



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES (FINAL)

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 24, 2022

6:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL ROOM

CALL TO ORDER: Tamie Ehinger, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:05 P.M.

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

Jeff Gritsavage

ABSENT: Leslie DiCarlo;

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

A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair made a motion to approve the June 8th, June 29th, July 6th, July 20th, and August 3, 2022, Minutes of the Design Review Board with very minor edits. 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, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor

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. **#20220773 340 BROADWAY STOREFRONT MODIFICATIONS,** 340 Broadway, Extension of expired approvals for Historic Review of replacement storefront, awnings, and sign band within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.
2. **#20220562 270 W. CIRCULAR STREET, EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS,** 270 W. Circular Street, Architectural review of exterior modifications to an existing commercial structure within the Transect-4 Urban Neighborhood District. **MOVED TO THE REGULAR AGENDA**

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone on the Board had any questions, comments or concerns on either consent agenda items.

Tad Roemer stated he had a concern regarding 270 W. Circular Street application.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there were any questions or comments from the audience regarding this application.

None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, moved consent agenda item #2 to the Regular Agenda.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of 340 Broadway Storefront Modifications, 340 Broadway that this application be approved as submitted. Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, 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; Ellen Sheehan, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

C. DRC APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

1. **#20220562 270 W. CIRCULAR STREET, EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS,** 270 W. Circular Street, architectural review of exterior modifications to an existing commercial structure within the Transect-4Urban Neighborhood District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, emailed the Board with these modifications the applicant provided. She indicated it would be moved to the consent agenda. In reviewing the application, it appeared straightforward and was discussed at the caravan. No one voiced any concerns at that time.

Tad Roemer questioned if the applicant was proposing to replace glass block in 4 window cavities on lower 1st floor on the elevation facing West Avenue 1 window and facing Circular Street 3 windows with the same style as other building windows, double hung, green shade matching color.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated that is correct.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone on the Board had any questions, comments or concerns on this application.

None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there were any questions or comments from the audience regarding this application.

None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of 270 West Circular Street Exterior Modifications, 270 West Circular Street, that this application be approved as submitted. 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, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor;
Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, opposed

MOTION PASSES : 5-1

2. #20220262 29 MADISON AVENUE PRINCIPAL AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

ADDITION, 29 Madison

Avenue Consideration of Advisory Opinion to the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding 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 applicant has been before the DRB for this application several times. After reviewing the application, the Board did not have concerns regarding the primary structure but did have concerns regarding the mass scale and appearance of the carriage house.

Applicant: Carrie Carlson

Agent: Mike Tuck, Peter Urban, Balzer Tuck Architects

Mr. Tuck stated the Board reviewed the addition to the main house and the DRB did not have any issues with the main house. The carriage house is where we have been debating the merits of the addition in terms of design and how it relates to the scale of the existing structure. A visual of the alternative designs were provided to the Board. We have a proposal which reduces it noting suggestions made by the Board to help reduce the mass or footprint. We have drawn a plan that reduces it, but we still believe the gambrel roof is the way to proceed. We had reduced the size of the dormer, but now have increased the size of the dormer. This scheme provides the space the applicants needs even though the space is smaller in size for an office, powder room on the second floor and a space for one car on the first floor. We feel this meets the intent of the UDO regarding the compatibility of the character of the carriage house and we do not feel it overpowers it in terms of scale. A visual of all elevations was provided. Examples of alternatives were provided for the Board.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, noted this is an Advisory Opinion to the ZBA on the mass, scale, and design of both the primary structure as well as the addition to the carriage house. This application will return before the DRB for full design review. The Chair feels that the reduction is good but is it enough. Dropping it below the peak of the gable does are effective. The Chair reviewed the DRB's Standards and Guidelines as it refers to additions to Historic structures. Building additions should not look as though they are original to the historic building, they should be distinct and identifiable as an addition to the historic structure. An addition should be smaller in scale, than the primary structure so that it does not overshadow the existing building. It should complement the original building's roof form, massing, floor heights, proportions, and window and door fenestrations. An addition should be located where it is least visible to minimally effect the perception of the original structure. Additions should not obscure, damage or destroy the character defining features of the primary buildings or streetscape. The Chair is pleased with the reduction but would like to see this reduced further knowing the applicant's agent must work with the program in terms of the interior.

Discussion ensued among the Board, and it was the Boards consensus that the revised plans presented this evening are successful especially marrying the new with the old.

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

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated in consideration of the request for an Advisory Opinion by the Zoning Board of Appeals in the matter of 29 Madison Avenue Principal and Accessory Structure Additions, 29 Madison Avenue. Following a discussion this date August 24, 2022, the DRB issues a Favorable Advisory Opinion. The Board feels that the addition on the primary structure is of the proper mass and scale. The addition on the carriage house, after going through revisions seems appropriate in mass, scale, and design. Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, 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; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

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

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we have had this application before the Board previously. We have requested additional information which has been provided and will be reviewed this evening.

Agent: Loreen Harvey, Kasselmann Solar

Ms. Harvey stated they provided additional photographs for the Boards review. They are proposing to install 39 panels on the structure. Panels have been moved from the Clinton Street side which were the primary concern. Visuals of the proposed solar panel array were provided to the Board. Also, the applicant's agent noted they have designed a better conduit run and have provided information and visuals to the Board which will be painted to match the underlying material color. Photographs from existing views in the neighborhood were also provided.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the renderings provided have been especially helpful and she is comfortable with the location of the solar panels and the conduit. The Chair did review the historic district guidelines for alternative energy systems. Alternative energy systems should be installed in a manner which limits negative visual impacts to the building and from the public right of way. Installation of any energy systems should not damage or remove historic materials or cause irreversible changes to historic features. The energy systems should be able to be removed in the future without damages to the historic structure. Installation of any energy systems should not change the historic roof configurations dormers, chimneys, or other features. The Chair stated she feels these are placed appropriately.

Discussion ensued among the Board regarding the solar array installation application.

Jeff Gritsavage did voice concern regarding the solar array. He is unsure if locating these on an iconic signature historic architectural structure in the city the best application. Panels on the garage would be ok. It cuts too much into the character of the home and he will be voting against it.

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

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation thanked the applicant for removing the panels from the Clinton Street side. Ideally no panels would best but it is a reversible change. Thank you for making the changes.

Ellen Sheehan made a motion in the matter of 75 Clinton Street Roof Mounted Solar, 75 Clinton Street, Design Review Board issues the following decision on August 24, 2022 - Approve with the following conditions: - that the conduit will be painted to match the underlying house material color. 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, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor;
Jeff Gritsavage, opposed; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 5-1

4. #20220625 69 PHILA STREET EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS, 69 Phila Street, Historic Review of exterior
Modifications including window and door replacement, porch modifications, change in materials for an existing single-family within the Urban Residential-4 District.

Applicant: Joseph DeLeva & Rachel Ferluge

Agent: Susan Lomonaco, SUVI Architecture

Ms. Lomonaco stated they are so excited to be in front of the DRB to speak about this building. The applicants are proposing to keep the house as original as possible. Their goal is to make modifications to update on the missing pieces such as the porch, railings, and balusters. To replace the windows that are non-original with new Pella Architectural Series windows that will reflect what the originals looked like. There are original windows existing, and we plan to restore those and moving them to the **front façade**. Ms. Lomonaco reviewed all the elevations. We are keeping the original footprint. A visual of the site plan was also provided to the Board. A new asphalt driveway is proposed with a new curb cut. All elevations show the replacement of the porch, and the windows will be replaced and restored as planned. The applicants are proposing to restore all the original details, missing dentals, corbels a detail on the columns which they plan on replicating or restoring to the original. New steps are proposed. **On the rear façade the mansard roof will be turned around this corner.** Part of the wall which is currently plywood will be built with a wood frame and fiber cement siding and details. We will keep within the current footprint of the building. The first item is a proposal to raise the rear corner of the roof to make it level with the remainder of the building. Visuals of the roof and what currently exists noting what will be removed, rebuilt, and making it level with the main structure. Columns and trim which currently existing have enough detail for the applicant to see the trim we need to replicate. We will keep all the columns and trims, restore them. We will replicate the profile of the railings taking care from what is there and the neighborhood. In speaking with Patrick Cogan, Building Inspector, Zoning Officer regarding the railing heights and we expressed to him our desire to keep the railing height at a historic height about 30". However, in the very front corner of the porch where to the two sides meet on the left side the sidewalk dips below 30" and requires the higher railing. After our conversation with Mr. Cogan and the owners have decided to add flower boxes to this area to meet the railing height. Concerning the front door and we did research, and we would like to replace the front door with a solid wood door keeping the sidelights and the transom as shown. A visual of a salvaged door was provided to the Board and this is what we are proposing. A visual of the side door was provided as well. Ms. Lomonaco provided a window survey reviewing each window and its replacement. Again, all originals

are to be kept, restored, **and placed on the front façade**. Cut sheets for all new windows were provided for the file. Ms. Lomonaco stated a new curb cut is planned with a new asphalt driveway. Fiber cement board siding is proposed. An example of the fencing for the backyard was also provided.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair thanked the applicant's agent for the thorough presentation. She is happy and kudos to the new homeowners for taking on this project. The city came close to losing this historic structure. She appreciates the all the work and details being done to return this historic home. Everything which is being done is appropriate and she has no objections to moving this forward.

Ellen Sheehan stated this is just wonderful.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, echoed the sentiments of the Chair. Not only is this one of the greatest projects that has come before the Board in years and the most heartwarming. It one of the best and most complete applications and best presentations we have ever seen. The Vice Chair questioned if what is being spec'd out for the porch is all wood. What will be done with the exterior of the brick where the paint is peeling.

Ms. Lomonaco stated yes everything is wood. We are proposing to pressure wash and repaint the brick. Possibly repaint the brick and seal it.

Ms. Ferluge stated the idea is to let the natural brick come through and use a Victorian color scheme.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, questioned if the driveway will have a concrete apron, and he questioned lighting fixture choices.

Ms. Lomonaco stated yes, they are proposing a concrete apron. Once construction has begun, she believes they will return before the Board for lighting choices.

Jeff Gritsavage questioned if they are proposing the use of an Italianate door with a Greek Revival surround. Samantha Bosshart, SSPF, could speak about this.

Ms. Lomonaco stated the building has the look of Italianate in its details as well as on the side door. Just for consistency's sake I would not want to propose taking down the side lights and the transom. She would love to open the transom more. She would not feel right putting a Greek Revival Door in the main entry when the side door has the Italianate look.

Chris Bennett stated it is a great project and looks forward to watching the reconstruction. On Walton there is an Italianate with sidelights and a transom just like this one. Which is his understanding is original to the building which is about 1800's.

Tad Roemer stated he reiterates what everyone has already said. A concrete driveway versus asphalt he would not object to.

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 has been a long time coming. She has been advocating for this building since 2008 and the Foundation since 1998. They are making all the right choices turning it back into its former glory. As far as the door, a majority of the house does have an Italianate. She does not believe the front door is a historic front door. She suggested an Italianate door which would match the side door just for consistency which would be period appropriate. It is so exciting.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated the applicant's agent indicated that they would be returning before the Board for final details.

Is there a need for them to return?

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated if everyone is comfortable, they will be returning for lighting details. The only request the Chair has is for submittal of final details on the front door for the file. This can be done administratively.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair made a motion in the matter of 69 Phila Street, Exterior Modifications, 69 Phila Street, the Design Review Board issues the following decision on August 24, 2022 - Approve with the following conditions: - that the driveway apron be concrete, wood materials for porch and lattice. The applicant will provide details on the front door and exterior lighting to be approved administratively. 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; Ellen Sheehan, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, opposed; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

5. #20220485 81 PHILA STREET NEW TWO-FAMILY, 81 Phila Street, Historic Review of a new two-family home and accessory structure on a vacant lot within the Urban Residential-4 District.

Applicant: Scott Trifilo, Terrace Home Builders, owner

Agent: Bob Flansburg, Dreamscapes Unlimited.

Mr. Flansburg provided a visual of the site plan noting a detached garage to the left of home. Mr. Flansburg reviewed the project site noting the size and configuration of the lot. We appeared before zoning for variances which were approved, and the site plan reflects the approved variances. Mr. Flansburg provided a visual of the floor plans for the Boards review revealing an apartment in the basement with a bilco door in the rear to allow for storage. Mr. Flansburg noted it is a three-story home about 40-41 feet in height. There is an area along the side of the building and front for gardens as well as a proposed rooftop garden off the second floor. A rendering of the proposed project was provided for the Boards review.

Mr. Trifilo provided an aerial view of the proposed lot. He provided visuals of neighborhood comparables for the Boards review, and what he is proposing for the rooftop garden and landscaping plan for the site, The new construction will conform with what is there currently and be visually appealing. He spoke about the driveway and what he is considering either asphalt or two strips of concrete to the garage. He is proposing fiber cement siding and panels and bead board on the upper level. Mr. Trifilo reviewed the windows and their placement and the reasoning for their placement.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated it is exciting to see a home being built on this vacant lot. The Chair proceeded to review important points from the Historic Standards and Guidelines for new construction in historic districts. Architectural Styles for new construction should reflect and represent the period in which they are built. The style of new construction should be compatible with surrounding buildings, but it should not give the false impression of being historic. The placement and orientation of such new building should be consistent with neighboring buildings maintaining a consistent streetscape and **façade setback is recommended.** Building height and scale should be consistent with the existing

streetscape and neighboring building patterns. Roof lines and shapes should be consistent with surrounding historic structures. New construction windows and doors should complement the window and door sizes, patterns, and rhythm of neighboring historic buildings.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this is an interesting house. **The windows on the front façade** are not **inappropriate specifically because of the simplicity of the front façade**. Lowering the pitch of the third floor is important. It is an eclectic way to present the third floor and the chair is not against it, especially since it is setback and will not be visible from the street. The roof pitch does need to be much lower, borderline flat but not that low. The cornice is not too ornate as presented but would not object to it being simplified. In terms of the driveway, the owner indicated a narrow driveway but is also considering two strips of concrete leading to the garage. The Chair does feel what the applicant is proposing in terms of landscaping and planting the use of two strips of concrete is a good one for multiple reasons. The Chair also noted she is wrestling with the east side fenestration and the use of the small second story windows toward the front are fine, but the remainder of the windows do not seem to work.

Tad Roemer stated he feels this is a nice building. The rooftop structure is something he does not feel comfortable with.

He agrees with Tamie regarding the height slope of the roof. He questions the circular window, a whole wall of glass.

It is not that visible from the street, and so he could be more flexible. The overhang and the side walls on the third floor are questionable. He also spoke about the windows being aligned, which might entail reworking the floor plans inside.

Jeff Gritsavage stated he has no issues with the roof pitch. He does not feel the round window is inappropriate on the tabature and the corbels a simpler medallion. He likes the idea of the two strips of concrete for the driveway. He is a bit disappointed about there not being a porch. He suggested opening the sides of the enclosed front porch to give the impression of a small porch. He likes this building and the way it is proceeding.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated what the applicant has designed is successful even without a porch. You also spoke about the idea of experimenting with a flat roof. You noted you wished to have a vaulted ceiling in that area. He feels that the third floor is successful in that you are interpreting a gable Greek Revival Style in a different way. He also feels that a flat roof would work better but your interior design dictates the roof style and pitch. One issue with the roof is that the snow will come right off the roof onto the stairs to the basement apartment which will be a constant maintenance issue. Also, please treat the foundation by either parging or stone. Masonry for the stairs.

Ellen Sheehan agrees with the Chair and Tad regarding the windows. There does not seem to be a rhythm or relationship with the window placement. They do not line up. She agrees with the comments concerning the pitch of the roof but questioned the reasoning for the size of the overhangs on the third floor. It seems very deep. She voiced concern regarding the windows and Italianate style on the bottom and they are usually one over one or two over two.

Mr. Trifilo stated it is not really an overhang on the third floor but more of a covered area at 8 ft. He spoke about the windows and their thoughts in the placement.

Chris Bennett stated as far as the window alignment he agrees with his fellow Board members. The idea of opening the entranceway on two sides is an interesting idea and concept. Regarding the third-floor overhang. Instead of using the wainscotting why not bring the wall system up and over versus introducing a new material. He spoke to the east and west sides of the building. The cornice between the second and third floor wants to run around the entire building.

The transition from the second to the third-floor stories on these sides is missing something. Perhaps wrapping the front detail around the sides of the house would provide a smoother transition. Perhaps

even simplifying the cornice details to accomplish this. He also questioned drainage on the third floor of this green roof idea.

Mr. Flansberg stated there is an internal drainage system designed to accommodate this.

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

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation, thanked the applicant for investing in this property. It has been long vacant and will be a nice addition to this block and a significant investment and she appreciates his taking the time to meet and discuss the project. The Foundation does have concerns regarding the roof pitch and reducing that. This house reads more of a Greek Revival. If the corbels are to stay seem more Italianate and if they are to stay her concern is if they are the correct size and detail. A cleaner beefier cornice would be more of a statement of its own time. We also feel the door should come a bit more forward so that it is not as hidden. She agrees with Chris regarding wrapping the cornice around the building.

Tad Roemer stated if the roof pitch were lowered you would get more protection from the rain on the third floor. He also agrees with the two over two window choice and bringing the front door more forward to make it more visible for a nice look on the front facade.

Ellen Sheehan stated there is also a garage which is proposed with this project if we would like to review that at this time.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we will review the proposed garage as well.

Mr. Flansberg stated the garage is placed in the rear of the property per zoning requirements. The size of the garage also per zoning requirements. The roof pitch will match whatever is decided for the third floor. It is a simplistic structure with detailing to match that of the house but will look like an accessory structure.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated it is a quite simple straightforward structure. Matching the roof pitch of the garage to the roof pitch of the house is fine and makes sense. We will need details on the materials themselves such as cut sheets for the doors and windows.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated the applicant may wish to add a window in the gable area of the garage.

Tad Roemer questioned the height of the garage; it seems like it could be brought down.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Board has expressed their concerns. Overall, the Board feels that a much lower roof would be much more appropriate. No objections to simplifying the cornice and it might be a better solution. The Board is concerned regarding the fenestration on the east side and provided suggestions regarding mitigation. There were also concerns regarding the banding. We hope this helps to provide information to the applicant so we can move this project forward.

8:11 P.M. The Board Recessed.

8:16 P.M. The Board Reconvened.

6. #20220613 38 BEEKMAN STREET DEMOLITION, 38 Beekman Street, Determination of architectural/

historic significance and possible review (Architectural) of demolition for an existing residential structure

within the Neighborhood Complementary Use-1 District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated there are two things we need to accomplish. First, we need to determine whether there is any historical or architectural significance to the house. Based on what the Board concludes - if the Board determines there is no historical or architectural significance, we can then move into a discussion regarding demolition. If the Board does feel that there is historical or architectural significance, then we are not able to discuss demolition currently. There would be a series of good faith demonstrations which would need to occur prior to the demolition discussion.

Applicant: Eric Pankorian

Agent: Bob Flansburg, Dreamscapes Unlimited

Mr. Flansburg provided a visual of the site plan noting the house is condemned by the city and the reasoning for this.

We initially embarked upon a renovation. The idea was to move the house to the vacant lot and have a new foundation and reset the building. We then looked at all the renovations needed such as the roof replacement with new trusses, the porch was removed since the building could not be moved with the porch intact. What became evident is how to place a new roof on a structure when your overhangs are dissimilar. Everything became evident that we could not put a new foundation on a house which was not square. Everything became increasingly expensive and cost prohibitive.

Mr. Eric Pankonin spoke regarding the desire to renovate and preserve this property. We decided to move the building. Prior to the building being move we inspected the interior and roof was in disrepair and the rafter's needed replacement, the second-floor system needed to be replaced, realizing the home was out of square. To square the building and what needed to be removed to do so we would have been left with the first-floor front wall and the left facing wall, along with the increased expense. At this time, we decided to look to demolition and a rebuild.

Mr. Flansburg stated they received comments today from the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation. We are looking at combining these parcels on the corner of Beekman and Ash Streets. Doing a mixed-use building on this property so that
Would be something we would come back to the Board with. If this building does get razed, the result would be a better use of the corner lot. We would then return before the Board with those drawings. This building has been vacant, and it was not secured it was unfinished and down to bare studs.

Mr. Pankonin stated we submitted paperwork to the Building Inspector's Office from Larmon House Movers regarding the possibility of moving the building. The Building Inspector's Office questioned how we planned to stabilize the building. To move the building, we needed to remove the porch.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, questioned if they made mention of the need to appear before the DRB prior to removing the porch.
Is this even possible.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner stated it was her understanding that the applicants were rebuilding, and you were applying for a building permit to perform the repairs. It would not be remove and forget about it.

Mr. Flansburg stated the building permit was not actually issued. We spoke with the Building Inspector's office and the concerns regarding moving the structure. They were advising us on how to proceed with moving it an adding a new foundation. The porch was removed noting when the building was returned to the site the porch would need to be replaced in kind.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she understands the rationale regarding removal of the porch. The applicant and applicant's agent are aware of the neighborhood this house is in and the fact that it would need to come before the DRB. So, this is just very disappointing.

Mr. Flansburg stated he understands what the Chair is stating. He was unaware that the porch was removed until he visited the site, and the porch was gone.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Board is tasked with two tasks to accomplish. One is to determine if the house has any historic or architectural significance. We need to review that with a different lens than whether it needs to be demolished. We all recognize the condition the home is in. The discussion begins with is it historically or architecturally significant. The Chair stated the home was built in 1916. It is a contributing structure to the Beekman Street neighborhood, from a historic standpoint. From an architectural standpoint at one time this was architecturally significant. It reflected the area in which it was built and ties into the theme of the Beekman Street Art District. As compared to the compatible buildings and structures around it which is carried throughout Beekman. It is disappointing now that those balconies are removed. Clearly over the years the condition of this home has continued to deteriorate, and the original character has been compromised to a certain extent to the point that it is no longer architecturally significant. From a historical standpoint a structure built in 1916 and is a contributing structure to a neighborhood, in the Chairs mind is historically significant.

Ellen Sheehan stated Larmon moved a home for them about 10-15 years ago and they remove the porch. She has a gut reaction to tearing down a house. She does not believe that this is historically or architecturally significant. She does wish it could be saved. You have done your due diligence and in good faith tried to save it. Architecturally you will end up with two walls which are significant.

Tad Roemer reviewed the sequence of events with the structure from the thoughts about a new foundation and then refurbishing the remainder of the home.

Mr. Pankonin stated that is correct. Then we discovered the roof, the trusses the second-floor system needed to be replaced and then the first floor was not square.

Chris Bennett questioned if the entire foundation needed to be replaced, and what is the issue with the second floor.

Mr. Flansburg stated the rear portion of the foundation was crumbling and the second-floor bounces when you walk on it.

Chris Bennett stated just because a floor bounces when you walk on it does not mean you need to replace the entire floor system. The other issue just because a building is not square does not mean it needs to come down. The reality is that it is an old house. Why not just have Larmon lift the building and replace the stone foundation back with block since the home is not square you are able to manipulate the block any way you want. Why move it - just lift it slightly.

Mr. Pankorin provided information to the Board regarding the area where the foundation needs work and the topography of the properties adjacent.

Chris Bennett stated he does feel the building has architecturally or historical significance.

Jeff Gritsavage stated because the house was not square does not mean you cannot replace the foundation. It can be done. There is a certain shape and street pattern to Beekman Street with these long porches like this building had. Unfortunately, the south part of Beekman Street falls apart and the large empty lot next to it is part of the reason. He is not sure there is enough there to save it. What gets built in the future can bring the rhythm of the street back. He does not believe it is historically or architecturally significant.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated potentially in and of itself it does not have architectural value or historic value. In the context of the neighborhood, it has tremendous historic value and architectural value. Considering that the building has been there for over 100 years, it has the same architectural features that the other houses on the street have. The Vice Chair feels it has historic value and should be considered as such and we should be forced to go through the steps required deciding whether the building should be demolished. It should be a thoughtful exercise. To set the record straight the red "X" is put on the building by the fire department to indicate to them to not enter the building in case of fire because it is not safe. Also, the Vice Chair noted that the way it was listed when it was sold was inappropriately worded.

Tad Roemer stated its significance is tied to its surroundings. He does not feel it is significant.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated as now it stands 3 Board members feel it has architectural significance and 3 Board members feel it does not.

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

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation, stated the Foundation believes that this building contributes to the streetscape, and she disagrees that it totally falls apart. Grant money was available in 2005 for help with this building. The owner at that time refused. She would ask that the Board consider going through the steps to determine if it is significant historically or architecturally. She spoke about having a house lifted and made more plumb without moving the structure. The entire porch was not removed for this process.

Ellen Sheehan stated a post demolition plan is a big consideration. You have the best of intentions and that is a big concern. She is leaning toward changing her vote.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Board will determine if this has architectural or historical significance. If it is determined that there is no historical or architectural significance then we would pursue a conversation regarding demolition. Perform a SEQRA Review and move on. If we determine there is historical or architectural significance, then what happens is the applicant goes back and performs a good faith effort in reviewing the 7 criteria to provide to the Board. Frankly, having heard the applicant's presentation they have done this already but not in an organized format specifically addressing the zoning. A part includes a post demolition plan.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner spoke regarding the procedure. It is two separate discussions. Currently we are discussing whether it is significant or not. If in the discussion regarding demolition you would like to see post demolition plans, you can ask for it even if you determine it is not significant. You can ask for it to make your decision.

Mr. Flansburg stated we are close to being able to submit that post demolition plan to the DRB.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated if this vote ends in a stalemate, it does not do anything. It is not denied but it also is not approved. Then it either die or could return when we have a full Board present to discuss and vote again.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of 38 Beekman Street, Determination of Significance, 38 Beekman Street, involving the determination of Architectural/Historic significance for an existing residential structure within the Neighborhood Complementary Use-1 District tax parcel #165.74-2-28, within the City of Saratoga Springs. Consistent with Section 7.5.11 "Demolition" of the City's Zoning Ordinance, the Design

Review Board determined on August 24, 2022, that the structure noted - has Architectural and/or Historical significance contributing to the historic fabric and resources of the City of Saratoga Springs. Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair 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; Ellen Sheehan, opposed;
Jeff Gritsavage, opposed; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 4-2

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we ask the applicant to review 7.5.6 of the Zoning Ordinance, staff can assist. We ask that you provide us with good faith and demonstrate good cause as to why the structure cannot be preserved. It also includes a post demolition plan which you must provide as well. We will then schedule a public hearing and we can then have a conversation regarding formally demolishing the structure and/or not based on conclusions.

7. #20191122 LARKIN MARRIOTT AC HOTEL, 176 South Broadway, Architectural Review of final details
for a new 120-room hotel within the Transect-5 Neighborhood Center District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we have previously approved mass and scale for this project. The applicant is before us for final details.

Applicant: Larkin Hospitality

Agent: Dennis McGowan & Brett Balzer, Balzer Tuck Architecture

Mr. McGowan provide a visual review of the project. Initially the project was before the DRB in 2019. We requested and received an extension in 2021. We are before you this evening for final details for the project. A visual of the site plan was provided to the Board. The previous site plan you have seen has changed and gone back in front of Planning and has been reapproved. The access to the site is the same from Todd Street. At Lincoln it has been adjusted and it no longer connects to neighboring properties as previously shown. It is just entry and exit out to Lincoln Avenue. From a building standpoint the footprint remains the same. The sequence of entry for cars and vehicle drop off has remained the same. However, going down Todd Street from Broadway and into the property and go under the porte cochere where there is entry for guests. Off Broadway there is a main entrance to the hotel, and there is a service parking lot as well. Mr. McGowan provided a visual of the entry sites to the hotel. There is a ramp at the north side of the property to parking below level. Floor plans were provided to the Board. The roof plan was provided and is different from what was originally presented. We have collaborated with the mechanical engineers to consolidate our HVAC equipment. Mr. McGowan reviewed all the elevations and provided information on the materials proposed for the building. Examples of Nichiha panels were provided as well as metal panel system and brick both red and black proposed. Views of the hotel at night highlighting the lighting proposed. Views of the hotel from all directions was also provided.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, reiterated that this applicant has appeared before the Board previously and received approval for Mass and Scale. Everyone felt that the hotel was appropriate and headed in the right direction, just final details on materials. Not much has changes as you have stated. The Chair believes this will be a great addition to downtown.

The materials you have chosen are great. The modern steel and glass add a nice feel. The use of the red brick ties in to the adjacent and surrounding buildings. The black brick adds a flair of its own. The niche ha panels are rough, do they make it in a smooth surface.

Mr. Balzer stated they do not offer a smooth choice in this panel.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the applicant will return before the DRB for signage. All cut sheets have been submitted for the record. Great project and she appreciates the workmanship.

Ellen Sheehan questioned a change in the design. On the Broadway side you have relief of the grey metal panels on the top floor. They are proud of the brickwork. On the south side in the 2019 rendering, it is like the front and now it is flat.

Mr. McGowan provided information concerning the relief on the Todd Street side to first bay and they we flattened them since it created a simpler design.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated he likes the design and the contrasting materials and how it relates to South Broadway.

He likes the front porch, and the restaurant brings life to the street and into the building. It is successful.

Chris Bennett stated it is a great project and building.

Tad Roemer thanked the applicant for the complete presentation. He likes the brick and questions if they tried different blends. He questioned the materials for the stairs.

Mr. McGowan stated they have tried different blends. He stated the computer generation does not ready completely accurate. Mr. McGowan stated they are proposing bluestone pavers.

Jeff Gritsavage stated it is a good job and will look great on South Broadway.

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

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation questioned what is happening with the original sign.

Mr. McGowan stated they have kept the sign an intend on using it in the building on display. It will be removed, reused, and relocated.

Tad Roemer made a motion in the matter of the Larkin Marriott AC Hotel, 176 South Broadway, the Design Review Board issues the following decision on August 24, 2022 - Approve with the following condition - the main entry steps will be of bluestone. 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; Ellen Sheehan, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

8. #20210872 STEWART 'S NEW CONSTRUCTION, 402 Lake Avenue, Architectural Review of a new convenience store, gas canopies, and signage within the Rural Residential District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated the applicant has appeared before the Board on several occasions. They have returned this evening to provide additional information and revisions to the application.

Applicant: Stewart's Shops

Agent: Ryan Ribado, Stewart's

Mr. Ribado stated the last time he appeared before the Board he presented a standard Stewarts shop. The Board requested at that time we try to expand the stores design to include what is Saratoga the racetrack, horses and a farmhouse style building is what we have produced. A visual of what they are proposing was provided to the Board.

We are using cement clapboard siding; the gables have scalloped siding in a different shade of grey. We have introduced a cupola on the building along with a wraparound porch, giving it a farmhouse feel. There will be decorative trim over the windows and door, as well as a stone base. We have updated site plans which he can provide.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this design is a huge improvement. The introduction of the cupola and dormers and the extended front porch gives it an equestrian agricultural feel which we did encourage and feel like you have done so.

It is a giant improvement and is quite successful. The Chair did note that the cupola was a bit small and spindly for the large expanse of roof. She would like to see a little more heft. The Chair questioned the signage which was discussed with the Building Inspector and staff.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated she did discuss the signage placement with Patrick Cogan Building Inspector, Code Enforcement and he felt the signage and where it was placed was fine.

Tad Roemer questioned the overhang of the dormers. He feels that they are not detailed correctly. He provided suggestions for the applicant regarding the dormers.

Mr. Ribado stated the rendering is not correct. The two-dimensional drawings depict this better. He will provide them to the Board.

Ellen Sheehan stated she agrees with Tad the dormers should be done right. Otherwise, it will look just put up there.

The details should be done well and right.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated the gables should be shingled.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the applicant seems amenable to the changes the Board has suggested. The more direction we can provide will be helpful for the Board and the applicant and moving this application forward.

Discussion ensued among the Board regarding suggestions for the applicant on the building.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated the Board would like to send the applicant back to obtain further details on the dormers and gables which would be more appropriate. A beefier cupola to help break up the roof mass, rethink the trim and details on the dormers. The applicant can supply the Board with a rendering of the store with no dormers. We look forward to seeing the applicant back with these revisions.

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Design Review Board Meeting, Wednesday, September 7, 2022, at 6:00 P.M.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

There being no further business to discuss Tamie Ehinger, Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Buzanowski
Recording Secretary

Meeting minutes approved September 7, 2022