



**Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, November 15, 2012**

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: Louise Birkhead, Cynthia Carrington Carter, Bob Haley, Dan Leary, Julia Marshall, Jeff Romano, Don Radke

Excused: Joe Saya

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

J. Romano made a motion to accept the minutes of November 1, 2012 as submitted, which was seconded by D. Leary. The minutes were approved unanimously as submitted.

OLD BUSINESS

Project Site Review: 201 S. Salina Street (White Memorial Building). Based on a site visit on November 13, 2012, D. Radke and B. Haley reported on the condition of the windows in the White Memorial Building, noting that there was peeling paint, instances of rot in the lower sashes, missing glazing and loose glass. B. Haley also noted that the storm windows--custom-built and installed in the 1980s--were nailed into the sashes and inoperable, which had contributed to the deterioration of the windows. They discussed with the project architect the possibility of installing new glazing within the existing sash, but the architect stated that it was too expensive and that the owners were only interested in installing new sash. The board discussed the high architectural value of the building, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the recent conversation with staff from the State Historic Preservation Office regarding replacement materials. The board agreed to recommend to Zoning that the owners be encouraged to repair the windows rather than replace them. If the owners chose to replace the sash, as proposed, then the board recommended that the sash and any other window component, be replaced in-kind, which includes material (all wood), profile, design and function. It was noted that that some of the windows had arched upper sashes. In addition, the curved horns on the meeting rail of the upper sash were also noted as significant and should be replicated in-kind.

CA-12-27 248 Brattle Road. Daniel Stazzone (designer) presented the application for the owner. The proposed landscape design called for removing most of the existing landscaping in the front of the house, including mature cedars that were planted too close to the house as well as yew hedges and other shrubs and perennial plantings. The proposed plan included a more formal design with boxwood to either side of the front walk, shrubs at the base of the house and pots for annuals. D. Stazzone also requested that the application be amended to include a new brick front walk (to replace the existing concrete walk). In the back of the house, the plan calls for the installation of a cedar hedge along the back property line for privacy and a wooden arbor. A wooden pergola would be installed on the existing back deck and would not be attached to the house.

The board recommended that he select a variety of cedar or a type of hedge that would not encroach on the overhead lines in the rear of the property. In regard to the front walk, the board recommended that the

brick be a clay brick and stated that the board would need to see and approve the type of brick as well as the proposed brick pattern. Understanding that the owner also wanted to rebuild the front porch at some point, board members recommended that the owner wait to select the brick for the front walk until he had decided the new design of the porch.

J. Marshall made a motion to accept the application as submitted with the condition that the owner provide the board with a sample brick and pattern for the front walk. The motion was seconded by L. Birkhead and approved unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

CA-12-28 1500 James Street/Variance: 1500 James Street. Lisa Tabor, owner, was present. D. Radke noted for the board that the work had been completed and that the owner was seeking retroactive approval. He also noted that the applicant had to go before the Board of Zoning Appeals for a Variance regarding the new construction. K. Auwaerter noted the formal character of the James Street mansion row, which is features large homes with wide setbacks from the road, and narrow drives on the west side of each property that lead to detached garages behind the homes.

L. Tabor described her stewardship of her house and her desire to create a space in front of the house where she could place flower pots and seating. She also wanted to remove a line of bushes between her and her neighbor's yard, which she said were dead. She noted that she had received permission from the neighbor to remove the bushes and construct the retaining wall over the property line. She described the sequence of events that led to her being cited by Codes and her current appearance before the board.

D. Radke stated that the front yard patio and retaining wall was a new element unique within the James Street area of the district and to approve this change would establish a new precedent along James Street. He also noted that the paving material was a synthetic concrete mix, made to look like stone, and that the board's precedent was to deny the use of this type of paving material. J. Marshall questioned the definition of patio. D. Leary stated that there were other, less obtrusive ways of creating areas for pots and seating, for example installation of individual flagstones.

B. Haley made a motion to deny the application for the front yard patio and retaining wall, which was seconded D. Leary. The motion passed unanimously.

D. Radke clarified for the applicant that the patio and retaining wall did not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, specifically, Standards 2 and 9 that speak to spatial relationships and site design. The applicant stated that she did not know that the site was included under the board's review. K. Auwaerter noted that the applicant had received a letter and brochure earlier in the year that described both the board's jurisdiction and its review procedures. During a discussion of the contractors' obligations and knowledge of permitting requirements, the applicant stated that it was BrickScapes that had done the work.

In regard to the Variance application related to the this project, the board also agreed to recommend denial to the Board of Zoning Appeals for the same reasons that it had denied the Certificate of Appropriateness.

DISCUSSION

Holy Trinity: Planning Commission hearing. K. Auwaerter reported that the Planning Commission would be meeting on Monday, November 19 and would make its decision regarding Holy Trinity Church. She reported that the public hearing was closed.

Roundtable discussion planning: Modern materials in preservation districts. K. Auwaerter reported that the roundtable discussion with local preservation architects would take place on December 6, 2012 directly after the board's regular meeting.

ADJOURN

C. Carter made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by J. Romano. The meeting adjourned at 9:24 a.m.