



**Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, October 20, 2016**

Meeting Minutes

Common Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Don Radke called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Tom Cantwell, Cynthia Carter, Bob Haley, Dan Leary, Julia Marshall, Jeff Romano, Don Radke

Excused: Joe Saya

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of October 6, 2016 were approved unanimously with the following corrections on the motion of J. Romano, which was seconded by C. Carter:

CA-16-22 203 E Water Street. The Board reviewed the material and agreed that the proposed signage is appropriately scaled to the historic storefronts and that it would not alter the historic character or visual qualities of the property or the surrounding preservation district. *C. Carter asked why no signage was proposed for the transom areas above the storefronts, which is the traditional location for signage. N. Evans explained that they intend to install awnings over the storefronts in the spring, which would hide any signage on the transoms. J. Romano recommended that the projecting signs be attached to the building through the mortar joints rather than the face of the stone panels above the storefronts.*

Special Permit: 953-55 N Salina Street. The Board discussed the use of the lot as parking and noted its high visibility and exposure on three sides. *K. Auwaerter reported that the parking use is not compatible with the vision for this area as outlined in the adopted Land Use Plan. D. Leary commented that the lot was large enough to be buildable. However, he also stated his concern that by denying the application, no improvements would be made in the foreseeable future and it would continue to have a detrimental visual impact on the historic district. Nonetheless, the majority of Board recommended that the application be denied because of the impact of the parking use on the character of the historic commercial district.*

OLD BUSINESS

CA-16-12 408 Sedgwick Drive. The Board agreed to hold the application open until the next meeting.

Site Plan Review (SR-16-09): 311 Genant Drive. K. Auwaerter noted that the applicant had not yet received the SHPO comments. The Board agreed to hold the application open.

NEW BUSINESS

Certificate of Appropriateness Applications

CA-16-23 109 Dorset Road. Kerry Quaglia (Home Headquarters) and Hilary Mansur (Group 1 Design) and David Michel (University Neighborhood Preservation Association/Berkeley Park Neighbors) were present. K. Quaglia introduced the application, explaining that at the request of UNPA and the Berkeley Park Neighbors group, Home Headquarters had agreed to assist in purchasing the property from Freddie Mac and Citibank. He noted that it took 2 years to facilitate a short sale and prevent the house from going to auction. During that time, with no heat in the house, water infiltration and freeze-thaw action severely damaged the foundation to the point that it is now in danger of collapse. K. Quaglia explained the foundation will need to be replaced from the slab to the sill plate. K. Auwaerter and B. Haley confirmed that they have both been to the site to review the project with Home Headquarters staff.

The foundation is concrete block that is faced in brick above grade level. The same brick is used for the front stoop and steps, which are also in poor condition. In order to replace the foundation, the house will need to be shored up from the inside and the foundation excavated from the exterior. The excavation will result in the removal of the front stoop. The side porch will be partially dismantled and the porch roof supported while the repairs to the foundation are made. K. Quaglia said that they must to complete the work this fall to protect the house. Home Headquarters solicited 3 bids for the foundation and stoop reconstruction and the bids ranged from between \$150,000-\$170,000. He noted that these bids were very high and in combination with the amount paid for the house, Home Headquarters is concerned that it won't be able to sell the house and recoup its investment, especially with the amount of work that is still required (roof, kitchen, bathrooms, etc.)

In order to economize, Home Headquarters has decided to have their construction crews do the work themselves. It also is requesting to use new materials for the foundation and porch; specifically, the application calls for a new concrete block foundation to grade level and Spec-Brik --which is a concrete block with a brick-like finish --from grade level to the sill. The application calls for reconstructing the front stoop to match the original dimensions. It will be constructed on a concrete foundation and will feature a 7'-wide masonry stair with Spec-Brik risers and limestone treads, and Spec-Brik wing walls with concrete caps. The side porch will be supported/partially dismantled during the excavation of the foundation and then reassembled with new Spec-Brik piers to match the new foundation. H. Mansur explained that they would save approximately \$50,000 on the cost of the foundation by using this material and yet would retain an appearance that was consistent with the original.

D. Leary asked them if they had considered a concrete-block foundation with a parged finish and suggested that this might both appropriate and provide a cost savings. He and B. Haley noted that the Spec-Brik units are larger than standard brick so the scale and thus appearance would be very different from the original. D. Leary also questioned the longevity of the color of the stain and asked the applicants if they had any information about potential fading. C. Carter said that if the entire foundation was to be concrete block, it should have a rock-face finish rather than parging. T. Cantwell said he did not object to the Spec-Brik because it would not be competing with any original brick on the house and so the uniform appearance would be maintained. B. Haley noted that the joints of the Spec-Brick should match the brick color so that it de-emphasizes the scale issue. D. Radke commented that time was of the essence for the house; a delayed decision might result in the loss of the house. J. Marshall and J. Romano recommended that the exterior and interior of the foundation should be insulated and there should be proper drainage too to prevent future water infiltration. D. Michel stated that UNPA and the Berkeley Park Neighbors group were very concerned about the house and also about keeping the cost of the project down so that the house can go to an owner occupant. J. Marshall made a motion to approve the Spec-Brik foundation and stoop material with the option of substituting a rock-face block on the foundation. The motion was seconded by T. Cantwell and passed on a majority vote, D. Leary voting no.

CA-16-24 941 Comstock Road. The applicant was not present. K. Auwaerter reported that this was an application for work that was completed without a permit or Certificate of Appropriateness and is subject to a Stop Work Order. The application includes the removal of a modern, wooden deck on the front of the house and the installation of a concrete slab and steps to the front door. She noted that the slab appeared to be out of scale with the entrance and suggested that the size of the slab was more appropriate as a rear deck than a front stoop. She referred the Board to an earlier image of the house that indicated there was a circular metal canopy over the door. J. Marshall speculated that the given the age and appearance of the house, the original stoop was possibly circular too and made of brick. J. Romano made a motion to deny the application as submitted, which was seconded by C. Carter. In discussion, the Board agreed to include a statement within the resolution that the stoop was out of scale with the house and that the application lacked any reference to the original design or appearance of the entrance canopy, stoop and door. The motion carried unanimously.

Zoning Referrals

Project Site Review (16-43): 100 Salina Street (Syracuse Savings Bank). James Knittel (Dalpos Architects) presented the application to illuminate the west façade and tower of the Syracuse Savings Bank. He noted that

the lighting would be low profile, attached to sills and to the stone face of the building, and that the housing would match the color of the stonework. The Board reviewed the information and although generally supportive, commented that it did not have sufficient information to make a determination at this time. D. Leary recommended that the applicant commission a façade lighting intensity model for the project in order to determine the appropriate levels of illumination. The Board also recommended that the applicant seek the assistance of a lighting design expert to develop a lighting plan for the building in order to ensure that the desired effect is achieved. B. Haley expressed concern regarding drilling directly into the stone for the installation of the lighting and conduit and requested details of the installation on the façade and tower. D. Leary noted that the best effect could be achieved by lighting from Clinton Square, but acknowledged the practical difficulties of this.

Project Site Review (16-36A): 938 E Fayette St, 941-49 E Genesee St, 325-27 Irving Av, 310 Crouse Ave, 313/311/309 Irving Ave. Connie Brace and Mike O'Shea (QPK Architects), Justin Pelland (Cube 3 Studio), James Trasher (CHA) and Mark Riley (Peak Campus) were present. C. Brace made a presentation regarding 945 E Fayette Street, which is proposed for demolition as part of the housing development. She presented a report that provided documentation about the building's history based on research at the Onondaga Historical Association, historic images of the building, Sanborn Maps, an analysis of the integrity of the property and images of the interior and exterior of the property.

The Board discussed whether the property met the criteria for eligibility as a local Protected Site. C. Carter stated that she did not believe that the property met the criteria, because of the loss of architectural integrity as well as loss of context. She noted that the property would derive significance as part of a commercial streetscape, which unfortunately has been demolished. Both J. Romano and J. Marshall agreed. B. Haley commented that although the property did not attain "heroic" individual status, it is still of value to the city as an excellent example of early 20th century mixed-use commercial architecture built at a pedestrian scale; a scale that the community now is trying to replicate in other locations. D. Leary agreed that it may rise to the level of local designation. T. Cantwell admired the scale and detail of the property and contrasted it to large scale development proposed to replace it. D. Radke took a voice vote of Board members. A majority of the Board, which included J. Marshall, J. Romano, C. Carter voted not to forward the property for potential designation as a local Protected Site; D. Leary voted to forward the property for designation; and T. Cantwell and B. Haley abstained stating they needed more information.

In review of the Project Site Review application, C. Carter and J. Marshall commented that it was regrettable that the development did not incorporate the historic building into the new design and noted how this has been done successfully elsewhere (specifically, the design for the Sylvester Apartments at 900 E Fayette Street). J. Pelland presented the design to the Board including a volumetric study of the surrounding streetscape and how the new multi-story development fit into its surroundings. It was noted that the design and set back of the development took into account the future Sylvester Apartment project, located at the northwest corner of the block facing E. Fayette Street. The Board expressed concern regarding the façade of the ground-floor on the Irving and Crouse Avenue sides of the building, noting that the lack of articulation, landscaping, and/or lighting presented a very inhospitable environment for pedestrians. The Board also commented about the importance of screening the rooftop HVAC units as well as location of dumpsters how trash pick-up would be facilitated.

Overall the Board was supportive of the new design and agreed to recommend approval with the following comment: The Board recommended incorporating lighting, landscaping and/or other features (for example creating greater visual interest and openness along the garage facade) in order to create a more pedestrian-friendly environment along the ground floor (garage level) on the Irving and Crouse Avenue sides of the property.

DISCUSSION

I-81 Discussion: D. Leary asked whether the Board should make a statement regarding the remaining two options that the NYSDOT is publically discussing for the I-81 project: a new viaduct, which will result in the demolition of 24 structures; and the community grid, which will result in the demolition of 5 structures. K.

Auwaerter stated that she would summarize the information from the DOT for the board at the next meeting so that the Board could make comment and submit it to NYSDOT.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 AM.