



DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION

MINUTES (FINAL)

WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 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; Tad Roemer

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

A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Deferred to the May 25th meeting.

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. **#20220275 OSTERIA DANNY EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS,** 26 Henry Street, Historic Review of a patio awning and wall signage within the Transect-5 Neighborhood Center District.

2. **#20220317 WASABI PERGOLA MODIFICATIONS** , 63 Putnam Street, Modification of Historic Review approval originally granted on 03/20/2019 and 06/13/2019 and extended to 04/07/21 for a new pergola attached to an existing building within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.

3. **#20220359 CAFÉ LENA FREESTANDING SIGN,** 47 Phila Street, Architectural Review of a new freestanding Sign within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.

****REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA PLACE ON REGULAR AGENDA****

4. **#20220363 SARATOGA BOTANICALS WALL SIGNS,** 130 Excelsior Avenue, Architectural Review of wall signage within the Transect-5 Neighborhood Center District.

5. **#202200365 STYLED BY LILY SARATOGA WALL SIGNS,** 25 Lawrence Street, Architectural Review of wall signage within the Transect-5 Neighborhood Center District.

6. #20220369 SARATOGA NATIONAL FREESTANDING SIGN, 458 Union Avenue, Architectural Review of a freestanding sign within the Rural Residential District.

7. #20220277 PITNEY MEADOWS GARAGE EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS, 223 West Avenue, Architectural Review of a roof replacement and exterior modifications for a garage structure within a Planned Unit Development (PUD).

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if there were any questions or comments from the Commission regarding these applications.
None heard.

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

Tenant of Spencer Condominiums voiced concerns regarding the Café Lena Freestanding Sign.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated since concerns were voiced regarding this application it will be removed from the consent agenda and placed on the regular agenda.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of Osteria Danny Exterior Modifications at 26 Henry Street, Wasabi Pergola Modifications, 63 Putnam Street, Saratoga Botanicals Wall Signs, 130 Excelsior Avenue, Styled by Lily Saratoga Wall Signs, 25 Lawrence Street, Saratoga National Freestanding Sign, 458 Union Avenue, Pitney Meadows Garage Exterior Modifications, 223 West Avenue 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; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

C. DRC APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

1. #20220359 CAFÉ LENA FREESTANDING SIGN, 47 Phila Street, Architectural Review of a new freestanding sign within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.

Applicant: Peter Martin, Volunteer, Secretary of the Board of Directors Café Lena;
Sarah Craig, Executive Director, Café Lena

Mr. Martin provided a visual of the location of the freestanding sign which is located on the far-left hand side of the courtyard as you face the courtyard. It will be prepared in a metal like the existing metal archway crafted by the same fabricators who did the archway. There is a footing which will attach the signage to the ground. A visual of the proposed footing was provided to the Commission. The electricity will come from the building at 47 Phila Street underground and up through the inside of the casing. The pavers will be removed for a short time, but it is next to the wall and will not affect any of the pavers on the adjoining properties. **The Café is responsible and does contract with the same company as Spencer Condominiums to care for our access and property.**

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

Tad Roemer questioned the size of the signage.

Mr. Martin stated the sign is 54 inches in height including the finials on the top and bottom.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair questioned if the signage itself would be internally lit.

Mr. Martin stated the sign will be internally lit and illuminated on the posters inside the box.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, spoke regarding the scrolling and finials and noted the signage will present differently than on the sketch.

Leslie DiCarlo noted there maybe concern over the size of the box.

Ms. Craig, Executive Director stated they have custom designed poster artwork for every event posted in the signage.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated what might be helpful for the Commission, if possible, to rethink the sketch and detail it out further. The group would be more comfortable in determining if the signage requested is appropriate. Also, a mockup of the signage should be in the permanent signage location.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated as soon as this information is received it will be circulated amongst the Commission members and if there is no objection, we will place the application back on the next consent agenda. If the applicant would speak with his neighbors regarding concerns about construction.

2. #20220306 105 REGENT POOL AND LANDSCAPE SCREENING, 105 Regent Street,
Historic Review of a
new pool and landscape modifications within the Urban Residential-4 District.

Applicant: Ashley Gardner

Ms. Gardner stated they are proposing a pool installation for their home. A visual of the property was provided. The pool is a 16 x 35 ft. located to the rear inner portion of the property. We are proposing associated landscaping with a paver patio.

We have proposed interior landscaping as well as on the perimeter of the property for additional privacy. Fencing will remain however additional modifications will be made to meet the code requirements for the pool.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, questioned what is being proposed for the plantings, and what is the current height of the fencing.

Ms. Gardner stated they are proposing arborvitae as well as larger trees on the corners for privacy. Ms. Gardner stated the current fence is approximately 5ft 4in. in height.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated she has no concern with the installation of the pool or landscaping. Her only concern is the proposed height of the plantings. Arborvitae tend to grow quite tall. The Chair noted she would be comfortable with the landscape screening to be no taller than the fence along Park Place. An alternative to the arborvitae could be considered.

Ellen Sheehan stated her concerns are the same as the Chair. She would be okay if they were a bit higher than the fence but not 10 or 20 ft. in height creating a huge wall along Regent Street.

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

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding screening, height of the proposed screening and type of materials that could be used effectively in this area.

Ellen Sheehan made a motion in the matter of the application of the 105 Regent Pool and Landscape Screening, 105 Regent Street, the DRC Issues the following decision on May 4, 2022 - Approve - with the following conditions - that the Park Place screening will be no taller than 6ft. 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; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

3. #20211195 RAY THIRD FLOOR ADDITION, 30 Fifth Avenue, Historic Review of a third-floor addition to an existing single-family within the Urban Residential-1 (UR-1) District.1

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated the applicant has previously appeared before the Commission. The applicant's agent has provided the Commission with final drawings and looking for approval for the project at this time.

Applicant: Justin & Caroline Ray

Agent: Bob Flansburg, Dreamscapes Unlimited

Mr. Flansburg stated they have appeared before the Commission. The Commission did provide feedback and requested additional work be focused on the third story dormers trying to reduce their scale. The three small dormers have been reduced in size. The windows are smaller and there isn't any siding on either side of the windows just trim work for the window casing. There is a small amount of siding in the peak. We have also matched this design on the other side of the gable, so it is symmetrical. The third story gable has become a bit larger and cleaner and more classic.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this new design is a huge improvement in terms of fenestration and is much more appropriate for the style of the house, the neighborhood and district. The Chair did have a concern with the material on the interior of the gables which looks to be sided. The Commission will discuss and review if that is appropriate. The other concern is regarding the materials themselves. The siding is proposed to be fiber cement as exterior cladding.

Mr. Flansburg stated the third story materials will be fiber cement siding. The reveal and color will match that of the home.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated our design guidelines and standards note any alterations and additions onto a historic home should be made of natural materials.

Ellen Sheehan stated on **the front façade there was something about the dormer** which seemed off. She analyzed this and she believes although it has been improved with the dormers and windows being smaller, the cheeks and the corner boards are wider than the windows below them. They should be the same size or a bit smaller. Also, when she drove by, she noted in the architects drawing the

second story windows are wider than the first floor but, they are narrower. Her concern is that the top floor windows will appear oversized.

Mr. Flansburg stated he will re-measure them and verify that. The drawings or visual are not correct.

Ellen Sheehan stated her concern is the dormers in addition to them being overall too wide what you want to have is the top to have a lighter feel. Also, the chimney is proposed to be removed. Will there be roof venting for the HVAC unit?

Mr. Flansburg stated it is being removed, however, he is unsure of the venting. It will not be on the **front façade of the home.**

Chris Bennett stated he agrees with Ellen. The project is a bit top heavy. The siding and the gable are a concern.
The overall idea of the three separate dormers looks good with the house. Perhaps closing the cornice returns would work.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding finishing the front façade, the front of the dormers, eliminate the siding in the dormers, re-check the size of the windows. Perhaps photographs of successful dormers would be helpful to the Commission to see.

Mr. Flansburg stated he appreciates the feedback from the Commission. The applicant's agent will take the suggestions and rework the plans and return before the Commission with a finalized product.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, questioned the applicant's agent if he is proposing decreasing the size of all three dormers?

Mr. Flansburg stated a slight reduction in size about 6 inches overall and tying the gables together.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated for them to be appropriate they should not be any wider than those below. You mentioned code regarding the windows on this historic home. Have you spoken to Patrick Cogan, Zoning Officer, Building Inspector?

Mr. Flansburg stated he knows Patrick Cogan very well.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the reason Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, brings this up is there are exemptions for historic homes. It does become complicated, and you may wish to explore that avenue with Mr. Cogan.

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

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked the applicant's agent if he is comfortable with the suggestions the Commission has provided.

The dormer size, ensuring at a minimum the same width as the windows below, potentially a bit narrower, or the same. We spoke about looking at alternate materials for the gables, the use of natural products on the exterior, and a meeting with Patrick Cogan, Zoning Officer/Building Inspector.

4. #20220230 BAILEY'S EXTERIOR KITCHEN REPLACEMENT, 37 Phila Street,
Architectural Review of a new
exterior kitchen within the Transect-6 District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the applicant has appeared before the Commission previously. He has returned with additional

information.

Applicant: Sam Bottini, Owner

Mr. Bottini stated he collaborated with the gentleman who does the photoshop for the container company. A visual rendering of what currently exists and what the new kitchen will look like on the site was provided. The container will be painted a dark grey in color.

It is set far back from the property.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the renditions are helpful. It is what it is. Aesthetically it is not appealing nor is it an ideal solution for the Bailey's.

Mr. Bottini stated the rendering presented to the Board is incomplete. The completed product will have openings like a garage door matching the color of the container.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she is happy it will be painted to match the container. There may be detailing added to it to make it more aesthetically pleasing. An awning coming off which would allow better access. Any type of architectural feature on the front of the container would help.

Mr. Bottini stated once they have their fence and greenery and the tree that is blooming this container is not very well seen from the street.

Leslie DiCarlo questioned if the footprint of the new container would be larger than the previous shed. With the plantings and greenery surrounding it will be fine. An awning might make it look more festive.

Mr. Bottini stated the new container is a bit larger.

Tad Roemer questioned the original application showed the kitchen size as 24 ft.

Mr. Bottini stated the original application was for a rebuild. The containers only come in certain sizes.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, questioned if the applicant is proposing any exterior lighting on the container kitchen.

Mr. Bottini stated he was not proposing any exterior lighting. There is exterior lighting on the building and rope lighting in the patio. There is interior lighting in the kitchen area.

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

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Commission is in favor of an awning or a type of metal visor over the window openings to soften the effect on the front. We will move forward on this application. Information on the awning or visor can be approved administratively.

Jeff Gritsavage made a motion in the matter of the application of Bailey's Exterior Kitchen Replacement, 37 Phila Street, the DRC issues the following decision on May 4, 2022, - Approve with the following conditions - that a permanent metal type visor awning or awning is constructed above the windows to be approved administratively. Final plans and dimensions to be submitted for the file. 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; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor;
Ellen Sheehan, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

5. #20220308 145 UNION REAR ADDITION AND EXTERIOR MODIFICATIONS, 145

Union Avenue,

Historic Review of reconstruction of a rear porch and a new single-story addition within the Urban

Residential-4 District.

RECUSAL:

Leslie DiCarlo recused from this application due to the proximity of her property to the application.

DISCLOSURE:

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, disclosed that she owns property at 115 Union Avenue.

Applicant: Kate Amello, owner

Agent: Sue Davis, SD Atelier Architecture

Ms. Davis provided a visual of the property location noting the neighborhood context as well. We are proposing reconstruction of a new porch and a new single-story addition on the rear of the structure. None of the proposed construction involves the front of the structure at all and is not visible from the street. A visual of the existing site plan was provided noting the lot width is only 40 ft. We are proposing to remove the existing porch and rebuild it extending it out to the end of the house to become usable interior space. The only access to the basement is from a hatch in the rear porch. We are trying to provide better access to the basement from the interior of the house. Ms. Davis noted the applicant is dealing with water/snow accumulation issues on the north elevation. There are also interior renovations which requires a new foundation, and the east elevation porch is suffering with structural issues. We are proposing to remove the stairs on the north elevation and reconfigure the east elevation and create a roofline that will push the snow further away from the house. Floor plans, photographs and all elevation views were provided to the Commission. The owner states she has old doors which will be integrated into the rear of the home. On the east elevation porch railings will be reused where possible, cedar railings where necessary will be used painted to match existing. On the west elevation, a metal roof is being proposed. The other roof will be rebuilt with Architectural shingles. Columns will be wood painted, deck is composite tung and groove, windows on the addition will be a Marvin Signature Wood Double hung. Siding to match the existing exposure. At the areas where non-combustible wall is required, Boral Ash Fly or fiber cement board siding is proposed.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she feels this is a very straightforward application and a nice improvement to the rear of the home. There is little visibility if any and feels the asphalt shingles is an appropriate choice for this area. The area you referred to using a non-combustible material per code is correct it cannot be wood, with the remainder of the project using wood.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, questioned the condition of the two windows being removed from the second story of the structure on the west elevation, and are they historic?

Ms. Davis stated she does not believe these windows are historic windows. These windows are being replaced due to the interior reconfiguration and floor plan and the concern regarding the roof. Ms.

Davis stated she will re-investigate the condition of the windows, but since they were replacing one window on this elevation, they decided to replace the other to match.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, requested the Commission review the proposed elevations for clarification regarding the windows.

Are these windows original to the home?

Kate Amello, owner stated she is unsure when the addition was added on to the home as viewed in the east elevation drawings. She does not believe that these are original to the home.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, questioned the area concerning the new porch. Is the entire porch being removed and rebuilt anew?

Ms. Davis stated the columns are short approximately 6 ft. 8 in. in height. There is no header on the current porch.

We would prefer to keep the railing. There are three columns matching, one does not.

Chris Bennett stated those are nice columns, there is a way to deal with these and reuse them. If you can save them, save them. Historic preservation is repurpose and reuse.

Ms. Davis stated we would like to do that and will investigate reutilizing them.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, spoke about the composite decking proposed. He does not see why a wood material could not be used since this is a covered area. He questioned the material for the lattice be wood as well.

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

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Commission feels there is nothing inappropriate about these renovations. The lattice work should be square lattice framed in. Wherever possible natural materials should be used. Since this is a rebuild on an existing historic home, natural materials are preferred.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding the use of synthetic materials on a non-visible porch versus the historic guidelines which indicate the use of natural materials regardless of the location of the project.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the only remaining item is the condition of the existing windows prior to removing them. In reviewing the application, the Chair stated she does not have any strong concerns in this regard from a precedent perspective. To ensure that we are consistent with what we require from applicants we will need documentation on the condition of those windows and why they cannot be maintained.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, made a motion in the matter of the application of 145 Union Rear Addition and Exterior Modifications, 145 Union Avenue, the DRC issues the following decision on May 4, 2022, - Approve with the following conditions - Wood porch decking, retain as much of the existing porch materials as possible, wood lattice in a wood frame and provide documentation on the condition of the windows being replaced. 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, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

NOTE:

Leslie DiCarlo resumed her position on the Commission.

6. #20220224 150 HENRY STREET, GARAGE DEMOLITION & NEW STRUCTURE, 150
Henry Street,
determination of significance and possible review of demolition of an existing garage
structure. Possible
architectural Review of a proposed two-family residence within the Urban Residential-4A
District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated the Commission will review this proposal. First, we will determine if there is any Architectural or Historical Significance to the structure proposed for demolition. Based on that determination we will then move forward in one of two ways. If there is Architectural or Historical Significance the applicant will then need to return with additional documentation to allow the Commission to move forward with reviewing an application for demolition. If we determine there is no Architectural or Historical significance, we will then discuss demolition to ensure the Commission is comfortable. At that time, a SEQRA analysis will be performed. If a Negative Declaration for SEQRA is determined, we can then move forward with the proposed new structure.

Applicant: William & Wallace Allerdice

Agent: Sue Davis, SD Atelier Architecture; Dave Carr, LA Group

Ms. Davis provided a visual of the proposed project, the site overview and photographs of the existing garage structure which currently exists on the site. The garage is currently sagging, it has a hole in the roof and is not in great shape. We contacted Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director of the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation who confirmed the garage had no Historic or Architectural significance of which she was aware. It has always been used for storage, with no history behind it. We are proposing to have it demolished for the new project.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated in terms of the first step for the Commission this evening is determination if the garage has any Historical or Architectural significance. In reviewing this application, the Chair does not feel this structure has either Historic or Architectural Significance. She is comfortable with this structure being demolished.

Chris Bennett stated there may be decent timber left in the structure and the windows could be salvaged.

He is suggested recycling any useful materials from the deconstruction.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone in the audience who wishes to comment on the demolition of this structure. None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated in the matter of the application of the 150 Henry Street Garage Determination of Significance, 150 Henry Street, the DRC has determined that the structure does not have Architectural and/or Historical significance contributing to the historic fabric and resources of the City of Saratoga Springs. 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; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Commission will move onto completing the SEQRA review.

SEQRA REVIEW:

No large or important areas of concern were noted.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of the 150 Henry Street Garage Demolition, 150 Henry Street, involving Architectural Review of the demolition of an existing garage structure within the Urban Residential-4A District, within the City of Saratoga Springs. In accordance with 6NYCRR Part 617, the Design Review Commission classifies this request as a SEQRA Unlisted Action. The DRC reviewed the submitted Short EAF Part I and evaluated any potentially adverse environmental impact as part of this action. Based upon the information provided and the analysis conducted, including any supporting documentation, the DRC determined that the proposed action would not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts and has issued a SEQRA Negative Declaration. In accordance with the objectives, standards and guidelines contained in the City Zoning Ordinance Article 240.75 Architectural Review, the DRC issues the following decision on May 4, 2022 - Approve with the following condition - Any deconstructed materials be recycled or salvaged if possible. 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; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we will now review the proposed project for this property.

Ms. Davis provided an overview of the site and neighboring properties. It is varied neighborhood with different type structures. Large scale buildings, Spring Valley smaller residential units and accessory buildings with small businesses and garages. In the design our approach was to take cues from the neighborhood with carriage house type garage structures. The design we are proposing is at an angle because the design did go through zoning issues. We decided to stagger the two-family structure because it works better with zoning and the visual street scape. Ms. Davis reviewed the statistics of the project to clarify the location of the driveway. There is no sidewalk on this side of the street it is located on the opposite side of the street. We are going with a contemporary barn type of image with a red color palette. It is built into the hill and the landscape. Views of all elevations were provided for the Commission. Ms. Davis stated they are proposing a true exterior poly fly ash product for the board and batten in a dark red color. Marvin Elevate Line windows in black. We are going with double hung for a more traditional character. The stone has not yet been decided, a cultured stone in a linear pattern. The railing is an aluminum cable railing system. Exterior doors are proposed to be a Therma-Tru Classic Craft Door painted and garage carriage house doors.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this is a great little project for the area. The driveway does seem odd. A look at the middle ground between the two units to help with the aesthetics.

Ms. Davis deferred to Dave Carr with the LA Group to explain the reasoning behind the driveway design. She believes it was a type of zoning issue.

Mr. Carr stated because the site is so small, we did require a variance from zoning for parking. It requires two parking spaces per unit, one is in the garage and the other cannot be in the setback. The site is so tight. The setback is 10 ft. There is no room to maneuver.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated her only other thought is the cultured stone. She is not sure it is appropriate in this case.

Jeff Gritsavage stated reversing the floor plan with the garages next to each other would not have the desired effect.

This design breaks it up and he feels it works.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated the design is very appropriate for the setting. His concern is the use of patio sliders in the front. Can they be changed to a French door which might be more appropriate than the suburban look of a patio slider.

Chris Bennett spoke regarding the board and batten and to assure that it is a smooth finish.

Leslie DiCarlo stated she had the same thought as Rob regarding the sliding doors on the front.

Tad Roemer stated this good but could be better. He feels the same regarding the front slider doors. Does the driveway need to curve? Can they be straight.

Mr. Carr stated it is the angle of the lot and the difficulty in maneuvering. It appears like more of a curve than pictured.

Tad Roemer questioned the type of stone, proposed, the railings and the windows which are not centered on the building.

Ms. Davis stated they have not thoroughly discussed the stone. They struggled with the window placement taking into account the interior design and working within the room. The comments we will take into consideration. The final determinations regarding the railings and stone, what the budget will accommodate and availability.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she feels with the barn type of design a stone product would be appropriate.

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

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated there are details to be finalized. Alternate door in terms of the sliding door, French Doors, railing details, type of stone to be used, lighting details, and venting will need to return before the Commission. The Chair suggested approving Mass and Scale for this project to allow the applicant to apply for a building permit so they can move the project forward.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of the application for the 150 Henry Street New Structure, 150 Henry Street, the DRC issues the following decision on May 4, 2021, that the application be approved for Mass and Scale only and the applicant will return before the Commission with final details. 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; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 7-0

8:16 P.M. The Board recessed.

8:20 P.M. The Board reconvened.

7. #20220129 30 CAROLINE STREET, 6 STORY MULTI-USE BUILDING, 30
Caroline Street, Architectural Review of a
proposed mixed-use project within the Transect-6 Urban Core District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated this project has appeared before the DRC previously. This project is here for Architectural Review even though it is part of Broadway's Historic District. The applicant has provided the Commission with options based on the feedback we provided.

Agent: George Olsen, Olsen Associates Architecture; Dave Carr, LA Group

Mr. Olsen stated we received today comments from the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation. We did not have time to provide information to staff in response to this correspondence. We attempted to address the Commissions comments and concerns. Copies of the proposed schemes, elevations and streetscapes were provided to the Commission. We have two separate schemes. Scheme A and Scheme B. Scheme A's design is more historic in character. The plans are the same as previously presented. The first floor is retail, a small restaurant or bar tenant. There is a total of 15 units, five floors. We attempted different facades considering comments we received. Scheme B is more modern in design. It is more contemporary less historic in nature and provides a contrast and does not conflict with the adjacent buildings. A visual of both designs were provided to the Commission. Additional changes we made were we reduced the height by 7-8 ft. We were at 70 ft. and these Schemes show 62ft. & 63ft. which reduces the height of the structure by a floor which is more compatible with the surroundings. A comment from the Commission previously was less glass. Both schemes show more masonry with punched windows and limestone sills and lintels above. Scheme B shows more masonry with larger punched windows. Mr. Olsen provided views of the initial design as well as Scheme A and Scheme B for the Commissions review. One of the other changes was the window patterns. Commission members and the Preservation Foundation noted that the windows did not relate to the adjacent buildings. The windows are more neutral in the new schemes. The existing east and west walls we have added glass and brick detailing as well. Views of these elevations were provided. Finally, the last change we made was the brick color a more historical brick color for both schemes. Mr. Olsen stated in the correspondence received today from the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation. In this letter they indicated that this building is much higher than buildings in the surrounding area. Mr. Olsen stated one building referenced was 29 Caroline Street, which is the City Tavern and as shown in a visual the proposed building is 7 ft. taller; 54 Phila Street is 60ft. in height and our proposed building is 62-63 ft. in height. 55 Phila Street is between 53-54 ft. tall, and 68 Putnam Street is 33ft. taller than the adjacent building. Mr. Olsen provided street scape photographs of buildings along Broadway, Caroline Street, and Phila Steet to demonstrate what we are proposing is not an anomaly for Saratoga.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation did send a letter today which was forwarded to the Commission members. Sperry's did also send correspondence to the Commission as well and is posted. The Chair stated she will read the points she feels are relevant and

important as it is a property directly adjacent to the proposed project and information the Commission should have.

Dear Commission:

I am the owner of both the building and Sperry's Restaurant, located at 30 ½ Caroline Street, immediately adjacent east to the referenced project. This letter constitutes my formal objection to height, scale, and directional expression of this proposal, as further defined below. Simply put, the proposal is out of character with the existing neighborhood and should be denied. As for height and scale, the applicant relies upon the current zoning as located within a Transect-6 Urban Core District. However, the fact that such a district allows up to a maximum of 6 stories in height does not mean the applicant is entitled to that height. As the Commission well knows, all applicants must satisfy the requirements that height, scale and directional expression are consistent with historic form and context of site and surrounding properties. This 6-story proposal is incompatible with the scale of both adjacent properties, with my building only 2 stories and Hamlet & Ghost only 3 stories. Caroline Street is a narrow corridor, not wide like Broadway or Lake Avenue where there are 6 story buildings consistent with scale and context. Even the most recent new commercial construction at 68 Putnam Street is only 4 stories.

The proposed building would tower four stories above my building and built out to our shared property lien, thereby raising the potential issues and damage to my building from water runoff from their eastern wall and roof as well as snow load. The proposed design and architectural features of the **façade are not my concern**. I don't believe everything needs to be Victorian or traditional design. Variation should be promoted but extreme differences in mass and scale should be avoided.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated what the DRC looks at with projects such as this is the mass and scale, proportions, contextual appropriateness, how the structure relates to neighboring structures, and the district. We look at street orientation, entrances, articulation within the building, step backs, and quality of materials. This is all taken into consideration in these proposals to ensure they meet our historic standards and guidelines. In the two options provided they are both improvements in terms of design standards. The Chair feels that Scheme A, would be the more appropriate of the two. She appreciates the reduction in height, the change in fenestration and the use of sills and lintels around the windows makes a huge difference. The brick color is helpful, and the cornice details help. The brick details on the sides are nice changes. She still wrestles with the height overall. In looking at this district, what is appropriate for infill development on this lot, in this location would be a four-story building. Reviewing the entire schematic of the city she recognizes that this is in a valley and a bit lower, five stories could work. Personally, the Chair feels 6 stories is inappropriate regardless of how well designed the building is. Especially on a one lane, one way street within our historic downtown. It is too towering. The height is something she continues to struggle with.

Tad Roemer stated he would not bother with the windows on the sides of the building. It is not necessary. Detailing with the brick on the side ameliorates the concerns of the Commission regarding a big mass. In the correspondence from the Preservation Foundation Samantha's point regarding the **proportion of the windows of the primary façade and how they relate to adjacent buildings**. He encouraged the applicant's agent to try to use taller windows. The top floor could be a penthouse type feel setback a bit.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she agrees with Tad regarding the windows on the side elevations. They should be removed.

The detailing you incorporated with the brick does help with the massing.

Ellen Sheehan stated she agrees with Scheme A, it is a safe building. She would elongate the windows and tweak it a bit. She feels that there is an opportunity which is being lost here. She is torn. The height is a bit tall.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated if this project were submitted under the new UDO guidelines which restricts height

Not by the zoning district but by the width of the right of way. This is a narrow right of way estimated at 50 ft. In that case the maximum building height would be height 1.1 times the right of way which is about 55 ft. barring any bonuses that would have to be done by the applicant to go any higher.

Jeff Gritsavage stated Scheme A feels the storefront works well. It has balance, and he likes the entablature and the way it reads. The remainder of the building looks like a YMCA. If the second floor had sliders with balconies going across the opening. On the top floor because it is lofty, do something crazy up there. Our goal is to assure something is appropriate and he feels that is a low bar especially since we have so few vacant lots in the center of Saratoga Springs.

He has no problem with 6 stories it can work, but the language on the floors and windows he would like to see progress.

Leslie DiCarlo stated the height bothers he because of the width of the street and how it will feel when you walk on the street and where it is located. It feels like too many floors into that space. She wishes the more contemporary design were more appealing.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated he agrees that it should not be taller than 50 ft. to 55 ft. in height. It is too tall as presented. Scheme A, there is nothing inappropriate about it, but he would much rather see something that is a product of our time and not a faux early twentieth century building. Is there an opportunity to revisit Scheme B and do something different with the windows?

Mr. Olsen stated the sliders are French doors which face to the street. If we go the historical route a semi-boring building is between a cap and a base. We are in the Broadway Historic District and are looking at this through a historic lens.

It is wrong, but I will produce the best building we can do given the parameters are set.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated based on the feedback the Commission is providing is Scheme A is a conservative scheme, however, it is appropriate, but it would be nice if there was a little something. It should reflect the era in which it is built.

This is appropriate but the Chair fully agrees if there were a couple of more modern or contemporary elements added to this would help. We do not want boring either.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated he personally preferred the black brick as opposed to the red brick.

Tad Roemer stated this cornice is too small for the size of this building. Something unique with the top floor windows.

Chris Bennett stated in relationship to the street the building is too tall and the way it interacts with the rest of the neighborhood. You are checking off the boxes, using brick, quality products, yes agreed it is a safe building.

The building is too tall in the relationship to this context.

Ellen Sheehan questioned if the applicant likes the design and the building.

Mr. Olsen stated the applicant loved the first building. He did read the comments from the Board, neighbors, and Preservation Foundation. He feels the only way to get this built is to give them what they want. He wants to build a building he can rent out smaller studio apartments. He wants to get it done.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated it is not about what we want or even what we like. It is about what the city has deemed appropriate in terms of standards and guidelines. We are representing the city and those standards and guidelines.

Mr. Olsen stated this is a tough spot. Is 55 ft. acceptable, is 63 ft. acceptable if the 6th floor is stepped back.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated just to clarify so nothing is being misconstrued, this is not part of our local historic review district. This is part of what is considered the Broadway Historic District based on the State and National Register of Places. What the Board is considering is the context of the neighboring buildings and the surrounding area as part of their review which is appropriate. This location is in the Architectural Review District not in our local Historic Review District as part of the National and State Historic Broadway District and they are looking at those buildings as part of the context.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Architectural Review District in terms of new construction the standards and guidelines are very much the same as the Historic District.

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

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation stated that her door is always open. When she sees these drawings one week in advance and this is not her sole responsibility, and she goes out of town with a limited time to respond. There is a committee that she collaborates with it is not just her. While the applicant keeps speaking about the studio apartments and the need for them and the number for his pro forma that is not to be considered as part of this discussion. It is not relevant to the discussion and is not to be considered. Again, we have strong concerns regarding the height of the building and to correct something which was misconstrued noting these buildings are of different heights. She stated she did not say that her letter did not state that it referenced floors and the number of stories. It is an important difference. The concern remains the proportion of the windows because the floor height is compressed. The Foundation also felt Scheme A was appropriate. The guidelines and standards we discussed are not the Foundations guidelines and standards referenced are the standards and guidelines from the Architectural Review Ordinance and that is also important to clarify. We would welcome a building which is a statement of its own time. We do not think a building with sliders and repetitive floor heights is appropriate to the context nor successful as a more modern statement of its time. Again, appropriate is Scheme A - the height remains a strong issue.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated about 4 out of 7 Commission members felt the height as presented is inappropriate whether in Scheme A or B. The number 55 has been spoken of and staff confirmed it is the appropriate ratio from which the city will be viewing come UDO approval. It is the appropriate ratio from street width.

Discussion ensued among the Commission regarding the building height, what is acceptable, what is presented and what is appropriate.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated to conclude would the group agree that the applicant should be looking at a height of 55 ft. as being an appropriate height. Taking that information and doing what he does to accommodate that.

Does the Commission feel like this?

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair stated in walking around this neighborhood there is no building that is taller than 4 stories.
Everything is four stories or less.

Jeff Gritsavage stated there are two things going on here. There is the street proportion that has to do **with the façade.**
If you speak about a 55 ft. building height is different than the proportion to the street width.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the message is that the building is too high and needs to be reduced you can return to the Commission following a conversation with the applicant. The height needs to be in proportion to the street. **Perhaps reworking the front façade, Juliet balconies on the second-floor level, larger cornice, taller windows, and something different on the 6th floor.**

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.

Applicant: Stewart's Shops

Agent: Libby Coreno, Attorney; Ryan Ribbideau, Stewart's Shops

Ms. Coreno stated the Planning Board has issued a SEQRA Negative Declaration. The ZBA has granted the variances required to proceed with this project, as well as DRC for demolition. We will return before the Planning Board to receive Site Plan review.

Mr. Ribbideau provided a visual of the Stewart's Shops standard design. The materials proposed are a cement board siding, estate grey Owen Corning shingles and a stone veneer base. All the crown moldings on the base are a fibon material which weathers well. The trim will be done in a Azek material for durability. We have two entrances to the store because the gas is on the front and side portion of the building.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated based on the last conversation for this project there was discussion regarding the gas canopies. If that is something, you can confirm and review for the Commission.

Mr. Ribbideau stated we have four dispensers between the store and Lake Avenue. We have two dispensers on the side.

Ms. Coreno stated she is unsure if the Commission is aware of the new four-way intersection to be located at the corner of Weibel Avenue, Lake Avenue and the extends into the Stewart's property omitting the current entrance off Lake Avenue.

Ellen Sheehan stated when this was presented it looks exactly like the one which was presented in September. She is disappointed in what was presented and feels Saratoga deserves a better design it is the entrance into the city.

Tad Roemer stated questioned if the building was repositioned or will it remain as presented. There is something about the standard Stewart's its clean and dependable. Pedestrian safety is disregarded in this area.

Ms. Coreno stated the Planning Board has decided on the placement of the building and gas canopies. Ms. Coreno reviewed the surrounding area noting the more rural nature of the area and is in the RR District. This new intersection will be safer.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated there are examples of Stewart's that have gone beyond in their design. She knows they have the capability.

Jeff Gritsavage stated you have your rural design in a rural setting. The City of Saratoga Springs is developing so rapidly it will be out to this location in no time. Why are your gas dispensers not angled 45 degrees to allow people who are pulling boats or trailers easier access to the pumps? Also, could a portion of the asphalt apron be reduced. At Broadway and Lincoln, you will not be able to use this design for the store. This is the main entrance to the city. It will have to be something unique.

Mr. Ribbideau stated we have reviewed angling the pumps, but it only works in one direction and would not be feasible

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated as mentioned by members of the Commission it is an opportunity to make this a flagship store.

This is a great opportunity to create something distinct and more creative. I would suggest that you look at the design

For the new firehouse around the corner and notices the equine feel of the area. Something more barnlike and horse race tracks you can take cues from.

Leslie DiCarlo stated she agrees with the Chair. Adirondack Trust Company's banks are all different. Well thought out and well designed. There is a way to make it architecturally more interesting but stay with the new Stewart's look.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated it is hard to make suggestions for the building when the gas canopy locations have been set.

The building will be buried behind it and will not be seen. The whole site plan should be reversed. Take another try at the design.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated the Planning Board has not completed their Site Plan Review.

Libby Coreno spoke regarding regulations which require the gasoline pumps be visible from inside the store. This limits the siting of the building and the location of the pumps.

Chris Bennett stated as far as the building goes, this is an upgrade from what currently exists. He is concerned regarding building new buildings and tearing down the old ones. The Stewart's in Manchester is impressive. It has longevity built into it. Stewart's is an anchor in New York and the buildings should be built to reflect that.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated we are hoping that Stewart's will step up to the plate in this location and build a new store a bit beyond that Saratoga will be proud of.

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Design Review Commission Caravan, Wednesday, May 18, 2022, at 5:00 P.M.

Design Review Commission Meeting, Wednesday, May 25, 2022, at 6:00 P.M.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

There being no further business to discuss Tamie Ehinger, Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:02 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane M. Buzanowski
Recording Secretary