



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES (FINAL)

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2022

6:00 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL ROOM

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

PRESENT: Tamie Ehinger, Chair; Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair; Chris Bennett; Leslie DiCarlo; Jeff Gritsavage; Tad Roemer

ABSENT: Ellen Sheehan

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

A. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, made a motion to approve the September 7, 2022 Minutes of the Design Review Board 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; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

B. POSSIBLE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS:

NOTE: The intent of a consent agenda is to identify any application that appears to be “approvable” without need for further evaluation or discussion. If anyone wishes to further discuss any proposed consent agenda item, then that item would be pulled from the “consent agenda” and dealt with individually.

1. **#20220877 ALLSTATE SIGN,** 68 Congress Plaza, Architectural Review of a new wall sign within the Transect-5 (T-5) Neighborhood Center District.

2. **#20220875 PURDY’S WINE & LIQUOR SIGN,** 68 Congress Plaza, Architectural Review of a new Wall sign within the Transect-6 (T-6) Urban Core District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone on the Board had any questions, comments or concerns on either consent agenda items. None heard.

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

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of Allstate Sign, 68 Congress Plaza, and Purdy's Wine and Liquor Sign, 68 Congress Plaza that these applications be approved as submitted. Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, seconded the motion.

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

VOTE:

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

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

C. DRC APPLICATIONS UNDER CONSIDERATION:

1. #20220842 15 MARION SECOND FLOOR PORCH MODIFICATION, 15 Marion Place, Historic Review of exterior modifications to an enclosed second floor porch within the Urban Residential-3 (UR-3) District.

Applicant: Rick Woldring & Dr. Tracey Brennan

Agent: Tonya Yasenchak, Engineering America

Ms. Yasenchak stated the applicants are proposing to enclose the upper left sided unheated porch and turn that into usable closet space. The existing floor plan was provided to the Board. They are proposing to change out the windows on the front of the porch from three to two to match the front. We are requesting that the three windows currently existing on the southern side be removed. It will add to the privacy along the south side of the house. A window survey was included in the application. There are three different types of windows currently on the home. The windows on the front give the appearance of double hung windows are individual storm windows nailed together. They are painted shut. Photographs of the interior of the windows was provide to the Board. There is no interior frame. Along the south side of the house, there is a single panel in swing window with a faux rail, it is painted shut and is not usable. The remaining two windows are double hung windows and they are not original to the home. They have no hardware are nailed and painted shut. There is not much to save with these windows either. We are proposing to frame those windows in.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, thanked the applicant's agent for a thorough application and for supplying the Board with a window survey and schedule. The Chair questioned if the porch was originally enclosed and if the windows were added at a later date.

Ms. Yasenchak stated the porch was originally an open porch, the windows were added later.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, read into the record Window Standards and Guidelines as it pertains to homes in the Historic District. Maintaining original trim details in the original configuration, size, shape, and proportion of windows. The original window size and location should be preserved. Do not replace windows with units that alter the original size of the window opening or the trim detail. Replacement windows should match the existing in material and design and should be based on historic evidence. Those are the standards we have been asked to maintain. These windows are not original to the home. The product you are using for replacement windows is a good product and appropriate.

Leslie DiCarlo questioned if the Board is looking at window replacement or porch infill.

Ms. Yasenchak stated her perspective is window replacement in the front of the home and removal of the windows on the side. These windows are not original to the home and are more than 50 years old.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, questioned if the applicants infilled the windows on the porch.

Ms. Yasenchak stated no they did not. If you review the window survey submitted with the application notes the inswing windows and the fasteners used date these windows back many years.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, **stated he feels the applicants are simplifying and cleaning up the façade of the house.** He does have an issue with the blank space on the south side of the house as well as the ganged windows on the east side. It would be more appropriate to have a single double hung window on the east side and if you can place a single window on the front and one on the south side makes the building more balanced.

Jeff Gritsavage stated this modifies the look of the house. This porch has not been infilled it has been enclosed and is still a porch. You are modifying the exterior. The interior use of buildings change as time goes on. He is not in favor of modifying this porch. It was a sleeping porch. There are ways to rework and rearrange space internally. He is opposed to this application.

Tad Roemer understands what Rob and Jeff have stated. He feels we can allow people to occupy their home in more contemporary ways. He likes Robs suggestion of changing the double set of windows on the front to a single window. He feels he could support this application.

Chris Bennett stated he agrees with Rob. It is possible that this was an open porch at one time. Someone enclosed it.

Adding those windows as Rob suggested does a lot to balance the home. He feels he could support this project.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, read portions of the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation correspondence for the benefit of the Board. "The Preservation Foundation is suggesting that the top rail detail of the solid balustrade should be preserved."

Discussion ensued among the Board regarding this suggestion and if it is an important feature to preserve on the home.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Board feels that with modifications this application can move forward. That would include modifications to the front facing windows, removal of the ganged windows to be replaced with a single window on both sides of the house, along with preserving the balustrade.

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

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated diagonally across the street we denied part of an application dealing with removal of a window. He feels the need to have this on the record noting that it is a different scenario. Someone was removing an original window which would have created a large blank wall. These are clearly infill windows and this is a different situation.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated in addition to the rail detail there is a casing detail as well.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, made a motion in the matter of 15 Marion Place Second Floor Porch Modifications, 15 Marion Place involving Historic Review of exterior modifications to an enclosed second floor porch, the DRB issues the following decision on September 28, 2022 - Approve with the following conditions - the applicant will retain the rail and casing detail. One

window on the east elevation and one window on the south elevation centered on each bay will be installed and revised drawings to be submitted administratively. 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; Leslie DiCarlo, opposed; Chris Bennett, in favor;
Jeff Gritsavage, opposed; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 4-2

2. #20220485 81 PHILA STREET NEW TWO-FAMILY, 81 Phila Street, Historic Review of a new two-family home and accessory structure within the Urban Residential-4 (UR-4) District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the applicant has been before the Board at our last meeting. They have provided the Board with revised drawings based on the feedback they have received.

Applicant: Scot Trifilo

Agent: Bob Flansberg, Dreamscapes Unlimited

Mr. Flansberg stated they have revised the project. The window pattern has gone to a two over two patterns as opposed to a four over one. We also have revised renderings as well. The third floor has been given a more Georgian look the roof pitch has been brought down considerably from an 8 to a 5, and we simplified the fenestration on the third floor as well. We have added columns on the front of the covered porch to provide more shelter. The pediment around the front porch has been reworked to fall in concert with the third floor. We have tweaked and aligned the windows. One of the biggest changes is we added a band between the first and second story and the same band between the second and third floor as well. We also eliminated a window in the stairwell. The revised renderings were provided to the Board. Regarding the detached garage, we also lowered the roof pitch to match the house and reduced the plate. Also, a water table was added to the base.

Scot Trifilo thanked the Board and the Preservation Foundation for all the suggestions and comments to help make the project beautiful.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the changes made have made a huge difference especially with the contextual appropriateness and how it relates to the neighborhood. Lowering of the roof pitch was what really made the biggest difference. It makes the whole area lighter. The pediment and columns work well. The trim bands are interesting. The columns are a bit heavy is there any consideration to making slightly narrower playing off the size of the corner boards.

Mr. Flansburg stated the columns should be larger than the corner boards, but we will review them and see what can be done.

Jeff Gritsavage stated what has been done at the top with the pediment and roof slope looks appropriate and balanced. The size of the columns looks appropriate. He did voice concerns regarding the corbels above the second floor under the cornice.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated this is successful. He is also concerned regarding the cornice which does not project

far out and does not leave space to put something substantial. Can you apply a different type of molding there that interprets that 19th century style today or lose them all together. He likes the windows on the east elevation and how the banding goes through them. He questioned the proposed materials for this project.

Mr. Flansburg stated we are using fiber cement for the house and trim. The windows will be Pella Architect Series aluminum clad with wide muntins and SDL glass.

Tad Roemer thanked the applicant and applicant's agent for listening to the suggestions of the Board. He questioned a concern regarding snow in the stairwell to the apartment.

Mr. Flansburg stated we will have proposed drainage; this will be a maintenance issue as well.

Tad Roemer spoke regarding the garage door and windows on the side of the structure.

Mr. Flansburg stated we lowered the pitch from 12 to 11.

Chris Bennett stated there have been appropriate changes to the building, it has come a long way. The column size is appropriate. It is holding up a big roof and should be beefy and proportionately correct. Nice job.

Leslie DiCarlo agrees with Chris regarding the size of the columns and pediment. She questioned how the corbel detailed will be managed.

Mr. Flansburg stated he is hoping that could be an administrative action.

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

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation stated as noted in her letter they appreciate the applicant lowering the pitch and the fenestration of the third floor. She shared information with the applicant regarding a more ornate cornice detailed. Going to large medallion is better. Dentils are small. Again, we would like to see the front door moved up to 4 ft. not 5 ½ ft. **so it does not appear so far back** and is more visible from the street which is a primary feature and always have been. We are excited to have this long vacant piece of property be redeveloped. Ms. Bosshart stated the use of a horizontal band would relate to the house and break up the space over the door.

Jeff Gritsavage stated he spoke regarding the use of medallions versus the use of a dentil. In this case square works with this design.

Ms. Bosshart agreed considering the style of this house.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, reminded the group that often the Board finds themselves designing for the applicant. We certainly do not want to do that. In terms of the corbels, the feedback we have provided as it is presented does not work. The applicant should return before the Board with options. The Chair stated the Board has no issues with the size of the columns and feels that they are appropriate as presented. We understand the Preservation Foundations thoughts about moving the front door. The Board does not have an issue with the placement of the front door.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated regarding the suggestion from Ms. Bosshart regarding a band on the garage. If the applicants choose to place a band on the garage, then the area above it should be shingled not sided. That would be appropriate.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated based on the length of discussion regarding the corbel, she feels the applicant should return before the Board with that detail. In terms of the band on the garage it would be a personal decision made by the applicant. Our next meeting is scheduled for October 12th, at which time you could return with the final details on the corbels. The other option would be moving the application forward this evening except for the corbel detail and the applicant would need to return for that approval.

Jeff Gritsavage made a motion in the matter of 81 Phila Street New Two Family, 81 Phila Street, involving Historic Review of a new two-family home and accessory structure, the DRB issues the following decision on September 28, 2022 - Approve with the following conditions - the applicant will return before the DRB with cornice details. Final cut sheets to be supplied for the record. Tad Roemer 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; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor;
Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

3. #20210870 120 SOUTH BROADWAY DEMOLITION, 120 South Broadway,
Determination of Architectural
Historic Significance for motel and spa structures and gazebo with a mineral spring within
the Transect-5
Neighborhood Center (T-5 NCU) District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, noted that when the Board reviews a building for demolition the first order of business is to determine if the structure has any Historical or Architectural Significance. Following that determination, we will discuss demolition.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated we are determining the historical significance of the entire property. The applicant was previously before the Board for partial demolition. That is how this project differs from the application previously denied.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated that has been amended to not include the gazebo. That is not part of this evening's discussion or to make any determination of significance on that nor is it on the table for demolition.

Applicant: Stephen Ethier

Mr. Ethier, applicant stated he has appeared before the Board previously. At that time, the Board requested additional information as to what is proposed for the site. Brett and Shawn from Balzer Tuck Architecture are here to provide information to the Board what is being proposed. We have appeared before the Planning Board, a SEQRA Negative Declaration has been issued as well as a Special Use Permit. We will return for Site Plan Review. There is complete preservation of the gazebo and Springs as will be indicated on the Site Plan.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated if the applicant has any information about the history of the building or if you feel there is architectural significance of the building this would be the time to discuss that. Once a determination of Historical or Architectural Significance is made then we can discuss the proposed new project.

Mr. Ethier stated he does not see any of the structures having Historical or Architectural Significance. Only the gazebo and the Springs, and that has been protected.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated after reviewing this application, does the Board have any thoughts about these structures Having Historical or Architectural Significance. None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated, although these buildings have been here for a long period of time, and reflect the era in which they were built, historically and architecturally do not have any significance from her perspective.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, asked if anyone in the audience wished to comment on whether this application has any Historical or Architectural Significance. None heard.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated in the matter of the 120 Broadway - Determination of Significance, 120 South Broadway, involving the determination of Architectural/Historical significance for motel and spa structures within the T-5 Neighborhood Center District, tax parcel #178.35-1-6, within the City of Saratoga Springs, consistent with Section 7.5.11 "Demolition" of the City's Zoning Ordinance, the Design Review Board determines on September 28, 2022 that the structures noted do not have any Architectural or historical significance contributing to the historic fabric and resources of the City of Saratoga Springs. This does not include a determination of significance on the existing gazebo and mineral spring. 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; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor; Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated we can now move to discuss demolition. SEQRA has been completed and a Negative Declaration has been issued by the Planning Board.

Agent: Shawn Corp, Brett Balzer, Balzer Tuck Architects

Mr. Corp provided a visual of the site on South Broadway along with the surrounding neighborhood. Architectural photographs were provided noting the surrounding buildings are 1-2 stories, new, with flat and pitched roofs. The existing site plan was provided noting what is proposed to be demolished except the gazebo and Rosemary Spring. A visual of what the applicant is proposing was provided noting this is what was presented to the Planning Board and received a SEQRA Negative Declaration and a Special Use Permit. We have two 18,000 sq. ft. two story buildings to the front each six town house style units. There are garages along the rear either one or two car garage. The main living space of these town house units is raised about 4ft. above the sidewalk. We have stoops which come down to the sidewalk. We have raised the basement up partially out of the ground. Next to each stoop there will be an area way allowing light into the basement as well as for egress. As you enter from the boulevard entrance into the center of the site there is a green which will be utilized as civic space for the community and the residents as well. We are also providing a community building in the middle. To the north and south we have larger 23-unit four story typical apartment buildings. An aerial isometric of the proposed site was provided. We have broken up the massing of the buildings with a series of bays that have pitched roofs and introduced flat roofs noticing the context of the neighborhood along the street and to keep the proportions of the building smaller. These will have

more traditional materials, brick, stone, and we will treat them in a more contemporary manner. Cleaner lines, larger more contemporary windows, and metal balcony rails. There is proposed a large flat area creating a well on the roof structure where we intend on house exhaust fans, condensing units and any type of plumbing vents will be tucked inside and not visible from the street. The community center is still in flux, and we continue to work on that building. To the north and south we have the two larger four-story apartment buildings. Here we are visualizing a more modern design keeping the transition from South Broadway from a more transitional building and these two lower buildings in the front to a more contemporary modern building in the back. Views from across South Broadway looking into the site were provided noting the placement of the buildings, the use of the proposed materials, the entrance to the houses being raised and the front stoop as well as the area along the front of the townhomes basement with fencing provided in front. Different types of roofs and samples of a variety of contemporary window types proposed. Also views of the village green, the community center, Rosemary Spring, and the berm in the rear with the row of proposed Cedar trees. Views of the project from the third floor were provided showing the area and neighborhood. Elevations of the proposed building were provided.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the applicant is before the Board this evening for demolition approval only. The post demolition plans allow the Board an opportunity to give feedback to you prior to your formal appearance before this Board for review. It is great to see something like this going into the area. The Chair stated she strongly feels the town homes lining South Broadway are not appropriate. She is not opposed to Town Homes in this area, but there may be an opportunity to bring the larger buildings up front. A mixed use would be most appropriate. Town homes are too residential for this neighborhood and this stripe of South Broadway. Moving the town homes to the back would be more appropriate. The Chair stated she cannot move this forward with the Town Homes in the front. Providing the Board with sightlines and perspectives from South Broadway would be helpful in determining if the height is out of character. It is an interesting corridor of the city, which is changing, the Comprehensive Plan is encouraging change. We need to assure that the height is appropriate for the lot. She has no issues with demolition. If we were to move forward with an approval for demolition tonight, we could condition the demolition on the applicant receiving remaining approvals. The applicant is not before the Board tonight for full review so feedback would be appreciated but note they will return before the DRB for full review.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated even if we were to condition demolition approval there is no guarantee that anything is ever going to come of that. The Vice Chair questioned if there were active businesses and leases in these structures currently.

Mr. Ethier stated the tenants are actively seeking an alternate location. Without a demolition permit he cannot move anything forward.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated he does not have a problem with the demolition of the entire site and building what is proposed. It looks fine with a bit of tweaking.

Mr. Ethier stated he would like to demolish the entire site. There is not a financing issue. If the Board would like to consider conditioning the demolition in phases, he is fine with that as well. He cannot do a project with one building demolished.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated for him to support demolition, everything must be demolished at once. If it must wait until the tenants vacate, then that would be conditional. The entire lot must be razed at once, and the lot cleaned until you are ready to begin construction.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated what the Vice Chair is referring to is that the site cannot be demolished in stages.

Discussion ensued regarding the demolition plan, possibility of phasing the demolition, and post demolition plan.

Jeff Gritsavage stated this part of South Broadway is ill defined. There are motel structures not functioning as such, there is mixed use a bit of a hodge podge of buildings including the diner lot. He does not have a problem with the site plan. Bringing the town homes close to the street helps to define the area. When you get to Adirondack Trust there is a transition, and you are coming into the built environment. Mixed use does not mean the site has to have mixed use the neighborhood needs to be mixed use and he does not find that inappropriate. It would add interest.

Tad Roemer stated he agrees with Tamie's opinion regarding placing Town Homes on the street. He does not feel that this is the direction this area is moving in. He would explore placing the large buildings in the front and not having town homes at all. He echoes Robs concerns regarding demo.

Chris Bennett stated demolish the whole thing, and until construction begins the lot should be aesthetically pleasing. He does not want to see another Spa City Diner lot. He agrees with the Chair placing the larger buildings to the front. Replacement is architecturally appropriate; he likes was being proposed. This is the gateway to the city.

Leslie DiCarlo stated she is in total agreement we do not need another empty unkempt lot. Can we condition approval on demolition can occur once a building permit and construction is ready to begin.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the applicant has put their best foot forward in bringing their plans which is not necessary for approval for demolition. It is great for us to see this and know there is a vision for this lot.

Discussion ensued regarding the Lash Boulevard tenant and the remainder of the lease which is 14 months. Planning Board Site Plan Review is pending.

Mr. Ethier stated he would relocate Lash Boulevard so there could be a complete demolition of the site.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated if the concern is the tenant, then remove the building in the rear and retain the remainder of the buildings until such time as you are ready to return for final approval and begin construction.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated if the applicant is comfortable with demolition of the rear building at this time. We can do that.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated the Board is going to approve demolition at some point. The question is are we approving demolition of all buildings now, or later.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated she is hearing if there is no approval for demolition now, the applicant cannot move forward with the plans as presented.

Mr. Balzer stated the applicant is willing to phase the demolition of all structures this evening. The rear building to be demolished immediately. The remainder of the three structures would be demolished upon mass and scale approval/final approval by the DRB.

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 120 South Broadway - Demolition, 120 South Broadway, involving the Architectural Review of the proposed demolition for motel and spa structures

within the T-5 Neighborhood Center District, tax parcel #178.35-1-6, within the City of Saratoga Springs. In accordance with 6 NYCRR Part 617, the Planning Board acting as the only involved agency issued a SEQRA Negative Declaration of environmental impact on September 15, 2022. In accordance with the objectives, standards and guidelines contained in the City Zoning Ordinance Article 240-7.5 Architectural Review the Design Review Board issues the following decision on September 28, 2022, - Approve the demolition with the following conditions. This does not include the demolition of the existing gazebo and mineral spring. The demolition be phased so the rear structure is demolished immediately. The remaining structures to be demolished following final approval by the Land Use Boards. Appropriate seeding of the lot following demolition of the structures as staged. 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; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor;
Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

4. #20220775 119 WOODAWN AVENUE DEMOLITION, 119 Woodlawn Avenue,
Determination of architectural
historic significance for an existing residential structure within the Urban Residential-3
(UR-3) District

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, noted that when the Board reviews a building for demolition the first order of business is to determine if the structure has any Historical or Architectural Significance. Following that determination, we will discuss demolition.

Agent: Sarah Green

This application is under Section 13.9J4 of the UDO on the basis the structure represented is imminent danger to safety and welfare of the community. As such we request the Board refer this application to the building department to review and record pursuant to City Code 118-9, Unsafe Structures.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the first step in our process is to determine if there is any Historic or Architectural Significance to the house. This is a separate discussion from the demolition process. If you have any information you would like to provide to the DRB with our discussion of this property. This would be the time to do so.

Ms. Green stated she just wished to bring forth that this is an issue of safety both to the immediate and surrounding areas.

Photographs of the property were provided. There was correspondence stating opposition by the Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation noting that this home was in the West Side Historic District. The map of this area does not corroborate this. Information and printouts were provided to the Board by Ms. Green.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated Ms. Green is correct. This is not part of the West Side Historic District but in the Architectural Review District. This property is in the National Historic District.

Ms. Green stated the Preservation Foundation indicated that the French doors on the building were historic. The photograph they provided was from 2019. The property was purchased in 2022. Those doors have already been removed. Photographs of the existing doors boarded up was provided. The

safety concerns outweigh any historic or architectural significance on this property. Therefore, it is in the interest of the neighborhood and the city to demolish this property to avoid any potential injury.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the Board knows this property. The question before the Board is whether this

Structure has any Architectural or Historic Significance. The Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation did provide correspondence on this structure late today. The Chair read portions of the letter into the record. "The Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation reviewed the application for the residence located at 119 Woodlawn Avenue, constructed in 1866.

A history of the property was also provided. This home is built in the Greek Revival Style. The house retains its wide ban of trim which forms a triangular pediment shown on the original French doors which lead out to the full width front porch currently boarded up. It appears that turned wood and balusters of the front porch were added later as well as the board and batten. The residence is a contributing building to the West Side Historic District listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The house retains the same appearance as when the district was created aside from the **inappropriate second story one over one windows of the primary façade**. The Foundation listed this structure on its endangered species list in 2012. The Foundation recommends that the DRB find the structure to be significant and therefore allowing the applicant to go back and provide good cause demonstrations, which would include a post demolition plan, prior to the DRB approving any demolitions. It is important for the DRB to know the history of the structure it is important in determination of architectural or historic significance."

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated she would like the Board to be aware the applicant is now indicating that they would like to refer this to the Building Inspector for a determination on the jeopardy, health, and welfare to the community. It was not indicated on the application.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated there has been a great deal of discussion on this application. When did the applicant purchase this property.

Ms. Green stated this year.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated and this has gotten significantly worse over this last year.

Ms. Green stated this has been getting worse over the last 20 years.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, stated they purchased it in the condition that it is currently in. You have emphasized that several times that it is a public hazard, but your client purchased the property knowing the condition it was in.

Ms. Green stated with the understanding that it would have to remove the hazard to the community. It is dilapidated to the point where it is unsafe to even be inside and work on. She is unsure if it is even a buildable lot. There is 24 ft. of frontage with 12ft. wide total setback.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, questioned if the goal is to buy properties and join them together to build something large.

Ms. Green stated no it is not, adjoining this property is a parking lot. At this time there is no concrete determination as to what is going to be done. Another building will not be built on this site. The applicant currently owns a property across the street 118 Woodlawn and the parking lot adjoining this site.

Jeff Gritsavage questioned what happened to the historic French doors. They were there not that long ago. Those front doors were there a month and a half ago. They were removed and the house was boarded up. Some architectural elements have been removed to make this look less significant.

Ms. Green stated she had no knowledge of that.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the applicant is requesting this be referred to Patrick Cogan, Building Inspector for a determination. The applicant will return before the DRB once those determinations are made. At that time, we can discuss significance and based on those determinations move forward.

Chris Bennett stated this structure is no worse or better than those on Phila Street and one of those is about to be renovated.

Amanda Tucker, Senior Planner, stated the applicant can seek demolition approval on the basis that the structure presents eminent danger to the health, safety, and welfare of the community. The DRB shall refer the application to the Building Inspector for review and report pursuant to City Code. The DRB will then review the Building Inspector's report and made a determination.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated we will see the applicant for further review and determination.

8:01 P.M. The Board Recessed

8:06 P.M. The Board Reconvened.

5. #20220129 30 CAROLINE STREET MULTI-USE BUILDING, 30 Caroline Street,
Architectural Review
of a proposed mixed-use project within the Transect-6 Urban Core (T-6 UC) District.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated the applicant has been before the Board several times. We are looking at Architectural Review of a mixed-use project in the T-6 District.

Agent: George Olsen, Olsen Associates Architecture

Mr. Olsen provided a visual of the proposed project. They began with a six-story building at a height of 55 ft. to the top of the cornice. Then we presented a five-story version and we also submitted at the last meeting a four-story building with a fifth story set back 15 ft. There were comments regarding windows and visuals from other locations which we have submitted. Tonight, we have revisions showing two different schemes with different window patterns. Hopefully, these are the final of two submissions. We have labelled them "C" and "D." The first visual rendering is "C" and our preferred version with a type of studio or loft feel up on the upper floor which is more transparent and brought down the scale. The building is about 7 ft. taller than Hamlet and Ghost at the street level. We made those upper windows larger and deeper coming down to the foundation. The windows on the second and third floors are wider and taller. We also slightly raised the retail higher, a more traditional type of look. A review of all elevations was provided to the Board. Mr. Olsen then provided a visual rendering of Scheme "D." We explored larger windows which expanded the space between the second a third floor a bit. Both schemes relate better to Sperry's and Hamlet and Ghost. All elevations were provided to the Board. The building will remain all brick all around. The Board requested views from the parking lot noting the stair tower and elevator massing. This aerial view for context shows the stair and elevator tower for the building. Mr. Olsen provided floor plans for the project floor levels. Mr. Olsen provided details per the Board's request. Brick details at the base, and cornice details were reviewed. The Board requested views from several locations and angles on Maple, the Library and Lake Avenue and angles which were provided.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, stated this project has come a long way. The brick detail it helps to break up the mass and the vertical elements on the front also work better. The windows two over two better mimics the adjacent buildings while still providing the fourth floor. The four stories with the fifth-floor setback are a huge difference from the original structures presented. This works well from this pedestrian

standpoint. The fifth floor is much more visible from Lake Avenue than she anticipated. This is well done and this version over the others is more compatible.

Tad Roemer stated the two double hung windows look better than the wider windows and the brick looks good. The visual from far away is not a concern for him.

Discussion ensued regarding the visual of the building from a distance seems to make the third and four floor merges. Using the same double hung windows on the fourth floor may help to mitigate that.

Mr. Olsen stated in looking at the view of the building from a distance the use of a lighter cornice would help to mitigate the window issue.

Jeff Gritsavage thanked the applicant for providing the two additional windows. These windows work and are appropriate.

He does not think breaking the limestone band would work. The detailing on this is very good. He is prepared to advance this design as it is presented.

Leslie DiCarlo stated she agrees that it does read from a distance as a double mansard roof. She feels it is very appropriate and fits in with neighborhood and other buildings surrounding it as it is. It has come an exceptionally long way.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, echoes what has been said. The Vice Chair stated if you were adhering to the new UDO, it would be 1.1 street width plus right of way would put you at 55 ft, which is within the new UDO calculations. The design is good in interpreting what is around it and is very appropriate. To present something that has relevance today but also harkens back to something previously. He spoke regarding setting a precedent for infill development. The height of the building is appropriate.

Chris Bennett stated he agrees with everything Rob stated. The design is a lovely little building which has come a long way.

The height is still regal but fits in with the new UDO and great infill development.

Tad Roemer spoke regarding the fire wall detail in the entranceway.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair, questioned the location of the gas meters and trash room or dumpster location.

Mr. Olsen stated the trash room will be located on the upper floors, Trash receptacles will be taken to the street for pickup and then be returned to their trash room locations. No dumpster on site.

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

Samantha Bosshart, Executive Director, Saratoga Springs Preservation Foundation stated she agrees that Scheme "C" is well done. With the window fenestration and the brick work this design has come far from the first submission. The Foundation still has concerns regarding the height. We prefer not to have the 5th floor setback. The Foundation suggests bringing on the 5th floor on the sides of the building so that it reads separate. A few feet on either side may help break up the fifth-floor mass. The different material on the 5th floor could also help with the massing. The brick work detailing and brick around the building is a nice detail.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, questioned how the Board feels about the suggestion to bring the building in a bit on the fifth floor.

It is a good way to mitigate mass. The Chair does not feel the fifth-floor massing to be inappropriate. Her concern is only that it seems to merge with the fourth floor.

Tad Roemer stated he believes it would work but feels it is not necessary.

Leslie DiCarlo stated she agrees with Tad.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair stated the pedestrian feel is a four-story building. From a distance you see the fifth floor, The pedestrian feel is what we were most concerned about.

Jeff Gritsavage stated he does not feel it is necessary to step the building in on the sides.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, requested the applicant supply cut sheets for the file.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated the Board will now review SEQRA for the project.

SEQRA REVIEW:

The applicant has submitted Part I of the SEQRA Short Environmental Form which has been reviewed by the Board and is accurate.

The Board reviewed Part II of the SEQRA Short Environmental Form and has found no large or important areas of concern noted.

Rob DuBoff, Vice Chair questioned the location of the mini split units.

Mr. Olsen stated they will be placed on the roof, and he will submit a roof plan denoting the location of these units on the roof.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of the application of 30 Caroline New Mixed-Use - SEQRA Review, 30 Caroline Street involving Architectural Review of a proposed mixed-use project within the Transect-6 Urban Core District, Tax parcel #165.60-1-82, within the City of Saratoga Springs. In accordance with 6 NYCRR Part 617, the DRB classifies this request as SEQRA Unlisted Action - SEQRA Assessment and Determination: "We have reviewed the SEQRA Environmental Assessment form and determined that Part I is complete. We have reviewed Part II of the SEQRA form and determined that it is accurate. Therefore, I move for the issuance of a Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance because analysis of the information provided and presented in the environmental assessment form demonstrates that the project will not result in any large and important impact and, therefore, is one that will not have a significant impact on the environment. 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; Leslie DiCarlo, in favor; Chris Bennett, in favor;

Jeff Gritsavage, in favor; Tad Roemer, in favor

MOTION PASSES : 6-0

Tamie Ehinger, Chair stated the Board is in position to move the application forward. There are still outstanding items such as updated cut sheets for the file on windows and lighting. Roof detail plans, brick samples, mortar samples and paint samples to be provided.

Mr. Olsen stated they will provide samples for the Boards review. He requested the Board to provide a full approval with the remainder of the items to be approved Administratively.

Tamie Ehinger, Chair, made a motion in the matter of the application of 30 Caroline Street New Multi-Use Building, 30 Caroline Street that the application be approved with the following conditions - provide a detailed roof plan, samples of the mortar and brick, cut sheets for the windows and lighting as well as paint samples for Administrative Approval. Jeff Gritsavage seconded the motion.

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

Design Review Board Training, Wednesday, October 5, 2022, at 4:00 P.M.
Design Review Board Meeting, Wednesday, October 12, 2022, at 6:00 P.M.

MOTION TO ADJOURN:

There being no further business to discuss Tamie Ehinger, Chair adjourned the meeting at 9:12 P.M.

Diane M. Buzanowski
Recording Secretary

Meeting minutes approved October 12, 2022