

**ADOPTED**



**Schenectady Historic District Commission**

**Meeting Minutes  
February 16, 2016**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Commissioner Britt called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Commissioner Britt noted that due to the recent turnover of Commissioners the Commission is currently without a Chair or Vice Chair. The Commissioners decided that for the next three meetings the members with the most seniority (Commissioners Britt, Craven, and Wiles) will each take a turn as temporary Chair to allow the new Commissioners to get to know each other and the workings of the Commission before voting on a new Chair and Vice Chair.

**II. ROLL CALL**

**PRESENT:** Carrie Britt; Jackie Craven; Ben Wiles; Mark Meigher; Patricia Yager

**EXCUSED:** David Lowry; Dean Bennett

**STAFF:** Rima Shamieh, Assistant Planner; Ryan Bailey, Assistant Corporation Counsel; Jennifer Mills, Secretary

**III. CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

None.

**IV. ADOPTION OF MEETING MINUTES**

Motion by Commissioner Craven, seconded by Commissioner Wiles, to adopt the January 19, 2016 Meeting Minutes as submitted.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

**V. OTHER BUSINESS**

Assistant Planner Shamieh informed the Commissioners that the Department of Development is currently working on a grant application for a grant to fund the development of design guidelines for the elevation of structures located in the flood plain in the Stockade. She noted that as part of the application the Historic District Commission is asked to designate a liaison who will serve as a point person for any information requested or received from the Commission. Ms. Shamieh explained that typically the liaison is the Chair, but since this position is currently vacant someone else must be designated. Commissioner Wiles suggested that the new Commissioners should be given an opportunity to express their opinion. The other Commissioners concurred. Ms. Shamieh noted that the application requires that the liaison be named

## **ADOPTED**

by February 29, 2016, but that she would inform the new Commissioners of the situation and discuss the nominees via email with all of the Commissioners.

Ms. Shamieh also noted that a volunteer tour guide to lead tours of City Hall is currently being sought. There were no volunteers from the Commissioners at this time.

Counsel Bailey suggested that the Commission send a letter to the Mayor and/or the City Council explaining that the Commissioners feel that there are issues with their governing laws that need to be reviewed and revised. He explained that he and Assistant Planner Shamieh could formulate a draft letter for the Commissioners to review at the March meeting. Commissioner Britt asked if it would be necessary to choose someone to sign the letter, since the Chair is currently vacant. Counsel Bailey stated that who would sign the letter could be determined at the next meeting. Commissioner Wiles asked if the letter would list specific areas of concern. Staff replied that it would briefly outline or list the most major problems that have been identified. Commissioner Wiles stated that he would specifically like the letter to mention the clarification of the Commission's jurisdiction over plantings and trees.

## **VI. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. Consideration for approval submitted by James Plowman, on behalf of Robin White, to landscape. The premise is located at 1 Cucumber Alley.**

Jim Plowman, contractor for Mr. White, and Joe Fava, property manager, appeared before the Commission. Mr. Plowman and Mr. Fava last appeared before the Commission at the January meeting for consideration of this proposal. At that time the Commissioners agreed that the majority of the landscaping was acceptable, but prior to voting on the application they requested a photograph of the brickwork from the perspective of the street approach, showing the full length of the driveway including both the brick and the asphalt portions. The applicants submitted photographs prior to this month's meeting.

Prior to the discussion of the driveway photo, Commissioner Yager asked Mr. Plowman if the property owner, Mr. White, had expressed to him what he would like the exterior of the building to look like if he was not concerned with getting approval from the Commission. Mr. Plowman replied that Mr. White would like to make the property as attractive as possible, as this will be his residence when he is in Schenectady. Commissioner Yager stated that her interest is that the building is a mid-century modern building with a front façade that does not reflect this time period, while the three other sides of the building do. She explained that because of the extensive record of responsible preservation work that Mr. White has done in the Stockade, it is her opinion that should he request a more mid-century modern treatment of the façade the Commission might consider it. Commissioner Craven noted that as a mid-century modern building the structure is now classified as historic, as it is more than fifty years old.

## ADOPTED

Commissioner Wiles asked for clarification of the scale of the photograph submitted. Mr. Plowman replied that the brick portion is twenty-five feet long and the asphalt portion extends an additional seventy feet to the street. Commissioner Wiles asked the applicants if the garage doors will be replaced. Mr. Plowman stated that they planned on replacing them in kind. Commissioner Yager asked what Mr. White would like to use for replacement. Mr. Plowman replied that he would prefer using flush, flat doors, which would better accommodate the flood vents that are required to be installed. Commissioner Yager stated that she had heard on her site visit that glass garage doors had been discussed. Mr. Plowman stated that Mr. White had mentioned them but that Mr. Plowman quickly talked him out of using them, due to their difficulty to maintain in this climate. Mr. Plowman noted that they would also like to remove all of the shutters from the building. The Commissioners agreed that removing the shutters would be acceptable. Commissioner Craven asked the Commissioners if they had any other outstanding issues with the landscaping. Commissioner Wiles stated that he did not feel that the brick in the driveway should extend any further. Mr. Plowman stated that it would not.

Motion by Commissioner Wiles, seconded by Commissioner Yager, to approve the application as submitted with the following conditions:

1. Once commenced, the project will be completed within one year.
2. The brick paver portion of the driveway will be limited to where it has currently been installed.
3. The applicant will obtain staff approval for the final design of the garage doors prior to installation.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

Findings:

1. This is a Type II SEQRA.
2. The building is an old building in the Stockade district that has a distinctly different architectural pedigree from the majority of the buildings in the district, as it dates from the 1950s.
3. Should the owner decide to change the façade of the building more dramatically the Commission would likely consider such a proposal favorable because a more dramatic change could be made without compromising the historic integrity of the building.

**B. Consideration for approval submitted by James Plowman, on behalf of Robin White, to rebuild the deck and replace windows. The premise is located at 1 Cucumber Alley.**

## **ADOPTED**

Jim Plowman, contractor for the project, and Joe Fava, property manager for Mr. White, appeared before the Commission. Mr. Plowman and Mr. Fava appeared before the Commission at the January 19, 2016 meeting. Prior to acting on the proposal, the Commissioners had requested at the January meeting that the applicants return with specific detailed cut sheets of the doors and windows to be used on the building. Commissioner Britt asked Mr. Plowman if he would review the plans for the deck, windows, and doors. Mr. Plowman explained where the new deck will be constructed and showed where the new windows and doors will be installed on the building. Commissioner Britt asked if the two new sets of three doors would be divided light or single pane. Mr. Plowman replied that they would be single pane. Commissioner Britt stated that she feels that the changes to the building will be positive and in keeping with the style of the structure. The Commissioners agreed.

Motion by Commissioner Britt, seconded by Commissioner Wiles, to approve the application as submitted with the following conditions:

1. Once commenced, the project will be completed within one year.
2. The new doors will be single light tempered glass and not the divided light doors that were shown on the submitted cut sheet.

***Motion carried unanimously.***

Findings:

1. This is a Type II SEQRA.
2. All new windows to be installed will be wood windows.

## **VII. NEW BUSINESS: Applications**

### **A. Consideration for approval submitted by OEM, LLC to paint the buildings. The premises are located at 410-412 Union Street.**

Ryan Lucey and John Daley appeared before the Commission. They explained that they are rehabbing these buildings and are currently taking part in a lead abatement program which will require complete repainting of the exteriors of the buildings. They noted that they do not plan to do any further work on the exterior of the buildings at this time, and Commissioner Britt explained that if in the future they do decide to make other exterior changes they will have to seek approval from the Commission. The Commissioners briefly reviewed the proposed colors for the buildings and they agreed that the colors are historically appropriate. Mr. Lucey explained that the front door on 410 Union Street will most likely need to be replaced. The Commissioners reviewed the photo of a new door that was submitted with the application and concluded that the style is not appropriate for the building. The applicants stated that this was a door that they already had and

## ADOPTED

thus had considered using it, but that they would be willing to simply replace the existing door in kind. Commissioner Britt asked that the old door be salvaged if possible. The applicants agreed.

Motion by Commissioner Yager, seconded by Commissioner Craven, to approve the application as submitted with the following condition:

1. Once commenced, the project will be completed in one year.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

Findings:

1. This is a Type II SEQRA.
2. The applicants and Commissioners discussed the replacement of the door on 410 Union Street which was not a part of this application and was not approved or disapproved. As part of the discussion the Commissioners reviewed a photo of a door that was submitted with the application. While the Commissioners agreed that the door was an attractive door, they do not feel that it is historically appropriate for this property. If the applicants decide to replace the current front door in kind they are not required to return to the Commission for further consideration. Should they decide to pursue an alternate design they are required to obtain approval from the Historic District Commission.

**B. Consideration for approval submitted by Michael and Mary Ellen Brockbank to replace the roof. The premise is located at 1494 Wendell Avenue.**

Mary Ellen Brockbank appeared before the Commission. Mrs. Brockbank explained that the law office addition portion of the structure still has its original slate roof, which is in severe disrepair. She and her husband propose to replace it with architectural grade shingles, photos of which were submitted with their application. Commissioner Britt noted that according to the file for the property the original slate roof on the house portion of the structure was replaced in 2008. Mrs. Brockbank confirmed this. Ms. Shamieh noted that the office addition was constructed in the 1950s. Commissioner Craven asked the applicant if there are now asphalt shingles on the entire main house. Mrs. Brockbank confirmed that in 2008 they re-roofed the entire residence portion of the structure with historic shingles, which were approved by the Commission.

Commissioner Wiles noted that at the beginning of his tenure on the Commission the practice was to require architectural grade shingles within the historic districts, but that in recent years the practice has been to require three-tab shingles. He stated that in his opinion the most important aspect of this project is that the two roofs match. Commissioner Wiles explained that during the time period when the

## ADOPTED

addition was constructed it was no longer the general practice to use slate roofs, thus it must have been the intention of the architect to match the office and the main house. Thus he feels that in order to support the original intention of the design, the two roofs should be of matching materials. Commissioner Craven agreed that she would prefer three-tab shingles on the addition but most importantly feels that the roofs should match. Commissioner Britt noted that she is very conflicted because ultimately she would like the slate to remain, but she also believes that the roofs should be the same material so as to support the original intent. She also noted that the slate is most likely only about halfway through its life span and perhaps could be repaired. Commissioner Craven asked Mrs. Brockbank if she has had a qualified slate contractor evaluate whether or not the roof can be repaired. Mrs. Brockbank responded that the roof is leaking very badly and many slates are falling off. She stated that when anyone goes on the roof the slates are cracking and falling apart. Commissioner Yager asked her if the slates are flaking. Mrs. Brockbank stated that they are coming apart in layers.

Commissioner Britt commented that it is not uncommon for slate roofs to lose slates every year and require yearly maintenance by a qualified contractor. She explained that she feels that slate roofs are undervalued, and that when properly maintained they can certainly survive their suggested one-hundred-year life span. Commissioner Britt noted that Schenectady was historically a slate roof city, and as the original slate roofs are lost they will never be replaced. She stated that she also feels, however, that the two roofs should match, as was the original intent.

Commissioner Wiles noted that if the Commission were to require that the slate roof be repaired this could potentially lead to fifty more years of inconsistency between the roofs. Commissioner Yager noted that she believes that the original intent was for the roofs to match, and thus she would have no trouble supporting a new roof on the addition, as long as it will match the residence roof in style and color. Commissioner Wiles noted that this situation is an inherited issue for the Commission since a previous decision had allowed the slate roof on the residence to be replaced. Commissioner Britt asked the applicant if the shingles on the residence match those proposed. Mrs. Brockbank stated that they are a different brand of shingle because that is what the contractor prefers to work with. Ms. Shamieh stated that is not determinable from the photos what type of roof is on the house – three-tab or architectural shingles. Ms. Shamieh looked up the shingle type noted in the file to have been used on the house. The Commissioners determined from the internet photo of the shingles that they believe them to be three-tab style. Commissioner Britt stated that she feels that it must be clear in the Commission's decision that the intent is for the two roofs to match in style and color. The Commissioners concurred.

Commissioner Yager asked Mrs. Brockbank what color the fascia boards are on the office. Mrs. Brockbank responded that she is not certain. Commissioner Yager noted that from the photos it appears that they are dark brown, and a white drip

## ADOPTED

edge is proposed. She stated that she would prefer the use of a dark brown drip edge in order for it to better blend with the fascia. The Commissioners concurred.

Motion by Commissioner Wiles, seconded by Commissioner Meigher, to approve the application as submitted with the following conditions:

1. Once commenced, the project will be completed in one year.
2. The application specifies a white drip edge will be used. The applicant will instead install a dark brown drip edge which will match the fascia of the building as closely as possible.
3. An architectural type shingle is proposed in the application. Because it was impossible to determine at the meeting exactly what type of shingle has been used on the residence portion of the building, the Commission requires that the shingles used on the office addition match the shingles on the house in color, style, and configuration. Thus, if architectural shingles were used on the residence, they are approved for use on the office, in a matching color. However, if it is determined that the shingles used on the house are the three-tab style, those are required for use on the office, in a color matching as closely to the house as possible. The result should be that the two portions of the structure have roofs that blend as seamlessly as possible, as was the original intent.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

Findings:

1. This is a Type II SEQRA.
2. The roof to be replaced is a slate roof that is approximately sixty years old and most likely could be sufficiently repaired.
3. The main house roof was replaced with asphalt shingles in 2008. The original intent of the architect was for the two roofs to match, as determined by the use of slate for the addition during a time period when the use of this material was not the general practice. Therefore the Commission concluded that this intent should be supported by approving a matching roof at this time.
4. The Commission supports the use of architectural grade shingles if they match what is used on the main house. If it is determined that three-tab shingles were used on the house, then this same type of shingle must be used on the office. It is the intent of the Commission that the color, style, and configuration of the shingles should match and blend as seamlessly as possible.

**C. Consideration for approval submitted by Arthur Edelstein to replace the roof. The premise is located at 1060 University Place.**

## **ADOPTED**

Arthur Edelstein and Eric Montgomery appeared before the Commission. Mr. Montgomery is the roofing contractor who will be doing the work. Mr. Edelstein explained that he replaced the other half of the roof thirty years ago when he purchased the property, and that he would now like to replace this half of the roof. He noted that he plans to replace the half of the roof that was replaced thirty years ago within the next few years, so that the entire roof will match.

Commissioner Britt asked Mr. Edelstein if the proposed shingles are as close in color to the other half of the roof as possible. Mr. Edelstein responded that they are. Commissioner Britt asked the Commissioners if they had any opinion on the proposed change from three-tab to architectural shingles and what they think of the proposed color. Commissioner Craven noted that while the original roof was most likely slate, with straight rows, as are three-tab shingles, the architectural shingles are staggered and more irregular in appearance, and thus do have a different appearance than the original slate did. However, she stated that in this case the roof is so high that it is barely visible from the street, and she would support the use of the proposed shingle for this reason. Mr. Montgomery stated that the applicant had chosen the architectural shingles because they are more durable and have a longer life span. He stated that the three-tab shingles currently available on the market are very thin and not very long-lived. Commissioner Wiles stated that he would support the use of architectural shingles in this case, due to the height and pitch of the roof. He noted that the other half of the roof, which the applicant stated will be replaced within a few years, is expected to be replaced with the same shingles. The Commissioners concurred. Mr. Edelstein stated that it is his plan to replace the second half of the roof with the same shingles as soon as it is financially feasible.

Motion by Commissioner Wiles, seconded by Commissioner Craven, to approve the application as submitted with the following conditions:

1. Once commenced, the project will be completed in one year.
2. The work on the roof is approved in two phases. Phase one will be the replacement of the south half of the roof, as explained in the application. Phase two will be the replacement of the remainder of the roof on the north side, which will be replaced with the same color and style shingles as used in phase one.

***Motion carried unanimously.***

Findings:

1. This is a Type II SEQRA.
2. The project was approved in phases so that the applicant has the option to replace the second half of the roof without having to return for further consideration by the Commission.

## **ADOPTED**

3. The owner is not required to pursue phase two of the application. Should he decide to only complete phase one, and phase two is not commenced within one year of this decision, he may return to the Commission at sometime in the future for consideration of the second half of the roof.
4. The north side of the roof was replaced thirty years ago, and it is in fair condition. The south side of the roof is in a more severe state of disrepair, and requires more immediate attention.

**D. Consideration for approval submitted by Judy and Greg Miller to demolish the side porch, replace kitchen door with a window, alter the size of windows on the side of the house, demolish the garage, erect a fence, replace windows and storm windows, paint and repair the front porches and front door, and other alterations. The premise is located at 1037-1039 Gillespie Street.**

Judy Miller and Chaya Tal appeared before the Commission. Mrs. Miller and Ms. Tal appeared before the Commission at the January 19, 2016 meeting for an informal discussion regarding the property. Due to the large scope of the application, Commissioner Britt suggested that the Commissioners review and discuss it in sections following how it is divided by the owners in the application. The Commissioners agreed. Commissioner Yager noted that in her research she found that the house was built around 1900, and not in 1920 as was stated in the application. Commissioner Craven agreed that it appeared to be a style that was prevalent around the turn of the century. The applicant stated that according to the information they had been given about the house it dated from 1920, but agreed that this information could be slightly off.

Commissioner Britt then opened the discussion with Section A of the application, dealing with the side porch and kitchen door. Commissioner Britt noted that from the evidence provided it could be concluded that the side porch was not original to the house. The Commissioners concurred. Commissioner Craven asked if the applicants know if the side door was original or added later. Mrs. Miller stated that she did not know. Commissioner Yager asked Mrs. Miller if the house was originally a two-family home or had been converted from a single family residence. Mrs. Miller stated that she did not know, but that there was a single front entrance with a nice staircase in the entryway. Commissioner Craven commented that this style was very common for a two-family home of this time period in this area of the city, so she would be inclined to conclude that it had always been a two-family residence. Commissioner Britt commented that because there is another rear entrance to the first floor she would conclude that the side door was a later addition. Commissioner Craven asked Mrs. Miller how she planned on repairing the vinyl siding after removing the porch and door. Mrs. Miller stated that they planned to use vinyl siding from the rear of the building.

The Commissioners discussed the window with which the applicants proposed to replace the door. The consensus was that the window was too small and did not

## **ADOPTED**

appear to be the size that would have originally been used, as the other windows surrounding it are larger. Mrs. Miller stated that they had chosen the smaller window because it fit better with the interior kitchen floor plan. Commissioner Britt suggested that perhaps they could leave the door and simply nail it shut. Commissioner Craven stated that she believed that nailing the door shut might not be allowed under city code. Commissioner Yager noted that she believes that the window replacing the door should be larger. Commissioner Craven concurred and stated that the proposed smaller window is not consistent with the original style of the house. Commissioner Britt agreed and stated that the consensus of the Commission seemed to be that they would approve the installation of a window of the same size as the adjacent windows. Ms. Shamieh noted that the larger window would require extending the opening higher than the door opening. The Commissioners concurred that they would be okay with extending the opening further up. Commissioner Britt noted that perhaps the original framing for the window might still be in evidence once the siding is removed in that area. Ms. Shamieh noted that according to the design guidelines the goal of the Commission should be to maintain the original intended rhythm of the fenestration, which would require the larger window. Commissioner Britt stated that it is the opinion of the Commissioners that the porch may be demolished and the door replaced with a two pane over two pane wood window of the same size as the other windows surrounding it. The Commissioners concurred.

Commissioner Britt then advanced the discussion to Section B of the application, dealing with the garage. Commissioner Britt asked if any of the Commissioners had gone into the garage or inspected it closely. Commissioner Craven stated that she had observed the exterior and poked her head inside. She stated that she believes the garage to date probably from the 1950s, and that while she is not an engineer it appeared to her that the garage could most likely be saved. Commissioner Craven stated that her concerns regarding the removal of the garage led her to two questions. First, how would the space be physically filled when looking into the property from Gillespie Street, and second, how would the applicants replace the significant noise and privacy buffer that the garage provides. Commissioner Craven also noted that Union College students have repeatedly made an opening in the fence at the rear of the property, even using tools, in order to facilitate their use of the property as a shortcut to access the carriage house on the property behind it, where many student parties are held. Mrs. Miller stated that perhaps she could install a chain link fence behind a stockade fence so that it would be more difficult to vandalize. The Commissioners agreed that this could be an option.

Commissioner Britt asked for the Commissioners' opinions regarding the demolition of the garage. Commissioner Yager stated that it appeared to be in a state of severe disrepair and that she would not be averse to allowing it to be demolished. Commissioner Meigher agreed. Commissioner Wiles stated that he would not agree with demolishing the garage, and that he believes that repairing it

## ADOPTED

would be less costly and complicated than the applicants believe. He noted that the neighborhood has many garages of different styles from different eras and that he believes that they should be preserved if at all possible. He stated that without the garage the rear of the property would most likely end up as a large parking area which was clearly not the original intent.

Commissioner Britt next moved on to Section C of the application – Front Door and Porch. She noted that much of the proposed work would be replacing or painting in kind, with the exception of the stair railings and the approval of the brown paint color. Commissioner Britt noted that it would be her recommendation to replace the newel post with a square post, but that the Commission could not require it. The Commissioners concurred that a square post would be more in keeping with the original intent. Commissioner Meigher asked Mrs. Miller if the entire porch would be painted the brown color submitted. Mrs. Miller stated that this was their intent. The Commissioners agreed that this would be acceptable.

The Commissioners next discussed Section D, concerning the windows.

Commissioner Britt noted that the metal capping proposed has already been used elsewhere on the house, and that she would agree to the use of new brown metal storm windows. The Commissioners concurred. The Commissioners discussed the replacement of windows “a” and “c” and the kitchen door with three windows of the same size as window “2” (as designated on the submitted photo). The Commissioners concluded that they would be averse to decreasing the size of the three windows, because as previously discussed this would negatively impact the original intended rhythm of the fenestration. Commissioner Britt noted that Section E of the application, dealing with the back of the house, is not under the purview of the Commission as it is not visible from the public right of way.

The discussion then returned to the demolition of the garage. Commissioner Britt stated that she agreed with Commissioner Wiles that the garage should be preserved if at all possible. Commissioner Meigher stated that he did not visit the property but that he feels that the garage does not significantly add to the aesthetic value of the site. Commissioner Craven stated that she believes that the garage is salvageable. She noted that it was most likely built to replace the original carriage house on the property and that without it there would be a significant hole at the end of the driveway. Commissioner Britt noted that repairing the garage would most likely be of the same cost or less than demolishing it. Mrs. Miller stated that she believes that the garage is in a severe state of disrepair and is structurally unsound. Commissioner Wiles noted that unfortunately Mrs. Miller is the new owner of the property and the garage was previously allowed to fall into disrepair, but that letting the structure deteriorate to this degree does not give an automatic license for it be demolished. As a courtesy Ms. Shamieh reviewed the relevant section of the City Code Section 264-76.C.2 (e) which states, “ No structure may be demolished unless the Commission finds that preservation of the structure is not warranted under the general standards set forth in this section. Demolition may be

## **ADOPTED**

permitted only after the developer of the site has submitted and obtained approval for such plans for new development, including Commission approval for new construction, including an acceptable timetable and guaranties which may include performance bonds for demolition and completion of the project. In no case shall the time between demolition and commencement of new construction exceed six months.”

Commissioner Britt stated that it is her opinion that the garage should be removed from the application and considered separately, after the applicants have an opportunity to investigate the cost and viability of repairing the garage. The Commissioners concurred. In response to Mrs. Miller’s suggestion that she could construct a gazebo or similar structure in place of the demolished garage, Commissioner Craven noted that while a gazebo might be lovely it would not be in keeping with the original working class character of the property or the neighborhood. Commissioner Britt concluded the discussion by thanking the applicants for all the work that they are doing to rehabilitate the property and for working with the Commission to ensure that the work is done according to historic standards.

Motion by Commissioner Britt, seconded by Commissioner Craven, to approve the application as submitted with the following conditions and amendments:

1. Once commenced, the project will be completed in one year.
2. Regarding Section A of the application – the kitchen door (b) will be removed and replaced with a two over two pane window to match window (a) in the photo submitted in materials, dimensions and situation.
3. The garage demolition is removed from the application and will be considered at a later time when the applicant will submit a more detailed plan for the garage, as required by City Code 264-76.C.2 (e).
4. Regarding Section C of the application – the paint color is approved as submitted, as are all other repairs that are not in kind.
5. Regarding Section D of the application – Item 1 is approved as submitted. Item 2a. regarding the kitchen window is not approved. Item 2b. replacement window will match window (a) indicated in the photo submitted in the application. Item 2c. to shorten the west 2nd floor window is not approved.
6. Section E dealing with the rear of the house is not within the purview of the Commission and therefore was not considered.

***Motion carried unanimously.***

Findings:

1. This is a Type II SEQRA.

## **ADOPTED**

2. The Commission recommends that the applicants consider replacing the newel post on the front porch with a square 4” by 4” newel post with an appropriate cap.
3. The garage will be considered at a future meeting. The Commissioners concluded that they need further information regarding the viability and cost of repairing the structure versus demolishing it, as well as plans for what would be constructed in its place should it have to be razed, per City Code 264-76.C.2 (e).
4. The current condition of the property is not good. The applicants are undertaking a significant amount of work and expense to rehabilitate to property according to historic standards.

### **IX. MISCELLANEOUS**

The Commissioners agreed that Commissioner Wiles will serve as acting Chair for the March meeting. If for some unforeseen reason he is unable to attend the meeting, Commissioner Britt will serve as acting Vice Chair and lead the meeting.

### **X. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion by Commissioner Craven, seconded by Commissioner Meigher, to adjourn the meeting.

*Motion carried unanimously.*

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 pm.