



*SYRACUSE
LANDMARK
PRESERVATION
BOARD*

**Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, April 3, 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, Bob Haley, Dan Leary, Julia Marshall, Don Radke, Jeff Romano, Joe Saya

Excused: Tom Cantwell,

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

J. Romano made a motion to accept the minutes of March 20, 2014, which was seconded by D. Leary. The motion passed unanimously with the following correction:

OLD BUSINESS

Project Site Review: 205-09 E. Jefferson Street. The Board also recommended that the new trimboard cornice should be either *wood*, cementboard or ~~a bonded~~ aluminum of a proper thickness to avoid rippling or "oil-panning", rather than the PVC product described in the drawings.

OLD BUSINESS

CA-14-01: 501 Park Street. Mirza Tihic and Mark Cass, representing the North Side Learning Center, presented revised information regarding the proposed cross removal and the installation of a fence around the property at 501 Park Street. Prior to the applicants' presentation, Chairman Radke made a statement to the audience regarding the process for the deliberations over the application, noting that he would allow for brief public comment during the discussion period once a motion had been made. He also clarified that local designation of a historic resource does not preclude change; rather it is the Board's charge to manage appropriate change over time. Finally, he stated that Corporation Counsel had provided guidance to the Board specific to the removal of the crosses, noting that federal law restricts land use regulations, including preservation regulations, that affect religious expression or exercise. Therefore, in this instance wherein a religious organization requires the removal of another faith's symbol (crosses) in order to worship in the space, federal law precludes the Board from denying the removal of those features. However, the Board does have jurisdiction over how the features are removed and what replaces those features in order that the impact to the historic character of the property might be minimized.

M. Tihic presented revised and additional information to the Board regarding the cross removal and fence installation. He described the 6 crosses to be removed including the two copper-clad crosses on the bell towers and the 4 stone crosses on the body of the building. The proposal calls for removing the metal-clad crosses at a seam at the base of each cross and installing a flat copper cap over each base. The masonry crosses would be removed from their masonry bases, which would then be capped either with a concrete patch or with a stone cap, both designed to shed water.

D. Leary stated that the pictures and drawings provided were inadequate to make a determination regarding the suitability of the removal or proposed capping. He also noted that the removal of the crosses as design

elements would have a substantial visual impact on the architectural character of the property and that the appearance of the proposed caps was not acceptable.

M. Tihic said that the proposed capping was an interim solution, which would allow the project to move forward while the applicants engage with the neighbors about the design of acceptable substitute features. He noted that he did not think it was appropriate to commit to a design solution without neighborhood input.

B. Haley also noted that the removal of the crosses would have a significant impact on the architectural character of the building. Their size, craftsmanship, design and materials combine to provide an important aesthetic finish to the design of the building. The replacement caps or finials should serve the same aesthetic purpose, so he recommended that the applicant consider caps or finials that have a similar massing and material as the original crosses. He also noted a technical issue regarding the existing lighting rods that would be removed with the crosses. He recommended strongly that the applicant consult with an expert about the lightning protection system, noting that these associated requirements may impact the design of the replacement caps.

In regard to the fencing, M. Tihic again explained that it was for safety issues that the applicant wished to install a fence around the property. He noted that the extent and style of the fence had been revised based on Board comment. The revised fence proposal includes the installation of a 6' tall open picket-style metal fence along the front (Park Street) property line including a 3' tall gate leading to the former shrine area, and a 12' wide, sliding gate along the curb cut to the parking lot. The fence will span between the section of existing fence located in front of the former church to the northeast corner of the school building. At the rear of the property, a 12' wide, sliding gate will be installed to match the exiting chain link fence. In addition, on Highland Street, a 6' high gate will be attached to rear wall of the school building spanning the opening between the school and the neighboring property's 6' chain link fence.

He also stated that the applicant is planning to plant trees along Highland Street and that they will reinstall concrete sidewalks and remove the asphalt within the tree lawn area along Park Street.

In discussion, J. Marshall commented that the Board had requested that the fence be stepped down from the height of the fence that currently exists in front of the church. D. Radke also noted that the Board would not recommend approval of a fence that exceeds the height limit established by the Zoning Ordinance. J. Saya asked about the local Protected Site application for the church, which K. Auwaerter noted was available for review.

J. Marshall made a motion to approve the design of the fence as revised, noting the location of the fence as indicated on the site plan provided, that it should be stepped down along Park Street, and that it should be within the allowable height limit established by the Zoning Ordinance. This motion was seconded by J. Romano. In discussion, it was clarified that the fence would be black in color. The motion was approved unanimously.

J. Marshall made a motion to approve the removal of the six rooftop crosses, subject to Board review and approval of the following items: documentation of the existing crosses and detailed specifications for their removal; complete design details and specifications of the interim and final replacement caps and/or finials; the submission of a lightning protection plan, noting that this was in accordance with Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, specifically Criteria 1 and 9. C. Carter seconded the motion. During discussion, 2 people spoke in general terms about the proposal, 4 people spoke in favor of the cross removal and 6 people spoke in opposition. M. Tihic noted that approving the changes would allow the new congregation to move into the space, which would help assure the preservation and maintenance of the

building, which has been vacant and unheated for four years. The motion was approved with a majority vote; J. Saya voted to deny the application.

NEW BUSINESS

Project Site Review: 529-35 N. Salina Street. The Board reviewed with project architect Anthony Phan the details of the proposed façade renovation at 529-35 N. Salina Street. The Board agreed to recommend approval the proposed window and door replacement; specifically, it recommended approval of the applicant's preferred alternative, the "Base Bid" (plans dated 3/3/14), with the following clarifications: that Note 10 on the plans should be revised to read "Repair unsound and deteriorated plaster/stucco/tile area," rather than "Remove and repair;" and that the new EFCO-Pella aluminum windows and frames would be "Hartford Green" in color.

Project Site Review: 309 St. Marks Avenue. Project architect David Oliver presented the application to install a new handicap ramp on the east façade of the church into an existing entrance. The Board determined that the proposed work would have no adverse effect on the historic character of the property and recommended approval of the application.

Variance: 200 Leavenworth Avenue. The Board agreed that the approval of the proposed Variance would have no effect on the historic character of the house. In regard to the reconstruction of the proposed wrap-around porch, however, the Board strongly recommended that the applicant consider following the original footprint of the porch rather than the proposed clipped rectangular plan. The original rounded porch, which is well documented in photographs and the historic survey, was designed to complement the large circular bay window along the side of the house and is appropriate to the overall aesthetic of the Victorian-era home.

Sign Waiver: 329 N. Salina Street. The Board reviewed the application materials and determined that the rooftop and free standing billboard signage is inappropriate to the historic character of the building and site. It recommended that the application be denied.

Sign Waiver Modification: 214-18 S. Warren Street. The SLPB reviewed the resubmission of the proposed extension of the blue LED lighting along the east and south facades of the Merchants Bank Building. It determined that the proposed lighting would have no adverse effect on the neighboring Snow Building and recommended approval of the lighting as proposed.

In regard to the alteration of the clock on the Snow Building, the Board noted that historically the clock has been used for advertisement and so had no objection to the introduction of the new building and tenant logos. However, it recommended that the horizontal division of each clock face into lower and upper halves should be retained (note that the proposed east elevation design is a single face advertising Merchants Commons). In addition, the Board recommended that the applicant retain the analog clock style in the lower panels of each clock face rather than proposed digital clock style as more appropriate to the historic character of the property.

DISCUSSION

916-18 N. Salina Street. Architect Louis Boisnier and owner James J Shattell provided preliminary information about the rehabilitation of the property at 916-18 N. Salina Street. K. Auwaerter noted that the property is on a block of N. Salina Street that is being considered as part of an expansion of the North Salina Street Historic District. L. Boisnier described the stabilization activities that they had undertaken including structural shoring and an installation of a new roof. They noted that the building would be rehabilitated for mixed residential and commercial use. The Board commended them for their work to save

and restore the building. It encouraged them to continue to keep the Board informed as their work progressed.

ADJOURN

B. Haley made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by D. Leary. The meeting adjourned at 10:10 a.m.