



**Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, June 5, 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: Tom Cantwell, Cynthia Carter, Dan Leary, Don Radke, Jeff Romano, Joe Saya

Excused: Julia Marshall

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of May 15, 2014 were approved unanimously as submitted upon the motion C. Carter, which was seconded by D. Leary.

OLD BUSINESS

CA-14-01 501 Park Street. Mark Case and Dennis Earl were present at the meeting representing the applicant. D. Earl presented designs for the proposed replacement finials. The proposed new finials to take the place of the masonry crosses are precast-concrete, onion-shaped domes. Lightning rods run through the center of each dome and emerge from the top of each unit with a point. The applicants proposed a similar shaped copper-clad dome for the two towers. D. Earl explained that the "onion" shape is a common decorative feature found on mosques. The Board discussed the designs and agreed that they were appropriate in material and massing. It was noted, however, that the applicant had still to provide details of how the existing crosses would be removed and the how the new finials would be installed. D. Leary noted that it would be hard to ascertain until someone was able to inspect the existing crosses and their attachments up close. He also noted that the details regarding the storage of the crosses had not been provided.

D. Leary made a motion to approve in concept the proposed onion-shaped finials, which was seconded by B. Haley. It was noted in discussion that the applicant was still required to provide detailed schematics regarding how the crosses would be removed and the new finials installed, and details of how the crosses would be stored on site. The motion passed on a majority vote; J. Saya voting no.

Project Site Review (modification): 200-38 W. Water Street. J. Trasher was present at the meeting representing the applicant. D. Radke initiated the discussion of the modification by stating that the Board was not opposed to the development of the site. However, he did state that the encroachment was still an item that must be resolved, that parking was still not a preferred use on the ground floor based on the impact it has on the character of the setting of the Amos Block, and that certain other details such as the brick color and fenestration pattern still needed to be resolved. In particular, he noted that earlier iterations of the addition had a brick color that matched the red brick of the Amos Block, but this latest version showed a brown brick.

J. Trasher noted that parking was a requirement of the project. He stated that the applicant had compromised by pulling the ground-floor back within the property line so that the encroachment was now only on the upper stories. By doing so, the sidewalk was opened up along the face of the new addition all

the way to the National Grid signal box at the southeast corner of the property. He also noted that the design continued to incorporate the retail space at the eastern end of the property facing Clinton Square.

C. Carter noted that if parking was to be allowed on the first floor that the design needed to be modified so that the building did not appear to be “on stilts”. She suggested design modifications that would pick up on the articulation of the Amos Block. D. Leary noted that an earlier design showed false storefronts. He asked if the applicant had determined whether or not this was an option given parking garage ventilation requirements. T. Cantwell stated that the “car culture” has damaged the aesthetics and functionality of our nation’s cities and that the community should look to fundamentally change its relationship to the car.

In conclusion, the Board agreed that its position regarding the ground-floor parking had not changed from earlier comment and that the issue of the encroachment still needed to be addressed. D. Radke reiterated an earlier suggestion that the architect use the north elevation windows as a guide for the style of windows for the new addition. In addition, at K. Auwaerter’s suggestion, the Board agreed that it would recommend that the City work with the applicant to encourage National Grid to move its signal box from the southeast side of the property so that the applicant would have more options and space to work with on that corner.

NEW BUSINESS

CA-14-06 259 Brattle Road. Bill Magnarelli (applicant) and Joe Piraino (architect) were present at the meeting. The application called for the installation of a screened in deck along the rear wall of the house. The framework for the screens and the baseboards are all wood. The roof is an asphalt shingle to match the color of the roof on the house. The enclosure will be bolted to the main body of the house through the mortar joints. The construction of the enclosure will require the removal of a set of steps that used to lead to a rear entrance. This entrance was bricked-over before the current owner moved into the house in the early 1980s. A wooden gable-roof portico and the steps are the only remnants of the entrance. The Board recommended that the enclosure be painted to match the house (dark brown baseboards, lighter brown trim and white frames for the screens). T. Cantwell made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the revised paint colors as recommended by the Board. B. Haley seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

CA-14-07 116 Wendell Terrace. The applicant was not present. K. Auwaerter noted that the application calls for replacing a chainlink fence on the south side of the house to the property line with decorative black, aluminum, open picket style fencing (56”tall x 24’ long) with a 5’ gate; installing the same decorative fencing on the north side of the house to the property line (56” tall x 25’ long); and repairing existing chainlink fencing around the perimeter of the rear property line. D. Leary made a motion to accept the application as submitted, which was seconded by J. Romano. The motion passed unanimously.

CA-14-08 121 Circle Road. The applicant was not present. The application calls for repainting the house from blue with white trim to shades of cream and tan. K. Auwaerter distributed the color chips for the review of the Board. J. Romano made a motion to approve the application as submitted, which was seconded by C. Carter. The motion passed unanimously.

DISCUSSION

248 Brattle Road: new porch construction. Claire Richards (owner) and Beth Crawford (architect) came to the board to discuss the proposed construction of a new front porch on the house, an asymmetrical Colonial

Revival style house. There is currently no porch or portico over the front entrance, nor was there any indication that there was a porch historically. They provided examples from around the neighborhood of similar houses with either full-width front porches or smaller gable-front porticos. D. Radke noted that this would be considered an addition to the house rather than an alteration. C. Richards also noted that they would like to change the color of the shingles on the second story of the house. The Board thanked C. Richards for coming to the Board for early consultation. It noted that either a full-width or a smaller porch would be appropriate depending on the design and encouraged her to use the similar properties within the district as a guide.

Predevelopment: YMCA on Montgomery Street. William Walton and Bob Haley presented information about the proposed renovation of the YMCA on Montgomery Street, which is in the Columbus Circle National Register Historic District. The residential renovation would involve the 4th-6th floors of the building, 99 rooms total. The exterior alterations would include new energy efficient windows. K. Auwaerter noted that this would probably require Project Site Review and would come before the Board as a referral from Zoning. W. Walton asked the Board for a letter confirming that consultation with the Landmark Board had been initiated, which the Board agreed to provide. He noted that he needed the letter as part of the required documentation for a grant application for the project.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m.