



DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

MINUTES (FINAL)

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2022

6:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL ROOM

CALL TO ORDER: Tamie Ehinger, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:01 P.M.

PRESENT: Tamie Ehinger, Chair; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair; Leslie DiCarlo; Chris Bennett; Tad Roemer; Ellen Sheehan; Jeff Gritsavage

STAFF: Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, City of Saratoga Springs

A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, made a motion to approve the January 26, 2022 DRC Meeting Minutes with minor corrections. Leslie DiCarlo seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the DRC received communication this date from the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation regarding the Klein & Brontoli porch modifications at 49 Bryan Street. As a result of that communication we will pull that application from the consent agenda and place it on the regular agenda.

B. POSSIBLE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

NOTE: The intent of a consent agenda is to identify any application that appears to be "approvable" without need for further evaluation or discussion. If anyone wishes to further discuss any proposed consent agenda item, then that item would be pulled from the "consent agenda" and dealt with individually.

1. **#20211232 cb20 SIGNAGE**, 11 Federal Street, Architectural Review of a wall signage within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.
2. **#20220046 PITNEY MEADOWS SIGNAGE**, 223 West Avenue, Architectural Review of a freestanding sign, within a Planned Unit Development (PUD).
3. **#20220031 KLEIN & BRONTOLI PORCH MODIFICATIONS**, 49 Bryan Street, Historic Review of porch Modifications within the Urban Residential-2 District. ***** MOVED TO THE REGULAR AGENDA *****
3. **#20211230 TUCKER SINGLE-STORY ADDITION**, 208 Lake Avenue, Architectural Review of a single story Addition within the Urban Residential-2 District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there were any questions or comments from the Commission regarding these applications. None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on these consent agenda items. None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of cb20 Signage, 11 Federal Street; Pitney Meadows Signage, 223 West Avenue; Tucker Single-Story Addition, 208 Lake Avenue, that these applications be approved as submitted. Jeff Gritsavage seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, noted no new applications will begin after 10:00 P.M. If your application has not been called by that time it will be adjourned to the next meeting's agenda.

C. DRC APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

1. #20220031 KLEIN & BRNTOLLI PORCH MODIFICATIONS, 49 Bryan Street, Historic Review of porch Modifications within the Urban Residential-2 (UR-2) District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated correspondence received today from the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation with concerns expressed regarding the use of the type of railing proposed by the applicant for this historic structure, despite the porch itself is not historic. The consensus of the Commission the last time we reviewed this application was because the porch was historic the railings were not inappropriate. Are there any concerns regarding this application following receipt of this letter?

Tad Roemer stated he agrees with the Preservation Foundation the stars do seem out of place.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated he supports the use of the iron railings with what appears to be an existing bluestone decking and granite. Iron goes with stone; wood goes with wood in his estimation. Since this part of the building was built post 1950's or 1960's and remodeled we owe some design latitude to the applicant.

Ellen Sheehan stated she agrees with Rob.

Chris Bennett stated he agrees with Rob. The iron goes well with the bluestone and granite, and we do not have any photographic evidence of what was there. The quality of the material is there and will stand the test of time. Iron railings in a secondary structure that housed a carriage with iron, and possibly horses it is not an inappropriate material to use in a substructure.

Leslie DiCarlo stated she does not feel this is inappropriate.

Jeff Gritsavage stated it is a small expression and he has no objection.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation since this is not facing a prominent street, and an accessory structure, this is somehow being considered acceptable. This is an original carriage house built in the matching style of the house pre-1900. It was adaptively reused in the 1970's. Your design guidelines call for the railings to be in keeping with the style of the house. She is unaware of any other carriage houses particularly along North Broadway and those associated with it or off Broadway that have a wrought iron railing. They have wrought iron on their carriage railing on the inside but not on the exterior of a Queen Anne of this prominence. She is disappointed the Commission is not following the guidelines and takes specific issue with the stars which do not relate to the style of the home.

Leslie DiCarlo stated she is struggling because the whole entryway is not historic. If this is considered a new addition to the structure including a raised stone porch. Should it be considered as part of the Queen Ann Historic Building or is it a new addition.

Ms. Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation, stated she does not understand the booster railing addition. If a booster railing is required it should be simple, not ornate and should recede out of the visual impact. According to Chapter 12, any building under 3,000 sq. ft., can contain its stair guard railings as they exist.

Leslie DiCarlo state that is what she is struggling with are we looking at it as part of a historic Queen Ann building or a new addition.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she looks at this as an addition to the carriage house. There would not have been a porch there but access to the doors there. As such there is more flexibility in the use of materials.

Rob DuBoff paraphrased information from the Secretary of the Interior Standards for rehabilitation with respect to this such thing. Changes that create a false sense of history are to be discouraged and the notion that you would pull architectural details from another part of this building and incorporate them into a railing is doing that very thing.

Tad Roemer stated he totally agrees with Samantha. The stars are out of place. It would be a more cohesive building if it spoke the same language as what was already built. He has no objection to the applicant placing a booster rail.

Chris Bennett stated the booster rail was up to the building department and code regulations.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner stated the booster railing is required.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated it is unfortunate in pulling this from the consent agenda to the regular agenda that the applicant is not present. The Chair believes the applicant discussed installing a booster railing only if it was required by Code Enforcement. The Chair stated we can potentially move forward on the Bryan Street railings and the applicant can return for booster rail approval.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated since there is some resistance to the star motif, perhaps additional input from the applicant is for this application.

Chris Bennett stated the Commission must be careful not to design this project for the applicant. If it looks good, it is good and that is the simple reality.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding moving this forward with the applicant present for the application.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated based on the discussion and hesitancy of the Commission, we will table this application for this evening and request the applicant return before the Commission

2. #20210939 LASH BLVD SIGNAGE, 120 S. Broadway, Architectural Review of a freestanding sign within the Transect-5 Neighborhood Center District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this is third time the applicant is appearing before the DRC. We provided the applicant's agent with our suggestions and input. They appeared before the ZBA for required variances which were granted. They return for final approval. Has there been any changes to the application regarding the lettering?

Agent: Russ Hazen, Ray Signs, Inc.

Mr. Hazen stated at the last meeting it was suggested we have some dimension to the lettering versus flat. He has given a bit of 3-D dimension to the sign to provide a bit extra depth and the lettering will provide a halo type effect.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair stated he is opposed to the light up sign.

Tad Roemer agrees with Rob regarding the lighting of the sign.

Jeff Gritsavage stated he considers this a standard for the area.

Leslie DiCarlo stated considering the signage in this area it is appropriate.

Chris Bennett questioned the lettering on the signage.

Mr. Hazen provided some additional information regarding the signage and what it will look like.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this is the 3rd time the applicant is appearing before this Commission. The applicant has responded to each request we have made. If at this point, we are going to introduce a new issue that is difficult. The Chair does not feel that this sign in anyway is inappropriate, and the lighting is appropriate as presented.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application None heard.

Jeff Gritsavage made a motion in the matter of the Lash Boulevard Signage, 120 South Broadway application the DRC Commission issues the following decision on February 16, 2022 – Approve as submitted or shown on the attached plans. Chris Bennett seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, opposed; Chris Bennett, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 6-1

3. #20211224 SPENCER CONDOMINIUMS METAL PARTITION, 55 Phila Street, Historic Review of a metal Partition within the Transect6 (T-6) Transect-6 District. *****TABLED NO REPRESENTATION PRESENT*****

4. #20220036 228 CAROLINE WINDOW MODIFICATIONS, 228 Caroline Street, Historic Review of window modifications within the Urban Residential-3 District.

Applicant: Martha McGregor

Mrs. McGregor stated they are proposing removal and replacement of several windows in the addition portion of their home. A visual of the two windows they are requesting to replace, and a window to be removed and replaced with siding. Specifications regarding the Pella Reserve window choices were provided.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, noted on the east elevation the applicant is replacing a vinyl window with an aluminum clad window. The second window you are proposing to remove in its entirety and toothing it in with siding. The Chair reviewed the

Standards and Guidelines for windows in Historic homes. The Chair questioned if the window which is proposed to be removed original to the home.

Mrs. McGregor stated probably yes.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated if that is an original opening it would be inappropriate to fill it in. The original opening should remain as it is in size and shape. It is required in our guidelines and standards. There has been flexibility in that dependent upon circumstances. The Chair is unsure if it will apply in this case. It would be helpful if the applicant could go back and determine if they were original to the home.

Mrs. McGregor stated she misspoke. The first part of the home ended before the kitchen. The window we are proposing to remove is in an addition to the home sometime after it was built in 1906. This is visible from the basement where the addition can be fully seen. She is unsure of the exact date.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated in instances we have allowed an applicant to remove an original window. We have asked the applicant to provide some sort of definition or architectural feature to indicate that the window was there. Tothing it in and making it seamless is not something we would typically approve.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair stated that is not an original window. Secondly, the applicant is proposing casements which we typically do not allow in a historic home.

DISCLOSURE:

Tad Roemer disclosed his home is about 501 ft. from this property.

Tad Roemer stated that little window on this elevation does not belong there, and he would like to see it toothed in. It is not aligned with the windows above it. It would be fine to remove it and toothed it in. The windows scheduled for replacement will they remain the same size.

Mrs. McGregor stated they will be a bit larger in size. Double hung will be replaced with double casement, which is easier to open over the kitchen sink.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the double hung window is to be replaced with a double hung casement window.

Jeff Gritsavage stated this house has some colonial revival and some Victorian elements. He is unsure why the applicant is looking for more dividers in the windows since he is unsure if it goes with the original architecture.

Mrs. McGregor stated they are proposing to replace a one over one vinyl window with a two over two casement window because that is what remains in other parts of the kitchen. The original home was built in 1906 with the kitchen added on later. The last addition was in 2006. Mrs. McGregor spoke about the windows in the home somewhat a mixture but mostly two over two.

Leslie DiCarlo stated there is a 4 over 1. Are you leaving that window?

Mrs. McGreggor stated they are keeping that window.

Ellen Sheehan stated she is fine with a casement window since it reads as a double hung and is not original to the house.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she agrees with Ellen, knowing that the window is not original to the house makes the difference.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated he believes the only two original openings are the two ganged windows and the one above those to the right.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation stated we reviewed this application. We do not have issue with the removal of the window because we don't feel it is original. We do not have concern regarding the two casement windows proposed. This home has had many changes made to it.

Ellen Sheehan made a motion in the matter of the 228 Caroline Street, 228 Caroline Street application the DRC Commission issues the following decision on February 16, 2022 – Approve as submitted or shown on the attached plans. Tad Roemer seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

5. #20220082 65 PHILA EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS, Historic Review of exterior modifications within the Urban Residential-4 (UR-4) District.

DISCLOSURES:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair disclosed that she is a member of the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation.
Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair disclosed that he is a member of the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation.
Leslie DiCarlo disclosed that she is a member of the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation.

Applicant: Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation, Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director

Agent: Matt Hurff, Frost Huff Architecture

Ms. Bosshart stated the SSPF purchased this property in May of 2021. Their goal is to remove all the challenges associated with this building, environmental remediation, and structural to complete the exterior of the building for a future buyer to invest in the interior of this single-family home. A visual of the property was provided. The previous owners removed the original porch railings and installed those as seen in the photograph without DRC approval. We have completed a thorough window survey. All the window sashes, except for two windows exist, their intent is to restore all the windows. Two-bathroom windows which are not original to the house and exist on the east elevation. A standing seam metal roof will be installed which is a replacement in kind.

Mr. Hurff stated this is largely restoration. To the greatest extent possible all the clapboards will be retained. All the existing windows which exist will be repaired. The existing porch railings and columns inside the house will be restored and replaced on the exterior of the building. The only departure the Commission should be aware of is the railing is very short, so we may have to return, depending on how the building inspector reads it for a booster railing. The east wing has a shed roof which sheds to the north, and we will have to rebuilt that roof out because it is completely rotted. In doing so we intend to lower it about 6-8 inches. It will not impact the visual from the street but will move the roof away from the original windowsills on this elevation to mitigate water damage. The rear of the building is currently painted OSB. We will remove that, replace with new sheathing, and new fiber cement panels. It is not intended as a permanent solution. It is our opinion that whoever purchases this property will likely put an addition onto the home.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated Kudos to the SSPF. We are aware the changes you are proposing, and the entire city applauds your efforts in restoring this very important building. There were some questions regarding a curb cut and the use of a fiber cement product as a temporary solution. The Chair stated the standards and guidelines and the original façade to

the building even temporary should typically be a natural material. Due to the visibility of this elevation and the temporary nature the organizations intent to sell the Chair feels she can move forward with this.

Jeff Gritsavage stated increasing the pitch of the roof is not going to make a difference because of the parapet wall.

Tad Roemer questioned what the DRC would be approving.

Ms. Bosshart stated they will be removing two-bathroom windows which are not original to the home. That would be a change. The lower pitch of the roof would be a change. We would be changing the porch in theory but using the original columns, which is a change. We are restoring all the windows but will replicate two new windows to match those that we do not have sashes for, and the use of fiber cement panels in the rear.

Mr. Hurff stated the standing seam roof will be replaced in kind, and the tung and groove deck will be replaced in kind on the front porch as well.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated he assumed everything will be replaced in kind. The two missing wood windows will be replaced in kind that match what is found in the house. The front porch balustrade will remain, missing pieces will be replaced in kind the same as the floor. You are fixing and repairing what is there and replacing in kind what is there.

Ellen Sheehan questioned on the west elevation the decision to keep the six over six windows. She also questioned the corbels.

Ms. Bosshart stated the house was originally built in 1851. It was built in the Greek Revival style. The six over six windows are most historic and original. It was heavily renovated 1870-s in the Italianate Style which is why we are keeping the six over six and the two over two. All the corbels will be replaced all the way around the house.

Tad Roemer questioned the mixed use of six over six and two over two windows.

Ms. Bosshart stated they are because it tells of the revolution of the building. We are not removing windows we are refurbishing and replacing two windows to match those which were completely rotted. Total of 27 windows, 25 exist. The front door will be retained and restored.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application. None heard.

Ellen Sheehan made a motion in the matter of the application of 65 Phila Street Exterior Modification. 65 Phila Street, the DRC Commission issues the following decision on February 16, 2022 – Approve as submitted or shown on the attached plans. Leslie DiCarlo seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, opposed; Chris Bennett, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

6. #2011223 73-75 BALLSTON AVENUE EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS, 73-75 Ballston Avenue, Architectural Review of exterior modifications within the Urban Residential-3 (UR-3) District.

Applicant: Shelters of Saratoga

Agent: George Olsen, Olsen Associates

Mr. Olsen stated they are assisting Shelters of Saratoga who purchased the motel and hospitality house/office for the motel. A visual of the property site was provided. We are keeping the house as it exists with the color and trim. We are working with the State for funding. There are issues with the window and egress so, we will be enlarging four windows and changing some with energy efficient windows as well as the front and rear doors. The house is a mixture of stone, shakes and some wider trim. Around the back houses an old porch which is enclosed. There appears to be windows, but they are all covered with dry wall and never really worked. A prefabricated cement porch and stairs provide entry with an aluminum railing attached. We are required to provide handicap accessibility and we are proposing a lift in this location, extending the porch roof across moving and widening the door with a gable end roof. The lift will be installed in this location. A rendering was provided noting the siding will be matched, a gable end will be added, and we will keep the location of the window as shown. The two windows on the front and rear elevations will be larger for egress. The openings will stay the same we will raise the head of the window about 9 inches. All the decking material is Trex, and fascia and colors will match the existing. Photographs of the existing motel were provided. It is a mixture of concrete block and stucco and on plywood in others. It is in good shape, and we are pretty much keeping the motel the way it is. We are moving several doors as well as adding several doors for better continuity and use of the space. We will use new material to mimic the stucco which remains on the building. We are replacing the asphalt shingles on the roof of the motel to match what currently exists on the house. Colors will also match the house. We will paint the existing stucco and doors and windows. Color samples were provided to the Commission. Mr. Olsen reviewed all elevations for the Commission, noting all doors and windows will be replaced with newer more efficient models in the same openings. We are still reviewing lighting for the motel. Windows are Marvin Elevate, fiberglass exterior wood interior windows.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this is wonderful to see an investment being made into this building and motel. Nothing seems inappropriate with the changes or proposed materials. This portion of the project seems straightforward. The Commission does not have purview over color in this area. The palette chosen is very nice and works.

Jeff Gritsavage questioned if any thought was given to changing the treatment on the gable, we are looking at the seams.

Tad Roemer questioned if this would have central air?

Mr. Olsen stated they all have split systems and they will be located on the alley side of the building around the rear.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated this is a nice 1960-s motel. He is glad they are keeping the stucco. It would be nice to treat the gable differently rather than continue the cement board all the way up. Perhaps a cement shingle to separate it. Why the awning windows versus casement.

Mr. Olsen stated because these will only swing out about 5 inches and there is an issue with leaving the windows open causing rain damage and they are in a walking path.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, questioned the new fiber cement product on the end gable. Does it go all the way down to the end?

Mr. Olsen stated down to about 8 inches above the grade. There is a concrete wall.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated there is some consensus regarding the motel gable end and perhaps a different type of treatment. Simplicity works in this case.

Mr. Olsen stated they will send the Commission several iterations of what could be done for the Commission review and input.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we can now move onto the house, which is in an Architectural Review District, but the home is historic. We hate to see historic windows go and based on our standards and guidelines if there is any way to prevent that we prefer it. The Chair understand the need for egress, but does it need to be on the front façade?

Mr. Olsen stated the windows become a second means of egress and these are bedrooms. The other option was to widen the windows. Raising them 9 inches it doesn't seem to effect it as much. Widening it just did not look right.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner questioned if why the egress requirements were being enforced and not being considered as a pre-existing non-conforming use.

Mr. Olsen stated it currently is used as a residence, but it is mainly NYS which is providing funding requires egress windows.

Discussion ensued regarding egress windows on the front and rear of the structure, state requirements for egress windows versus nonconforming structure and type of window proposed.

Jeff Gritsavage noted the HVAC system proposed will eliminate the need for window air conditioning units. Geometrically it is a graceful solution, and it does not make the building disproportionate.

Mr. Olsen stated that will be eliminated.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, questioned if there are units available where the entire window can be pushed out for egress.

Mr. Olsen stated he is unsure if those are available.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair requested a review of the rear elevation.

Mr. Olsen reviewed the rear elevation and existing porch. They are proposing to re-side to match the existing house. Asphalt shingles on the roof, install the gable end porch which will cover the stairs and the handicap lift. Everything will match the existing.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application. None heard.

Leslie DiCarlo made a motion in the matter of the 73-75 Ballston Avenue Exterior Modifications, 73-75 Ballston Avenue, the DRC Commission issues the following decision on February 6, 2022 – Approve with the following conditions – the applicant will provide sketches of the south gable of the motel. Applicant will return for lighting approval. Ellen Sheehan seconded the motion.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, opposed; Chris Bennett, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor

MOTION PASSES: 7-0

7:55 P.M. The Board recessed.

8:00 P.M. The Board reconvened.

NOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, recused from the following application.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair assumed the duties of the Chair.

Karen Cavotta, Alternate joined the Commission for this application.

7. #20220006 700 NORTH BROADWAY DETERMINATION OF ARCHITECTURAL/HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE,
700 North Broadway, Historic Review determination of architectural historical significance and possible review of the demolition of a single-family residence and accessory structure and proposed plantings over 3' within the front yard setback within the Urban Residential-1 (UR-1) District.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, read into the record the Demolition Ordinance 7.4.11 – The Commission shall determine whether the proposed structure has architectural or historical significance. “Significance” includes having particular important associations within the context of the architecture, history or culture of Saratoga Springs or region and may include listing as “contributing” on the State and National Register of Historic Places.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, continued with additional information regarding a non-contributing structure within a National Register District. Regarding the application for demolition, the Commission is tasked with determining whether the structure located at 700 North Broadway has either historic or architectural significance. The applicant will present their application for demolition and their thoughts on the property determination of architectural or historical significance. We will then discuss the application and have public commentary. There may be a determination this evening on whether the structure has actual historic or architectural significance. If the Commission determines the structure does not have either historic or architectural significance, we will then discuss the application for demolition and allow further public comment. The demolition of the structure will be a separate vote, judged on its own merits and based on the information the applicant has provided to the DRC.

Agent: Tony Adang, Attorney

Mr. Adang stated this is a demolition request for the property located at 700 North Broadway. The premises consists of two buildings. One principal building on Broadway and a detached garage connected by a covered walkway. A visual of the property was provided from all elevations. The purpose of the application is for a demolition permit to demolish both structures. There is no plan at this point for replacement of a structure. The plan currently is to surround the lot both on Broadway and First Street with Spruce Trees. Photographs were provided to the Commission. These are currently on the adjoining lot. In researching the property in the City of Saratoga Springs Building Department there is no certificate of occupancy for having been issued for 700 N. Broadway. There are no plans, and the building file is bereft of any information. The only information found was a structure at 29 First Street which has since been demolished.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated he assumes the applicant and applicant's agent feel this structure has neither architectural nor historical significance.

Mr. Adang stated it certainly has no historical significance according to the Building Department it may have been constructed in 1965 but that is questionable. Based on that it does not have any historical significance. In terms of architectural significance, it represents a significant departure from most of the structures on North Broadway and we don't feel it has neither historical nor architectural significance.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated this property is located in the Broadway Historic District which was last surveyed in 1992 and at the time the survey indicated while this house fell within that survey district, it was a non-contributing structure to that district as it did not fall into the period of significance which ends in 1920, keeping in mind that the survey was done in 1992 when that house was 27 or 28 years old. Now, thirty years have passed since 1992. If the survey was done today, would thoughts be different regarding historical or architectural significance of the structure. Should we reach out to the State Historic Preservation Office and ask them for a determination of eligibility now that 30 years have passed since this district was last surveyed. Do they feel the structure has historic or architectural significance and whether this would be eligible to be listed individually on the National Register?

Chris Bennett stated this structure is unique, in both style and design. It is also represents a period in 1960s which is a pinpoint of a well-designed piece of architecture, with some gothic details.

Ellen Sheehan stated she does not see any downside to asking SHPO to weigh in. Mainly because once this building is gone there is no going back. We need to dot every I and cross every t to assure that we get it right. Having SHPO weigh in is a good idea.

Jeff Gritsavage, he feels this is a French eclectic with a bit of new formalism. We can debate that but once it's gone its gone. This is unique and the façade is important. It is a snapshot of the time in 1969. He does not have an issue with demolishing the garage or the walkway.

Karen Cavotta, Alternate, stated whoever this architect was did build a well-designed building. It was thought through given a postmodern feel with other elements added. It does make an impact on North Broadway; it is unique and represents the history of that street. We must be careful in determining what is part of our history we are okay with losing and what part we are not.

Leslie DiCarlo stated she agrees with what has been said. Once the building is gone its gone. It is unique and they used quality materials and deserves more thought.

Ellen Sheehan questioned why the structure is being torn down.

Mr. Adang stated it is what the applicant is requesting, and he does not know why.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding the architectural or historical significance of the structure.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on this application.

Samantha Bosshart Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation stated this house was architect designed by William Cooper of Amsterdam, NY constructed in 1965. This falls into the Neo-Eclectic Neo-French Style. The most characteristic feature of this style is the steeply pitched hip roof, doors and windows extend into the cornice line and frequently have round or segmented arches above. It is very representative of the 1960's. The Foundation does not want to see this building lost to an empty lot. More research could be done on the architecture and architect as well as other significance related to this structure. The Foundation also strongly objects to the planting of a privacy tree hedges that is not in keeping with the Historic streetscape of North Broadway. The detached garage and the walkway are significant. They read as an important combination and period of homes being developed in the 1960's.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, suggested additional research could be conducted. I do not know how quickly SHPO will respond to our request.

Ms. Bosshart, SSPF stated once a request is made, they are required to respond within 30 days.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding the tree buffering proposed on the site.

Ellen Sheehan stated according to the Secretary of the Interior Standards for historic properties does not recommend introducing plant materials that are visually incompatible to the site or that alters or destroys the historic districts patterns or use. Those trees would.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated they will request information from SHPO for determination of eligibility, and following that receipt of information review and discuss the information and place the application back on the agenda. At that time, we will provide further commentary on that and discuss the four criteria the National Park Service has established in determining if a structure is historic. We will review that and make a determination at that time.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, resumed her position on the Commission.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, resumed his position on the Commission.

Karen Cavotta, Alternate, exited the meeting.

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Design Review Commission Caravan, Wednesday, March 2, 2022, at 5:00 P.M.

Design Review Commission Meeting, Wednesday, March 9, 2022, at 6:00 P.M.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

There being no further business to discuss Tamie Ehinger, Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Buzanowski
Recording Secretary

Approved: March 24, 2022