

Vestal Historic Preservation Commission

Minutes: Meeting June 17, 2019

In Attendance: N. Versaggi, M. Hadsell, P. Deeley and M. L. Supa

Absent: A. Jablonski

Meeting called to order at 5:30 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Old Business:

The Commission continues to discuss the National Register Rounds House property at 301 Main Street, Vestal, N.Y.

The following document is the review prepared by Commission member and architect, Paul Deeley, after a meeting with Vestal's Code Department and Dr. David Muench. This document was reviewed and approved by all members of the Commission.

Vestal Historic Preservation Commission Architectural Review Certificate of Appropriateness Application 301 N. Main Street (Historic Rounds House) Addition, Vestal, NY June 7, 2019

Per the National Park Service's Technical Brief No. 14 (New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns), the proposed design for the new addition to 301 North Main Street embodies the spirit of these standards. However, the following points need to be addressed before the Commission can continue the review of the addition.

Points 1 through 3 involve choices of finishing materials that do not represent the best choice of materials that would complement the Queen Anne style of the original structure. While the NPS Technical Brief requires that new additions be markedly distinct from the historical buildings to which they are attached, the same guidelines discourage design choices that are drastically different from or incompatible with the original building's style. The Commission considers the structural elements of the proposed addition (i.e. the new hallway and cutout between original building and addition) sufficient to distinguish new from existing structures. The Commission concludes, therefore, that the stylistic choices discussed below are not needed to meet the requirements of the NPS guidelines, and further that being quite different from the style of the original structure they will distract from its overall (holistic) appearance.

Points 4 through 7 address irreversible changes to the original structure which would prevent any future owners from restoring the structure to its original form.

Review Comments:

1. The brick veneer material that covers the addition's foundation wall. While brick was a widely used material in the 1800's, it is unusual to have brick used as a foundation material. In addition, there is no other brick foundation work on the building. While we understand that the designer was attempting to differentiate the addition from the original structure, the commission recommends using a stone veneer that more closely resembles the existing stone work. This could be a thin veneer similar to the brick specified in the construction documents.

2. The siding material (style) covering the new addition is markedly inconsistent with what was used for Queen Anne style structures. The decision to use fiber cement siding is commendable. This material is durable and an appropriate choice for the project. The Commission is recommending a clapboard style that closely resembles the style of the existing structure be employed on the addition.
3. Window type specified for the addition. In keeping with Technical Brief No. 14, it is appropriate to use either single pane with transom or double hung windows for the addition. Casement style windows are not compatible with Queen Anne style.
4. Existing exterior wall areas, and the fenestrations located in those areas, will be encapsulated by the new construction. The existing perimeter walls of the original structure need to be preserved during the new construction in a manner that the house can be returned to its original condition at a future time. The existing clapboard siding with its associated trim, plus all windows and doors within the new building area need to be protected (usually by encapsulating them with wall furring & gyp. wall board). This requirement extends to the connections of the new to the existing structure.
5. The exterior wall removal. The submitted plans do not show the connection details and in fact show the exterior wall's removal on the section detail located on sheet #6. **Technical Brief 14** clearly states that this is a historic preservation violation for new additions on National Register buildings since it prevents a future owner from restoring the structure to its original form. This design will need to be revised on the plans.
6. The rear porch of the existing house will be demolished as part of the new building addition. The rear area in question has seen many alterations and the original porch has been modified, both during the kitchen's south addition and the recent second story egress stair that was part of the accessible ramp. It is the Commission's opinion that the demolition of this area is a compromise between the Commission and the owner and we recommend that a proper photographic survey (documentation) of the rear porch be completed prior to the start of work. The Commission can assist with this photography.

The existing area above the roof area of the addition should be returned to its original condition, less the balcony, as part of the new construction. This will include the dormer's window repair and the replacement of the building brackets at the roof's soffit. The door to the roof top area, (the additions roof) shall match the size and style of the historic photographs. This work can be completed as part of the new construction or prior to the new addition's construction as part of the building's comprehensive repair plan.

New Business: None

Next meeting July 15, 2019