



**Landmark Preservation Board**  
**Thursday, April 2, 2015**

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, Julia Marshall, Don Radke, Jeff Romano

Members Absent: Dan Leary, Joe Saya

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of March 19, 2015 were approved unanimously as submitted on the motion of C. Carter, which was seconded by J. Marshall.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Project Site Review: 800 N. Clinton Street. Wayne LaFrance (Lake Architectural) presented a revised window proposal for the former factory building. The revised specifications call for aluminum frames and sashes rather than the previously proposed PVC product. Filling each masonry open will be paired 1-over-1, single-hung sash windows with fixed upper transoms. The color for the aluminum windows and the new door systems is dark bronze. The Board agreed to recommend approval of the revised application.

**CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS APPLICATIONS**

CA-15-02 207-233 E. Water Street. Anthony Catsimatides and Tom Kinslow of Open Atelier Architects and Mike Wicker of Wicker Associates presented the application. The project includes the construction of two additional stories on an existing two-story office building adjoining the historic Grange Building. (The Grange Building is located in the Hanover Square Preservation District.) The two buildings will be linked together from the interior in order to share egress, certain utilities and roof access. The ground floor of the new building will be retail and the upper floors will be residential. K. Auwaerter explained that the Grange Building and the office building are located on separate lots that will be resubdivided into a single lot. With the resubdivision, Zoning has determined that the entirety of the new lot will be encumbered by the local preservation designation. Therefore, a Certificate of Appropriateness is required for the new construction. However, she also noted that until the resubdivision is approved by the Planning Commission, a Certificate of Appropriateness cannot be issued. In the interests of time, the applicants had requested an advance review of the Certificate of Appropriateness, subject to the decision of the Planning Commission.

A. Catsimatides and T. Kinslow described the new construction in detail, noting that the building will have precast concrete base, the second and third floors will have an EIFS panel system and the fourth floor will feature a metal vertical panel system. The Board discussed the articulation of the new façade through the fenestration pattern and use of materials and colors. The applicants stated that the narrow fenestration pattern was modeled on the original window openings uncovered on the two-story office building, including the original loading bay windows. B. Haley expressed concern that the overall color scheme would be too bright against the darker brick of the historic Grange Building. He recommended that the applicants mock-up large panels with the proposed paint colors to compare against the Grange Building. The Board also was concerned that the proposed alternating colors on the vertical metal paneling on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor would be visually

distracting. J. Marshall also noted that it would become a maintenance issue over time. The Board recommended that they select a single color, specifically, the lightest of the proposed three colors. J. Marshall made a motion to approve the application subject to the following conditions: the resubdivision must be approved by the Planning Commission, and that a single color (Benjamin Moore, 1073 “Malton”) be used for the vertical metal siding on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor. C. Carter seconded the motion. In discussion, B. Haley suggested that the applicants consider darker colored window frames and sash instead of the proposed white. He noted that there are few other buildings with white windows in the Hanover Square Historic District and that the window openings would appear even narrower because of the white frames. The applicants explained their choice of the windows in the context of the articulation of the façade. After further discussion, the majority of the Board members did not object to the proposed white windows. The motion passed unanimously.

### **ZONING REFERRALS**

Resubdivision: 203 & 207-233 E. Water Street. The Board agreed to recommend the resubdivision application for the properties as part of the Certificate of Appropriateness discussions (above).

Site Plan Review: 120 Smith Drive. Jennifer Bybee (Syracuse University facilities) presented the plans for the site surrounding Machinery Hall, which is located in the Syracuse University/Comstock Tract National Register Historic District. The project called for relocating a standby power generator and providing screening for cooling equipment. The cooling equipment and generator will be screened by a retaining wall that will be faced in cast stone to match the stone used on the north stair. In addition a new set of stairs and a ramp will be incorporated into the retaining wall. Finally, a set of stairs on the south face of the building will be narrowed. The Board reviewed the proposal and agreed to recommend approval of the application as submitted.

Project Site Review: 100 North Salina Street.

Jim Knittel (Dal Pos Architects) was present at the meeting. The proposed project calls for the replacement of the 4<sup>th</sup> through 6<sup>th</sup> floor windows with aluminum-clad, full-frame, double-hung windows. The Board reviewed historic images of the building and agreed that the existing windows probably date to the c. 1930s renovation of the property, which significantly altered the ground floor and added 6<sup>th</sup> floor attic dormers. The Board suggested that the applicant consider sash replacements instead of full-frame replacement windows in order to preserve historic material to the maximum extent possible. In addition, the Board noted that the difference in reflectivity between the proposed low-E glass of the new windows and the plain glass of the remaining original windows (chiefly of the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor) would have a significant visual impact on the property. It suggested that the applicant reconsider the use of the low E-glass in this application. The Board determined it could not render a recommendation on the application until it had clarification on the above noted items. Mr. Knittel stated he would discuss the sash replacements as well as the glass with the owner/applicant and get back to the Board.

### **DISCUSSION**

Window Review Process. The Board reviewed a revised written narrative of the review process for window repair and replacement. The Board provided additional review comments to the narrative. K. Auwaerter will consult with Corporation Counsel regarding publically releasing information regarding the review procedures. K. Auwaerter will also work on the content of the window survey document so that it is more user friendly and yields more complete and useful information for the Board.

### **ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 AM.