



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES (FINAL)

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 10, 2024

6:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL ROOM

CALL TO ORDER: Tamie Ehinger, Chair, called the joint meeting of the Design Review Board and Planning Board to order at 6:05 P.M.

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

ABSENT: Chris Bennett, Leslie DiCarlo, Karen Cavotta (Alternate)

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

A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

A motion was made by **Rob DuBoff** to approve the minutes from November 1, 2023, November 15, 2023, and December 6, 2023. The motion was seconded by **Tad Roemer**. **Vote: 5-0 in favor. Motion carried.**

B. POSSIBLE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

NOTE: The intent of a consent agenda is to identify any application that is “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. **#20230994**, 11 Excelsior Courtyard Marriott Signage, 11 Excelsior Ave. Architectural Review of sign package replacement within the Neighborhood Center / T-5 District.
2. **#20230995**, Hebe Spa Signage, 28 Division St. Architectural Review of new wall signage within the Urban Core / T-6 District.
3. **#20231032**, U-Me Signage and Exhaust Hood 135 Ballston Ave., Architectural Review of a new wall sign and a roof mounted exhaust hood within the Gateway Urban Commercial District

Tamie Ehinger, Chair listed the Consent Agenda items and asked if anyone from the Board or Public had any questions or comments. There were no comments or questions. **Tamie Ehinger, Chair** made a motion to approve the consent agenda items. The motion was seconded by **Rob DuBoff**. **Vote 5-0 in favor. Motion carried.**

C. DRB APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION. Note: agenda item discussion will not begin past 10:00 p.m.

1. **#20230877**, NYS Rt. 29 New Mixed-Use Development NYS Route 29. Consideration of SEQRA lead agency in regard to a new mixed-used development including multi-family, row houses, and a hotel within the Neighborhood Center / T-5 District in an Architectural Review area.
2. **#20230947**, 73 Henry St Scupper and Downspout. Architectural Review of a proposed through wall scupper and downspout within the Urban Core / T-6 District.
3. **#20230944**, 12 Ballston Ave Demolition & Redevelopment 12 Ballston Ave. Determination of Historic/Architectural Significance for an existing commercial structure within the Neighborhood Center / T-5 District
4. **#20230920**, 165 Lake Ave Porch Modification 165 Lake Ave Architectural Review of front porch modifications including stair, lattice, railing, and column replacement within the Urban Residential-3 District.
5. **#20230532**, 395 Broadway Two Story Addition 395 Broadway Historic Review of the street entrance along Broadway within the Urban Core / T-6 District.
6. **#20230992**, 140 Grand Partial Demolition and New Addition 140 Grand Ave Determination of Historic/Architectural Significance for an existing residential structure and discussion regarding proposed new additions within the Urban Residential-3 District

1. **#20230877**, NYS Rt. 29 New Mixed-Use Development NYS Route 29. Consideration of SEQRA lead agency in regard to a new mixed-used development including multi-family, row houses, and a hotel within the Neighborhood Center / T-5 District in an Architectural Review area. **Tamie Ehinger, Chair** said this application is before the board for determination of SEQRA Lead Agency. She said typically with a project of this scope and magnitude the DRB would defer lead agency status to the planning board and said unless she hears differently, she will make a motion to do that.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair regarding NYS Rt. 29, New Mixed-Use Development, made a motion to defer lead agency status to the Planning Board should they seek it. The motion was seconded by **Rob DuBoff**. **All in favor. Vote: 5-0 to approve. Motion carried.**

2. **#20230947**, 73 Henry St Scupper and Downspout. Architectural Review of a proposed through wall scupper and downspout within the Urban Core / T-6 District.

Brian Casey represented the applicant Mr. Izzo. The DRB suggested that Brian talk with the attorney for the owner next door about the possibility of running the downspout on the north wall of the north corner, which would require easement approval. Brian said there were detailed conversations and exchanges of documents between the architects, engineers and attorneys and they did not result in an agreement to go down the north side wall. The two sticking points were that 79 Henry wants several easements and encroachments on 73 Henry in exchange for allowing the downspout and the applicant wants to avoid that if possible. Brian said he may be able to get his client to agree to some of those encroachments and easements if it would result in an end to the litigation. Brian said he was advised that it will not. He said they spent the

last several weeks trying to reach an agreement and he doesn't think they will get there. Brian said the applicant is asking for approval of the pending plan to bring the downspout through the east wall of 73 Henry St. and allow it to go down into the opening that exists on the street. Brian asked if the board had any questions.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair said that Brian didn't need to explain any further. Tamie said that Brian alluded to the idea at the last meeting that the issue likely couldn't be resolved regarding the location of the pipe, which is what the DRB deemed most appropriate. The board mentioned some conditions if the pipe were to be placed on the front of the building:

- The pipe should be copper.
- A round pipe versus a corrugated pipe.
- Smaller – 4" versus what was originally proposed.

Tamie said her preference is not to have the downspout on the front of the building but if it needs to be, then she would consider moving forward if all of the conditions listed are met.

Rob DuBoff said he doesn't have a problem with the downspout being mounted on the front of the building as long as it's done in an architecturally appropriate manner. Rob said he was in New Orleans for work and took pictures of downspouts situated exactly as what the applicant is proposing. There's a scupper that comes out through the parapet wall to a leader box that leads to a pipe that goes down the front façade. Rob said he doesn't have a problem with it, it just needs to be done in a way that's sympathetic to the building. Rob said he would like to have whoever is going to install the downspout provide a sketch of where it will be located on the building (how they will cross the pilaster on the right to get to the drain), how it will exit through the parapet up above, how they will get from point A to point B, the leader box, and the materials that will be used. He agrees with the 4" round copper pipe.

Jeff Gritsavage liked the examples that showed and noted that the leader box would likely have to be custom fabricated. He agreed that the downspout needs to be round and made of copper. He said it needs to look like how it would have been done when the building was built. Jeff said he would be good with administrative approval with Rob and Tamie.

Ellen Sheehan said Rob's photos were very helpful.

Tamie Ehinger noted that the photos showed painted downspouts and that copper does eventually patina and asked what the board's feelings were on that. The board agreed to stick with the copper. Jeff noted that paint chips away but copper ages properly.

Tad Roemer asked how a leader box would fit with the pilaster on the edge of the building. **Rob** apologized to the applicant and noted that they had previously supplied a sketch of how they would place the downspout. In their sketch they showed the pipe coming out through the parapet underneath the cornice, the leader box could go right

there – above the window to the right and then come over and down the pilaster. It was agreed that the leader box should also be copper.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair opened the floor for public comment:

Javier Mendez, attorney for Places in Saratoga, LLC the owner of the adjoining building on 79 Henry St. Javier said they won't get into the 4 years of litigation that's still pending, but they do have a sense of urgency in getting the stormwater discharge issue resolved. Javier asked the board where they envision the downspout being located if it were on the north side of the wall. **Tamie** said within the area where the wall is stained from the water naturally draining at that location. Javier asked if a copper downspout would still be required. Following some discussion, the board agreed that if the pipe were on the side of the building, it could be painted instead of copper – a black anodized aluminum. **Javier** said if the downspout were to be placed within a foot of the drainpipe on the street, his client has already granted Mr. Izzo an easement to do that. It was a porch settlement that needs to be documented for the clerk, that the drainpipe would be there for Mr. Izzo's use to discharge his stormwater into that system. The board agreed that this is the more appropriate location for the downspout.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked the applicant to return to the podium. **Brian Casey** said that is a much easier solution for the applicant and asked the board what they need to move forward. It was decided that the board would approve the location and materials tonight and have the applicant submit final drawings that would be approved administratively.

There was discussion about a leader box versus a scupper and the size of the pipe to be used. Because it's less prominent on the side of the building, the pipe could be 6" instead of 4" which would accommodate more water. It was decided that a leader box would be used. The final details: round, (not corrugated) black anodized aluminum 6" pipe, one foot away, matching leader box. Tamie said if the owner prefers the copper there would be no objection from the DRB.

Rob DuBoff made a motion to approve architectural review of the proposed scupper and downspout at 73 Henry St. with the following conditions: the drainpipe to be run down the north side of the building within one foot of the existing sewer drain, materials to be non-corrugated copper or black metal 4" pipe and a copper or black metal water collection leader box to be used, details to be submitted administratively. The motion was seconded by **Jeff Gritsavage**. Discussion: Tamie said it was agreed that the pipe could be 4" or 6". Tad added that the pipe should not be painted.

All in favor. Vote: 5-0 to approve. Motion carried.

3. #20230944, 12 Ballston Ave., Demolition & Redevelopment. Determination of Historic/Architectural Significance for an existing commercial structure within the Neighborhood Center / T-5 District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair reminded the board that the applicant is before them for a determination of significance, whether there is any historical or architectural significance to the structure. Tamie said that determination will allow the proper posting to be made. The posting will be up for the allotted number of days after which demolition and/or construction can be discussed. Tamie clarified the procedure for tonight's discussion with Amanda that the applicant will provide the DRB with their thoughts and information on the historical or architectural value. Amanda said once a determination is made, the applicant can provide information on the new development if they wish.

Jonathan Haynes, Phinney Design representing Collab Development and Chipotle. Jonathan showed slides of the existing building. The site is almost completely paved all the way around the building. The building has been renovated numerous times. The ceilings have been lowered to a height that Jonathan said he can almost touch his head to it. The building has fallen into disrepair and been empty for quite a while.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair reminded the board that if they were to find there was architectural or historical significance, that doesn't necessarily mean that the building can't be demolished. There would need to be extra steps taken before demolition is discussed. If the board finds the building is not historically or architecturally significant, after the posting, they can begin discussions regarding demolition. Tamie said regarding the structure, it has been at that location for many years, but she doesn't find that there is any architectural or historical significance to the structure.

The board members all agreed with Tamie that there was no historical or architectural significance.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair made a motion to approve the Determination of Significance for 12 Ballston Ave. The DRB determines that the structure noted does not have any architectural and/or historical significance. The motion was seconded by **Jeff Gritsavage**.

All in favor. Vote: 5-0 to approve. Motion carried.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair said the applicant could highlight some of what they are proposing.

Jonathan Hayes shared some context and ideas for their proposal:

- The project is located adjacent to the bowling alley and directly across the street from Pizza Hut and McDonald's and an insurance agency directly across Ballston Ave.
- Jonathan showed sketches of the elevations which are within the UDO requirements for building height in the zone.

- Slightly sloped shed roof to pick up on some of the architectural language in the entry ways of the bowling alley.
- They looked at each façade in creating steps, transitions and finish and incorporated the required glazing and transparency.
- Painted cement board finish and brick finish on the lower back portion which ties in with some of the neighboring structures.
- To add softness to the structure they have beadboard Douglas Fir soffit and brackets and a standing seam metal roof with a dark brown finish giving it the appearance of aged patina copper.
- They created a mechanical screen on the flat roof where the equipment will be screened from view in the least noticeable position.
- The signage was designed around the structure in keeping with the new UDO requirements.
- Jonathan showed a slide of the existing structure and the proposed structure and placement of signs.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair said it seems completely appropriate. It's new construction and looks like it was built in this era. She said she likes the use of the materials – standing seam, natural cedar. It's a really attractive building! Tamie said some early general feedback from her is that they are headed in the right direction.

Ellen Sheehan said she was trying to understand the walk-up order window. Jonathan said that is gone from the plan.

Tad Roemer said he's not seeing anything he would object to he would like to know more details about where the exhaust is going, grease, etc.

Jeff Gritsavage said he likes that they developed some verticality which looks purposeful in an area where there are a lot of flat one-story buildings. He thinks the lighter fiber cement board will work. There have been issues with darker colored cement board.

Jonathan asked what the next step would be in the process for signage. Amanda said there's a property sign notice that Julia will get ready, and they can pick it up and post it. She said they have plenty of time before the next meeting on January 24th if they want to be on that agenda.

4. #20230920, 165 Lake Ave. Porch Modification. Architectural Review of front porch modifications including stair, lattice, railing, and column replacement within the Urban Residential-3 District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair noted for the record that some of these changes have already been made. **Rob DuBoff** noted that the balustrade has not been put up.

Bob Flansburg, Dreamscapes Unlimited presented photos and descriptions of the project on behalf of the applicant. He showed a photo of 165 Lake in its prior history showing the porch columns and lattice below. He said his client was not aware of architectural review as he was doing renovations and learned about it when he approached the city. He then called Bob. Bob said the columns used to be round and now they're square and need a wrap at the top and bottom if they remain square. Bob showed a photo from the front right side of the house showing how it used to look. There are stone bases under the columns that are hidden by the lattice that the applicant would like to expose. Bob said the width of the stairs hasn't really changed. Bob showed a photo of where the railing tied in. He said they won't be able to replace the railing at that height because it won't meet the current building code. Bob showed a picture of the porch as it exists today. He said the scale of the columns is like the previous columns. Bob said the applicant would like to keep the porch deck natural. The stair treads are pressure treated with PVC risers. Bob noted the exposed stone column base to the right of the porch. Bob said no railing has been installed yet. The proposed rail is 2 x 2 cedar balusters with square columns.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair noted some historic standards and guidelines as they apply to porches:

- Porch size, design and materials are integral to the style of the building.
- Frame and protect main entrances and contribute to the visual character & architectural significance of the building.
- Every effort should be made to preserve an original or historic porch – size, design, materials.
- If the porch can't be repaired and needs elements replaced due to deterioration, it should match the original in size, shape, rhythm, dimension, material & quality.

Tamie said these are City, NYS and Secretary of Interior standards for historic structures. Tamie said the DRB doesn't know what materials were there because they've already been removed without authorization. The porch materials should all be replaced in-kind. The lattice needs to be wood not PVC. The porch is a character defining feature of a house. She said this is an historic home on a very prominent street and the porch is right up to the street. Tamie said the lattice work should be removed and replaced with wood lattice. The columns should be round not square to replace in-kind what was there originally. The pressure treated treads are inappropriate and need to be replaced with a natural wood product such as cedar or mahogany. The risers also need to be wood. Tamie said the original balustrade that was removed was a full panel balustrade and that is the look that should be maintained, in her opinion. She said if it doesn't meet code, then a booster rail would allow the original size and height of the balustrade to best mimic the original that was removed.

Rob DuBoff agreed with Tamie that what is being proposed is not suitable for the architectural style of the home. The style and run of how the stairs were installed is not appropriate. Rob asked Bob if he knew the age of the balustrade that was removed. He did not. Rob said he spoke with Smanatha from Historic Preservation, and they do not have any historic photos of the house. Rob said the DRB can't really determine the historic value of the balustrade that was there and was recently replaced. **Amanda**

Tucker, Planner said she found a DRB decision from 2011 where porch work was also being done without approval, and everything was being done in-kind leading her to believe that this is historic in some way.

Jeff Gritsavage said the PVC is completely inappropriate and should be replaced with wood. He said columns need to be round and have an entasis to them. They need to have a pedestal and be created out of wood. Jeff agreed with Tamie that the booster rail for the balustrade would make it meet code. The new building down the street is not comparable to an historic home. Jeff noted that other things have been done to compromise the originality of the house but that doesn't mean it should continue. This is an important gateway to the city.

Tad Roemer acknowledged that there are a lot of nice improvements that have been made to the building, the front doors look great. Tad said he's not sure the pier was meant to be exposed because of the quality of the masonry. The columns should be round. Tad agrees with the low historic height with a booster rail on the balustrade. He said the stairs might pass if there was a really nice rail.

Ellen Sheehan said she agreed with what has been said. Ellen pointed out porches on homes in the neighborhood on Google maps. She said she wouldn't be opposed to the exposed pier if it were faced with brick/stone material.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked if there were any comments from the audience. There were none. Tamie suggested that Bob take the DRB's feedback to his client and return with some revised plans.

5. #20230532, 395 Broadway Two Story Addition 395 Broadway Historic Review of the street entrance along Broadway within the Urban Core / T-6 District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair said the applicant has been before the DRB several times and has received approval for everything except the front entrance way. They have returned with some revised plans for the civic space and sidewalk.

Brett Balzer, Balzer & Tuck Architects & Scott Lansing, Lansing Engineering presented for the applicant. Brett gave an update since the last DRB meeting on 12/6/23:

- 12/6/23 DRB final approval received – sidewalk renderings/modifications requested.
- 12/22/23 Civic space site drawings, sidewalk renderings and analysis submitted.
- 1/4/24 Jason Golub/ Commissioner of DPW submitted email in support of design.
- 1/4/24 Planning Board workshop; no concerns stated.
- 1/8/24 Call w/Susan Barden (Mike Veitch) re: additional civic space/trees.
- 1/10/24 DRB meeting to review design modifications to civic space and sidewalk.
- 1/11/24 Planning Board meeting to request Final Site Plan Approval.

Brett showed slides of what they are proposing for the sidewalk:

- From the retail to the planter is 21' (10' planter & maintain 5' sidewalk along Broadway for people getting in and out of cars).
- The stairs would be threaded into the sidewalk as it slopes from Division St. and heads south on Broadway. There will be no more than 2 steps up to the 6' wide raised sidewalk into Prime Group Holdings main entrance and the business/retail entrance (currently slated to be Prime Construction). From the toe of that step to the planter is 13'. Then 10' planter, 5' width of sidewalk.
- Slides from Washington to Division St. showing many of the sidewalk widths are less than the proposed 13 feet.
- Slide showing sidewalk widths from Adirondack Trust Bank (10'10") on Broadway south to Division St. The sidewalk from Mystic World south to Division St. is on average 12'9" and 11'9" and they are proposing 13' just across Division St.
- DRB asked the applicant to use Bluebird Motel as a point of reference and that measured 11'9".

Brett talked about the Increase in civic space: The applicant was asked if they would consider increasing their civic space by including the Rhea (business next door) planter in their scope of work, which is currently gravel at grade – no curbing, plantings or raised bed. Brett said, for the record his client is willing to do that along with street trees along Division St. (in conversation with City Arborist to determine if there's appropriate width).

Brett showed photos of the existing sidewalk and a rendering of the proposed sidewalk. Brett noted that Article 18 of the UDO, the Public Realm, talks about arterial streets in the city and how they should be designed moving forward. He specifically cited "that all development that involves new construction of a principal building or an increase in floor area of 50% or more to any existing principal building must provide for sidewalks of the minimum dimension required by this article". Brett said the minimum dimension for the sidewalk of a 4-lane, undivided arterial street, which is Broadway, is 5 feet. Brett said they are not suggesting they go to five feet but that is what's in the UDO.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked Amanda to clarify what's happening with the planning board regarding this project. **Amanda** said she spoke with Susan Barden, City Planner who said that this proposal came before the planning board as a sketch discussion and has not come back to the planning board for further discussion. The proposal will be back before the planning board tomorrow for site plan first review. Tamie noted there was a lot of discussion in the applicant's presentation about determining the width of the sidewalk and what's appropriate. She said that's not the DRB's decision, it's for the planning board to determine. Tamie said the DRB is to determine whether the steps and raised sidewalk are appropriate. Tamie said in looking at the renderings the proposed sidewalk is far less intrusive. Tamie said the DRB should consider whether it's appropriate to do and if the design is appropriate. She said in her opinion the design is sleek, elegant, and less intrusive.

Rob DuBoff asked if it was within the DRB's purview to decide the taking of public space. Amanda said it's a 3-part approval process. Because this is the actual entrance into the building it is within the DRB's purview. It also has to be approved by the planning board, and in this instance the real estate committee would offer a

recommendation to the city council who would have to make a decision as to whether or not it's appropriate. **Rob** said he tried to find precedence and context for this proposal. He found that the City Center, Adirondack Trust Bank, Adirondack Mortgage center next door, and the Wine Bar have steps that seem to encroach into the public right-of-way and asked Amanda if the steps were within their property boundaries or in the public right-of-way. **Amanda** said she wasn't certain but thought some would be within the right-of-way and are likely historic precedence. **Rob** said he doesn't find the design to be particularly appropriate and questioned whether it was necessary. **Brett** noted that the applicant's first presentation before the DRB had Prime Holdings entrance on the corner of Broadway and Division St., as it is today. They had proposed to infill that corner but keep the entrance at that location. He said the DRB and Preservation Foundation felt it was more appropriate to bring retail to that corner which moved Prime Group's main entrance further south on Broadway. Brett said they need to bring grade up to the slab of the building. The floor height slab inside the building is only at the same elevation as the sidewalk at the corner. Brett said if you enter the building at the corner and head left there's a severe slope that is not ADA compliant. Rob clarified with Brett that in order to put the stairs inside they would have to cut out the slab that's in there to accommodate that. Brett agreed. Rob said he doesn't have a problem with the 13' width but not certain about the taking of public space for the front steps. He said there must be a way to design it so it's more appropriate than what's being proposed.

Ellen Sheehan said the design makes sense and looks good but she's not sure "sleek" fits Broadway. Ellen said the north approach to the sidewalk seems more appropriate.

Tad Roemer addressed Ellen's comment and said it's not uncommon to see stairs going up to a slope. Tad asked what the existing cleared space of the sidewalk is now. Brett said from the face of the building to the planter is 16'9". They are proposing 13' not including the stairs. Tad asked if the canopy came out over the stair treads. Brett said all the canopies have gutters, but the main entrance canopy goes out 6' and the others are 4'6". Tad suggested if the stairs were not appropriate, they could create a large recess at their middle entrance like some of the other buildings on Broadway. Tad said the picture looks good and he has no real objection.

Jeff Gritsavage said he thinks the design of the sidewalk is graceful and subtle and he doesn't find it to be inappropriate and would move it forward.

Ellen Sheehan asked if there was a concern about tripping. Brett said there are visual requirements in the code regarding the stair nose – contrast in color, material, etc. to indicate that there's a step. Brett said they are proposing concrete stairs to be in line with the sidewalk. Ellen said she thought they would be granite. Brett said a granite wall was discussed previously when that was in the proposal. He said they could do granite steps which would still require the metal stair nosing. If there were granite pavers where the sidewalk bleeds into the steps, they could add granite pavers between the edge of the step and the building – open for conversation. Brett said one of the challenges is that they're heating the sidewalk, and granite steps of substantial width and depth are not as easy for the heat to come through.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair said if this design moves forward, it's her opinion the simpler the better – simple and subtle. Tamie opened the floor for public comments.

Samantha Bosshart, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation said the Foundation agrees that this proposal is less intrusive on No. Broadway. Samantha said you can't enter the building without these steps, so they should be considered part of the building. She said she didn't think it was appropriate for the applicant to take part of the public right-of-way to enter their building. It shouldn't be the City's responsibility to adjust for the applicant's floor plan because they don't want to give up floor space in their own building for their entrance. Samantha said they are concerned about the stairs becoming a skateboarding problem or a place to loiter. Who will address this if it becomes a problem? Samantha is concerned about the stairs being a tripping hazard. She said she doesn't think it's appropriate for Broadway and does not relate to any historic stairs on any building. Samantha said it has not been explained very well why the stairs must be right up against their building. If the sidewalk plan moves forward, Samantha said it should have a simple railing with simple stairs. She cautioned the DRB to think about it and mentioned that Roohan has had a problem with the arcade building where Berkshire Hathaway is located with the small step -it's been a tripping hazard.

Ellen Sheehan said she thinks they need to get the planning board's thoughts on the proposal. **Brett** offered his perception of what he heard from the planning board in October. He said the PB was aware of what was being done out in front of the building and was very well received that evening. Brett said they met with the PB the night before (workshop?) and some of the members questioned why the applicant was back when they had already said they liked the plan. Brett said the PB is aware of the civic space and the proposed changes and voiced no concerns. DPW, no problems with the project. Brett said he feels they've done their due diligence and what they could to redesign. They're trying to get to an approved place with the planning board, DRB and DPW. **Tamie** said the DRB needs to determine if it's appropriate.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked for a straw poll of the board. **Rob** said he thought they still needed approval from the Real Estate Committee. **Brett** said it's his understanding after speaking with Susan that the RE committee would be where the applicant would get an application for a license for the awnings. Amanda said it's a real estate committee that provides guidance to the City Council who ultimately makes the decision. **Rob DuBoff** said he can't support the current design. **Jeff Gritsavage** said he would move it forward. **Tad Roemer** said he would move it forward but wants the details. **Ellen Sheehan** said the applicant should wait for a full board because they are at a disadvantage tonight. Four votes would be required for approval or disapproval so there is no vote.

Brett said the applicant is going before the planning board tomorrow night and are hoping for approval so they can submit for a building permit having had DRB approval for the project. Brett asked if there could be some sort of contingency that if they submit

for a building permit and their needs to be any design changes per the DRB after the next meeting that they would comply with that. **Amanda** said that is a conversation she can have with Susan in the building department to see if that's something they would be ok with.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair said the applicant can be placed on the next DRB agenda.

6. #20230992, 140 Grand Partial Demolition and New Addition. Determination of Historic/Architectural Significance for an existing residential structure and discussion regarding proposed new additions within the Urban Residential-3 District.

Amanda distributed a letter regarding 140 Grand to the DRB.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair reminded the board that the applicant is before them for a determination of significance, whether there is any historical or architectural significance to the structure. Tamie said that determination will allow the proper posting to be made. The posting will be up for the allotted number of days (two weeks) after which demolition and/or construction can be discussed. Tamie said it's a great opportunity to provide the applicant with some initial feedback on what is being proposed. Tamie said the determination of significance doesn't necessarily mean that the building can't be demolished. There would need to be extra steps taken before demolition is discussed. If the board finds the building is not historically or architecturally significant, after the posting, they can begin discussions regarding demolition. Tamie said they've seen the house on their caravan and it's in very poor shape. She said that should not be a factor in determining significance.

Joe Snyder, applicant/owner of 140 Grand Blvd. Joe said he purchased the property in 2022. Joe said he is proposing to demolish 2/3 of the building and rebuild larger, maximizing what he can build on his lot per the zoning ordinance. Page 22 of the plan, the site map, shows the current structure that is currently over his property line. The planning department recommended that he move the structure a little. Joe said the setback is 8 feet which would destroy the historical significance of it. In his plan he's proposing to demo it and rebuild it back 12" in which would be inside the property line and would need a variance. Joe said the current footprint is 1250 sq. ft. and he's looking to expand to 1900 sq. ft. He would keep the existing footprint and expand with a square addition to the right of the buildings, by the driveway. Joe said he's happy to change anything, he's just looking for a starting point. Joe said once he rebuilds, he would like to put a curb cut on Beekman St. on the side of the addition. Joe said the duplex right now is top and bottom and he would like to do side by side with the new design. Joe showed a sketch of the proposed plan. He said he has gotten feedback from Samantha that the windows should be 6 over 6 instead of 8 over 8, the columns on the front porch should be quite a bit thicker and it would be more appropriate to have a flat, square roll-off style roof rather than a gable roof for that section. Samantha suggested that the gable roof go all the way straight across. They suggested that the two windows that are side by side be separated. Joe said he would like to remove the chimney in the back section and box in a faux chimney on the front. The front of the

house is vinyl with asbestos underneath and a wood board underneath that. Joe said he's not sure what condition it's in. Joe said they will be doing asbestos remediation and will see if they can salvage some of the wood siding. The remainder of the house would be cement board. Joe said Samantha suggested he put up trim to delineate the original structure with the additions on the driveway and Beekman side. Joe referred to the engineering report where it was stated that "much of the exterior wall framing was found to be completed with poor workmanship even for the period of construction. Much of the exterior wall framing was made over several non-continuous misaligned, randomly oriented, randomly sized wood members. Many of the floor joists are undersized, bowed, split, cracked, and had smaller pieces of wood attached to them. Several of the beams for the second floor are undersized, bowed, and damaged". Joe said the middle section is completely bowed as shown in the photo.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair said age plays a big part in determining if a house is historically significant. She said it's hard to say it's not significant if it was built long ago. Tamie said another consideration is whether the structure played a part in the history of the community, who lived there, etc. Tamie said because it was built so long ago, she does find it to be historically significant. Tamie said because the house has been compromised so many times over the years, it no longer has any architectural significance. Tamie thanked the applicant for his investment in the property and for doing what he's proposing to do to save/revise it. **Joe** said that the house dates back to the 1850's. **Amanda** added that the applicant is proposing to demolish the two rear sections of the building, so the DRB just needs to determine if those specific sections are significant. Tamie said the original part of the house is historically significant to her. The back two additions do not appear to be historic in nature or well done. She wasn't sure about the historical significance of the middle addition. **Rob DuBoff** said he would want to walk through the house before making a decision because he was unable to make the caravan.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair asked Samantha Bosshart from the Preservation Foundation to give the DRB input about the historical significance of the house. Samantha toured the house yesterday. She was able to determine that it was on the 1852 Bevin map. It does appear to have the first rear extension "L". She said on the 1866 map the "L" is flipped. Samantha said the first rear section where you see the gable end with the chimney on the west side (not entire section, was narrower) is probably historic based on the type of timber used. She thought there may have been a fire at one point because of the charred timber in that part of the building. At some point that section was extended to the east. It has the same construction as 65 Phila, awkward framing and bricks in certain things. The back chimney is diagonal which also leads Samantha to believe that the back section is historic and dates to when the building was established. Samantha said the Preservation Foundation would lean toward keeping the western portion of the first section of the building. They don't think the rear section is historically significant and has been compromised more so than the middle section.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair said that applicant has agreed to let the DRB tour the inside of the structure. She said the DRB's purview is the exterior of the house, and she would

be fine with determining the middle section not historically significant enough to officially label it that way.

Jeff Gritsavage said it looks like a lot of the architectural detailing is buried in maintenance siding and other things that were done over the years. Jeff said as far as its form it's Greek revival from the mid-19th century on a corner lot. He said it's fairly modest but at the time it was a reflection of the fact that it was a young nation where people were proud of our democracy and paid homage to the Greeks who were the first democracy. Jeff said in his view the shape of the structure has to stay. Jeff noted that the applicant's designer doesn't show anything regarding historic restoration in their portfolio on their Facebook page. Jeff said it's a defining structure at the entrance to the art district. Jeff said historic restoration would be cheaper than tearing it down and building something new. He said modern materials won't be acceptable for this structure. Jeff said he would like to see the interior.

Tad Roemer said he doesn't need to go into the building to determine that the back two portions of the building can be torn down. They are not historically significant in his opinion. Tad suggested that the applicant work with an architect that's more skilled in working with historic homes.

Ellen Sheehan said it's wonderful that they are renovating the front part of the building. She said she doesn't think the second and third parts of the building need to be saved. She doesn't find them to be historically significant.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair said the DRB won't move forward tonight because 2 of the five members present wish to tour the home before determining the significance of the middle portion of the house. Tamie provided the following feedback to the applicant:

- Windows – salvage what they can from the front. Remove the asbestos and be open to using the clapboard underneath if it's salvageable and reusable. The goal is to preserve whatever historic character is left of the house.
- New additions – fiber cement board is not inappropriate.
- The chimney in the front portion should remain. A faux chimney is not appropriate.

Joe asked for clarification regarding the new build and the property line. Amanda said she misread the plan. She said it encroaches 2.1 ft. into the right-of-way. The board said that's ok because the front portion is going to stay two feet over the property line and the new construction will be on the property line two feet back from the front. Tamie said Joe should continue to discuss this with Amanda. Tamie said delineation between an addition and a primary structure is really important, so she believes the DRB would support and encourage what Joe is proposing. She said the DRB would ask that of a typical applicant – to provide some delineations. Tamie noted to Amanda that the ZBA could ask for an advisory opinion, or she could just pass that information along. Joe supplied his contact information so he could schedule a walk-thru tour for the DRB.

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Caravan Wednesday, January 17, 2024

DRB Meeting January 24, 2024

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

There being no further business to discuss a motion to Adjourn at 9:00 p.m., was made by Rob DuBoff and seconded by Jeff Gritsavage. **ALL IN FAVOR**

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Gizzi, Recording Secretary

APPROVED 1/24/2024