



**Landmark Preservation Board  
Thursday, March 19, 2014**

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: Cynthia Carter, Tom Cantwell, Bob Haley, Dan Leary, Julia Marshall, Don Radke, Jeff Romano and Joe Saya

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of February 19, 2015 were approved unanimously on the motion of C. Carter, which was seconded by J. Romano with the following correction:

Project Site Review: ... Mr. Shattell provided a supplemental drawing that included greater detail of the front elevation. The Board agreed to review and comment on this supplemental drawing. It recommended approval of the overall project *subject to submission of revised drawings to Zoning with the following specific information:*

**OLD BUSINESS**

*No Old Business*

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATIONS**

*No New CofA applications*

**ZONING REFERRALS**

Sign Waiver: 208 W. Water Street. The Board reviewed the application materials and agreed that the number of signs was excessive. The Board recommended that the applicant consider a single projecting sign on both street frontages as an effective means of attracting attention and business to the restaurant. In addition, the Board suggested that an additional decal sign on the main doors of each street frontage would not detract from the overall character of the historic building.

**DISCUSSION**

800 N. Clinton Street: Window and Door Specifications. Wayne LaFrance (Lake Architectural) presented a new window proposal for the former factory building. He noted that there are presently no windows in the building; all the window openings are boarded over. To fill the wide window openings, he presented a proposal for paired single-hung, PVC windows with a fixed transom. W. LaFrance noted the cost of the material as well as energy performance as reasons for selecting this type of window. The Board stated that it could not support the application if it included the proposed PVC windows. The Board suggested alternatives including metal, wood or aluminum-clad windows as more appropriate for the historic structure. The applicant stated that he would consult with the owner.

Review Process diagram. The Board reviewed a written narrative of the proposed review process for window repair and replacement. The Board agreed that the priority should be placed on repair and retention of historic materials. Only after confirmation that repair is not feasible would the Board need to address issues of material, form, design, character, etc. To that end, receiving accurate and detailed information regarding window condition is very important. The Board discussed the current window survey form; K. Auwaerter noted that it was basic and needed additional direction for applicants. The Board suggested including a diagram identifying the parts of a window would be beneficial. In addition, Board members recommended including language regarding types of window problems that do not justify replacement, including broken sash chords, missing glazing, peeling paint, etc. D. Radke requested that Board members continue to review the narrative and K. Auwaerter agreed to distribute copies of the current window survey to the board members.

**ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 AM.