



**Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, September 21, 2017**

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, Dan Leary, D. Radke, Jeff Romano, J. Saya

Members excused: Julia Marshall

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

J. Romano made a motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by T. Cantwell. The minutes were approved with the following revision.

Project Site Review (PR-17-22): 751 North Salina Street. James Shattell (owner) and Mike Geraghty (MG Architects) presented the application for the restoration 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, including the reconstruction of the storefront. The storefront design is based on historic images as well as physical evidence. *The applicants also stated that the dimensions (sill and head heights as well as width) of the original upper story window openings would be verified based on the remaining physical evidence.*

OLD BUSINESS

Screening Device Waiver: 219 Crawford Avenue. D. Radke noted for the record that the owner/applicant, Cynthia Carter, is also a member of the Board. C. Carter clarified that the proposed deer fence for the back yard of her property would be medium-weight box wire. Two feet of deer fencing would be added to the top of an existing wood privacy fence so that the fencing would be a total of 8' tall. She explained that 8' was the industry standard. After discussion, the Board agreed that the proposed fencing would have minimal visual impact on the house and on the surrounding historic district. The Board agreed to recommend approval as submitted.

NEW BUSINESS

Certificate of Appropriateness Applications

CA-17-20 929 Comstock Avenue. Johanna Keller and Charles Martin (applicants/owners) presented the application for site work at their Comstock Avenue house. The scope of work is as follows: Replace the driveway asphalt with brown concrete bricks in a herringbone pattern. There will be no alteration in the dimensions or alignment of the drive. The bricks will match the bricks used on the front walk. The portion of the driveway that intersects the City sidewalk will be restored with concrete to meet City standards. In addition, a short cement brick sidewalk will connect the front steps of the house to the driveway, using the same brick as the front walk and new brick driveway. The scope also calls for the installation of a rear patio at the back of the house with the same cement brick as the driveway. Currently this area is mulched. The new patio will connect the rear of the house to a small oval lawn area. J. Keller noted that although the plans indicate a curved form for the patio, they would prefer the patio have straight edges. The Board agreed that a rectilinear form would be more appropriate. Finally, the application includes the installation of a cedar arbor and gate at the south side of the property to hide the HVAC unit. The arbor and gate will be located behind the front edge of the house and will be minimally visible from the street.

The Board discussed the proposal. J. Keller confirmed that the patio would not be used for parking and/or as a turnaround for their cars. She noted that there was sufficient room to make a three-point-turn on the existing turnaround next to the garage and that these dimensions would not change. She also noted that they intended to place flower pots between the driveway and the patio. C. Carter made a motion to approve the application as submitted, which was seconded by T. Cantwell. In discussion, J. Romano noted that the brick they were proposing was a concrete brick rather than a natural brick. The applicants confirmed that this was the same brick as had been installed on the front walk. There was no further discussion of the brick type. The motion passed unanimously.

CA-17-21 1681 James Street. Pamela Aspinall (owner/applicant) presented the application. The scope of work includes the installation of a new window to replace an exterior door on the rear façade of the house. The plain wood door enters into an enclosed (formally open) porch at the northwest corner of the house. The doorway opening will be infilled with salvaged clapboards from the interior wall of the former porch matching the rest of the siding on the house. The new window will have trim to match the existing windows. It will be 36' wide and the head height will match the height of an adjoining kitchen picture window. The Board noted that the adjoining picture window was not in keeping with the character of the house. The applicant agreed and stated that in the future they hoped to replace the picture window with a more appropriate window treatment. The Board recommended that the new window feature a 6-over-1 grid pattern to match the surrounding historic windows and that the muntins be exterior applied.

The application also calls for the replacement of a damaged wood garage door with a white aluminum, paneled, overhead door. The new door has a single row of rectangular glass window panes running along the top of the door. The Board had no additional comment regarding the garage door. Finally, the application calls for the installation of a 10', black aluminum, driveway gate with two arched leaves at the rear corner of the house. The Board recommended that the gate have a simple flat top rather than the proposed arch.

T. Cantwell made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions: the new window shall feature a 6-over-1 grid pattern with exterior applied muntins; and the gate shall have a flat top rail. The motion was seconded by J. Romano and it passed unanimously.

CA-17-19 107 Dorset Road. K. Auwaerter explained that the applicant was unable to attend the meeting. The Board reviewed the scope of work, which includes replacing the concrete walk that runs from the sidewalk all the way to the rear porch of the house. The walk will be replaced in kind. The portion of walk along the side entrance porch next to the driveway -- the driveway narrows at this location due to this section of walk-- is non-functional and broken due to cars driving over it. It will be removed and replaced by a narrow planting strip and the driveway will be widened slightly at this point to give it a consistent width. The asphalt and concrete driveway that runs from the street to the garage at the rear of the property will be entirely replaced in asphalt. It will retain the dimensions and alignment of the existing, with the exception of the slight widening next to the side porch as noted above.

The scope also includes rebuilding the two side entrance porch piers which have subsided. The existing face brick will be salvaged and reused in the face brick of the new piers, which will be built with new footings and more substantial square footprint. The new mortar will be tinted red to match the historic mortar on the house foundation and other piers. The wood screening will be repaired or replaced in kind. Finally, the scope includes structural repairs to the front porch. The porch floor and roof framing will be jacked to reestablish level surfaces. The two center brick piers will be rebuilt with proper footings and the brick will be cleaned and reused as the face brick on the piers. New mortar for the piers will be tinted red to match the foundation. The southwest porch column will be repaired and other repairs will be performed, as needed, to the deteriorated floor structure, rafter tails, flooring and interior porch finishes. All repairs and replacement will be in kind, including repair or replacement of the porch skirting.

The Board discussed the application and recommended that the same mason who performs the side porch pier repair also work on the front porch piers in order to match mortar color and tooling. The Board also recommended that the concrete pad at the base of the side entrance stairs be widened to meet the driveway for

ease of use by people accessing the side porch from the driveway. J. Romano made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the above noted recommendations, which was seconded by C. Carter. The motion was approved unanimously.

CA-17-22 507 Sedgwick Drive. The applicant was not present. The Board reviewed the scope of work, which includes the removal of a large Silver maple at the northeast corner of the front yard and the removal of a large hemlock at the southeast corner of the house. The application explained that the Silver maple was diseased and in decline, and that the hemlock was impinging on the corner of the house. The Board reviewed the materials and agreed that the maple appeared to be in decline; however, it also noted that the letter included in the application was not from a certified arborist. It noted that it preferred the opinion of qualified arborists in cases of major tree removal. C. Carter made a motion to approve the application as submitted, which was seconded by T. Cantwell and approved unanimously.

Zoning Referrals

Project Site Review: 205 E. Jefferson Street. William Walton (Walton Architects) presented the application for the façade restoration at 205 E. Jefferson Street. He explained that the project is a historic tax credit project and that it had already received approval for the Part 2 by the National Park Service. He noted that the storefront windows and doors will be restored based on physical and historic documentation. The same is true for the replacement cornice, which will be based on historic images. The windows will be repaired and new glazing installed. He confirmed that the windows will need screens. B. Haley asked about paint colors, which W. Walton shared with the Board, noting that the cornice and storefront will have similar color palettes. B. Haley requested a rendering of the color scheme be submitted for review. The Board agreed to recommend approval of the application as submitted.

Special Permit (SP-14-18 M2): 938 Salina Street. K. Auwaerter explained that the property at 938 North Salina Street is part of the North Salina Street Historic District Boundary Expansion, which was approved for inclusion in the New York State Register of Historic Places on September 14, 2017. Recognizing that the application process began before the designation became official, she notified the Board that its comments and recommendations were non-binding for this project.

The Board reviewed the proposed installation of a 45sf, box-awning sign in relation to its effect on the surrounding historic district. The Board commented that the proposed sign appears to be out of scale with the building's storefront. It also noted that a projecting box awning is a contemporary, suburban design that is not typical of the North Salina Street historic commercial corridor. The Board recommended that the applicant comply with the Sign Ordinance by installing a wall sign in the sign band area above the storefront that is no more than 40sf. In addition, the Board encouraged the applicant to consider including only the name of the business on the sign. Excessive text on the sign will create visual clutter that would detract from the visual character of the surrounding district.

DISCUSSION

Fayette Park Lighting. Glen Lewis (Parks Department) and Joe Sisko (LOCUS) were present at the meeting. J. Sisko presented a lighting expert's renderings of the proposed illumination of the monuments at the east and west entrances to the park and the Eckel memorial and fountain at the center of the park. The east and west monuments will be illuminated by three flush-mounted fixtures inset into the concrete pads of the monuments. Each light is adjustable. The two side lights have a medium distribution level and the center light, which is proposed to be placed close to the base of the monuments, will cast a broad wash of light over the center and side figures. The proposed placement of the lighting is intended to reduce or eliminate any sharp shadows on the monument figures. B. Haley stated that he remained concerned that the center fixtures would produce harsh shadows at the base of each monument and create a "Halloween" effect on the monuments' figures. He requested that the lighting expert experiment by pulling the center light back further from each base to

determine if the result would be softer, more general illumination. The Board had no concerns regarding the low pole light fixtures that will illuminate the Eckel monument. J. Sisko confirmed that the fixture had a custom lens that will direct the light upward and not create any glare for users of the park.

J. Sisko also noted that because the entire scope of the lighting project had been reduced, he was investigating other possible items to add to the project scope including improving the paths with new stone dust and metal edging, and also repairing and painting the fence.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 AM.