to find another way to put an elevator shaft in. And also the skylight. Use a flat one or something." Member Neibert, "To me, my main objection is having structures above the original roofline that goes straight across. And it's above the fire-break walls that bracket each building. And those are the highest things. And all of the roofs are below those fire-break walls all the way down the town. And we've got a skylight and an elevator structure that actually extends up above the roofline. To me that's what bothers me the most." Member Miller, "It bothers me too." Member Young, "The rooflines are extremely important I think that when you have historical buildings. And this looks like a little trailer or a little hose that's stuck up there."

Member Neibert, "There has to be a way to do this and maintain the roof line." [Multiple conversations] Member Neibert, "Because even on the other ones where there's dormers, they still don't go above the roofline." [Multiple conversations] Mr. Eggleston, "This dormer won't either." Member Neibert, "No, it's the elevator shaft and skylight." Member Kinder, "Bob correct me if I'm wrong but we couldn't do that at the LakeView House because of the height ordinance. We really wanted to put another elevator open into the penthouse. Aren't you going to have trouble with the height ordinance there?" Mr. Eggleston, "What we are required is 4 feet of refuge above it, oh no, actually those types of structures are exempt from the height ordinance – cupola, and chimneys and those kinds of things." Member Kinder, "But the shaft wasn't at LakeView House. And it's actually 6 feet of refuge above it now. It was 4 feet a few years ago, but I think they raised it to 6 feet now."

Member Dyson asked, "What kind of variance do you need to get for the mass of the building -- because you're adding a lot on -- as to the space?" Mr. Eggleston, "Currently it's we're allowed a 3.5 story building and we're asking for a 4.5 story as per the definition that's been applied for the last 3 or so applications. And then there's some question is it 4.5 or is it 5? Well, it's virtually the same as what has been done on the Kiltz building, the LakeView House, the Shannon and the Seitz building." Member Young, "Maybe those were all mistakes. Maybe we need to stop at some point and decide we're not going to continue this." Member Kinder said, "I'd like to address that. I'd like to put my developer hat on. I'm sure the public opinion is that it is incredibly lucrative to redo these buildings in Skaneateles – there's a lot of money. Believe it or not, the margins on these things are fairly tight. And adding that top square-footage, even if it's only... We put an extra 750 SF at LakeView House – adding that square-footage is often the difference between making a profit and making it economically feasible to do the project. It's hard to believe, but that extra floor is enough to put it over the top in terms of making it feasible. Would all developers make 12 stories there? Maybe, but obviously we can't do that. But since the precedent has been set and we've got them all over the place, I don't see how you can deny adding a fourth story to that." Member Young, "Using money isn't an issue though." Member Kinder, "But then the building wouldn't get done." Member Young, "Well then it wouldn't get done."

Mr. Eggleston said, "What we are looking at and a lot of the things that you are not looking at or seeing, are the other major advantages to the community. This will now be a sprinklered building and now will have integrity to the fire separation where a lot of these buildings have been remodeled, cut in. This building, because it has been touched so little, really doesn't have any violation because it is the only building that hasn't been expanded. When we were at the Keady building the building just east of it ripped out their whole wall and was up against the Keady building. There was no wall there." Member Young, "It's not an either/or. You can make it historical and put the sprinkler system in." Member Miller, "Bob, I don't have as much problem with that other floor as I do the elevator and the skylight that stick above it. Those are the things that are objectionable to me." Member Dyson, "And I don't have so much of a problem with adding the story, because I understand the economics here a little bit, but I don't like that dormer look that's starting to be added. I love the look of the Fleur de Lis building that is so classic and goes up another story." Mr. Eggleston, "One of the problems I have with doing that would be I think it takes away the historic reference of the fact that these buildings are all straight across. So I think if you look at the Secretary of State's standards for adding onto

buildings – they are going to suggest don't make it look like something it wasn't as a full 4 story building. So I think they're going to say how do you deal with the dormer in an appropriate way, so you know it was an addition, it was something added later, but it's appropriate to the building and it doesn't distract from the building." [Multiple conversations]

Member young, "That's so at some point somebody will come along and be able to remove it." Mr. Eggleston, "I think it is so people recognize that it is different. When you look at the addition on the Skaneateles Savings Bank they kept kind of the massing, they kept the general color of the brick – but the brick is different and you can see that they have a setback. You can clearly see the 1970s addition rather than the original 1880s building, and that was appropriately added on to. So I think those are the kind of things that we are dealing with." Member Ramsgard, "I would tend to agree with Bob on that one, and agree with the Secretary of the Interior standards for adding onto historical buildings. It can be done. Skaneateles Savings Bank is the right idea; really bad result, execution. My criticism of the dormer is that, if you are going to add on, it should be in an architectural character that is unique enough that it is its own thing. Particularly, when you look at the elevation and compare it to the other two, It's sort of like the one next to it but it's not different enough to give it enough architectural character that can stand alone and say 'hey, ok, wow. That's a nice, great piece of architecture. The other ones did it this way. It has its own individual standards. So I don't have the problem with adding onto the fourth floor. And I don't mind necessarily going up 4 either if the architrave, which is the main horizontal component is kept, because that is the reference to what was there. But I don't think as proposed in any of the schemes that it is enough architectural merit to say that it is good enough, yet, to stand on its own and fit within the character of what the Secretary of the Interior standards would be,"

Chairman Blackler, "When you look ahead in the next 10 or 15 years as more of these buildings are going to be sold, it wouldn't bother you to have them also put a top on the roof until it goes all the way down the street?" Member Ramsgard, "If you thought about it as the boathouses along the Potomac – where there's individual boom-boom pieces of character. Each one is unique and stands alone. I could absolutely see the possibility of how each one could be icing on the top of cake as character adds to the..." Chairman Blackler, "It wouldn't bother you?" Member Ramsgard, "It wouldn't bother me because if you left the reference line of here's the datum of what was there, I could absolutely see how it could look great. I can also see how it could look terrible if it's not done right. [Multiple conversations] So each one is an individual case. One of the significant things which is required as part of our application and is missing, is a perspective drawing that would show how the relationship of this roof line is reflected -- particularly in those photographs – from the northeast looking toward the southwest. And that's extremely important to understand what the visual impact is. Because it is not just straight on. It not just a simple elevation."

Member Young said, "I think some larger cities handle it by it has to be back far enough so you can't see it from the street. So that you still keep the look and the roof line of the original building." [unintelligible] Member Dyson, "Well what you are really talking about is designing a little gem on the top that stands alone and says, wow that's really attractive." Member Young, "But it should be compatible with the building. If you go through some of these other towns in the Finger Lakes, like Seneca Falls or Waterloo, you don't see that on top of the buildings. And

it is so refreshing to go through a town and just see the buildings – the three story that they were meant to be.”

Chairman Blackler, “I think that we would like to hear from everybody.” Mr. Eggleston said, “What I would like to do is to finish the presentation. I think we have had a very healthy discussion about the concept of the dormers and what does it look like. Pat Blackler asked me to consider some other options, so I’d like to run through those options. Again we have

- the original option, and
- 2b that I touched on is keeping just the shed dormer but with windows that are proportionate to tie in, but not having the reverse gable which takes some of the focus off from it.
- The option 2c, was actually to make the reverse gable dormer stand out forward, lower the side eaves on the shed dormer itself so as to make this even more pronounced and special. So that’s bringing this a little bit down more in proportion – reverse gable in the front.
- 2d is basically taking a cue from the Kiltz building and doing 4 dormers across the front in the same manner. That takes away a little bit from the unique, because it has been done once already.
- 2e would be having a shallower smaller dormer set further back.. And you’ll see that this may be what a couple of you have been referring to because you’ll see in the side section this sets back 4 or 5 feet, rather than 2 feet, what the other dormers were. This actually is what they did on the next building down. I did not have enough architectural information for that building, but there is a dormer with just a small slice. It’s also similar solution that was done on the bakery when that third story was added on the 2 story.” Member Neibert said, “But it does show up in this photo.” Mr. Eggleston, “Yes it does. You’ll see in this photo it is set back a little bit further and it’s a little bit lower, so it is much less pronounced, so it would give you less appearance.”

Member Kinder, “My personal opinion, I really don’t like the reverse dormers – is a 4 over 12 – or gable facing the road. It looks too suburban to me. The one right next to it is kind of the same way – I’ve never really liked that.” Member Young, “It is very cluttered.” Mr. Eggleston, “So you’re saying you do not like the reverse gable?” Member Kinder, “I do not like the two that have the reverse gable.” Member White agreed. Member Kinder, “I prefer one of the two that have the shed dormer, especially the one that sits even further back. That would be 2e or possibly 2b.” member Young said, “I know you are not talking about materials now, but it makes a big difference if you are using asphalt shingles or slate. Also the elevator and the skylight have to go. Unacceptable.”

Member Miller asked, “Is there a way that you can do that, Bob, get rid of the elevator and skylight?” [multiple simultaneous conversations] Member Neibert asked, “So what’s the alternative to the skylight? To me that’s not the problem, because you can do that flat and that’s not going to show. But the elevator shaft...” Member Miller, “We don’t like that.” Member Neibert, “Because it sticks up higher than the fire wall.” Member Young, “There has to be other ways to do elevators, where you do not put the shaft on the roof.” Member Neibert, “How high is the ceiling in that.” Mr. Eggleston said, “It’s 9 feet.” Member Neibert, “So what if you lowered the ceiling?” Mr. Eggleston, “The cab is only the height of the cab and you need so

much height above the cab.” Member Young, “Just have it go up to the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor.” Member Kinder said, Yes, that’s right. There’s an internal stairway right?” [multiple conversations]

Member Smalley said, “So you asked me what I thought. I think it’s nice. I like that addition on top. Of all of the ones that I see,, I like this one best [indicating 2b] because it is plain and simple. It’s b that I like.” Chairman Blackler, “Beverly, you haven’t said anything.” Member White, “No I haven’t. I don’t object to the dormer. I prefer 2d as opposed to the other ones – it needs to be tweaked. I still think you have a lot of work to do in the back. The skylight, as you say is solvable, but I’m not sure about that elevator shaft.” Member Dyson said, “I like this one but it is so similar to this one. [2d] Is this between the two fire walls – it spans. I like d but I also like the one that comes after it [2e] that’s set back.” [multiple conversations]

Member Neibert, “So Bob, on 2d the two ends are going to be the original slope of the roof?” Mr. Eggleston, “On all of them” Member Neibert, “And then between the two end windows, that’s going to come out and then there’s going to be like a fake, a little bit of an offset back between the windows.” Mr. Eggleston, “Actually, I have done it different from what Kiltz was doing on that one. On Kiltz’ it was maybe a 6 inch difference, if that. What I was proposing was actually making these real dormers, by coming back with a sharper piece. So in other words, they are really doghouse dormers, they are not three appliquéés on a shed dormer clad in copper. That’s just what I wanted to clarify on this. Again I didn’t pay a lot of attention to it because you said it should be unique. So instead of it being a 6 inch appliqué, it actually comes back significantly.” Member Young, “Could there be a different header?” Mr. Eggleston, “Oh, sure. If we decide it’s the appropriate way to pursue, I will further develop it and we’ll make it enough different so it is unique as Andy was suggesting.”

Member Neibert said, “On your roof line on the side you show a – I don’t know what you call it – but there’s an angle there. Are you changing the roof line.” Mr. Eggleston, “This is the actual roof line that’s the 2 foot here. But here this is like a 12x12 pitch between there. You see on the Kiltz building, what they did is they did this, so it’s only maybe a 6 inch appliqué on the front of a...” Member Neibert, “But on the sides, that’s the original roof line.” Mr. Eggleston said, “That’s the original roof line just like on all of them.” Member Dyson, “Bob, this looks like it is pretty abrupt. That bothers me a little bit. Is there a design that could carry from fire wall to fire wall and carry the design through...” Mr. Eggleston, “Actually that’s what I’m doing is making them deep.” [multiple conversations]

Member Kinder suggested that the Commission go one at a time with each member picking hers/his first and second preferences, so as to give some kind of idea as to where the consensus might be, if there is a consensus.

1. Member Kinder: 2e (set back further less obtrusive), 2b , and 2d (could live with)
2. Member Smalley: 2b
3. Member Young: First choice is leave it 3 story. Second is 2d, if lower windows and roof line.
4. Member Dyson: 2d and 2e. Would like to see 2d developed. Likes 2e because it looks different.
5. Member White: 2d. While it needs to be worked on a little bit, it is better than the rest.

6. Chairman Blackler: 2d.
7. Member Ramsgard Not willing to pick from drawings presented the night of the hearing. We don't have a complete application. We require plan, section and elevation in order to understand and our rules require a perspective drawing also.
8. Member Miller: 2c and 2b.
9. Member Neibert: there have to be some other styles available, but from what is in front of the Commission he likes 2e (set back, less obtrusive).

Member Dyson asked, "Could this be brick?" Mr. Eggleston said, No it wouldn't be appropriate in brick because it is set further back.

Chairman Blackler, noting that this is a public hearing, asked, "Is there anyone here that would like to speak in favor of the application?" Ms Sharpe said, "I am Julie Sharpe from the adjacent property with the plain looking roof. I know Bob is a very competent architect. He did work for me. And I know that Rick is very concerned about meeting all the criteria required, and has been very thoughtful of my considerations, and has talked also with Eloise, to minimize any impact on us. I am going to be losing windows – that's life in the fast lane when you live back there. It's a fact of life. I think it will be an absolute improvement and I have no objection to that 4<sup>th</sup> floor, which will overshadow me." Mr. Sutherland, "Doug Sutherland from the Planning Board. I'd just like to thank you for taking this on short notice and giving some initial thought. When the Planning Board first looked at it, we had a lot of the same concerns that were expressed here – sort of 'mission creep' with additional pieces coming. How you organize those, if they are going to happen, so they don't look like the top drawing where they all look very different and none of it is particularly appealing is a tricky question. I think it is especially tricky when you are coming down Genesee Street. You see those in the distance, and how those look from that angle is maybe as important as the head-on views. Maybe with the next round of drawings, we can get a better sense of that side as you come down the street. It is a stunning row of buildings right now. I think Andy is right to a degree. If we have things that are really clever – we haven't had a lot of clever that's come up to date – and you sort of hold your breath. What we have now is very nice. How you add onto it will, in large measure, you'll see it for years and years."

Member Neibert, "It's not only coming down Genesee. It's coming down Jordan and coming down State, because these buildings are all very visible, particularly this group of buildings right here. When you're coming down State Street, that's what you see. This jumps out at you. That's why I am really adamant about these structures that are above the roof line and above the fire walls. When you're coming down the street, you see all of that. You see the roof line and you can see the vents and everything that's up there -- the less junk that's up there the better. There's enough stuff up there as it is."

Mr. Sutherland said, "I think one thing that Andy was saying about individual boathouses along the Potomac. I don't know the Potomac houses, but the ones in Philadelphia are all different. But they are different from the ground up, rather than launching off a pretty common set of buildings. That makes getting those individual roof – that's a really tough thing to do. If you go down that road there is probably a way to do it, but you are at the mercy of each designer that comes forward.—some more capable than others. You just don't know what's going to happen." Member Ramsgard said, "Absolutely. That's why I said I could envision it good and I can

envision it bad. If I could just comment on perspectives; with a base perspective from a particular angle, I don't think it would take more than a couple of hours to do sketch out what each one's going to look like. And when you consider the 15 people in the room and the time we have spent on this and the importance of the decision, the time is necessary to properly inform the Board and the public. And it is one of our requirements."

Member Young said, "Another question on these dormers. It bothers me a little bit that across the top it is going to look like it is one large dormer. But yet, then you are trying to make these look like each is a separate dormer. But to me it is not going to work. It doesn't fool the eye. You may not get as much bang for the buck inside..." Mr. Eggleston said, "I'll totally disagree with you because the Kiltz building demonstrates that you never see that. That's drawn in elevation. You never see what is up here. It will be more pronounced with this because I'm making these real dormers instead of appliques, which are over here. If you look at these photos..." Member Young said, "Frankly when I look at that photo, I hate the Kiltz building. It looks like these three little things. I like it here better, even though..." [multiple conversations]

Chairman Blackler, "Is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor of the application?" Hearing no one wishing to be recognized, "Is there anyone who would like to speak in opposition to the application?" There was no one wishing to be recognized. The Chairman then read the following statement, "At the Planning Board meeting last Thursday, they did not make any recommendations to the ZBA for variances. They wanted to hear from us first, so they deferred their discussions on the applications for 46 East Genesee Street until their next meeting in November. I recommend that we do the same thing – leave our public hearing on this application open until our next meeting in November. By then we are going to know if the Planning Board is going to have recommendations to the ZBA and we're going to know if there are yeses or nos on the ZBA variances. So we would like to leave this public hearing on this application for 46 open until the next meeting, until we know more about it." Chairman Blackler asked, "Does anyone else agree with me?" Many members expressed their agreement with the suggested course of action. Member Neibert asked, "In November when this comes up again, could there possibly be some other alternatives other than the five that you have here?" Mr. Eggleston, "I have obviously received a lot of valuable critique tonight, for me to take back. What I will obviously be doing is making some adjustments, I will be representing to the Planning Board and then we'll be coming back here to further the discussion with the historic board." Chairman Blackler asked, "And when you come back here it is going to be more micro against the macro?" Mr. Eggleston, "No, we are still macro. And I will be looking for a macro approval. After we get through the Zoning process, we will then come back for the micro and talk about color and fixtures and all that."

Chairman Blackler asked, "Doug, is that right?" Mr. Sutherland, "We will be getting this again before you do, so we have some benefit from tonight. I assume Bob will have next-generation based on this, that we can take a look at at our next meeting." Mr. Eggleston, "We will continue talking. Everyone has their own issues to focus on, yet it is one big building. The Planning Board wanted some of your initial thoughts before they proceeded with their recommendations. So we will continue to do the design development for the Planning Board and for yourselves." Chairman Blackler asked, "Can you keep us posted as you go along?" Mr. Eggleston, "Oh, absolutely."

Trustee Lanning said, "As someone who attends all of these meetings I want to express that there is a tremendous emphasis from the Planning Board and your Board to come up with ideas and thoughts and form a consensus rather than have Mr. Eggleston present a formal set of plans that will be torn apart. I appreciate that everybody seems to be working together to get the feedback first before he puts together a set of plans and then he gets critiqued. I think the Planning Board, by letting you guys see this, get your input and bring it back. And I'm sure it will be the same with the Zoning Board, so we appreciate the cooperation that all 3 boards are exhibiting here. The process works better that way." Chairman Blackler expressed her concurrence.

Member Young, "I just have a question for Bob. Bob, can you explain why it looks like this here, and it looks so different there. I find that scary." Mr. Eggleston said, "It is probably the difference between perspective and an elevation. That means you don't see those ridgelines anywhere from Genesee Street, and what I'm showing is the factual elevation. The problem in working in elevation is that it doesn't show it as the eye perceives it. And that's why, with perspective, the ridge line doesn't even become an issue, because no one sees it. Just like the elevator..." Member Young, "Then you have to be much more cautious with these silly dormers that stick up." Member Ramsgard, "It depends where the station point of the perspective is taken from, as to whether you see it or you don't. Which means that you can pick your point and not see it, and I can pick another point and I can see it. But it's appropriate to take from where it is most impactful. As you come down Genesee Street as Doug suggested, the Board might like one scheme rather than another, and would help communicate the idea really well for everyone to see."

Member Ramsgard continued, "I just wanted to clarify that this goes back to the Planning Board again. It does not yet go to the ZBA." Chairman Blackler agreed and thought that the Certificate of Approval might not be granted until after both Boards had completed their work. Member Dyson, "I think that there is one thing that we have not said too much about, and that's the impact that these three, not just this building, but this building in light next to the other buildings." Chairman Blackler said, "I think Andy talked about that." Member Dyson, "But those are the only ones in the block, pretty much." Member Ramsgard, "Pat, I want to come back to that again. So Planning Board is up here, it's come to the Zoning Board, it's going to go back to the Planning Board..." Mr. Sutherland said, "I don't think we want to get ahead of you on the dormer question in particular. And so there may be a little back and forth. Eventually we will recommend to the ZBA. We may choose to do that next meeting – I'm guessing that we may let a final resolution on the dormer happen first. Giving them a good feel for where we are going but not get there. It's just a guess."

Member Ramsgard said, "For all the Boards to work together, the best way to do it, in my opinion, is that it go back to the Planning Board. If the Planning Board so decides that they have enough Site Plan Review and they have enough information for their application, they could move forward and make their recommendation to the ZBA contingent upon the Historic Board doing their approval. Therefore it would let the Historic Board do their approval and then give it to the ZBA. Then all the dominos line up. Because if the ZBA gets it and approves the Variances – what are we doing here? So I think that we should be either first or second." Chairman Blackler said, "Well first I don't mind as long as it is a discussion. I don't want a

Certificate of Approval the first time that we see it.” Member Ramsgard said, “So we can either be second or first and the ZBA goes last.” Mr. Eggleston, “The ZBA will not be making any decisions on what the dormers look like, the only thing the ZBA will be looking at is whether they will allow a 4.5 story building.” Chairman Blackler asked, “Does my committee here understand everything that you people just said about the route?” There was agreement.

Member Young brought up the height. Chairman Blackler and Member Ramsgard articulated that ultimately, that matter will be decided by the Planning Board and the ZBA. Member Ramsgard continued, “Our decision is does it look appropriate? While the actual number is not ours to call, we do need all the drawings; plan, section, elevation to be the same and consistent. To understand it dimensionally, we still need to know what the number is, but it is their call on the actual final number. But we need to see all that they do and for it all to be consistent.”

**Member Ramsgard said, “I move that we continue the open public hearing for Finger Lakes Luxury Homes, Inc. for consideration of 46 East Genesee Street in the Village of Skaneateles.” Member Miller seconded the motion.**

Upon the unanimous vote of all the members in favor of the motion, it was declared passed. Chairman Blackler thanked the participants for coming.

This portion of the meeting concluded at 8:48 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to HLPC