



**Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, July 7, 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, Cynthia Carter, Bob Haley, Julia Marshall, Don Radke, Jeff Romano, Joe Saya

Excused: Dan Leary

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of June 16, 2016 were approved as submitted on the motion of C. Carter, which was seconded by J. Romano.

OLD BUSINESS

CA-16-12 408 Sedgwick Drive. K. Auwaerter reported that the applicant had asked the Board to hold the application open as there was no one available to speak to the proposal. The Board agreed to hold the application open. D. Radke stated that the application would be a discussion item after the Board had reviewed the other applications on the agenda.

Project Site Review: 300 Erie Blvd E. Julia Zimmer (Kepler Hahn and Hyatt) was present at the meeting. K. Auwaerter reminded the Board that it had concerns regarding the project to encase the cast-stone parapet caps on the Niagara Mohawk/National Grid Building in a grey colored copper coping. The Board had requested to see the SHPO's response to the scope of work before it made a final determination. J. Zimmer presented a letter from SHPO that stated that the proposed project appeared to have no adverse effect on the building. J. Zimmer emphasized that the detailing of the caps would be excellent and barely visible. J. Marshall stated that she could recommend the approach because it was reversible. T. Cantwell also noted that the repair would be high above the ground, limiting its visibility. B. Haley reiterated his desire to see the applicant restore or replace in-kind the cast stone elements. The Board agreed to recommend approval of the proposed project because of the limited visual impact. Nonetheless, the Board also noted that it wished to have a statement in the memorandum to Zoning that the best preservation practice would be to repair the damaged cast stone parapet caps and/or to replace them in-kind.

NEW BUSINESS

CA-16-14 416 Sedgwick Drive. Andy Holtsbery (owner) presented the window survey and application to replace 12, wood, inward swinging, single casement windows located on the enclosed porch at the side of the house. He went over the details of the window survey with the Board, noting that some of the casements were damaged and did not shut properly and all needed to be reglazed. He also noted that they were concerned about the lead paint that was chipping and flaking off of the windows. He stated that they were unable to use the room because of the condition of the windows. He also stated that one of the benefits of the new windows would be that they could remove the existing fixed exterior storm windows, which he believed detracted from the look of the house. The proposed replacement windows are aluminum clad, outward swinging casement

windows. The muntin pattern would be replicated with exterior applied muntins that match the dimensions of the originals.

The Board considered the application. It agreed that the overall condition of the windows warranted their replacement. It also noted that the windows were not located on a significant façade of the property and that the replacements would match the dimensions of the originals without a loss in the amount of glass area. C. Carter made a motion to approve the application as submitted, which was seconded by T. Cantwell. The Board approved the motion unanimously.

CA-16-15 208 Berkeley Drive. The applicant was not present. K. Auwaerter explained that the applicant was seeking to repair a section of CMU wall on the garage that had been exposed when the previous owner had done repairs to the garage. The repair was never completed. The application calls for re-facing the exposed CMU section with the brick that was removed so that it matches the rest of the garage and the house. J. Marshall made a motion to approve the application as submitted. The motion was seconded by J. Romano and approved unanimously.

CA-16-16 124 Dorset Road (gutter installation). James Greenwald (owner) presented the application to install aluminum K-style gutters on the house. The house is a front gable Dutch Colonial with an open front porch. The application also included installation of downspouts. The downspouts will be colored to match the paint color of whichever feature of the house that it is adjacent to. B. Haley made a motion to approve the application as submitted, which was seconded by C. Carter. The motion passed unanimously.

Zoning Referrals

Project Site Review: 713-715 North Salina Street. Lisa Welch (owner) presented the application. She noted that the property was constructed in 1872 and had been used as a furniture store and funeral parlor. The application calls for no alterations to the front façade. On the rear façade, the application calls for masonry repair and the installation of new fire doors and a fire escape for the upper story units. The Board expressed its full support of the project and recommended approval of the proposed work.

Site Plan Review: 311 Genant Drive. K. Auwaerter explained that the owners had requested that the project be held until the next meeting. The Board agreed to hold the application open.

Variance: 134 Circle Road. The applicant was not present. K. Auwaerter explained that the house is in the Berkeley Park District. Because the owners are seeking to replace an existing asphalt driveway in-kind (no change in width, length or alignment) no Certificate of Appropriateness is required. However, the existing driveway is too wide for the zoning district and so the owners must seek a variance to retain the existing width. The applicants indicated that the driveway was installed by a prior owner and that they need the extra width in order to enter the driveway from Acorn Path. The Board noted that the main façade of the house faces Circle Road and that the driveway is not visible from Circle Road. The Board agreed to recommend approval of the application.

DISCUSSION

CA-16-12 408 Sedgwick Drive. The Board discussed the previously submitted materials and the process of review. It was the opinion of the Board members present that the proposed glider windows were not an appropriate replacement option for the original casement windows. Although the glider-style window might possibly have a comparable amount of glass area, the design of the windows is distinctly different from the original outward-hinging casement design. This change in the design of the windows plus the possible use of exterior screens would alter the character of the house significantly.

The Board agreed that it would ask the applicant to consider casement replacement windows with the narrowest sightlines available. Reviewing the comparative drawings of various manufacturers provided by Crawford & Stearns, the Board recognized that a modern casement window would most likely result in less glass area. However, it was felt that the overall design of the window would be more compatible with the historic structure than the proposed gliders. J. Marshall recommended that the applicant seek out a cost estimate for steel windows. B. Haley suggested that the owner seek estimates from companies such as Hope's Windows and Kirchner Windows which manufacture and/or repair steel windows. D. Radke suggested that the most important windows are the windows in the living room area of the house, which look out over the interior courtyard of the property and out to the sidewalk. He suggested that the applicant could consider repair or replication in steel of the living room windows and that the others could be casements made of a material other than steel. The Board agreed that the applicant could consider wood, aluminum-clad, and fiberglass as possible alternatives. Vinyl would not be an acceptable material. K. Auwaerter stated that she would contact the owner with these recommendations. The Board was appreciative of the owner's patience as well as good stewardship of the house.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 AM.