

**The City of Auburn**  
**Historic Resources Review Board**  
c/o Office of Planning and Economic Development  
Memorial City Hall-24 South St.  
Auburn, NY 13021  
(315)255-4115

**Meeting Minutes**  
January 11, 2022  
Council Chambers

Present: Mike Deming (Chair), Jackie Guntow, Linda Frank, Richard Stankus, Ed Onori, Jim Hutchinson, Andy Roblee

Staff: Jenny Haines, Director of Planning and Economic Development; Nate Garland, Assistant Corporation Counsel; Gretchen Messer, Planner

**Mike Deming** 00:01

Okay everyone's on board we are either on Zoom or here so we have our full board. We can start we have a motion to accept the minutes from November 9?

**Jim Hutchinson** 00:12

So moved.

**Mike Deming** 00:14

Second Richard, any corrections /additions All in favor?

**Everyone** 00:22

Aye, except Andy Roblee and Ed Onori because they were not present.

**Mike Deming** 00:47

Okay, we'll move on for the public to be heard. If you're on the agenda, you'll have your time for your project. But if there's anything else you'd like to address historic district, the public is free to speak.

**Jenny Haines** 01:06

So I'll just quickly introduce our new planner Gretchen Messer, she has joined us this evening. She comes to us most recently as an adjunct professor at SUNY ESF, and has decided to get back in the planning game. So we're excited to have her with us. So she's joining me tonight.

**Mike Deming** 01:32

Welcome. I thought you were from the newspaper.

**Jenny Haines 01:36**

That's why I made sure to introduce her.

**Mike Deming 01:40**

Okay, well 128 South Street,

**Jenny Haines 02:00**

While the applicant comes up, I'll just give a little bit of background, which was in my memo here. The applicant was in front of this board on September 8 of 2020, requesting both a temporary shed and permanent shed. At that time, it was the staff's understanding that both were approved, a 10'x14' wood storage shed conditional upon the issuance of an area variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The COA is in your packet from that time issued by Holly Glor, who was staff at that point. In February 2021, the Zoning Board approved 2 area variances and then in August 2021, the building permit was issued. Last Friday, Code Enforcement Office issued a stop work order, citing that the shed currently under construction did not comply with the shed design that was provided in the original COA application, which is attached. So the owner submitted a new COA application requesting that the structure and its present design be approved and allowed to continue to proceed. I'll let them also add anything. I emailed you this afternoon, the proposal for the type of siding that they're planning as well, which would be critical for you to see. So we can work through that as we go through this discussion. So, if you want to go ahead Erica and Kevin, with anything you'd like to add or present.

**Erica Iantuono 03:44**

Good evening, yes. I'm not really sure what to say. I was at the original meeting for our request to build the shed, we were asked to provide some sort of visual representation. Being neither an artist nor an architect I pulled the drawing out of a hat. I figured you were more interested in the historical appropriateness of the structure that was being built, rather than any critical dimensions provided in the picture. The picture in question didn't have any dimensions involved. We were running on the impression that any dimensions would be under the jurisdiction of the code enforcement and ZBA. So I think the structure that we are proposing or that's currently underway, substantially meets your requirements of being historically appropriate to the rest of the property. I think once completed, that it will be perhaps the nicest shed in Auburn, at least that's my goal.

**Mike Deming 05:08**

As part of the application, we would require all the dimensions for the building, which still isn't on here, specifically the building height. We would need at least a rough rendering. I don't think there's enough information here to do this tonight, unless you can provide us with detail. It is a required detail and not just a code object.

**Erica Iantuono 05:28**

Okay, I can provide any information you might need.

**Richard Stankus 05:33**

I guess my issue is, and again, you and I had talked about this some time ago as you are my neighbor. My understanding was that there was concern for the temporary structure you have, which will be considered

**Mike Deming 05:48**

Richard, can you pull the microphone closer?

**Richard Stankus 05:49**

I'm sorry. Yeah. You and I had a brief discussion some time ago, when the people came by and said, "Hey, look, your temporary tent-like structure that you're using for storage is, I believe, larger than what's allowed by code." And when we spoke briefly, knowing that I'm on the board, you said, "Well, I plan on replacing that with a more permanent shed." I guess part of the question is, is how do you define shed? Now, to me a shed is not what I'm looking at: it's not a two story structure. Well, however many square-foot building this is, it is an actual significant structure. When you look at the height of it, it approaches the roof line on your existing garage. So for me, this is more than a shed when I think of a storage shed. I think there are defined size limitations to what's defined as a shed, in terms of square footage. When you go beyond that, then you're talking about a garage, or you're talking about an addition, or you're talking about something completely different. So when you have approval for a specific structure, and the only thing I could remember, because I wasn't at the meeting that decided this, you would have to go through planning and zoning and other boards. I saw a picture of a shed, that was a nice little garden shed that, you know, you could build yourself, you could pick up single story, maybe 140, 180 square feet, but this, this is, this is like a garage. When you look at what you're constructing, it's well beyond the confines of what you suggested you are going to build. So we as a board, when we approve certain things, we approve them, because of a certain size of how it's going to look, when it's done, we go through details of what's the roofing going to be like, what windows are going in, what kind of doors are going to be used. That's what we do in a historic district. So when someone wants to come along and change their windows, we may sit for half an hour and talk about what windows would be appropriate for that particular historic structure. And if you're going to build something or add something on to this magnitude, we certainly would have to have a lot more details than what you've provided so far, in terms of this particular structure. But still, it brings to debate, how in the world could you propose that you're building a specific structure, which gets approved by the board, then what you actually end up building is well beyond what you suggested was going to get built. These sorts of things just should not be allowed to happen. You can't build a structure, come back and say, "Well, I know I did more than what I said I was going to do, but you know, it is what it is. So you all just go ahead and approve it." That's how boards cease to function. I mean, our job is to look at what your proposal is. Look at how we may guide you in terms of what we think as a board is appropriate for you to build or

not build on this particular site. It'd be like me saying, "Look, I want to put a structure in my yard and I ended up putting a pole barn in the back of my or on the side of my property across from you." And you say "Well, we've got a pole barn up there." That would be totally inappropriate. And I'm telling you, "I'll just be putting a shed up there. I'm just putting a small little something or other". Then all of a sudden, "I'm building a pole barn and Codes come by and tell me I can't build it for a good reason." Because that's not what you said you were going to construct; and when I look, here is a major structure that certainly would not qualify as a shed.

**Erica Iantuono** 09:55

Okay

**Jenny Haines** 10:00

So again, the Code Enforcement office issued a stop work order because it was not compliant with what was originally proposed. So we asked the applicant to come in have a discussion with the board about how to address the situation. I guess he's requesting that what he's started constructing be allowed to continue. So we obviously need to discuss that and determine if that can be the case or not.

**Jim Hutchinson** 10:36

Well, part of the problem here is that you went to Code Enforcement and got a permit for a structure. And it was then approved by the Historic Resources Review Board through Planning. The problem is this board never approved anything beyond your temporary structure.

**Erica Iantuono** 10:58

Okay.

**Jim Hutchinson** 10:59

Never. In fact, if you look at the minutes, page 12 of our meeting, where you came to get approval of the temporary structure, I said, "yeah, they have to come back and get a permit to have us review the shed anyway. So right now we're just approving the temporary shed." That's all we did, we approved the temporary shed, we never approved a permanent shed of any sort.

**Erica Iantuono** 11:24

Okay, that's news to me, that's not was not my understanding.

**Jim Hutchinson** 11:31

I don't, I don't know where this goes from here. There may be other issues that Corporation Counsel will want to be involved with. But this Board never approved any kind of a permanent shed, period.

**Jenny Haines** 11:43

What I will say from the staff side, is that the staff at the time, the takeaway was that there was an approval that night for the permanent shed as well. And when I spoke with Jim, earlier last week, I said, when I reissued the COA, I did not review the minutes. I just reissued the COA that was there. The building permit was issued based on that and the Zoning Board approval. So I'll take responsibility for my department for the misunderstanding that the Board did not approve the permanent structure. But that was the staff's take away from that meeting, that night in September of 2020. So I don't know where we go from here.

**Richard Stankus** 12:35

But with that same issue, did we have a picture of what looked like the potting shed?

**Jenny Haines** 12:43

Correct.

**Richard Stankus** 12:45

That is what I think was originally proposed.

**Jenny Haines** 12:47

Correct. And so what is being built is not.

**Richard Stankus** 12:49

No, no,

**Jenny Haines** 12:50

This is not correct. So, it needed to come back here, after the stop work order, regardless.

**Jim Hutchinson** 12:56

It was a Colonial Williamsburg, 10' by 14' wood storage shed, which we see here from those plans that were provided. That was a suggestion again, but it still didn't come back to us for approval, because when we do an approval, we're going to approve if you have mentioned a dormer, we're going to prove the siding, the windows, the roof, the height. We never did any of that. So it simply was not approved by this board.

**Jenny Haines** 13:24

So, the misunderstanding was staff's. The applicant moved forward, believing that they had the approvals needed. So that is on the staff. So, I guess I'll ask Nate to weigh in on that.

**Nate Garland** 13:44

From a legal perspective, Jenny, this is just what you've just described. I think it lends credibility towards the applicant is acting in good faith, if somewhat confused by the procedure of the board and

the underlying facts. A legal question, however, it remains untouched by any good faith by the applicant. The shed needs to be approved by this board.

**Nate Garland** 14:21

And so I agree with board members that a full and complete application for the historic appropriateness of this, of a proposed shed, has to be put in front of this board.

**Richard Stankus** 14:41

Would you define what a shed is in terms of dimensions?

**Nate Garland** 14:44

I don't know if our historic code describes that or not.

**Mike Deming** 14:48

I am familiar. I was telling Jenny that our church built what I thought was a shed and I couldn't get the permit. We think it was on its way here because the shed is under 144 square feet. The building inspector kept saying to me, "Is this a shed? Or is it a garage?" And when it's over, you'd have to look at the code for the exact size but I think it's 144 SF. It has to be referred to as a garage, because there's limits to which sheds you can do on your property. Just so for your terminology. As we try to correct this, this would have to be referred to as a garage because of scale?

**Erica Iantuono** 15:27

Well, if we were issued an area of variance by the ZBA, allowing our shed to be bigger than the standard definition of a shed, Does that matter?

**Mike Deming** 15:39

Well, I would just talk to the Building Inspector, just so your terminology is correct so that you don't go back and forth as we try to correct this issue. We don't add more monkey wrenches into it. It's a simple thing.

**Erica Iantuono** 15:54

Sure.

**Jenny Haines** 15:56

We can help clarify that with Brian.

**Jim Hutchinson** 16:01

Well, if you go back to the ZBA meeting, the letter from the Historic Review Board mentions a 10' X 14' shed. However, then your request with them was a 10' X 18' shed. I think they did, and there was even some question about a 10' X 17' shed. I believe ZBA ultimately approved a 10' X 18'. But we

never approved a 10' X 18'. Well, we didn't approve anything, frankly. So, but 10' X 14' was the shed that was suggested that you were going to seek approval for in the spring, which was the one that was the Williamsburg whatever shed. It is here somewhere

**Mike Deming** 16:54

It's right in front of you.

**Jim Hutchinson** 16:56

Oh, in front of me. That was the suggestion that you showed us that night. But still again, we never approved shed of any kind. This would have been 140 square feet, what you're saying 144 SF might be. So I don't know where we are on this.

**Jackie Guntow** 17:19

And with all due respect to the board I've known Erica and Kevin for a while; they are clients of mine and I'm going to have to abstain from discussion. So I just want everyone to be on the same page as far as what I'm going to be doing in this current situation.

**Linda Frank** 17:40

I think we missed the last part of what you said

**Jackie Guntow** 17:42

I said I am going to abstain in this current situation. These folks are clients of mine.

**Linda Frank** 17:52

The image that was submitted with the original application was for a basic shed, and even the one today that was added on with siding sample is a normal height with a dormer attached. I mean this is just another building, this is not a shed in any way. The height, not even on the bottom. It is not a shed.

**Mike Deming** 18:25

Well as a group, would we consider the application complete without dimensions and everything that would be required to go further with this.

**Jim Hutchinson** 18:32

We would consider it incomplete in that we do not have dimensions. We don't have roofing shingle style, we do not have the siding, or what the windows or the doors will be.

**Mike Deming** 18:46

So we'd probably be better off tabling this rather than denying your application. That's not the object. We're trying to work something out.

**Erica Iantuono 18:55**

Okay,

**Mike Deming 18:56**

If you came back and worked with Planning and gave us a more detailed blueprint for the building, with all the materials, windows shapes, roof heights, and maybe you could even show them something from some previous applications. We would have these items to help us move along with what's required.

**Jenny Haines 19:19**

Again, just to clarify

**Linda Frank 19:22**

Is there a representation of what it's gonna look like instead of the garden shed, right and then here's this building. I think that would also be helpful with everything with what you are saying is added on to your submittal.

**Richard Stankus 19:33**

I think one of the biggest criticisms you're gonna run into is the height of your building. It's way too high. If you cut off the second story, you might stand a better chance of what you end up with being approved. If you leave it at the height that is, with the dimensions it is, even if we debate windows and doors and whatnot, it's still gonna be a structure that's well beyond what we would expect to see in a piece of property of that size. Again, I use the analogy if I wanted to put a pole barn up on my property, just because I have more land than you do, it's inappropriate for me to think about putting a pole barn up in historic district, it just doesn't work no matter what. Fancy doors or windows or whatever I apply, it's, the size of the structure in the property and the location. That, to me, at least I think, is what can change the neighborhood and how historic neighborhood looks. And I think the height of this is just overwhelming.

**Andy Roblee 20:51**

Will there be electricity in this building?

**Erica Iantuono 20:55**

Most likely no. It's just for basic storage of lawn equipment and what not. No real need for electricity.

**Andy Roblee 21:09**

Okay, so what's our next step?

**Nate Garland 21:29**

Would the chair entertain a motion to table this?



**Mike Deming** 21:33

Or do you want us to table ? If it's yes or no, then it gets dropped down. And, you know, we go on.

**Erica Iantuono** 21:42

You tell me with, you know, assuming Jenny can provide me with the list of what information you need. I'd be happy to complete a more thorough application with whatever you need.

**Mike Deming** 22:01

And I would just suggest, if you make applications, give us options. Because, I think the Board's found that objectionable, the height may be altering this. If you look at your discussion from our meeting, part of it said that this won't be very visible with the wall from Swift St, and you can see it all from South Street. And you can see it, it's huge. You can see it from South Street, you can see easily from Swift Street, the wall doesn't do anything, because the height is so much above it. But I get the impression; I don't think the board is going to accept it with that roof. So you can try but maybe do two options with two different drawing sets. Sounds like a good idea, Jenny? So, we can have some choices.

**Jenny Haines** 22:54

Yeah, I mean, we can work together on that. And what maybe I will do is put together a list of information. I'll email that to the Board and make sure it's complete as far as what you all want to see. And then I will work with Kevin and Erica on that.

**Mike Deming** 23:12

We will try to work with you. We're not here to be mean. But our job is to keep the integrity of the district. And we've worked at a lot of garages and carriage barns over the years and worked it out with people. So if we table it tonight, then you can go on and something can happen. If we were put to a vote tonight and it gets turned down you know, you're done. When I make a decision here, the next option if you didn't like the decision that was made is you can appeal to City Council. They would like us to work and make something that'll be work with us and with you.

**Erica Iantuono** 23:54

Sure.

**Ed Onori** 23:57

We're more than happy to work with you

**Mike Deming** 23:58

Okay, so Jenny will work together with what would you would need to come back again? Any motion,

**Jim Hutchinson** 24:05

Motion to appeal? I mean Motion to table.

**Mike Deming** 24:12

We have a second.

**Jenny Haines** 24:12

I was hoping that's what you meant.

**Mike Deming** 24:14

Richard? Okay, all in favor? Aye. Okay, so it's tabled. So it gives you a chance to come back again to the Board. And Jenny will work with you to try to come up with you know, some ideas, what you can bring back to the board that will be acceptable.

**Erica Iantuono** 24:35

I appreciate it.

**Mike Deming** 24:36

Did you have any other questions?

**Erica Iantuono** 24:37

I do, and if you guys know, I'd really appreciate it. I just I don't know the answer. I can ask the Code Office. The permit expires, I believe, February 22. I'm not sure when you y'all reconvene.

**Jenny Haines** 24:48

You can you can renew that for another six months at no cost,

**Erica Iantuono** 24:53

Can you renew that even with the stop work order.

**Jenny Haines** 24:57

We'll work through that.

**Erica Iantuono** 24:59

Okay.

**Jenny Haines** 25:00

We'll work through that. Don't worry about that.

**Mike Deming** 25:05

Just ask and work with Codes about the terminology so you get it correct, and I just know this from experience.

**Erica Iantuono** 25:12

Thank you.

**Mike Deming** 25:15

So we're all set then till next month and Jenny, you'll be happy to guide you along. Sorry for the hold up.

**Erica Iantuono** 25:26

Appreciate your time. Thank you.

**Mike Deming** 25:37

Okay we'll move to 3B. Just want to just explain the staff issue COA

**Andy Roblee** 25:47

Mike, can you speak in your microphone please because I can't hear the words.

**Mike Deming** 25:51

Okay. Staff issued a COA for 26 Elizabeth Street

**Jenny Haines** 26:00

As you can see, it was very simply just roof replacement; same color shingles you know, it was all in kind. It was pretty straightforward just to allow them to move forward and get a building permit. So we approved that the staff level.

**Mike Deming** 26:26

Yeah, is there any old business trying to

**Jim Hutchinson** 26:29

I'm trying to find this Elizabeth Street one on our approval.

**Linda Frank** 26:41

I don't think there was anything in there

**Jackie Guntow** 26:45

I just have to get there.

**Jim Hutchinson** 26:47

So this was what number this wasn't? What was it?

**Mike Deming** 26:53

26 Elizabeth

**Nate Garland** 26:55

Must be on the corner

**Jim Hutchinson** 26:57

For roofing?

**Nate Garland** 26:58

Yeah.

**Jim Hutchinson** 27:00

And do we know the color of the shingles. What do we know about it

**Mike Deming** 27:03

It was black.

**Jenny Haines** 27:08

Very straight forward. It should be right in your packet there.

**Jim Hutchinson** 27:14

I don't have a packet. I mean, it should be here. Right,

**Jackie Guntow** 27:18

The bottom right hand arrow .

**Jim Hutchinson** 27:20

Bottom right-hand arrow, okay. Oh, I know. Okay, now I know what you're talking about. I think we've got to be a little more careful about what gets approved with shingles and roofing. Last week. Last month, we hit we approved a metal roof for the back building at 5 Grover?

**Jenny Haines** 27:55

Yes.

**Jim Hutchinson** 27:55

It was a three Grover. Maybe three but right.

**Jenny Haines** 27:58

It was it was 5

**Jim Hutchinson 28:01**

And, you know, we had a sample of roofing. And we looked at it said, Okay, you're putting a metal roof on, these are becoming more common. It's black, it should look okay. But what we saw when it was put on metal roofs aren't metal roofs, necessarily. Metal roofs that we want in our historic district don't have the screws showing from the top of the roof like you'd have on a barn. And that's what ended up getting put on that building. It's basically, it's a metal roof. With a, they call it a washer screw type hex head, that screwed down with the metal roofing. Metal roofing now, in nicer homes, doesn't have any of that at all, fastens it up at the top, you don't see anything, and then it comes down. I think we got to be careful about what we approve. I think it also brings up another issue that I had a brief discussion with Jenny about. We have things brought before us here that we don't necessarily have any expertise in. And often we look over or I look over at Ed to my left, who's an architect. We look kind of look to him to maybe make a decision on some of this stuff. And that's unfair. Ed is not here is an expert of the city or a planner to bring a presentation to us. I think it's time that we put an end to that. I think it's time that the City provide expertise as we do legal expertise. I think we should have architectural or engineering expertise. For a lot of these, if it's something simple, no. But here we have this shed, building, whatever we end up with. I think an architect or an engineer should say, "Wait a minute. There's a problem here," not wait for us to approve it and then approve something that's inappropriate. I just think I've watched this happen over and over and over again. 50 South Street's another good example of that, with the recall, the right word for it, for the building on the back the greenhouse, or whatever. There are some issues with that. And I think we need to start having some expertise. For this Board to be presented, that comes in from the outside, through Planning. The City has spent next to nothing on this Board, and I think it's time that ends. I for one, frankly, if we get an issue like this, that's a bit iffy, I'm not approving it. Unless I see some outside expertise.

**Mike Deming 30:53**

Jenny, we were looking on the end of the minutes from this application, 50 South Street's on there. And then the proposal that we authorized, the Green House supports, they were supposed to be bronze. If you go by there, they stand out at you. That's not what we approved. It just bare aluminum. And like, there's a lot of things that happen that we're sort of like, just pushing along, trying not to be the bad guys. But that really stands out on that enormous greenhouse would have toned it down a little bit if they put it on the application.

**Jackie Guntow 31:30**

I think. I think too, this is one of the issues. I agree with what you're saying the building materials are so plentiful, and so different than what they were even five years ago. I mean, everything's changed. And I think to one of the issues that may be coming and causing some of these issues, is its so difficult to get qualified craftsmen and workmen to do this. And you may start with a project and you may have the proposal in front of you, this is what we're doing, this is what we say, the workmen get going on it. And the poor homeowners like, "Well, gee, I'm not sure about this." Now all this is the way it has to be done. And they kind of kind of push it through. And you end up with maybe a building or a structure where

there are certain sections of it, that maybe the homeowner themselves are unsatisfied with, but they don't have any, they have nothing to do, they have no recourse with the contractor that they get, unless you stand there and you watch these people, and you keep your eye on them. And even when you do that, some of the workmanship is not up to what you would consider quality or good workmanship. I mean, and we just had an issue of this in our house. I mean, there's no, there's absolutely nothing. You need a job done, you've got a big issue, a big problem, you hire somebody, and you may be satisfied, or you may not be satisfied at the end of the day on it. So I think you could dance around with this all the time. And that's what, you know, that's one of the issues, that's going to pop up. But I do agree with the types of building materials. I would have never known that there were two different types of metal roofs for Criminy sakes. I thought there was one, you know, so I agreed. I agreed with that assumption there.

**Richard Stankus 33:32**

Yeah, I think Jim brings up a really important point that we need to revolve as a committee in the sense that I look at the applications to come as one of three categories. The first is a replacement in kind, which is a relatively simple, straightforward application that I'm going to replace exactly what was there with its roofing material, a window or whatever. And there's really no significant change to the architecture of the structure, or the integrity of the building. Very, very simple, straightforward process. We should be aware of those things that are being I think, approved, but not necessarily have to come to a meeting to sit down and debate that approval because it's again, a very straightforward thing. Second, when someone takes an existing structure, and wants to change something on that structure, whether it's an upgrade to windows, whether it's an upgrade from a shingle roof to an alternate shingle roof, whether it's an upgrade to a door, whether it's an upgrade to siding, or whatever it might be. But then the third and most important categories when you're building a new structure, when you're adding something whether it's a greenhouse, whether in this case, it's a shed or a garage, or outbuilding, whatever you want to call it. You really do have to sit down and look very carefully at the design, not just the structure itself and what materials are being used. But how does it really fit with the historical nature of that particular property and the neighborhood to begin with. Again, that's where I think we could use help with people who say, well, if you're going to put this kind of whatever door or this kind of, because it's a completely new structure. And so the real question is, is does it really fit? I mean, most of this building we're talking about tonight is going up against a brick garage, a brick home, a brick wall, everything. And now you're going to have this, what he's calling a shed, and I'm calling an addition, basically, a huge addition, probably several 100 square feet, maybe, you know, eight-900 square feet. If you look at dimensions and height, compared to what a shed would be, this is not a shed, and it's completely new structure. So we see an image of what he proposed that, again, you're not going to see from the street. If the image was this particular shed that he's putting up, that might be a little more than what we thought, but you're not going to see it, it's in an occluded area, it serves its useful purpose. And so most of us, I think, would agree it's not a major issue. But if you're going to put something that seen from several roads or highways, that's going to be again, new construction, then that really has to be scrutinized at a much higher level than an existing structure, that you're simply replacing a window or door, or something else.

**Jackie Guntow 36:32**

Oh, I agree. I agree.

**Richard Stankus 36:33**

I agree. We need probably some more expertise to help us to guide us through because I think you're right. I mean, when somebody tells me they're gonna put a metal roof on, I'm thinking the same thing you thought, you know. So once you see on TV, that, you know, on all the home shows that "wow, that's a pretty nice metal roof". That makes good sense. And you are going to see some guys put rivets, the roof line that it's gonna be like, "Okay, I don't think so."

**Mike Deming 36:59**

Jenny, the City's starting their budget for this year, right?

**Jenny Haines 37:05**

We haven't started yet. But we will. We did set the budget calendar.

**Mike Deming 37:11**

So if we wanted to do this, we would have to ask for money in the budget.

**Jenny Haines 37:16**

Correct

**Mike Deming 37:16**

Pay for this?

**Jenny Haines 37:17**

Yep.

**Mike Deming 37:18**

How would we figure out our proposal, what would dollar amount be? Is that something that could be done?

**Jenny Haines 37:25**

I can reach out to a couple different firms and find out what it would take to provide that sort of expertise to the board?

**Mike Deming 37:35**

Because it wouldn't necessarily be every meeting. But when we had something.

**Jim Hutchinson 37:40**

It's not just that, but it's also that they give us our expertise. We approve it. At some point somebody needs to go out and do a final inspection on it.

**Linda Frank** 37:52

We approved something. Remember that brown house on Hamilton that had that rod iron, circle walkway. We told them they had to take it down and they never did. Right. Nothing. You know, the fence turned out differently on Worden's house than proposed. Then we found the roof thing. I think this is happening a lot. And yeah, addition to expertise, it would be nice to kind of have an in-progress review. Like what happened tonight.

**Jim Hutchinson** 38:19

Right? One, we don't need to all be coming to a meeting and saying, "Gee, I drove by that and that doesn't look like what we approved." And when you say, comment, we need somebody from the office, Planning office, whether it be a consultant or in-house, saying this is exactly what you approved? Which if it isn't, then it goes back to I would say the Codes Office?

**Jackie Guntow** 38:46

Would you highly suggest that instead of just, I know, you said you look to Ed and Ed is an architect? Would you highly suggest that the board should be looking to hire an architect to do this and not just a Planner or Code Officer.

**Richard Stankus** 39:12

But I don't think necessarily you need to hire somebody, and I mean, there, there are probably, you know, well-intentioned people out there who would be glad as we do every month or most months to come here, free of charge on our own time with busy schedules to do this sort of thing because we're dedicated to historic properties and to the historic district. So I'm sure if you spread the word that "hey, we're looking for someone, architect, whatever, who would be glad to spend occasional time with the board to review documents, reviewed proposals." I would bet that you could do that without having to pay someone a designated fee.

**Linda Frank** 39:54

Well maybe some of this could be Code. Maybe Code could, you know, how many applications a month do we have? You know, we're not talking about 50 things, right? In the summer, or spring.

**Jim Hutchinson** 40:17

A metal roof, a metal roof to codes, either one would be acceptable. That's not. It's not acceptable to us, though. That's why you need someone.

**Linda Frank** 40:26

That's what I mean Jim, that Code would be looking to what we approved.



**Jim Hutchinson** 40:31

Okay. That's a possibility. And that's the building inspector. That could work.

**Nate Garland** 40:36

The building inspector is authorized, has learned to issue a stop work order for service to this Historic Preservation chapter. So that Codes Office can take that on whether or not they have currently under capacity to work that in their workflow right now. That's not for me for me to say.

**Jim Hutchinson** 40:59

That's another issue.

**Mike Deming** 41:00

Right. This was, this was obvious, he drove by, and he knows it's not what we approved. You know, and they stopped it. Other things like the greenhouse the wrong color. Unless we physically looked at it and alerted him. But the issue of having someone come here to our meeting, if you'll look into options, so that we can put something in the budget.

**Jenny Haines** 41:27

I put something in the budget,

**Mike Deming** 41:29

Right, because the other thing the same people could do is we still haven't done training. We talked about it for years. And there's still issues, you know, that we could use the training on and if they were here for something on our agenda, we could, you know, spend a half hour with some additional training.

**Jackie Guntow** 41:52

I think going back to the whole suggestion, I think, Code, God bless them, they are overworked. They have a lot on their plate. I think the idea of having somebody who would volunteer their time, or, or some architect or somebody with a lot of expertise, especially in historical structures, because it's very difficult to find those people. And I know, too, we always seem to have a lot of issues with windows, they seem to be a huge, huge issue. You know, that doesn't get any better over time. And I think somebody who has that expertise, somebody can look it up a structure, look at the color of the greenhouse, so look at a possible new building and look at windows and look at everything, you know, the metal roofs, and all the little, the real nitty gritty of the stuff that I mean. I don't purport to know all of that I spend hours researching, you know, when something comes up, you know: I'll go to books; and I'll go to the internet; I go to the City of Rochester; and I do and all this stuff, you know, to kind of help me learn a little bit more, even though I've been in this district a long time. And I thought I knew a lot. I need to know a whole bunch more stuff. And I understand that. And I've done a lot of work to try to

educate myself on some of these items. You know, and it's an ongoing process. You know, you get new materials, new things happen. But I think we really need somebody who has some expertise,

**Mike Deming** 43:39

Right. That's why if you'll do some inquiries, because if we don't get this move in and get it on the budget, it'll never happen. So is this something where you put this on next month's agenda so that we have a report on this?

**Jenny Haines** 43:54

Yes. Before next month, I'll probably have to submit my department budget. So I'll make sure that I put a number in for that and see where it goes. I'll have to work through the City Manager and the Comptroller to get it in front of the City Council.

**Mike Deming** 44:14

I think all of us could work people on the City Council. They're the ones that are going to vote on this and there hasn't been a budget item and if we can get this and explain that to the middle. Everybody knows someone along the way. Anything else in this? How about the fence for First Pres? Did we get anywhere with the letter; who's responsible to send them a letter?

**Jenny Haines** 44:44

I will follow up on that, Mike

**Mike Deming** 44:46

Because I asked the building inspector he said it wasn't his job.

**Jenny Haines** 44:50

I'm not sure why that would be the case but I'll find out.

**Mike Deming** 44:54

But the fence is that historic fence and it's got a lot of ornate brackets in there. It just lays there. I asked them. I even gave them the fence to cover it up. I said, "some scrappers are gonna come by and steal all this." But it's all just laying there in the grass and it's repairable. It's really a lot, a really neat rod iron. Goes on and a car hit it from a car dealer so it had to be insurance.

**Jim Hutchinson** 45:21

I don't know, if we need a letter requesting as to what they're doing, I think a letter needs to come from legal counsel saying you need to repair it, as it was originally, based on what this board requires.

**Mike Deming** 45:33

Is that something that can come from your office?

**Jim Hutchinson** 45:34

I mean, maybe we need a resolution from us first. And we could do that next month.

**Nate Garland** 45:40

You know if it pleases the board, I can take direction today and get a letter out to them.

**Mike Deming** 45:46

Might be a simple thing. And then like, ask for a reply, right? What are their intentions are? Because I explained it nice. I told him, "I was the Chair of the Board and tried to help them save it. And that it would be required that they fixed it". Nothing's happening. So if you would do that, then that would make it easier, wouldn't it?

**Jenny Haines** 46:08

We will work between Code Enforcement and Corporation Counsel and see. Maybe they're waiting for insurance. I don't know what the situation is.

**Mike Deming** 46:19

But I just hate to see all those pieces get stolen. There's a lot of scrap. Really expensive now.

**Jim Hutchinson** 46:24

Heck of a hole in the fence,

**Mike Deming** 46:25

Right. Any other old business, new business? Nothing on the Schine is there.

**Jenny Haines** 46:37

The owner of the Schines will be making a presentation to the City Council on February 10. He will have his schematic designs back by then, and is going to be presenting that.

**Richard Stankus** 46:52

Any other thoughts that I think we wrapped up maybe a meeting or two ago regarding the expansion of the historic district and including Fort Hill Cemetery?

**Jenny Haines** 47:03

We had talked about that. That's another piece that would have to be done by a consultant. Again, as you remember, we had a grant application and for that, we can take another look at that as well.

**Mike Deming** 47:17

With your additional staff, is there going to be a new member working with the board?

**Jenny Haines** 47:25

Not committing that yet. This is her second day on the job.

**Jim Hutchinson** 47:29

Not after tonight.

**Jenny Haines** 47:33

We'll figure that out as we go.

**Mike Deming** 47:41

Anybody else have anything?

**Jim Hutchinson** 47:44

Motion to adjourn.

**Mike Deming** 47:45

Second, Richard. All in favor

**Everyone** 47:48

Aye.

**Mike Deming** 47:50

Thanks everyone.