

Village of Skaneateles
Historical Landmarks Preservation Commission
November 14, 2012

Present: Patricia Blackler, Chairman, HLPC
Karlene Miller, Member
Dave Neibert, Member
Andrew Ramsgard, 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
Carrie Chantler, Skaneateles Journal
Chad Rogers, Skaneateles
Jim Williams, Skaneateles
Peter Wiles, Skaneateles
Jorge Batlle, Skaneateles

Absent: Katherine Dyson, Member
Ted Kinder, Member
Mona Smalley, Member

At 7:52 pm Chairman Blackler re-opened the continuation of the Public Hearing in the matter of the 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. Chairman Blackler indicated that she would make a statement. She said, "I have been studying these architectural briefs that were given to all of us, for the last week. And I want to read a few important statements before we receive comments from the members and before we have any presentation from Bob. I have read them all and these are the ones that I think are important to us. These all come from the Secretary of the Interior standards of historic rehabilitation.

- Number 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historic development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties will not be undertaken.
- Number 9: New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and special relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with

the historic materials, features, site, scale, proportion and massing to protect the integrity of the original property and its environment.

- Number 14: Because a new exterior addition to a historic building can damage or destroy significant materials and can change the building's character, an addition should be considered only after it has been determined that the new use cannot be met by altering non-specific secondary interior spaces. If the new use cannot be met in this way, then an additional addition may be an acceptable alternative if carefully planned. A new addition should be constructed in a manner that preserves significant materials and preserves the historic character of the original building. Finally, an addition should be differentiated from the historic building so that the new work is not confused with the original building.
- About roofs: Identifying, retaining and preserving roofs in their functional and decorative features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. This includes the roof's shape such as hip, gambrel, and mansard; and decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys and weathervanes; and roofing materials such as slate, wood, clay, pipe and metal as well.
- Alterations for new use – recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces, elevator housings, decks and terraces, or dormers or skylights when required by the new use, so they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way, and do not damage strong character features.”

Chairman Blackler continued, “I also want you to remember that local municipal law controls and supersedes the suggestions of other towns, state & federal bodies. The Commission should respect the Applicant's choices when possible and try to make them appropriate.”

Mr. Eggleston introduced himself and said, “Again from last month there are really 3 areas that we are concerned about. We are looking for a macro approval – basically the shape, geometry and the concept --in that we are going through Special Permit, Site plan Review and Variances as well as Critical Impact. It is important to get the basic shape and concept of what we are doing. We will come back later with specific materials and products that we are using, and that type of thing. So we want to keep it on a fairly macro review level. There are 3 areas that we are concerned about: (1) the addition which is on the south elevation, (2) the alteration to the entrance of the first floor on the north elevation – Genesee Street – and, (3) the treatment of the dormers and additions on the roof level as seen from the north elevation looking south. Changes that have occurred with the plan itself are fairly minor relative to the scope and interest of this board – we have recessed back; changed the actual configuration of the floor plan on the 4th floor and 3rd floor, in that we now have brought the bedroom and great room wall back to align with Eloise's property on the west side, and kept it out where it originally was on the north side. That's to preserve some of her openness and her side vision from the decks on her 3rd and 4th level. What that means is that the west side will have; the façade will recess back so we'll have a deeper deck or porch on those sides as compared with this side. We have gone to 10 foot sliding doors which are consistent on the west side on the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th floor level. On the east side we have sliding doors on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd, and windows on the 4th floor – all similar to what we had talked about before.”

Mr. Eggleston continued, “We're in agreement, and this gets into the finer details, we will make the railing in the back total metal – the posts and the spindles will be metal. As we had done last

time, we changed the character and style of the overhead door to make a little more carriage-house appropriate. I know that last month you really didn't have too much trouble with the back and it's just the configuration. I guess first I'm going to ask if there are any questions about those changes or what we are doing on the south elevation?" Member White asked, "Are we talking about the garage doors? What is this material in here?" Mr. Eggleston, "What that will be is Coplay makes a door that has like a vertical grooved infill, like a beadboard type thing, and it will be a 3 dimensional paneled door; with a frame and then the vertical boards are recessed back. We will have more specific catalog cuts on that at a later hearing. So we're all set on the south elevation? No questions? Good."

Mr. Eggleston continued, "Next I'll talk about is the ground-level entrance. The one thing that I have specifically spelled out on the drawings – that would be page 5 – that it is 3 foot 11 inches that we are recessing the existing recessed door back 3 foot 11. What we have decided, contrary to what I had suggested before, and it's noted on the drawings, when we push the door back we are going to reuse the existing door and have a transom panel above it, but the panels on the side will be solid – they'll be wood panels. In that it is the residential portion of the entrance we felt that having it more solid would be more appropriate. We do want some light in there just for natural light. The side elevation as seen on drawings 8D or 8E, will actually have those glass panels on the entrance going into the retail space. So we'll have a door that will match the door going to the residential, and we'll have a glass transom, glass side panel wood panel in the very bottom, which will relate more to the fact that we have the glass on the front of the building. So that will be glass sidelights going into the retail. Are there any questions relative to the ground level of the north elevation?"

Member Neibert, "One comment. My store is in a location that has a similar type of entrance; it has a hallway going back and my store goes in one side. I can't tell you how many people go straight back thinking there is a store back there. They go back and they are looking in and they are opening the door. You need to have some kind of definite thing that designates the residence from business. People they walk in there and they tend to walk straight ahead, rather than going to the right into my shop." Mr. Eggleston, "I can appreciate your situation because your door is further back in than it necessarily needs to be. This will be very much akin to the Green Mountain coffee, where it just sets back the depth of the door. So we just have the existing 2 feet that ramps up and then the 3 foot 11 inches for the door itself. One thing I was thinking about is it might be appropriate to use translucent glass – frosted glass on the residential door so you are not seeing into it. It provides light, it is more private and I thought about that especially after doing cate&sally where the doors are identical, that maybe the residential needs a different treatment than the actual retail, because the retail should be more open, more transparent, more welcome. So I would suggest that we maybe use a frosted glass on the street level residential door that would help to differentiate and make that less welcoming than the retail door." Member White suggested, "Also, if there's a plaque that says PRIVATE." Member Ramsgard said, "It could be something as simple as color too; letting the façade wrap around as the commercial color and the inset piece as different." Mr. Eggleston said, "Those are all very helpful suggestions. And those would be details we will deal with on a more micro review as we get into the specific details."

Mr. Eggleston continued, “Then that takes us up to the 4th level on the roof. Last month I presented 5 different approaches and we talked about the virtues of how to deal with those. One of the things that came out of that – the 2 drawings should be labeled Option D and Option E. On the sections those are better noted. I chose to do that so it was consistent with the labeling that we talked about last month. The D last month was 4 dormers, very similar to what was done over on Kiltz building at 42 East Genesee. One of the thoughts was that it really shouldn’t be identical to that. We were going to upgrade the quality of the trims and not have it quite as flat. And also, we were going to make the dormers 3-dimensional. We have a side profile that shows that we don’t have a vertical roof between the dormers like over at 42, but it comes back at a steeper like 12/12, so you’ve got the appearance of siding that goes back 5 feet on the side. And they are actually 3 dimensional dormers instead of a 2 dimensional appliqué treatment. What we thought was appropriate for the 4 bay building as opposed to the 3 bay building which many of the others are, is the odd numbers would be more interesting and more typically used. So we had a larger center dormer with the narrower dormer on each side. These are traditional forms appropriate to this area, Skaneateles, and dormers found in the village. We will try to differentiate them – they do set back – and the comment that came from the board that I heard was to make them of a reasonable quality so that they are appropriate to the district. Obviously the treatment over here at 44 was not approved by the historic commission; it preceded it. That we’re living with until someone comes in and decides to change it. And to have something that holds its own and allows it to speak as an appropriate addition to the history of the property.”

Mr. Eggleston continued, “Doug Sutherland who attended this meeting last month was really interested in what the Historic Commission’s attitude was toward the dormers so he could go back to the Planning Board in that the Planning Board is making recommendations for the Special Permit and the Critical Impact on this. He kind of heard something different – he thought that what came from the Board, his feeling, was Option E. That is a shorter height shed dormer. It is very similar to the dormer that’s at 38 East Genesee Street. It sets back, and as seen in the section it sets back 4 foot 2 inches from behind the parapet, whereas this is 2 foot that the other dormer is set back from the parapet. So it sits back a little further. The dormer over here is 8 foot 4 inches high above the floor, whereas this will be 6 foot 10, so it’s down a couple of feet. We tried to make it less obvious and more subtle – more typical of what was done over here at 38. Another example of this was on the Shannon building. It sits back further but that one is quite a bit taller. And, of course, when it sits back, you don’t see it as you are walking down the street as soon, because you get the parapet walls that come out and the further back it is obviously, the more subtle it is. So we did this 2E option to suggest what that might look like.”

Mr. Eggleston continued, “For each of D and E, I did a rendering. We actually went back...first I’ll go back to the sections, they’re on drawings 8D & E. I placed the person over on the north side of Genesee Street on the sidewalk. There are 3 lines. From the parapet up you really don’t see beyond the existing roof. From the highest point of this roof that would be seen coming back and you don’t see the elevator tower at all. I have taken off the pyramidal skylight; we just have flatter-lined skylights so they will not be visible at all from the street, but still allow light into the center of the building. From the point of the dormer on D, again you don’t see anything behind it. I then projected back 250 feet from the building, and that basically is in the driveway of the M&T Bank. As Pat read from the Secretary of the Interior standards, the concern is what’s visible from the public right of way within the historic district. If we were not reasonably close

to the intersection of State Street, you would see none of the things behind. But I have put those same 3 lines in. What happens is the dormer totally hides any visual sight of that. And there is a very slight – you maybe see the last 8 or 10 inches of the elevator tower from there between the dormers. I have done a 3D rendering overlay of the photograph and constructed that with a computer model and then rendered over that. So that would be about the most you would see in this Option D perspective of the tower – and that may be even slightly exaggerated. On the E elevation section, from the person across the street on the north side of Genesee Street, they are not going to see the elevator tower at all. From the M&T parking lot – way back down State Street, they’re actually going to see a little bit more of the tower – in that the dormer is not blocking it. And that’s shown up here on the rendering of Option E. But you will see about the top foot of that, because the dormer doesn’t hide it. It’s interesting from the photographs; there’s air conditioners and mechanical equipments on 44 Genesee Street that you actually see in both those cases. And of course on this building currently, there is an air conditioner that sits right there. It something that your eye doesn’t really pick up on and focus, unless you are looking and sitting down taking a picture. It tends to see the architectural elements in the background because they do sit back, unlike the elevations that look straight on -- wrongfully depict what the visual sight is. So I appreciate Andy’s suggestion that we do a 3D rendering to show you. Again, this is just one very small spot. You have the library building here. It’s a very narrow corridor that you are walking down that you’d be able to get a glance of that. With that, I would be interested in your thoughts relative to Options D or E -- either Rick could live with -- though he does prefer D. It offers him a little better space in the building on the 4th floor for those bedrooms. I’ll take your comments.”

Member Miller said, “I was going to say, what if the elevator didn’t go up to the very top floor? You could do away with the elevator shaft. I climb the stairs every night to go to bed. Could you do away with the elevator going all the way up to the 4th floor?” Mr. Eggleston, “Rick Moscarito’s mother had a stroke and is in a wheelchair. He wants to make the bedroom floor available for her to have a bedroom and private bath up there. There is a small bedroom on the 3rd floor or den, but it is really very small; the bathroom is not as accommodating. It’s remote. He really wants to have the 4th floor...” Member Miller, “I really think that’s going to be the sticking point for this committee right here. I talked, I read Ted Kinder’s comments on the email today. He’s not in favor of it, I’m not in favor of it and I talked with other people on the Board and nobody’s in favor of that elevator tower going up there. So you might want to think about that.” Member Neibert, “Can’t you do a stair-climber for the lift from the 3rd to the 4th?” Mr. Eggleston, “Quite honestly, if we could get a conceptual approval tonight and that meant removing the elevator, I would take that back to Rick.”

Member Young said, “Bob, for me there are two things that are totally unacceptable. One is the elevator shaft has to go. The second is that the dormer in the 4th floor addition is totally out of scale to the building, and it needs to be set back so you keep that roof-scape. Comparing it to the Kiltz building, you are comparing something that we made a mistake with. The Kiltz building is totally out of scale, everything is wrong with it – it’s too far to the front, it looks like it is pretending to be part of the building, and it’s too high, it’s too wide – everything is wrong with it. We can’t keep going on and making each building worse than the last one. So with this one, I think the top floor, that 4th floor, has to be set back from the street and it has to be lower and narrower.” Mr. Eggleston, “So what you are saying is that you would recommend E versus D.”

Member Young, "I'm not recommending any of them, because they are all..." Mr. Eggleston, "Were you referring to D or to E..." Member Young, "I'm not referring to any of these, because I think they are all out of scale. They are all too high and too wide. And they need to be set back. And I think simple is better, so I guess the simplest one would be..." Mr. Eggleston, "This E? This is E viewed from 250 feet back. When you view this, and the eye can do another rendering that shows it from across the street, you'll probably see maybe just the top half of the windows in the view from across the street." Member Young, "I think it needs to be more like the one on the top of the building where Imagine is." Mr. Eggleston, "That's the one at 38, correct? The one next to Kiltz." Member Neibert, "That you can hardly even see." Mr. Eggleston, "You don't even know it's there until you go up State Street." Member Young, "But that's what we need to start doing in this Village. Set back from the street. And I think Pat read that says it too. And I think the Planning Board, I got the impression that most of them agreed with it too."

Chairman Blackler said, "I'd like to ask a question. On E, has that dormer been moved back at all since the first time you gave us..." Mr. Eggleston, "Yes." Chairman Blackler, "And you said it was 4 feet?" Mr. Eggleston, "It's 4 foot 2 1/4 from the back side of the parapet." Chairman Blackler, "So it has been changed since the first time you showed us this?" Mr. Eggleston, "Yes." Member Miller said, "Actually I don't mind 2D, if we didn't have the elevator shaft there." Member Ramsgard said, "I think 2D is a very nice solution. I completely disagree that Kiltz was a mistake. I think that now, unlike the previous proposals, now it stands on its own and each one of the buildings has a unique top. I don't like the shed because there are a bunch of those already, and it's too much copying of the same. They are more easily read as additions and unique pieces if they are all a little bit different. And I think that's very nice. I like the fact that you went to the double window and the singles, because it makes it stand on its own as a nice piece. I do have a problem with the elevator shaft peeking above the roof. I don't have a problem with the elevator concept at all. It looks like, from the perspective, if you just flipped it back a little bit more with that one powder room that you had, then it would totally disappear from the sight line. It would cause you modifications of one of the floor plans; it looks like on the other ones that you could flip that around and it wouldn't hurt you at all. Then you could have the elevator and it visually wouldn't distract from it. The lake side is fine; I don't think you would have an impact at all on that side. Just because it's so asymmetrical where it is; pushing it back to get behind that ridge line, I think it would be fine."

Member Miller, asked, "What about David's idea. Get rid of the elevator shaft to the top floor and have one of those things that go up the stairway? You know that you sit in and go up the stairway." Mr. Eggleston said, "You know, I'll take that back to Rick. Again, I would agree to that for him if we were to get approval tonight for D, as it stands. I guess we just have to see what the majority is thinking at this point." Member Ramsgard said, "I would support approval for D if the elevator just didn't break the ridge line. I think the perspective tells the whole story, and I'm glad you did that because that's what you really see and understand. As long as the tip of that elevator shaft – you didn't see it, then I think D is a very nice and appropriate solution." Member Young, "I think that as long as the elevator shaft is up there we're going to see it." Member Neibert, "So if you moved the elevator shaft back, would it still be the same height that it is? Or is it going to be down lower?" Mr. Eggleston, "It would be the same height, but because we push it back, it would not be visible from the front." Member Ramsgard, "It only

needs to move back a couple of feet, maybe 6 feet at the most.” Mr. Eggleston, “If you went up on the roof, you would be amazed at the number of roof top elements that are up there that you just don’t see. You hardly even see this little vent on Julie Sharpe’s building, but it’s there. You don’t see the air conditioner on Eloise’s building, but it’s there.”

Member Young, “If we see it once it is finished, are you willing to redo it so that we don’t see it?” Mr. Eggleston, “We would present enough evidence ahead of time for your approval, for you to be comfortable. Carol, I suppose that you will never be comfortable with it, but then I respect your opinion.” Member Ramsgard, “I think Carol’s point is a reasonable one. If you make a commitment that you are not going to see it, then you live to it.” Member Young said, “And that means coming down State Street, too.” Member Ramsgard, “I think it depends on where you define it, because if you are a bird flying over, you are going to see it. And does it matter. There’s a point at which it matters and a point at which it doesn’t matter.” Mr. Eggleston, “And I can guarantee that from Genesee Street, you will not see it. You do have that view from State Street and, of course, the historic district starts at the parking lot of the bank building. I think it’s unreasonable to expect anything further back than that.”

Member Neibert, “To me another issue is, once you have opened a can of worms of having a structure above the roof line and above the fire wall line, then where does it end on every other building that is going up. Everybody’s going to want that. And the next thing you know, to me it’s setting a precedent that we should not be setting – having a structure above the fire wall line and above the roof line. That is the visually line of the building; it’s the roof and the fire wall. I don’t care how far back it is, it shouldn’t be above the roof line or the fire wall line.” Member Miller, “I agree.” Member Young, “And right now we have just got a handful of buildings that have done this. But each one is getting worse.” Member Ramsgard, “It’s more than a handful. It’s maybe 60/40. There are some buildings that I would agree do not lend themselves to dormers and additions. Legg Hall for one; I would never support breaking through the roof on that building because it is so important and part of the architectural appeal. But these buildings have gone up and down over time in vertical elevation, and there is a datum that one line that actually jumps up and down where the parapets are. It is a strong enough architectural feature and because of the backdrop of the roofs of the rest of the buildings that you can apply dormers to those things. I wouldn’t want to see a steeple jump up and break the ridge line, which is what the elevator does – it breaks the ridgeline. But I am not at all offended by the dormers, I think they look great.”

Member Young said, “The Kiltz building seems to be the only one that really totally overwhelms the building. It really takes away from the 3 story red building. It overwhelms it – and now we’re going to come up with a second one that’s overwhelming.” Member White said, “I don’t think it’s overwhelming. I think that Andy’s suggestion was a good one; if you can somehow move that elevator back so you cannot see it. And I do like 2D. I think it is interesting, it’s a little bit different in that you have 2 windows in the middle and then 2 separated on the ends. As far as I’m concerned, 2E does kind of melt away. I think it is unremarkable and I don’t see anything terribly interesting about it. So I would have to go with this one. A lot of it is personal as to what you like and what you find appealing, but I don’t find it objectionable – just like I don’t find the dormers on the Kiltz building objectionable.”

Chairman Blackler said, "I would like to read in somebody's comment who is not able to be here." Member Young said, "This is from Ted Kinder: 'As I said at the last meeting, I feel that adding additional square-footage at the top level is essential to the economics of projects in that commercial block of downtown. If the project is economically feasible, then both owner and community benefit by having a building that can be brought up to structural, light, safety and ADA standards. That being said, I feel strongly that we should strive to keep the impact of any 4th floor additions to an absolute minimum on the overall look of the front and rear facades. Anything that is added should compete as little as possible with the original historic façade. Thus I am not in favor of allowing an elevator shaft to protrude above the roof line of the 4th floor addition. I understand that it would be difficult to see from the street level, but you would still be able to see it from up State Street hill and from the lake. In terms of the addition itself, I feel that it should be set back from the façade as far as practical and kept as low, simple and unobtrusive as possible. In the package we were just given, I like 2E – but I would set it back quite a ways from the front façade. My feeling is that the owner can pick up plenty of square-footage and still keep it back 20 feet from the façade, much the way Andy did on John Shannon's building down the street. Thanks. Ted.'"

Mr. Eggleston said, "I want to correct that. There is no way that John Shannon's dormer could be 20 feet back." Members Ramsgard, Neibert and White agreed. Mr. Ramsgard offered "maybe 2, maybe 4, I don't remember."

Chairman Blackler opened the public comment portion of the hearing. Mr. Williams introduced himself and said, "Jim Williams, 13 Jordan Street. I join in Andy's suggestion about ways of making the elevator invisible. It is important to take into account the needs of people with disabilities, and to the extent that elevator can be modified so it is less visible – I think it's important to make our Village as accessible as possible." Mr. Wiles said, "Peter Wiles, 13 Jordan Street. I would agree and I think that obviously moving it back will make where it becomes visible farther away. I think making the goal of removing all structures on Genesee Street to an elevation lower than the peak line is a burden that is not reasonable. Being concerned about the slight appearance of a structure in that row of buildings – visible only in the fall or winter when there are no leaves on the trees coming down State Street – is a burden beyond what is appropriate for being able to utilize the building. I understand that you have totally disagreed with that, but from the public perspective I want it to be known that I think that is beyond what is reasonable. And I would also throw out another suggestion, not looking at the blueprints, not knowing feasibility, but perhaps if the elevator height were to stop at a different elevation than the designed floor level and there were a ramp – that would allow it to be lowered as well. I don't know what it looks like but I'm just throwing that out that it might be another way to physically lower the overall height of the shaft and make it less visible in its current location."

Chairman Blackler asked, "Anyone else in favor?" Hearing none she asked, "Anyone against?" Hearing none, Chairman Blackler said, "If the people in this Commission are ready to make a decision on one of these designs for Bob, who has to present himself to the Planning Board before our next meeting, we can vote on one of these tonight if you are ready to do that. If not, we will close the public hearing and hold it over to next month." Mr. Battle said, "Point of order. If you close the public hearing and then he comes back again for more input, you will

have to have a new public hearing and advertise it again. So don't close the public hearing or the public comments yet."

Mr. Eggleston said, "I would like to know if the Board is ready to make a conceptual recommendation..." Chairman Blackler asked, "That is different from approval of the application?" Mr. Eggleston said, "What I am interested in; I think we are pretty much all in agreement on the conceptual approval of the south elevation. We are all in agreement on the conceptual approval of the first floor entrance. And I think that it is the top-level dormers that seems to be where the Board is divided. I hear people feel that D is appropriate, I hear people say that E is appropriate. I hear with comments on both D and E on the elevator. At this point you could make a condition, on the aspect of the elevator, because we will be coming back to deal with the micro, and we will be dealing with that. What I'm trying to is to get the box defined." Chairman Blackler said, "I know. But I'm uncomfortable, like the Planning Board, with not having something right in front of me that is final before you vote on it. And I would rather keep the public hearing open because the Planning Board meeting is before our next meeting, and who knows what problems are going to come up there?" Mr. Eggleston, "Would it be appropriate to; at some point I really would like to finalize is it D or is it E. I don't know if you are ready to take that kind of vote?"

Mr. Ramsgard said, "In the process of how this has to go through the Zoning Board and the Planning Board, Bob has to go back to the Planning Board. The Planning Board has to make a recommendation, the Zoning Board has to make an approval on the overall height pieces. In that process it is not uncommon for changes to be made. If there are changes, it would have to come back to us, even if they put it out as a conceptual approval, whatever that means. There are a whole bunch of approvals, including Critical Impact and Special Permit, so it is going to hit all four boards. We are going to see it again before we ultimately have to make a decision. My personal recommendation to the Board is that conceptually I think the D scheme is the right scheme to go, with the caveat that the elevator shaft is not visible." Members Miller and Young said it has to go. Member Ramsgard said, "It doesn't have to go." Member Young said, "Well some of us think it does. And some people on the Planning Board feel that way too." Member Ramsgard, "Once you get inside the building you don't have the right to tell somebody what to do. We do have comment on the visual components of the exterior, and we do have comment on that portion of the process. Bob's a smart guy and I know he can figure out a way to manipulate the plan to figure out the way to make it visually go away, and still have his elevator."

Chairman Blackler said, "It sounds like you would like to keep the public hearing open." Member Ramsgard said, "Bob's trying to get on to the process and I understand that. The public hearing has to stay open because we have too many things we have to..." Member Young, "There are several variances that Bob's asking for that have to be approved. How does the elevator shaft fit into that? Is that a height variance?" Mr. Eggleston, "No. No, because elevator shafts are exempt from height." Member Young, "What about number of stories?" Mr. Eggleston, "That is a variance, yes." Member Young, "And building height?" Mr. Eggleston, "Talking to Adam, he was in agreement with my calculations that it was under 45 feet and therefore it did not need a height, it needed a story variance. It is the number of stories, not the actual height because of the definition in the Zoning law. I think I agree with Andy that it's best to keep this open until; what I'd really like to do is to get the ZBA behind us, because they are

looking at both variances. The variances for square-footage of the lot and the lot width are variances that are consistent with every other building in the Downtown D Genesee Street area. The height issue is one that has been consistently granted, and then they have the Special Permit for the use itself. So I agree that probably what would be appropriate is to have the final approval by the Historic Commission after the ZBA decision.” Chairman Blackler said, “I think that’s perfect.”

Member Young said, “What do you mean that the height is consistently granted?” Member Ramsgard said, “The number of floors is consistently granted because it is not a unique situation. It has been granted many times before and every single one has been approved.” Mr. Eggleston said, “You have Seitz, you have Lakeview House, you have Shannon, you have Kiltz.” Member Ramsgard, “You have Rubenstein’s.” Member Neibert, “I just want to reiterate and I kind of agree with Ted’s assessment – I don’t have a problem with putting a 4th floor up there, but like 2E to me would be more appropriate because it’s less intrusive and less noticeable. I think that some type of internal lift arrangement from that 3rd to the 4th floor is what needs to be explored to do away with that shaft. I don’t care how far back you move it – getting rid of that elevator. And I don’t have a problem with the dormer. Like I say 2E is less noticeable, similar to what’s 3 or 4 buildings down; you hardly even see that up there really. You don’t even know it’s up there. And I think this if it is moved back and it’s little, it’s not going to be all that noticeable. But I do think you have to explore some kind of a lift situation from that 3rd to the 4th floor that’s going to be internal and not an elevator shaft sticking above the building.”

Member Young, “Can you do a drawing, Bob, where you’d have it set back and have it narrower and lower?” Mr. Eggleston, “Two things happen. For me to push this back further and still have a window, I now would have to bring this back; I’d either have to raise this or put a well underneath. So in other words, I can flatten out the roof in front of this so that I’d still have a window and it’s pushed back.” Member Neibert, “I don’t have a problem with that dormer; it’s 4 feet back, it slopes down, it’s the elevator shaft, not the dormer.” Member Miller, “Everybody’s against the elevator shaft here. Let’s get rid of the elevator shaft.” Member Young, “I think we should take a motion that the elevator shaft is not acceptable.” **Chairman Blackler said, “I think the motion we want here is to table action on this matter and to continue the public hearing -- until the Planning Board has had their meeting -- to our next month’s meeting by which time other problems may have been resolved. The next time we vote on something we will have more in front of us.”** Member Miller said, “I will make that motion.” Member Young said “I will second it.”

Mr. Eggleston said, “I have heard from 6 members and I just want to recap to make sure I understand where we all stand. I have Andy, Karlene, and Bev favoring D. I have Ted by letter and Dave favoring E. I have Carol favoring something less than E. And Pat, we haven’t heard from you.” Chairman Blackler said, “Mine is favoring D, and I believe there should be an elevator shaft.” Member Young said, “And why is that?” Chairman Blackler replied, “I believe that a building like this has to have elevator up to the 4th floor. All the way up to the 4th floor. And I’m one of those people who climb to the second floor of my house to go to bed, but I also have fallen twice and I don’t want to move. So I believe that people should be able to go up to the 4th floor.” [Multiple Conversations]

Member Ramsgard said, "So for preservation of the public record, the semantics of what we are talking about is the look of the elevator shaft on the exterior. We need to preserve in the public record that we are not against elevator shafts, because when someone reads this in 1,000 years, if they ever do, they will wonder why we were opposed to elevator shafts. The dialogue is appropriate to what the exterior appearance is." Mr. Eggleston asked, "Andy, one question I have because this is the second time you have stated this, is that the elevator not be visible from how far away? What is reasonable?" Member Ramsgard, "I can't give you a number right now since I haven't thought that through. I will have an opinion someday, but not sitting here." Member Young, "Does this mean that when other buildings want to do something and want to put an elevator up there, that we're going to have every building in the Village with elevator shafts?" Mr. Eggleston, "I think that's why you look at each application individually." Member Ramsgard, "And technology can be that someday maybe an elevator shaft does not need to project past the roof. And we are not opposed to elevator shafts." Member Miller said, "I am." Member Neibert, "So the question I have there are a lot of elevators in these new buildings that are going up. So what are they doing? Are they just going to the third floor, because there are no elevator shafts sticking up above the roofs on any of the other buildings?" Member Ramsgard, "I have an elevator in my building and I hid it underneath the ridge line. You can't tell that I have an elevator that serves all four floors of my building." Member Neibert, "If you can't see it then that's great." Member Ramsgard, "We are not opposed to elevator shafts." [Multiple conversations]

Chairman Blackler said, "Get out your briefs and read this. You have pictures in there too, as to what is acceptable and what looks good and doesn't affect the first building. Let's vote on the motion on the floor." The motion was repeated. By unanimous vote of the Members present in favor of the motion, the Chairman declared the motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Dundon, Clerk to HLPC