



# DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

## MINUTES (FINAL)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2022

6:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL ROOM

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

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

**ABSENT:** Tad Roemer

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

### **A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:**

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, made a motion to approve the January 12, 2022, & February 16, 2022, DRC Meeting Minutes with minor corrections. 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; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, 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.

- #20220116 294 LAKE SOLAR MODIFICATION**, 294 Lake Avenue, Architectural Review of rooftop solar panels within the Urban Residential-1 District.
- #20220125 SARATOGA DENTAL ARTS SIGNAGE**, 153 West Avenue, Architectural Review of a wall sign and freestanding sign within a Transect-4 Urban Neighborhood District.
- #20220135 ATHLETA EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS AND SIGNAGE**, 331 Broadway, Historic Review of exterior modifications and wall signage within a Planned Unit Development (PUD).
- #20220140 40 GEORGE ROOF REPLACEMENT**, 40 George Street, Historic Review of roof replacement within the Urban Residential-3 District. **\*\*CHAIR RECUSED\*\***
- #20220153 RAYMOUR & FLANIGAN SIGNAGE**, 121 Ballston Avenue, Architectural Review of wall signage within the Highway General Business District.

**6. #20220110 RHEA WALL SIGN**, 389 Broadway, Historic Review of wall signage within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.

**7. #20220092 4 STAFFORD BRIDGE BARN RESTORATION**, 4 Stafford Bridge Rd., Architectural Review of exterior modifications to a barn structure within the Rural Residential District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there were any questions or comments from the Commission regarding these applications.

**RESUSAL:**

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, recused from Item #4 – 40 George Street - on the Consent Agenda. This Vice Chair will manage this consent agenda item following the approval of the above listed Consent Agenda items.

**DISCLOSURE:**

Leslie DiCarlo disclosed she owns property within 500 ft. of the 40 George Street application – on the Consent Agenda. Chris Bennett disclosed he owns property within 500 ft. of the 40 George Street application – on the Consent Agenda.

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

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of 294 Lake Solar Modification, 294 Lake Avenue; Saratoga Dental Arts Signage, 154 West Avenue; Athleta Exterior Modifications and Signage, 331 Broadway; Raymour & Flanigan Signage, 121 Ballston Avenue; Rhea Wall Signage, 389 Broadway; 4 Stafford Bridge Barn Restoration, 4 Stafford Bridge Road; 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; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor

**MOTION PASSES: 6-0**

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, assumed the duties of the Chair regarding Agenda Item #4 on the Consent Agenda.

**4. #20220140 40 GEORGE ROOF REPLACEMENT**, 40 George Street, Historic Review of roof replacement within the Urban Residential-3 District.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, made a motion in the matter of the 40 George Roof Replacement, 40 George Street be approved as submitted. Chris Bennett seconded the motion.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, asked if there was any further discussion. None heard.

**VOTE:**

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

**MOTION PASSES: 5-0**

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, resumed the duties of the Chair.

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

**C. DRC APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION:**

**1. #20211224 SPENCER CONDOMINIUMS METAL PARTITION, 55 Phila Street, Historic Review of a metal partition within the Transect-6 (T-6) District.**

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Commission would like clarification on this application regarding the size of the screening and type of material proposed.

Agent: Jake McCumber

Mr. McCumber stated the applicant is proposing the screening at 5'3" in height to provide privacy from restaurant patrons when the tenants are entering the apartment building. The screening is proposed to be constructed of a zinc treated woven wire mesh which provides privacy and protection.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, questioned if there was any other consideration for alternative solutions.

Mr. McCumber stated this is what the owners of the property have decided to use in this area.

Ellen Sheehan stated the courtyard is very pretty with decorative ironwork. It is difficult to determine how big the screening will be. Also, you have industrial type screening proposed which does not enhance the courtyard and would detract from it.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated one of the concerns was patrons parking strollers, in front of the entrance.

Mr. McCumber stated this was taken into consideration in the thought behind the proposed screening.

Jeff Gritsavage stated this is new building and outside dining was not considered when it was built. He agrees screening is needed but it should be something less industrial and more creative and fits with the building.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated incorporating a custom planter into the ironwork would provide more privacy. Follow the cues that are there.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated there are no issues with installing screening in this location, it should be more compatible with what currently exists. Simple but complementary. As soon as we receive revised plans, we will place you back on the next agenda.

**2. #20211162 PRICE CHOPPER SIGNAGE, 115 Ballston Avenue, Advisory Opinion to the ZBA regarding the proposed installation of an illuminated directional sign on an existing light post on commercial property within the Highway General Business (HGB) District.**

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this is simply an Advisory Opinion to the ZBA for the installation of an illuminated directional sign on an existing light post.

Applicant: Price Chopper/Market 32

Agent: Tom Lee, Project Manager

Mr. Lee stated this is related to the grocery pickup program with hours of operation from 9AM-8PM. We are proposing the installation of signage on an existing light pole in the parking lot. The parking lot sign as well as pole light is controlled via solar clock inside the store. This will turn on 20 minutes before dusk and 20 minutes after dawn. The LED sign is intended to be a beacon to direct customers to that parking area. There is no adverse effect from this lighting on the neighborhood. Photographs of what is being proposed were provided. We are also requesting two directional signs on concrete posts.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the ZBA is requesting an Advisory Opinion on the light pole sign and two directional signs.

The Chair stated she personally feels a sign at that height, especially painted light green is not appropriate. The bright green is obtrusive and not compatible with that entire strip mall. Was there any consideration given to placing this on the side of the building, rather than the middle of the parking lot.

Mr. Lee explained the logistics of the location in the parking lot. It is convenience driven. The color of the signage is their logo, and they try to limit the size of the signage.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the location, the height and illumination is inappropriate and obtrusive.

Jeff Gritsavage noted the functionality of the location and since this is in a strip mall, he does not have a problem with the request.

Leslie DiCarlo spoke regarding the directional signage which is fine but the illuminate pick up sign is not appropriate. She feels this is more an advertisement of a service than functional.

Ellen Sheehan stated locating this on the side of the store would be preferable to her. With directional signage it would be easy to find.

Mr. Lee stated this location is a further distance for the employees. We try to limit the time patrons wait for their groceries. We try to keep it in the center of the store.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated the side location is also preferable to him. It would be the ideal location. The Vice Chair suggested the applicant should look at their competitor Hannaford and how they have accommodated this type of service along with signage. Also, since the service ends at 8 PM but the light remains on all night, a timer on the light would provide the ability to shut the illuminated sign off. Pavers versus paint in the pickup location would also provide additional designation for parking for this service.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding the light pole signage, versus wayfinding signage, illumination and timer setting on light pole signage and relocation.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, questioned the Commission and took a straw poll to determine the thoughts on the illuminated sign on the light and determine the consensus of the Commission.

Jeff Gritsavage is fine with one type of sign or the other, not both. Chris Bennett is fine. Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair is ok with the signage if it were on a timer. His preference is relocation. Tamie Ehinger, Chair, Leslie DiCarlo, and Ellen Sheehan feel the signage is not appropriate.

Leslie DiCarlo stated this is a nice strip mall. It is uncluttered, has nice plantings, and is well maintained. If we allow this type of signage for Price Chopper it may set a precedent for other business to request the same.

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

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of the Advisory Opinion to the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding the Price Chopper Signage, 115 Ballston Avenue the Design Review Commission issues the following opinion on March 9, 2022 - The DRC encourages the applicant to eliminate the beacon sign and simply use the wayfinding signs which are appropriate for this location. 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; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor

**MOTION PASSES: 6-0**

**3. #20220009 102 LINCOLN EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS & NEW ACCESSORY STRUCTURE**, 102 Lincoln Avenue, Architectural Review of exterior modifications and a proposed accessory structure within the Neighborhood Complementary Use-2 District.

Applicant: Catherine Sharp

Agent: Sue Davis, SD Atelier Architecture

Ms. Davis stated she is here to revisit the items discussed at a previous meeting. We discussed the front porch decking which is proposed to be replaced with Mahogany tung and groove decking, and the deck and stairs facing the west which is exposed. If the Commission will only accept wood, then we will use wood. We also spoke regarding the handrails and the bracket over the door protection, and we have revised that. The window on this elevation has been modified to provide a more accurate depiction. The storm door will be refurbished and used on the rear. The west elevation shows the new rear addition, the brackets and where the door is located and where the storm door will be repurposed. This elevation shows the new rear deck and railings. The client had concerns regarding using a black iron painted guard to meet the building code. The applicant prefers to use wood. A revision of that elevation regarding the railing coming into compliance using wood versus iron. A visual of the latticework was provided. Regarding the pavilion we have removed the cupola. Visuals of how the pavilion relates to the house, with the trees and such. Illustrations were shown regarding the revised handrail on the front porch. We are still working with the color palette. Our preference for the pavilion is wood but near the water table which we would like to use a poly ash product. Samples were provided to the Commission. Material listing was provided to the Commission.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we do not have purview over color since this is a residential unit. The Chair thanked the applicant for providing a summation of what the Commission requested and addressing everything the Commission raised concerns about. The Chair stated in terms of the guard rail detail, the wood versus metal it is appropriate. In terms of the decking, she is glad to hear they are considering the use of wood which the Chair encourages. There are unique circumstances with this deck. We do strive to be consistent. In this case, this is exposed to the elements, its location and it is not a highly visible area, it would not be inappropriate to use a product other than wood. Post details presented are far more appropriate than a stone base. The pavilion is considered new construction. New construction in an Architectural Review district we often allow for new materials. The chair has no objection to the base being an Azek product. She is happy the cupola is being removed. In terms of the lattice on the pavilion it is a struggle. The objective with the lattice is to reduce the impact.

Ellen Sheehan stated the changes made are great. She has no problem with the materials. Job well done.

Jeff Gritsavage stated he is pleased and agrees with the amount of detail in addressing the all the concerns. Good job.

Leslie DiCarlo stated it would be hard pressed to discern even from 10 ft. away the difference between Azek and wood. The best screening Dutchman's pipe. It is a vine that was extremely popular during Victorian times. It makes a very thick impenetrable screen and the leaves drop off in the winter.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated regarding the side porch, driving the floor in that location is the applicant does not want to paint it.

Ms. Davis stated there is concern regarding how it is going to weather. A sample of an Azek product was provided to the Commission. A painted mahogany with a painted house is not aesthetically what the applicant was going for. The front porch will remain wood.

Rob DuBoff questioned if the entire porch will be removed and replaced. Also, is the trim going to be wood or Boral?

Ms. Davis stated they are repairing those areas which require repair. They are hoping to replace just the decking.

The intent is not to totally replace. We are proposing to use wood on the house and Borel for the water table. Samples of flooring products were provided to the Commission.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, agrees with what you are proposing to use on the base of the posts for the pavilion. This house is a historic home in an Architectural District. If this came before the Commission and they wanted to remove the decking, the Commission would question why the decking is being removed. It is an original porch.

Chris Bennett stated Rob makes a good point, and it is a fair question to ask.

Ms. Davis stated she does not know what exists underneath. She is requesting approval tonight noting there will be repairs done to it. The applicant wants to have the entire floor decking replaced.

Chris Bennett stated is the flooring beyond repair. Does it need to be a complete replacement of the decking?

Discussion ensued regarding the decking on the porch and the current condition.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we can simply eliminate the porch decking from any approvals and request the applicant provide additional detailed information on the condition of the front porch.

Ms. Davis questioned if there is a possibility of a site visit.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she does not feel a site visit is necessary. The Chair feels strongly that the Commission will be moving forward with approvals this evening except for the front porch decking. Photographic evidence would be fine. If the applicant can provide the information to staff as soon as possible the application will be placed on the next agenda.

Chris Bennett stated his feeling is anything other than wood is detrimental to the environment.

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

Ellen Sheehan made a motion in the matter of 102 Lincoln Exterior Modifications & New Accessory Structure, 102 Lincoln Avenue the DRC Commission issues the following decision on March 9, 2022 – Approve with the following conditions – Approval on the application except for the front porch. The applicant will provide additional details on the front porch decking. Jeff Gritsavage seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE:**

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

**MOTION PASSES: 6-0**

4. **#2022005 LEIPONIS PARTIAL DEMOLITION & SINGLE-STORY ADDITION**, 225 Caroline Street, Modification to Historic Approvals for a single-story addition to an existing single-family residence in the Urban Residential-3 (UR-3) District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this is simply a modification to historic approvals for a single-story addition to an existing single-family residence. There is an existing approval, this is simply a modification to that approval. The Chair noted she initially recused from this application when it initially appeared before the Commission for a demolition of a garage. That is not before the Commission this evening so there is no need for recusal.

Agent: Matt Hurff, Architect

Mr. Hurff stated what the applicants are proposing is to do all the work on the original house, as approved in the original submission. We are taking the two-story addition on the rear and reducing it to a one-story addition. It has the same footprint as the original design. We took the approved roof design and dropped it down. A visual of the proposed project was provided to the Commission. The proposal is to match the existing stone on the foundation and how it ties into the original structure. We have matched the pitch and scale to the existing dormer with the addition.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, state she sees nothing inappropriate about this modification. Materials are the same. The mass and scale are more appropriate. Footprint is the same or minimally altered. She has no objections to this modification.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there were any further questions or comment from the Commission. None heard.

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

Julia Van Hall, Saratoga Springs stated this project is more appropriate for the home.

Rob DuBoff made a motion in the matter of the Leiponis Exterior Modifications and Single-Story Addition, 225 Caroline Street the application be approved as submitted or shown on the attached plans. Leslie DiCarlo seconded the motion.

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

**VOTE:**

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

**MOTION PASSES: 6-0**

**UPCOMING MEETINGS:**

Design Review Commission Caravan, Wednesday, March 16, 2022, at 5:00 P.M.  
Design Review Commission Meeting, Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 6:00 P.M.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN:**

There being no further business to discuss Tamie Ehinger, Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7:40 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Buzanowski  
Recording Secretary

Approved: March 28, 2022