



Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, June 7, 2012

Meeting Minutes

8:30 am Common Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Don Radke called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Louise Birkhead, Tim Bonaparte, Cynthia Carrington Carter, B. Haley, Dan Leary, Don Radke, Jeff Romano, Joe Saya

Excused: Julia Marshall

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

C. Carter made a motion to accept the minutes as submitted, which was seconded by L Birkhead. The minutes were approved unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

CA-12-05: 305 Sedgwick Drive. Christopher Wiles was present at the meeting. D. Leary made a motion to approve the application to replace the brick sidewalls of the front porch and install a new stair hand-railing in accordance with the recommendations of the board-appointed subcommittee. This was seconded by T. Bonaparte and approved unanimously. B. Haley noted for the record that he had seen another house up the block that had identical brick sidewalls on the front porch, which is additional evidence that the sidewalls at 305 Sedgwick Drive are original to the house. The board agreed that if the revised drawings and catalogue cut were submitted to staff and the materials conformed to the subcommittee's recommendations that staff can issue the Certificate of Appropriateness.

CA-12-06: 531 Oak Street. Joe Saya was present. D. Radke noted that he had seen the property and that the wattage had been reduced around the house, one light had been turned off on the northside of house, and all the bulbs were recessed into the fixtures, which cuts down the glare. J. Saya clarified that the original lights were 90 watt floods and had been exchanged for 75 spot lights. C. Carter noted that the corner light on the back porch had not been removed and D. Radke recommended that the applicant remove that light. Camille Tisdell (308 Highland Ave) asked to speak. She stated that the number of lights was still excessive and bright for a residential area. D. Radke noted that the property is now a commercial structure and is in compliance with Code. T. Bonaparte and D. Leary both stated that had the applicant presented an application prior to installation, the board would have recommended a different lighting solution that would have taken the lighting off the building. D. Radke noted that the Standards allow lighting on the building. D. Leary objected to the way that the application came to the board, noting that it sets precedent for other applicants who do work and then seek approval from the board after the fact. B. Haley made a motion to accept the application as modified including the removal of the light at the corner of the rear back porch. C. Carter seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a majority of the board, with D. Leary and T. Bonaparte voting "no".

NEW BUSINESS

CA-12-09 310 Montgomery Street. Tom Cantwell represented St. Paul's Cathedral, the applicant. The project calls for lighting the spire of the Cathedral and is funded through the Connective Corridor. Lights

will be installed on a neighboring city-owned parking garage and on the roof of the parish house. In addition, lights will be installed on the interior of the church to light the rose window. T. Cantwell confirmed that the lights on the parish hall will be hidden behind a low parapet wall. The board discussed various lighting options with the applicant. C. Carter made a motion to accept the application as submitted. B. Haley seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

CA-12-10 (modification of CA-11-35) 105 Sedgwick Drive. John and Maria Vigliotti presented the application. The application outlined the agreed-upon modifications to the front retaining wall that was installed in violation of the original Certificate of Appropriateness. K. Auwaerter read out the modifications as follows: Remove one course of block from the retaining wall in the front of the property in order to reduce the height of the wall by approximately 8" and re-install the bluestone cap; remove non-conforming piers at the south stair wall to a height flush with the adjacent retaining wall; paint retaining wall dark gray; install landscaping as follows: continuous myrtle band at the base of the retaining wall adjacent to the sidewalk, and English ivy between the existing box hedge and the retaining wall; regrade the lawn area to an elevation where the grade slopes away from the house; and install a bluestone walk from patio to north side entrance to the house. D. Leary made a motion to accept the application as submitted, which was seconded by J. Romano. The motion passed unanimously.

CA-12-11: 105 Sedgwick Drive. John and Maria Vigliotti presented the application to install a pool in the rear yard of the house. They confirmed that the application was for the pool, the pool's concrete apron and the pool enclosure fence only. J. Vigliotti noted that members of the board had reviewed the site and as a result the pool was moved to the center of the yard to be on axis to the house. The pool is 18' x 41' with a concrete apron. The pool perimeter fence is 48" black metal and features corner pillars that will be concrete block covered in stucco with bluestone caps. The lights proposed for the pillars are not included in the application and will be submitted at a later date. J. Romano made motion to accept the application as submitted, which was seconded by C. Carter and approved unanimously.

The applicants also requested guidance regarding the pool shed design. Board members expressed concern about the proposed size of the shed – 20' x 12' – but the board recommended that the applicant submit conceptual drawings including an elevation and plan for review before submitting an application. The board also requested cut sheets for the proposed pool fence pillar light fixtures and for the proposed 6' privacy fence to be installed along the north property line. The board noted that a solid cedar fence was generally acceptable.

CA-12-12 220 Green Street. Cindy Seymour (developer) presented the application with Jake Cooper (architect). The project involves the rehabilitation of the house and conversion into a mixed use property with commercial (nail salon) on the ground floor and residential upstairs. With the exception of three windows in the rear of the property where there was a fire, all the windows will be repaired and interior storms installed. C. Seymour noted that they plan to work with either Meier Construction or Solvay Glass on the windows; both companies have stated that they can repair the windows. The three windows to be replaced will be replaced in-kind using Hurd, all-wood full-frame replacements to replicate the style and size of the original windows. The side porch addition is in poor condition and will be removed. The resulting space will be lawn area. The house will be scraped and painted in the existing color scheme. Most of the side yard is covered in asphalt. The asphalt will be removed and the parking area will be reduced to a single space. C. Seymour clarified that they propose to install clay brick pavers for the parking area and walkway to the front porch. After discussion, she also clarified that that the privacy fence will not go beyond the building line of the house. B. Haley expressed concern that the proposed hanging sign obscured important architectural features of the front entrance. C. Seymour decided to remove the sign from the application in order to review other options. J. Romano made a motion to accept the

application with the revisions associated with the fence, hanging sign and driveway pavers. The motion was seconded by T. Bonaparte and approved unanimously.

CA-12-13 115 Green Street. Cindy Seymour (developer) presented the application with Jake Cooper (architect). She noted that this project was also a mixed-use rehabilitation. As with 220 Green Street, they propose to retain as much original material as possible. Again, only three windows on the east side of the property need to be replaced; all the others will be repaired and retained. The rear enclosed stairway addition will be removed and a new metal fire escape will go to the third floor. The clapboard under the asphalt siding is in good shape and will be repaired and repainted. They also presented a brown color scheme for the house. C. Seymour stated that she wanted to remove the hanging sign from the application in order to consider other alternatives. Finally, the board discussed with the applicants the west side of the property. It appears that a bay window had been removed and filled in with irregular sized clapboards and a small window. J. Cooper recommended that since this area was only to be used for storage that a new window matching the smaller original windows be installed and the clapboards be replaced to match the size of the originals. C. Carter made a motion to approve the application as revised, reflecting the removal of the sign from the application and the revision to the west façade treatment. The motion was seconded by L. Birkhead and approved unanimously.

Resubdivision: 2226-2306 S. Salina Street. The board reviewed the application and recommended approval as submitted

Sign Waiver: 362-64 S. Salina Street. The board discussed the application. K. Auwaerter noted that the board usually recommends that the applicant follow the sign ordinance. However, D. Leary noted that the proposal was only to install vinyl lettering on the interior of the shop front windows and that this appeared acceptable. The board agreed to recommend approval if this was the proposal. K. Auwaerter will get clarification on this matter.

DISCUSSION

217 Green Street: Partial Demolition. Cindy Seymour, future owner/developer of the property was there to represent the project. K. Auwaerter explained that the developers want to demolish a rear addition to the property. Because the property is in the National Register district, the demolition permit application will trigger a Local Protected Site review of the property. They have requested that the board consider ahead of time whether or not it will pursue Local Protected Site status for the house. Staff reminded the board that it must consider the overall impact of the demolition on the property and on the district. D. Radke requested that the board members review the plans and make the effort to visit the property. The subject will be taken up at the next meeting.

Hiawatha Lake Fountains. Glen Lewis (Parks Department) and John Zappola (Parks Intern) presented plans for the installation of two new fountains in addition to the existing fountain in Hiawatha Lake. G. Lewis explained that the Onondaga Park Association has presented a proposal to install a single new fountain. However, the Skilled Trades department had recommended that if they were installing a second fountain they should install a third as back up because of the logistics of draining the lake for repairs, etc. K. Auwaerter reported that she had spoken to Chris Capella-Peters (SHPO) who had expressed concerns about the addition of new fountains to the lake. G. Lewis clarified that the existing fountain was not original. The board examined the proposed spray patterns which included a taller (“Diana Standard”) and shorter (“Solace”) spray patterns. G. Lewis also explained that typically only a single fountain would be running; only on special occasions would all three to run. He also noted that all three fountains are located below the surface of the water. The board expressed its support of the proposal but recommended that all three spray patterns be the same (“Solace” pattern).

ADJOURN

D. Leary made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by J. Romano. The meeting adjourned at 10:02 a.m.