



**Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, May 5, 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, Bob Haley, Dan Leary, Don Radke, Jeff Romano, Joe Saya

Excused: Julia Marshall, Cynthia Carter

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of April 7, 2016 were approved unanimously as submitted on the motion of D. Leary, which was seconded by J. Romano.

OLD BUSINESS

No Old Business

Certificate of Appropriateness Applications

CA-16-05 (Modification): 259-277 E Onondaga Street. Wayne Palmeto (Heuber Breuer Construction) presented the modification to the window replacement application. Instead of full-frame replacement windows, the applicant proposed Sierra Pacific sash replacement kits. The jamb liners will be field cut to fit the slope of each individual window sill. D. Radke noted that a subcommittee of Board members had reviewed a mockup version of the sash replacement on site and had determined that it was a preferable alternative to the full frame replacement windows. In discussion, W. Palmeto stated that no decision had been made about whether the windows would have screens. D. Radke expressed his concern that the visual continuity of the façade would be disrupted if some windows had screens and others did not. He recommended that either all windows have screens or that none do. D. Leary noted that the installation drawings had not been included with the application as previously requested. T. Cantwell expressed his appreciation of the applicant's willingness to work with the Board to find an acceptable solution for the window replacement project. D. Leary made a motion to approve the modification to the original application with the following condition: submittal of the installation drawings. J. Romano seconded the motion, which was passed unanimously.

CA-16-09 312 Berkeley Drive. Margaret Himley and Robin Riley (applicants/owners) presented their application to install a 6' privacy fence in the rear of their property. The fence will be made of cedar and has a flat lattice top. The Board reviewed the application. D. Radke read out comments that had been submitted to the Board by the owners of an adjacent property, requesting that the applicants consider a non-solid fence style so that their view of the backyards and vegetation behind their house would not be obscured. They also expressed concern about the maintenance of the fence, in particular the side that would face their property. The applicants explained that they needed the solid fence in order to contain their dogs and also when they had visiting children. The Board reviewed the relevant passages from the Berkeley Park Historic District design guidelines, which allows for the type of fence proposed. It was noted that fences of this type had been allowed throughout the district. T. Cantwell made a motion to approve the application as submitted, which was seconded by J. Saya. The motion passed unanimously.

ZONING REFERRALS

Project Site Review (PR-16-18): 201-19 E Genesee St (State Tower Building). Chris Norris (Holmes King Kallquist Architects) presented the project site review application for the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the State Tower Building. This is a Rehabilitation Tax Credit project. The project includes the conversions of floors 9 through 21 into residential units. Floors 1 through 8 will remain office and commercial. The main building and fire code issue for the conversion of the upper floors to residential is the lack of a second means of egress. The applicant has determined that it could abandon one of the three elevator shafts that service the tower for the installation of a new emergency stair. The elevator shaft currently serves floors 11-20. At the 11th floor, the egress path will link to an existing stair that goes to the ground floor through an enclosed metal “corridor” that will be constructed on the roof of the 10th floor. The emergency corridor will be pushed at least 18’ back from the edge of the parapet and will not be visible from the ground. The Board recommended that the assembly unit be painted or have siding that is a dark color so that it fades from view. Other exterior work includes repointing masonry, repairing terracotta features, and replacing in-kind cast stone elements, as needed. The most significant exterior alteration of the building is the window replacement proposal. C. Norris explained the original steel windows are in poor condition and have asbestos in the glazing compound. The windows from floors 9 through 21 will all be replaced, the majority of which are original to the building. He provided information about the new replacement window, which is an aluminum window with an operable hopper. Upon review, the windows appeared to be a close match to the appearance, including color, of the originals. From the ground to floor 9, the applicant proposes to replace most but not all of the windows. There are currently a number of replacement windows from the 1990s that are in acceptable condition and do not contain asbestos. These windows will stay in place and the others will be replaced with the new window. D. Radke expressed concern that the mix of 1990s and new windows would disrupt the visual continuity of the façade. D. Leary also noted that reflectivity of the new low-E glass was very important and could accentuate the contrast between the new windows and the c. 1990 windows. The Board agreed that it was in overall support of the project. However, it recommended that the applicant consider and address the potential visual impact of the mismatched windows both in design as well as reflectivity.

Special Permit Modification (SP-15-23 M1): 509-11 W Onondaga Street. Aaron Metthe and Brian White (applicants) presented the modification. The Board had originally approved a new ramp that would be constructed on the east side of the building along an abandoned driveway and connect to the front porch. However, it was determined that the neighboring property has an easement along the driveway so the applicants could not abandon the driveway. The revised drawings show a ramp on the northwest corner of the property. They explained that it would “float” over the existing steps and would not require any alteration of the front porch. The overall plan for the ramp remained the same in terms of its materiality (wood decking and steel cable railings). The Board expressed its support for the project but asked that final elevations of the ramp be provided as well as details regarding the connections to the building.

Special Permit Modification (SP-05-14 M1) 435 North Salina Street. The Board reviewed the application materials. It noted that it did not have sufficient information to make comment. In particular, it requested information about the new solid door proposed for the tenant entrance as well as information regarding the proposed new windows. It noted that a solid, out-swinging door presented a safety issue for those on the sidewalk as well as those exiting the building. It also noted that the proposed color (turquoise) was out of character with the building and surrounding district. Apart from the paint color itself, the Board recommended that instead of painting the windows, sign board, transom and storefront a single color, that the sign band and transom be one color with everything below being a darker color to emphasize the visual “void” of the storefront. The Board noted that this would not only be in keeping with the historic character of the building, it would help highlight the sign to the business more effectively.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:33 AM.