

**VILLAGE OF BALDWINSVILLE**  
**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**Monday, April 3, 2006, 7:00 P.M.**  
Approved 5/1/06

**PRESENT:** Dean Johnson, Acting Chairperson  
Evelyn Mercer  
Connie Taft  
Toni Kleist

**ALSO PRESENT:** Susan LaQuay, Secretary

**GUESTS:** Renee Upfold, La Tresse by Renee  
Patrick Hovey, 5, 7, and 9 Mechanic Street  
Joe Mastroianni, PE

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Upon motion by E. Mercer and second by C. Taft that the minutes of the March 6, 2006 meeting of the Architectural Review Board be approved as corrected. Motion passed.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**18 Oswego Street sign – La Tresse by Renee – Renee Upfold-Newton...**

Renee Upfold Newton is present to address the Board. She stated she is attempting to make her salon more visible as a large salon just moved next door. She showed on the photograph where the sign will be located and stated it is to be centered above the window. The door and framing is green, so the sign will be burgundy and black with a white background. “La Tresse by Renee” will be burgundy and “Unisex Salon” will be black. The sign will not have lighting.

D. Johnson noted the application shows there will be trim cap around the exterior edges of the sign. C. Taft asked what color that will be. Ms. Upfold-Newton stated she is not sure. She stated that Metropolitan Signs is making the sign and he just told her it would be a very simple design. D. Johnson suggested the trim cap should be black or burgundy.

T. Kleist stated she feels white is okay for the background color. She noted they cannot use cream as it will blend too much with the building and will not stand out.

C. Taft asked if the decals will removed from the window. Ms. Upfold-Newton stated all decals except for the phone number will be removed. Ms. Upfold-Newton stated that Mr. Jim Orlando is the owner of the building.

Upon motion by D. Johnson and second by T. Kleist to approve the sign at 18 Oswego Street with the clarification that the trim cap around the perimeter of the sign will be burgundy or black in color. **Motion passed.**

## OLD BUSINESS

### **5, 7, and 9 Mechanic Street – Recommendation to Planning Board regarding design...**

Mr. Patrick Hovey, owner of the properties, and Mr. Joe Mastroianni, PE are present to address the Board. Mr. Hovey stated they were asked by the Planning Board to come to the ARB because Planning wanted the building that will eventually be built there to have a residential flair to better blend with the neighborhood.

E. Mercer stated that the Planning Board had approved SOCPA's resolution at their meeting on March 28, 2006 that stated the project will have no adverse affect. She noted the Planning Board had discussed the streetscape and softening the building's appearance to have it appear more residential than what was proposed. Mr. Hovey noted that most residential buildings are two stories and developers would rather not build two stories, as most business tenants would not like to be located in the second story. E. Mercer noted at the Planning Board meeting there had been discussion regarding the "block" look of building and they suggested the use of architectural details to soften the look. Therefore, the Applicant was sent to the ARB for direction.

D. Johnson stated the building could be built with a steeper roof and faux dormers to make it appear to have two stories even if it does not. He suggested adding a porch and double-hung windows rather than casement of slider windows to give it a more residential look. Mr. Hovey stated they are very willing to cooperate and would very much like to follow the guidelines.

D. Johnson noted they typically would be looking at designs to understand what the proposal would be. Mr. Mastroianni stated the Planning Board would like to incorporate deed restrictions for the property to address the appearance and this is why they were sent to this Board. He noted that Planning will be reviewing this again next month and wanted recommendations from this board on what verbage should be used to include in the deed. E. Mercer noted the Planning Board does not include members with the expertise that the ARB members have to address this type of detail.

T. Kleist suggested the use of horizontal siding and shutters.

C. Taft asked what the size of the building will be. Mr. Hovey noted they cannot design a building until they have a tenant and the size of the building would be determined by the tenant and intended use. He stated they plan to build closer to the street line and have parking in the back. He stated they will be sure to conform to the guidelines and design an acceptable structure, which will be smaller or larger depending on the needs of the future tenant.

D. Johnson stated he did not feel they should be too specific and suggested a recommendation as follows:

The design of any commercial structure on this property shall incorporate residential characteristics consistent with the neighborhood and other residential structures, such as horizontal siding, steep roof, faux dormers to give the appearance of a second story, porch and railing details, functional, double hung windows (at least on the front elevation) rather than casement, sliding or fixed picture windows, window shutters or trim, residential style door(s) not commercial aluminum entrance doors, and the building should be located close to the street to be consistent with existing residences.

The design must comply with ARB Guidelines and will require application for ARB review.

D. Johnson noted the Planning Board was looking at plans for the building on Route 31, which were submitted with the application. Mr. Mastroianni state the building will not look much different from that, but they are willing to do what is necessary to address Planning Board's concerns. He stated he is concerned that if they go back to Planning without suggested verbage they will be further delayed.

E. Mercer noted that plans and drawings will be forthcoming and they will be back before the Boards later in the process to address additional issues.

Mr. Hovey stated he understands the Planning Board's intent in sending him to ARB. He stated he purchased the property approximately 20 years ago and thought he would have had it developed by now. D. Johnson noted the ARB would give their recommendation to the Planning Board outlining what they feel would be desirable for the appearance of the building.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m. The next Architectural Review Board meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 1, 2006 at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan A. LaQuay  
Architectural Review Board Secretary