



*SYRACUSE  
LANDMARK  
PRESERVATION  
BOARD*

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

Meeting Minutes

Common Council Chambers

**CALL TO ORDER**

Vice Chairman Bob Haley called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Members Present: Tom Cantwell, Cynthia Carter, Dan Leary, Julia Marshall, Don Radke, Jeff Romano, Joe Saya

Excused: Don Radke

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of June 5, 2014 were approved unanimously as submitted upon the motion D. Leary, which was seconded by J. Romano.

**OLD BUSINESS**

CA-14-01 501 Park Street. Dennis Earle (architect) presented additional information regarding the removal of the four masonry crosses and two metal crosses from the former church and the attachment of the new "onion"-shaped finials. For the towers, the crosses, which are wood clad in copper, are anchored to the building with a wooden shaft that fits into a framework within the tower. The proposed method of removal is to sawcut the wooden shaft at the base of each cross. The new finial, which would also be copper clad wood, would be pinned to the remaining portion of the original shaft. The Board members expressed concern that the new joint would not be able to withstand the wind loads. D. Leary recommended that the applicant consider detaching the whole wooden member from the anchoring system within the tower and then insert the new finials in the same manner. Board members asked for a structural engineer's verification of the proposed attachment method.

For the concrete crosses, D. Earle stated that the crosses would be sawcut below the "donut" shaped base. The new finials would be bolted to the remaining octagonal base. He noted that the base of the new finials would be approximately 3-1/2ft wide with an attenuated top. D. Leary questioned whether the original bases had the structural capacity to bear the new solid-masonry finials and also whether they would be able to take the expansion bolts without cracking. J. Marshall suggested that the finials could be hollow to minimize the weight.

The Board requested that the applicant provide additional information including scaled drawings of the new finials, elevations of the new finials in-place, a description of the materials and weight; and details and description of the method of connection from the engineer or fabricator responsible for installation.

The Board asked also for a description of where the original crosses will be stored on site.

**NEW BUSINESS**

CA-14-09 248 Brattle Road. Claire Richards (owner) and Beth Crawford (architect) presented the application for the addition of a new front porch on the house. As described, the porch will have a hip-roof and be three-bays wide with a gable-end portico over the front steps. The porch foundation piers and new steps will be of brick to match the color of the existing brick of the first floor of the house. The porch

skirting will be a square lattice with a vertical orientation. Four plain, wood, tapered columns support the porch roof. The substructure of the porch will be steel supporting the concrete porch subfloor. The porch deck will be brick of a compatible color with the porch steps and piers. In addition, new wooden shutters are proposed to be installed by the first-story window at the far southwest side of the front façade. The shutters will match the design of the existing shutters and will be mounted on the window casing. Finally, the application called for painting the second floor shingles of the main body of the house a tan color and the shutters red. J. Marshall approved the application as submitted, which was seconded by C. Carter. The application was approved unanimously.

CA-14-10 203 Sedgwick Drive. Joe Saya (owner) presented his application to install an in-ground pool in the rear of his yard. The pool would be 16' x 36' rectangle. The pool skirting would be between 3' and 5' wide and made of a compatible natural material (concrete or bluestone were recommended). D. Leary made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the condition that the applicant provides staff with the final material choice for the skirting. The motion was seconded by J. Romano and approved unanimously. J. Saya abstained from voting.

Project Site Review: 1601 Park Street. The applicant was not present to discuss the proposed ramp. Due to the scope of the project, the Board decided to hold the project open until the applicant could be present to discuss the project.

Project Site Review: 509 Catherine Street. Terri Luckett (Home Headquarters) presented the application to demolish the three-story brick apartment building on the city's northside for a future housing project. The Board reviewed the engineers report, which indicated that the property was twisting and would be prohibitively expensive to rehabilitate. T. Cantwell noted that the report was incomplete in that it did not detail what the cost of rehabilitation would be. T. Luckett noted that the basement was filled with sewage which made it difficult to assess the cause of the structural issues – whether it was poor soil conditions or poor construction. B. Haley noted that a demolition permit would trigger a review by the Board to determine if the property should be designated a local Protected Site. He recommended that the historical documentation of the property should be initiated early so that there would be no unnecessary hold ups with the Board's eventual review. K. Auwaerter said she would verify who would bear the cost of the research. The Board also requested that the engineers report be completed with a detailed description of the cost of rehabilitation. B. Haley noted that it was the policy of the Board to recommend rehabilitation and reuse over new construction.

Sign Waiver: 706-10 N. Salina Street. The Board reviewed the application for a sign above the entrance to the offices on the upper floors. The application stated that the owners wanted to provide identification for the upper-story tenants. The Board recommended denial of the sign as proposed because it was not compatible with the character of the property or surrounding historic district. As an alternative, the Board suggested that the building number be prominently indicated above the doorway and that a panel be installed next to the main entrance listing the names of the upper story tenants.

#### **ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m.