



**Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, September 20, 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: Cynthia Carrington Carter, B. Haley, Dan Leary, Julia Marshall, Don Radke, Jeff Romano, Joe Saya

Excused: Louise Birkhead, Tim Bonaparte

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of September 6, 2012 meeting will be approved at next regular meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

Revised procedures (staff approval of paint colors and storm window installation): no report.

CA-12-17 114 Dorset Road. K. Auwaerter stated that she was working with the applicant and requested that the application remain open.

Sign Waiver: 301 S. Townsend Street/Park Central Presbyterian. Joe Russo (Park Central) and Jamie Bracy (Kassis Superior Signs) presented a revised drawing of the proposed sign. They noted that the sign was lowered by a foot although it still retains the peak and that the background paneling will be beige rather than white. The sign is the same area as the current sign. B. Haley and J. Romano noted that they preferred a flat-top sign (as is there now) as it would draw less attention to itself, while still communicating to passersby. Other board members had no objection to the peak. In conclusion, the board recommended approval of the lower height of the sign as well as the beige (rather than white) background. There was no clear majority opinion regarding the flat versus peaked design of the sign.

Sign Waiver: 208 E. Washington Street/Key Bank. Jamie Bracy (Kassis Superior Signs) was present to represent the applicant. K. Auwaerter reported to the board that the red banding along the transom windows of the first floor was not considered advertising by Zoning and nor did it reach the threshold for Project Site Review. Therefore, the board was only charged with review and comment on the proposed projecting corner sign. The board discussed the design of the sign and how it would be mounted with J. Bracy. The board was evenly split between those who thought a corner sign was not compatible with the historic context of the building and those who thought that a corner mounted sign was acceptable. The board did agree that how it was attached to the building was important. J. Bracy explained how the sign would be attached to the building

noting that they would attempt to go through the mortar joints rather than the block. J. Romano recommended mapping the joints to assist with the engineering of the attachments. B. Haley questioned the sign design itself and the use of molded foam for the decorative detail on the sign. J. Marshall asked if the prominent dentil detail on the sign was replicating a detail on the building. D. Radke suggested that the applicant consider simplifying the sign by removing the decorative dentils and cornice in order to diminish the sign's scale and visual impact. In conclusion, the board agreed that opinion was split as to the appropriateness of a corner sign. It requested specific drawings/details regarding how the sign would be mounted onto the building and also asked the applicant to consider simplifying the design of the sign.

NEW BUSINESS

CA-12-24 220 Green Street. Jake Cooper (architect) presented the application for the owners. He reported that because of the commercial use of the property, the building had to be wheelchair accessible. He presented drawings for the addition of a pressure-treated wood ramp that would access the side door to the property. He also noted that the owners were proposing to retain the side wing of the house (originally approved for demolition). After removing the siding and modern porch enclosure, the owners realized that the wing was in good condition and retained much of its original materials and so proposed to reuse it. Finally, the application also included revised paint colors. When the owners removed the cement board siding they found that the clapboard siding was in excellent condition and retained an older color scheme (burgundy for the body of the house and beige for the trim).

The board discussed the ramp. Specifically, the board recommended that the non-structural members be made of a painted finish wood. It also asked for clarification regarding the ramp decking. The board suggested that the door opening was wide enough to meet code and that the owners could retain the original door (possibly with a change of hardware). B. Haley made a motion to approve the application with the following modifications: the non-structural elements of the ramp will be made of a painted finish pine and the original side door will be retained. In addition, the approval would be subject to the submission of the material choice for the ramp decking. The motion was seconded by C. Carter and passed unanimously.

CA-12-25 715 Rugby Road. Sandra Hewitt (owner) and Scott Gasperini (Gasperini Landscaping) presented the application for the installation of new landscaping, stone patio and a retaining wall. The application also included brick cleaning and stucco repair. The board reviewed the landscaping plan which was limited to the side and rear yards and included removing a short section of chain link fence on the north side of the property to be replaced with a yew hedge, seeding the lawn, and planting a Japanese maple also on the northside of the property. In the rear yard, an old stone patio will be removed and replaced in kind with new blue stone. S. Hewitt noted that they had removed the ivy that was climbing over the sides of the building. The ivy had damaged the brick so that they were planning to clean and repoint the brick. The board cautioned against power washing the brick and K. Auwaerter reported that she had sent the applicant the National Park Service's technical brief on the care and repointing of historic brick. They also recommended caution with the repair of the stucco on the house. K. Auwaerter will provide the applicants with information regarding repair of their stucco. In regard to the proposed retaining wall at the rear of the property, the board recommended against using

the cast concrete, Versa Lok system proposed. Upon question, the applicant said they were not interested in grading the slope but wanted a wall. The board recommended that they consider stone, poured concrete, or brick for the wall. They also recommended against a curved configuration for the wall, but design the wall with a square line to match the house. Upon further discussion, the applicant requested that the wall be removed from the application and that the board vote on the remainder of the application. B. Haley made a motion to approve the application, excluding the wall, and including the landscaping, new patio and repair to the brick and stucco as proposed. The motion was seconded by J. Romano and approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION

Holy Trinity Church: update. K. Auwaerter reported that St. John the Baptist had appealed the board's denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the windows from the former Holy Trinity Church. The City Planning Commission will hear the appeal at its October 29, 2012 meeting. In the meantime, PACNY was attempting to organize a meeting of stakeholders to work together on a solution for the former church building that did not result in the removal of the windows.

Historic Preservation Component of the Comprehensive Plan: Review & Comment. K. Auwaerter and Katelyn Wright presented an outline of the historic preservation component to the board. The recommendations and goals are based on the plan that the SUNY ESF graduate-level urban design studio completed in 2003. The board discussed the "Historic Properties list" and recommended that it still remain as a resource, even if it was not longer used in a regulatory fashion. J. Marshall requested that staff look into if there are any established criteria that go with the preservation architect designation. The board also discussed the language for conservation districts. B. Haley suggested that the "sameness" of the physical fabric of the certain neighborhoods does not lessen but adds to the significance of the resources.

ADJOURN

J. Romano made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by D. Leary. The meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.