



*SYRACUSE
LANDMARK
PRESERVATION
BOARD*

**Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, August 3, 2017**

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, Bob Haley, Dan Leary, Julia Marshall

Members excused: D. Radke, J. Saya

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of July 6, 2017 were approved unanimously on the motion of D. Leary, which was seconded by C. Carter, with the following revisions:

CA-17-12 411 Sedgwick Drive.... J. Marshall made a new motion to approve the application as submitted with the condition that the new shingles on the house be *sealed*, natural cedar shingles. This motion was seconded by T. Cantwell and approved unanimously by the Board.

Local Protected Site Application 17-01: 1027 E. Genesee Street... D. Radke called a vote to designate 1027 E. Genesee Street as a Local Protected Site. D. Leary and T. Cantwell voted yes; C. Carter, B. Haley, J. Marshall, *and J. Saya* voted no. The designation did not move forward.

401 Sedgwick Drive. D. Radke reported that B. Haley and K. Auwaerter and he had visited 401 Sedgwick Drive to discuss with the owner her proposal to install a single-story addition on the rear of the house. B. Haley noted that they discussed the full program with the owner and made recommendations *regarding historic context and the district*. *They encouraged the owner to retain an architect to develop the design concept*. This meeting was in anticipation of a Certificate of Appropriateness application.

OLD BUSINESS

No Old Business

NEW BUSINESS

Certificate of Appropriateness Applications

CA-17-14 108 Dorset Road. David Lawlor (Cedar Bay Contractors) presented the application to weatherize the rear porch of the house for three-season use. K. Auwaerter reminded the Board it had denied the original application to fully enclose the rear porch, which substantially altered the historic character of the house. The new proposal calls for the installation of aluminum-frame glass/screen combination units to replace the existing wood frame screens. A new full-glass, aluminum-frame door will replace the existing wood-frame screen door. The unit framing includes low wood panel baseboards and glass transoms. The Board agreed that the revised design was appropriate in that it retained the open character of the porch as well as its decorative features. The Board discussed minor alterations to the design of the transom and baseboards. J. Marshall made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions: the height of the baseboards will be raised so that the top of the baseboards align with the top of the first course of the decorative trellis panels; the upper transom panels will be narrowed slightly so that the bottom edge of the transoms align with the bottom edge of the top course of the decorative trellis panels; and the framing for the glass/screen units will be moved back slightly so that the

framing aligns with the fixed glass panels to be installed behind the trellis panels. C. Carter seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

Zoning Referrals

PSR (16-27M5): 472 South Salina Street. Dave Schlosser (Schopfer Architects) reported that the applicant was seeking to install EIFS panels on the penthouse rather than the previously proposed fiber cement panels. D. Schlosser showed the Board samples of the material he proposed to use, noting that the color, texture and scoring pattern of the EIFS would match the approved cement panels. He also noted that the penthouse was only visible on the S. Clinton Street (west) side of the building and that the west façade of the building also had a pre-existing EIFS coating. The Board agreed to recommend approval of the proposed modification as submitted.

PSR (PR-12-16 M3): 214-20 South Warren Street. K. Auwaerter noted that this application was for a public art project. The Board determined it would table the proposal subject to further information.

DISCUSSION

Fayette Park: Lighting proposal. Joe Sisko (LOCUS) presented the revised plans for the Connective Corridor-funded lighting project in Fayette Park. He informed the Board that the focus of the project had narrowed to illuminating only the monuments at either end of the park and the Eckel fountain/monument in the center of the park. For the monuments on the east and west ends of the park, they are proposing to install flush-mounted light fixtures into the concrete bases of the monuments. He noted that the exact location of the fixtures was to be determined by the lighting designer -- the location will be important to minimize any unwanted shadowing of the figures caused by the up-lighting. The Eckel memorial will be up-lit with low pole fixtures set outside the fence surrounding the fountain.

The Board was generally supportive of the application. However, it asked to see the results of the lighting study that the designer is currently conducting so that it can confirm that the lighting will be appropriate and not result in unwanted shadowing or glare.

751 North Salina Street: Façade restoration and new construction. Mike Geraghty (MG Architects) presented preliminary plans for the façade restoration and rehabilitation of 751 N. Salina Street. The project involves removing a rear addition on the building and constructing a new addition in order to accommodate three residential units on two floors. The commercial space will be rehabilitated as well, including the reconstruction of the storefront. The storefront will be all wood and based on historic images and existing original material. Above the storefront is a wide band currently covered in plywood. M. Geraghty indicated that they had not determined what measures to take about the plywood band. K. Auwaerter noted that she believed there was leaded glass under the plywood. The Board stated its approval of the direction that the project was taking and looked forward to reviewing the finalized plans.

214 W. Water Street (Amos Building): Revised west addition design. James Trasher (CHA Consulting) presented the revised design for the west addition to the Amos Block. The revised drawings depict a 12-story tower connected to the Amos Block by a 5-story connector. (J. Trasher noted the height of the connector in the drawings was incorrect: it should only be 3-stories tall so that it is not taller than the Amos Block.) The addition (both the connector and tower) features two stories of parking with residential units above. The first and second stories of the addition are proposed to be built approximately 7 feet over the property line, and the tower section will project out an additional

two feet from floors 3 through 12. This will require either a permanent easement from the City or abandonment and sale to the developers of the strip of right-of-way. Either solution would require approval by Common Council.

B. Haley began the discussion by noting that the Board had been placed in the uncomfortable position of providing comment on the design of a building to be located in part on land that the applicant does not yet own or control. He also reiterated the Board's previously noted concerns and objections regarding the proposed expansion of the addition beyond the block's historic building line, and the creation of parking on the ground floor of the proposed addition.

In discussion, C. Carter noted that it was correct that historically the individual buildings on this block were different heights and included buildings that were taller than the Amos Block. However, she clarified that the proposal before the Board is for an addition to the Amos Block, and as an addition, it should be visually subordinate to the historic property. J. Marshall stated that the design might be more in keeping with the historic character of the block if the Amos Block, the connector and the tower all read visually as separate buildings. This might be accomplished by different material treatments and also by possibly stepping the connector back from the Amos Block and tower building lines so that the connector and tower do not appear as a single, monolithic building.

In summary, the Board stated that it was not opposed to the tower concept; however, the linkage between the Amos Block and the addition needed critical analysis. The Board also requested that elevation drawings of the new addition be revised to include the Amos Block in order to show context.

1027-29 E. Genesee Street: New construction. James Trasher (CHA Consulting), Dave Mosher (Harrington & Mosher Architects) and Norm Swanson (owner) were present at the meeting. J. Trasher introduced the plans for the new student housing to be constructed behind the Ward Wellington Ward-designed house at 1029 E. Genesee Street. The house next door (1027 E. Genesee Street) will be demolished in order to accommodate a driveway and access to the new construction. The plans also include a new curving, brick-faced retaining wall and patio in front of the Ward house. The Board's discussion of the design focused primarily on the proposed site work around the Ward house. The Board noted that the selected brick for the retaining wall was visually too busy for the house and suggested that the applicant might consider a different facing material with a larger scale than brick, such as stone or possibly stucco. There was disagreement by the Board members whether the curve in the wall was appropriate, with some noting that a straight wall would be more in-keeping with the rectilinear form of the house. All agreed that the fence running along the top of the wall at the patio should be black, rather than white. The Board also requested that the applicants provide their lighting plan for the Ward house. The Board had no comment on the proposed new construction, but did request an elevation drawing of the building site from the west (looking east).

106 Circle Drive: Window replacement. Laura-Anne and Jonah Zern (owners) discussed with the Board the positive lead finding in their home and their desire to address the lead in their windows. L. Zern explained that their child had tested positive for elevated lead levels in the spring. They had their house tested for lead and it was determined that the windows were a source of lead dust in the house. She explained that they had purchased window liners for their windows; however, they discovered that the liners could not be installed safely. They were considering replacing their windows and had done some research into different window options, but were concerned by the cost. They had come to the Board for advice.

K. Auwaerter stated that she had spoken to Meghan McLees Craner (Corporation Counsel) who had indicated that because there is a documented danger to public health, safety and welfare (in this instance the child's positive lead test), mitigating this danger would take precedence over the Board's usual review of the condition of the windows themselves. The Board cannot forbid the removal of the windows, but it still retains the ability to guide the selection of the new windows.

D. Leary stated that it was imperative that they receive an adequate assessment of the conditions inside and outside of their house. He noted that remediation without a planned procedure could create bigger lead problems and that window replacement may not be the most serious concern. After further discussion, the Board recommended a couple of options. The Board recommended that the Zerns investigate sash replacement kits over full frame replacements. The benefits of the kits include that they come with new liners (thus removing the lead abrasion issue entirely) and are custom measured and made to fit into the original window frame, which preserves the size of the opening, sills and trim. Sash kits are also less expensive than full frame replacements. J. Marshall also recommended that they look into single-pane sash with a storm panel as a less expensive option. The Board also recommended that they consider an incremental approach to any replacement scheme, addressing the windows of most concern first. It was acknowledged that this might result in a mismatched appearance to begin with.

As for any new windows, at a minimum, the muntin pattern (grid pattern) should match the original six-over-six configuration. The muntin bars should be exterior applied to the glass; however, they do not need to "true divided" lights. As for finish, the Board would prefer a painted wood window. However, they have approved aluminum cladding on wood windows in several circumstances. The Board has never approved vinyl windows.

The Board discussed with the Zerns where to look for window vendors and how to work with a contractor. They recommended strongly that they find a lead-safety certified contractor to help with the project. D. Leary also noted that it was important to have the whole family tested for lead on an annual basis.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 AM.