



DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

MINUTES (FINAL)

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 2022

6:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL ROOM

CALL TO ORDER: Tamie Ehinger, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

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

Karen Cavotta, Alternate

ABSENT: Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair

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

A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion to approve the May 25, 2022, DRC Meeting Minutes with amendments 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; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Karen Cavotta, Alternate, abstained

MOTION PASSES: 6-0

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. **#20220556 THE CHAIN AWNING,** 11 Spring Street Historic Review of awning modification within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.

2. **#20220558 TAQUERO SIGNAGE,** 68 Putnam Street, Architectural Review of a new wall sign within Transect-6 Urban Core District.

3. **#20220565 RHEA SIDEWALK CAFÉ,** 389 Broadway, Historic Review of a new sidewalk café within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.

4. #20220567 SAPPHIRE SPA BOUTIQUE SIGNAGE, 219 Broadway, Historic Review of a new wall sign within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.

5. #20220564 STUDIO 219 SIGNAGE, 219 Broadway, Historic Review of new wall signage within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.

6. #20220486 457 BROADWAY EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS, 457 Broadway, Historic Review of entrance modifications to a mixed-use structure within the Transect-6 Urban Core 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 who wishes to comment on these consent agenda item. None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of **The Chain Awning, 11 Spring Street; Taquero Signage, 68 Putnam Street; Rhea Sidewalk Café, 389 Broadway; Sapphire Spa Boutique Signage, 219 Broadway; Studio 219 Signage, 219 Broadway; 457 Broadway Exterior Modifications, 457 Broadway,** that these applications be approved as submitted. Leslie DiCarlo seconded the motion.

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

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Karen Cavotta, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

C. DRC APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

1. #20220482 75 CLINTON STREET ROOF MOUNTED SOLAR, 75 Clinton Street, Historic Review of roof Mounted solar panels within the Urban Residential-3 District.

Agent: Loreen Harvey, Kasselmann Solar

Ms. Harvey stated their proposal is to install 36 panels on the home at 75 Clinton Street. A visual of the proposed array was provided to the Commission.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated when solar panels are being proposed on a Historic Home the DRC must ensure that those solar panels preserve the existing character of the historic home. Therefore, we must ensure **that these solar panels are not visible from the front façade.** The Chair requested photographs of the home from a block away as well as visuals from the street. We have not allowed any panels on the **front façade.** In terms of the conduit, it should be painted out to match the home.

Ms. Harvey stated they intended to paint the conduit.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated as a reminder to the Commission we have consistently not approved applications for solar panels on the front facades of historic homes or if the panels are visible from the street.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding the solar panel installation.

Jeff Gritsavage stated what is the applicant hoping to achieve through this installation. These panels could be manufactured and have a more efficient exposure than these different angles. These are not necessarily at the optimum angle and there are trees blocking these panels. It will save money, but he is not sure this is making the best use of these panels.

This is an iconic piece of Saratoga architecture. He provided information regarding energy in NY State. Situationally this just might not be an appropriate use for this home. There may be other options.

Chris Bennett spoke regarding the placement of the solar panels and the running of the conduit and the possibility of the conduit being better placed. He does not feel many of the solar panels will be seen.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the DRC's job here is to review the exterior changes.

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

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation stated this is an important building and the concern is the visibility. We have stated this in our correspondence and email. It is difficult since it is a corner building.

Jeff Gritsavage noted that the trees on the property are deciduous, and, in the winter, the solar array will be very visible.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated what the Commission is going to need to see are photographs and images from different perspectives through the neighborhood, looking up from the street. On those roofs we will need to see the mock panels to see their location.

Ms. Harvey stated she will speak with her client regarding options.

2. #20220262 29 MADISON AVENUE ACCESSORY STRUCTUER ADDITION, 29

Madison Avenue,

Consideration of an Advisory Opinion to the ZBA regarding the Historic review of mass, scale and

general design of a proposed addition to an existing carriage house within the Urban Residential-1 District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this application is before the DRC for an Advisory Opinion to the ZBA. The applicant's agent appeared before the Commission at a previous meeting we requested to return with a revised plan. The applicant's will appear before the DRC for a full review.

Agent: Peter Urban, Balzer Tuck Architects

Mr. Urban stated following the last appearance before the DRC there were concerns regarding mass and scale. We collaborated with the client trying to reduce the mass and scale of the project and have returned with a workable solution. In studying the neighborhood context, we removed a full garage at the first level and kept habitable space above since they work from home. We have reworked the project and produce a scheme which would provide more of a carport. This reduced the surface square footage by 30%. It does reduce the overall size of the addition while still maintaining the needs

of the client for workspace on the second level. A concern was raised regarding the possibility of lowering the roof. In keeping that gambrel roof form to complement the existing carriage house, we were unable to lower the roof while still providing adequate head space in that area. To lower the roof, we would need to consider a sloped pitched roof or just a gable which would not match the existing historical context of the carriage house

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated in reviewing the mass and scale of the carriage house, we felt the addition was a little too large and heavy. We made recommendations and you have returned with a revised plan. We appreciate the surface footprint has been reduced. However, the Chair stated that her initial concern still exists. The roof line is just so heavy and overwhelming. Our design standards and guidelines indicate that any additions to a historic building should be much smaller in scale than the primary structure to assure that they are distinguished. We do not want to take away any of the character defining features of the original structure.

The Chair stated she recognizes the challenges that the applicant has internally in designing this. However, the Chair feels that the roof line is still too heavy and massive. In this structure you may have to consider an alternative roof style.

Again, because these two structures should be distinguishable, this is not inappropriate.

Tad Roemer questioned if the gambrel roof would work if you shrunk the north, and south dimension if **the front façade of the carport** were pushed back a bit.

Mr. Urban stated because it is not the same width as the east elevation and the north they do not align. There is a shallower slope in this area as well.

Tad Roemer stated it would be even better if the north façade, the blank façade was pushed back a bit, 240 inches is a big car. Upstairs houses a large powder room. You could sacrifice a bit and still make this work. The dormers help.

Mr. Urban provided a visual of an example across the lane from this home. This is an undersized lot for this area.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated her concern all along was the heavy roof line. In terms of aesthetics the roofline while still massive and inappropriate as compared to the primary structure this works better. The roofline now in the revision is more exaggerated.

Karen Cavotta, Alternate, stated she likes the openness of this, especially after seeing the other structure. It makes her want to read this instead of a roof but continuing it as a wall. A suggestion was made regarding having the main body of it appear to be the back of it and the gambrel just be pushed forward. Where you have the dormer could that be a straight wall with a roof.

There is a possibility of lightening up the roof.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked the Commission if they felt the roof appears too heavy for the structure.

Chris Bennett stated what the architect has done is heading in the right direction, but it is still large. It is far better than what was initially presented. The roof in relationship to the original structure is still large.

Jeff Gritsavage stated this does address the concerns we had. He understands wanting the roof to look lower, but it may not be possible with the gambrel. This is a graceful solution to our concerns, and he would be fine with it.

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

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation stated as submitted in their letter they appreciate the dormers being added. It is a nice change. That mass on top of the carport, the supports do not match the addition on the second floor. The columns are too tiny, and the Foundation felt that the garage gave better balance to large addition. The example across the alley has a large setback, making it distinct from the original. The issue with this is there is only a foot setback and appears as if there is no setback at all for the addition. Design guidelines state to differentiate from the original structure is to have a greater setback **from the primary façade or to have a reduced roofline**. Overall, we felt that the garage looked better. **Also reuse of the original windows on the east façade of the garage be incorporated into the addition.**

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, questioned the architects on the Commission regarding changing the shape of the roof would reduce the mass of the project.

Discussion ensued among Karen Cavotta and Tad Roemer regarding changing the roofline. Gambrel roofs always look larger. If it is setback, that would help.

Leslie DiCarlo stated the gambrel roof ending without continuing makes it look lopsided. She agrees that the carport is a nice idea, but the garage looks better. Increase the size of the dormer to continue the roofline east to west just a bit so that it does not end at the peak facing north.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the applicant will return before the DRC for a full review. This is again an Advisory Opinion to the ZBA regarding the mass and scale and if it is appropriate. It appears as if everyone is struggling with the mass of the roofline, something needs to be done. There have been ideas suggested. As it is presented now the opinion, we would be providing would not be favorable and that not the mass and scale are inappropriate for an addition to a historic carriage house. As you have requested previously, we could hold off on the Advisory Opinion and provide you with additional time to revise the plan prior to our issuance of an Advisory Opinion.

Mr. Urban stated he would request the ability to return before the DRC once again prior to the issuance of an Advisory Opinion.

3. #20220217 17 PARK PLACE SECOND PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE, 17 Park Place, Consideration of an

Advisory Opinion to the ZBA regarding the Historic review of mass, scale, and general design of a

proposed two family second principal structure within the Urban Residential-4 District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this application is before the DRC for an Advisory Opinion to the ZBA on the proposed carriage house. At this time, we can also provide feedback on the addition to the primary structure. This application will return before the DRC for a full review.

Applicant: Chris LaPointe

Mr. LaPointe stated they are intending to build a 2500 sq. ft. main house and a second principal structure with two units. We received correspondence from the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation which we will address. The single-family home we are proposing is at the corner of Regent and Park and the secondary principal structure is fronting on Park Place. The driveway on Park Place has been installed, we have an easement for this, and this is the only driveway associated with this project. We are proposing an attached garage and we were informed that this does not fit in the character of the neighborhood. Every house on the east side of Regent Street, which is where we are facing has an attached garage. We are proposing a side load garage. which was a recommendation from the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation, and not having the garage front on Park Place will satisfy the requirements of the Planning Board to be 100 ft. from the curb cut.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, requested to see the elevations of the second principal structure, which has no garages proposed there is simply parking out front.

Mr. LaPointe stated they have an easement on the driveway associated with 21 Park Place. There are three parking spaces allocated for the secondary principal structure.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the change in vocabulary from carriage house to secondary principal structure has made a difference. In attempting to build a carriage house the standards and guidelines would be quite different in terms of what would be expected.

Ellen Sheehan spoke regarding the parking location for the secondary principal structure, the driveway as well as the location and siting of the garage, which entails a large portion of the frontage. In reviewing the comments of the Planning

Boards regarding density, their concerns were legit. Her main concern is all the parking being visible as well as covering much of the landscape with all these grand homes surrounding you and the beautiful trees. She feels this is a problem. She also mentioned the proximity to the street the main house is proposed at. Most of the houses on Regent Street is setback. You have beautiful trees on the property which I am assuming you would like to keep.

Mr. LaPointe spoke regarding the house placement and the stairs noting they are approximately 16 ft. from the street.

The trees were a major consideration during the design process. We want to save as many trees as possible. The front porch area will be on piers to avoid the root system of the tree. The garage is reconfigured to avoid a tree in that location. There will be only one tree needed to be removed for construction.

Ellen Sheehan spoke regarding the two-car garage proposed and feels that a one car garage would suffice.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, questioned if the ZBA would place a condition on the approval to save the tree.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated it is possible the ZBA could place a condition on the resolution which notes the trees to be saved.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we are being asked our opinion on the mass and scale of the two-family secondary principal structure.

Leslie DiCarlo questioned the required parking for the secondary primary structure.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated in the UR-4 District it is 1½ spaces per unit.

Leslie DiCarlo also questioned how the secondary principal structure would be oriented. Will it have a separate address off Park Place and be oriented towards Park Place?

Mr. LaPointe stated it will be oriented to Park Place. A visual was provided to the Commission.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this application will return before the DRC for a full review. The Chair is looking at the proposed materials and style of the two-family structure. They seem appropriate.

Mr. LaPointe questioned the Commission regarding returning before the DRC for full review. They are not in a Historic District, and it was his understanding that they only required an Advisory Opinion.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated that was a condition of approval on the Site Plan Review, noted a full review under the Architectural Guidelines by the DRC.

Karen Cavotta, Alternate, questioned what information the Commission was required to comment on for the Advisory Opinion.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated what was requested of the Commission was general appropriateness, location of driveways, mass, and scale as well as any other aspects as the DRC sees fit on the entire project.

Karen Cavotta, Alternate, stated she is concerned regarding the mass and form of how the main house is addressing the corner. Whenever you have a corner lot, to give the illusion of two fronts, because you do not want to turn your back on either of those streets. She suggested they be cautious about the garage and consideration given to pushing it back. In the elevation off Regent Street, there are interesting windows, but it still feels like we are looking at the side or back of the house. How you address that corner will be particularly important. Suggestions were provided to the applicant.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding street orientation and should the main house front on Park Place or Regent Street. The secondary primary structure should front on Park Place.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated the narrower side of the lot should be the front.

Chris Bennett stated he agrees with Karen regarding the property having two fronts. The entire main structure does need further design work.

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

Stephen McIntyre, the applicants are his children. He understands what the DRC is saying. He agrees there is a lot on this lot, however, this is a massive lot. They are looking for the income from the rental of the secondary principal structure to assist them living on this street in the house they are proposing.

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation stated she appreciated the property owners meeting with her. What was previously proposed for the site was much larger. She still struggles with the attached garage, and it should not be fronting on Park Place. It is a challenge for them to have their frontage on Regent because of the huge setback which is already a precedent on Regent Street. It does give the appearance of two driveways. The second principal structure is fine with mass and scale, but it still looks subservient to the main house and is giving a narrative and its design looks like a mini house. It is not. If it really looked like a two-family house facing Park Place and a driveway next to it, it would look like it was its own piece. Now, it looks like you have a main principal structure, With two driveways.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated looking at the mass and scale of the second primary structure, it is not inappropriate for this area and location. The sizing of a two-family home as it is presented now, the roofline and the fenestration seems appropriate. The Preservation Foundation is suggesting that a larger secondary principal structure would be appropriate.

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation, stated she is not saying significant larger, but the design with board and batten and these shed dormers should not mimic a carriage house.

Jeff Gritsavage stated the site plan is fragmented. You are carrying design details with the gables and the board and batten from one structure to the other. Yet, the main house turns it back on the second primary structure. This could be more creatively oriented. I know you want to use this easement and driveway and do not want to give that up. If the second primary structure were pushed up against the driveway and you shared the driveway, this would function as two properties. It is a separate structure with a separate function and should have a different architectural language. There is asphalt all over the place. Apparently, you do not want to share your driveway with your tenants. This needs a little more creative thought and less meaningless patches of greenspace and a little less asphalt. It needs to be reworked.

Mr. LaPointe questioned if the additional setbacks suggested could be forwarded to the ZBA requesting additional relief.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated sharing a driveway would have been appropriate for a carriage house. If we are looking at two separate structures and want to emphasize that, would sharing that driveway be appropriate.

Tad Roemer suggested making this a carriage house and accommodating all the parking underneath.

Discussion ensued regarding the suggestions made by the DRC and what that would entail for the applicant and the site.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, questioned if the Advisory Opinion to the ZBA, if everyone should agree that we could comment and state we feel that the mass and scale of this second principal structure is not inappropriate. However, we suggest that the applicant look at relocating parts of their proposal to accommodate additional greenspace.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner stated she felt it was important for the DRC to give more specific recommendations to the ZBA especially if the Board is comfortable going forward with moving the second principal structure closer to the lot line. Because it is a principal structure it would have to abide by principal setbacks and accessory setbacks. If the Board is okay with it being closer to the property line that would be important to add.

Leslie DiCarlo stated she was thinking along the same lines as Tad. What if you made it a carriage house and attached the garages? How would that affect the setbacks.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated it still would be a principal structure because it would have a dwelling unit attached to it.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we have determined this is called a second primary structure not a carriage house. Have the garages attached to the second principal structure with dwelling units above allowing for more greenspace. Having it appear to be a carriage house with first floor parking. Then it becomes a true carriage house.

Discussion continued among the Commission regarding the Advisory Opinion to the ZBA and the wording of such.

Karen Cavotta, Alternate stated the applicant stated if the two-car garage becomes absorbed into the carriage house, The doors to the garage could be facing Park Place as a carriage house so the large, paved area between the two structures could be eliminated. That is another advantage along with reclaiming more greenspace between the structures. This eliminates the massive driveway between the structures.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated if the Commission were to provide the ZBA with an Advisory Opinion indicating that the secondary two-family principal structure as presented the mass and scale is not inappropriate. However, we strongly feel that a reconfiguration of the lot should be reconsidered. Specifically, that the more appropriate configuration would be to have these two families second principal structure be a real carriage house containing the parking for the principal structure.

Jeff Gritsavage stated if you move the carriage house over it will partially block the view of the parking from 21 Regent Street, so it does have a benefit.

Chris Bennett stated the carriage house could become a much larger structure and may need to return for another Advisory Opinion.

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

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation, stated that was the intent of their letter. The narrative stated either be a carriage house with parking provided in it, or not. This potentially could be the solution because of the greenspace and the added garage the **applicant may wish to consider the primary façade the main house be on Regent potentially if the carriage house has a driveway off Park Place.** This configuration should be encouraged

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated in the matter of 17 Park Place New Single and Two-Family Structures, 17 Park Place, Advisory Opinion to the ZBA the DRC makes the following statements - the mass and scale of the secondary principal two family structure as presented is not inappropriate. The DRC strongly suggests that the reconfiguration of the lot to allow for more greenspace, and a detached garage which is more historically accurate and appropriate, as well as allow the secondary structure to present more as an actual carriage house. The lot reconfiguration being eliminating the two-car garage attached to the primary structure and converting the existing two-family structure to a full carriage house, garage beneath with living space to accommodate two families above. To accommodate the new lot configuration, the DRC strongly suggests granting more relief on the side setback to allow for said lot configuration. Jeff Gritsavage seconded the motion.

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

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Karen Cavotta, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner questioned if the DRC would like to include in the motion if the applicant chooses to move forward with the suggested lot configuration, the DRC requests the applicant return to the Commission for an Additional Advisory Opinion on the Mass and Scale.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we are modifying the motion regarding 17 Park Place Second Principal Structure, 17 Park Place to include the following: should the applicant choose to move forward with the suggested lot configuration and plan the DRC strongly encourages the applicant to return before the DRC for a further Advisory Opinion on the Mass and Scale.

Leslie DiCarlo seconded the motion.

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

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Karen Cavotta, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

8:23 P.M. The Board recessed.

8:28 P.M. The Board reconvened.

4. #20220422 NIGHT OWL FENCE AND ENTRANCE MODIFICATIONS, 17 Maple Avenue, Historic Review of fence and courtyard entrance modifications within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.

Applicant: Alex Strauss

Mr. Strauss apologized for the Tiki type seasonal entrance awning over an existing awning. He felt since it was not permanent and removed every fall, he did not need approval. We have invested a great deal of money to upgrade the courtyard. It was a concrete parking lot. We have had issues with homeless people wandering in this area. It is a public park and is not patrolled as a public park would be. We have no security for this area currently. We are hopeful with your help to find a way to secure this area. Visuals of what has been to try to police this area with steel privacy panels in the fencing and the gate.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she understands their need for security. However, from the Chairs point of view the treatment of the fence is not appropriate for this Historic Street in Saratoga. There might be ways to provide security. In terms of the canopy, noting it will be removed in the winter, what will remain.

Mr. Strauss provided a visual of what remains is a steel archway.

Ellen Sheehan stated she understands the need for security as well. She reviewed the Exterior Design Guidelines regarding fences in the Historic District. It states privacy fences are to be avoided in the front. Putting the panels behind the fencing makes it privacy fencing and it is not appropriate.

Tad Roemer spoke regarding the privacy fencing. It is inappropriate for this area. Grill work on the fence for security with a crash bar on the interior.

Jeff Gritsavage stated, the solid wall does not work. It would be nice to have something metal crafted for the doorway. that does not look harsh or industrial.

Chris Bennett stated symmetry is important. Maintenance could be used on the brick and the fencing as well. Investment in that would be well spent.

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 Night Owl Fence and Entrance Modifications, 17 Maple Avenue, the

DRC issues the following decision on June 29, 2022, Approve with the following conditions: Removal of the solid panels on the gates and fencing. Grass canopy to be seasonal only and removed at the end of each summer season. Modifications of the security gate will mimic the design of the existing fencing and to be solid. Final details to be submitted for Administrative Approval. Ellen Sheehan seconded the motion.

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

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Karen Cavotta, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

5. #20200483 269 BROADWAY NEW MIXED-USE BUILDING, 269 Broadway Historic Review of a new 6 story commercial/retail building with on-site underground parking within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we have approved Mass and Scale for this structure. We have reviewed materials and details and have provided positive feedback. The applicant returns before the Commission this evening because we have requested, they review the entranceway and make modifications to this area.

Agent: Michael Roman, C2 Design Group

Mr. Roman stated we were asked by the DRC to review the entranceway and we have. We have also presented this to the Planning Board. Mr. Roman provided a review of the project information; the building section was provided noting the entranceway step back about 6'6" from the property line. The building design front elevation was provided showing the two-story design on Broadway. With the new rendition is the signage has brought down to just above the entry doors. We have introduced more brick into the entry space, we have minimized the metal panels between the 1st and 2nd floor, stepped back the entranceway 6'6". General updated renderings were provided. Lighting plan was reviewed and a visual was provided. This was provided and presented to the Planning Board and has been approved.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated presenting the patina is much softer and nice to see. In terms of the 269 Broadway letter signage. We can include that in this application as well, however any additional signage would need to come before the DRC for approval.

Mr. Roman stated the address projects off the brick, it will be back lit at night. We will work with the sign company and keep it as minimal as possible.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, thanked the applicant for providing the lighting details. All venting will be up through the roof. White louvered screening is also proposed on the roof to screen mechanicals. The reconfiguration of the entryway works as well as the signage being lowered. The materials proposed as of the utmost quality.

Ellen Sheehan stated the revised entranceway engage pedestrians and is much more successful than previous renderings.

By reducing those panels, it was highly effective **on the front façade**.

Tad Roemer stated the entrance looks nice. Sconces on the exterior, provide cut sheets for the file.

Jeff Gritsavage stated the project has evolved well over the last two years.

Leslie DiCarlo stated it is a successful project and excited to see the new building.

Karen Cavotta, Alternate, stated the evolution has been great to watch. The entry is one of her favorite aspects.

The materials and how the elements come together. Changing the scale makes is very pedestrian friendly.

Chris Bennett agrees with Karen. The applicant has worked hard to bring the appropriate design to **both the front façade and the opposite side of the building on Hamilton**. The project worked out quite nicely.

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

Kathleen Sonnabend provided information regarding the front setback and requested the building be moved back about 3 feet. The tree out front was not discussed this evening. Mr. Scirocco made saving that tree a requirement. The tree should be protected. A visual was provided noting the distance needed to determine the critical root zone.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated Ms. Sonnabend was accurate the city arborist does want the tree saved. It can be saved, and the Planning Board has noted the tree is to be saved as part of their Notice of Decision.

Ellen Sheehan made a motion in the matter of 269 Broadway New Mixed-Use Development - Final Details, 269 Broadway,

The DRC issues the following decision on June 29, 2022, approve with the following conditions: Lighting cut sheets will be submitted. The applicant will return for all signage approval. Chris Bennett seconded the motion.

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

VOTE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor; Karen Cavotta, Alternate, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

6. #20220129 30 CAROLINE STREET 6-STORY MULTI-USE BUILDING, 30 Caroline Street, Architectural

Review of a proposed mixed-use project within the Transect -6 Urban Core District.

Agent: George Olsen, George Olsen Architecture

Mr. Olsen stated the comments he received from the DRC at the May meeting were - the 1:1 ratio of the street. We spoke about this, **and the direction was 55 feet at the façade at the street which we do** have a visual to present. Also, the possibility of setback after those 55 feet for the penthouse. Windows were too small on the last plan submitted which were the more traditional brick version. We have changed the windows a bit. More glass at the top was suggested along with the strong

entablature at the base. We can discuss the black brick. What the visual of the building shows is that **we have taken the hybrid of the initial scheme we liked with the layering of the façade.** The building does have a strong base

We tweaked the height, and it closely matches the bases of the adjacent buildings. The larger areas of fenestration for the retail are like what exists in the city. We also went up 55 ft. and this allows us to tweak the middle sections to match those of the Hamlet and Ghost. We have attempted to make the upper floors of the building and the cornice more transparent.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she was disappointed when she saw the submittal. She feels that this was a complete reversal of what we spoke about. The Chair stated the last version Scheme A was appropriate, and more compatible with the neighborhood and adjacent buildings. It was missing a little something and there was still concern about the height. All these changes and the large windows and French doors a very suburban look. She feels this is not an appropriate design. Setting back the top floor works. However, she still feels the need to drop one floor back.

Jeff Gritsavage stated the first design was quite different. With this he feels this is ok, and the proportions are much better. He does not feel it is inappropriate.

Tad Roemer stated he thought the Scheme from last time needed additional work. He thought we were so close with the last design presentation. He liked the taller building, and this is squat. He is disappointed.

Ellen Sheehan stated she feels bad, she has nothing good to say.

A visual of Scheme A was provided for the Commission.

Chris Bennett stated I do think the building structurally is too tall for this location, however, you were successful with the design. The 6th floor does set a bad precedent for this area for the future. He does prefer the last presentation.

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

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation stated she was shocked to see the direction this was going after the last meeting. Scheme A was more traditional and in keeping with the design guidelines, as far as what is expected and outlined. Regardless the fenestration is not in keeping with the guidelines and the height is still an issue. She encouraged the Commission to ask for additional renderings and to attempt to keep this at 4 to 5 stories in height. The impact is far greater than what is being shown.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated except for Mr. Gritsavage most of the Commission is disappointed with what was presented today as compared to the direction we thought the project was taking. The punched windows while small certainly were more successful than what was presented this evening. Taking cues from Scheme A and taking the comments offered at the last meeting would be the way to proceed. To provide direction in moving forward in terms of the height of the building is 5 stories with the 6th pushed back. The building looks squat and strange. This has to do with the height of the first floor and the squat nature of the windows. Taller is not the way to avoid the squat look. The Chair stated she would like to see 4 stories with a 5th floor setback. A rendering so we could compare it to this.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, questioned if the Commission members would be more agreeable to seeing 4 stories with a 5th story setback due to the location of the building and the width of the street.

Leslie DiCarlo stated she would like to see 4 stories with a 5th setback in the Scheme A version. This is very safe but it could be very elegant.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated with the new UDO the maximum height is 55 ft. for the building.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated Tad is comfortable with Scheme A. Jeff stated there is room for creativity, it is going in the right direction. It was the consensus of the Commission members that the height remains an issue. The Chair spoke regarding her preference for the red brick versus the black brick.

Mr. Olsen requested feedback and direction from the Commission before their return.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated more than half the group has concerns regarding height. We cannot list out what you need to do to make this work.

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation noted that the recent submittal floor heights seem more appropriate than in the Scheme A. The floors appear compressed in Scheme A. Floor heights were better in this rendition except for the first floor.

Karen Cavotta, Alternate stated she is struggling with Scheme A. With the tall double hung windows and the vertical lines in the brick it feels like it wants to be a taller building. The punched open are too small and too historic and this is too far for this location.

George Olsen, Architect stated we will rework this and return.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we are all looking forward to seeing a building which fills in the gap in this area.

7. #20220502 ADVISORY OPINION TO CITY COUNCIL - UDO AMENDMENTS,

Consideration of advisory

Opinion to the City Council for proposed amendments to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO).

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, state the Advisory Opinion to the City Council regarding the UDO. The same thing happened the last time we attempted to discuss it. The Chair suggested set up an additional meeting simply to focus on the UDO.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, provide options to the Commission regarding the special UDO meeting.

Staff will reach out to Commission members to finalize the plans for this meeting.

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Design Review Commission Caravan, Wednesday, July 13, 2022, at 5:00 P.M.

Design Review Commission Meeting, Wednesday, July 20, 2022, at 6:00 P.M.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

There being no further business to discuss Tamie Ehinger, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 9:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Buzanowski
Recording Secretary

Meeting minutes approved August 24, 2022