



**Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, October 20, 2011**

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: Bob Haley, Dan Leary, Julia Marshall, Don Radke, Jeff Romano, Joe Saya

Excused: Louise Birkhead, Tim Bonaparte

Staff: Katelyn Wright

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

J. Romano made a motion to accept the minutes as submitted, which was seconded by D. Leary. The motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

No Old Business

NEW BUSINESS

CA-11-34 106 Wendell Terrace. Robert Halstead presented the application for a 4.725kW photovoltaic solar array installation at 106 Wendell Terrace. He noted that he had installed a similar system at 104 Wendell Terrace which had been approved by the board. The installation includes 21 modules altogether, the cables for which will run through the existing chaseway, if possible. If not possible, the cables will be run through a hole in the flat roof, fed through the attic and then will come out below the slate portion of the roof and run down the house in a 1" rigid conduit at the back of the house. The panels will be slightly visible from the street, rising approximately 4" above the height of the existing flat portion of the roof. R. Halstead reported that the other solar array at 104 Wendell Terrace was maintenance free and performing well. This new array is larger than the one next door and he anticipates a 25-30% reduction in homeowner's energy bill. B. Haley made a motion to approve the application as submitted. J. Marshall seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

CA-11-35 105 Sedgwick Drive. John Viglioti presented an application to replace a concrete block retaining wall at the front and south sides of the property and to enclose an open breezeway on the north façade of the house. D. Radke noted that the work on the retaining wall was underway without a Certificate of Appropriateness and that the City Code Enforcement office should not have allowed him to continue work. J. Viglioti said that he thought because he was replacing a block wall in-kind that approval was not needed. He noted that they discovered that the wall while replacing the front sidewalk. The wall had been obscured by overgrown groundcover. The plan was to replace the wall with a three to five-course concrete block wall that will follow the slope of the site. The finished wall will be parged, painted white and capped with a bluestone cap. The groundcover will be retained. When they have decided on a landscape plan, the owners will submit the plan for approval.

In regard to the covered breezeway, he noted that the breezeway was not original to the house. It has a shed roof and open wooden latticework set on wood baseboard panels. The breezeway shelters a side entrance into the house located at the top of a short flight of steps and to a basement entrance located at the bottom

of a short flight of steps. Because it is open, rain and snow collect in the basement stairwell leading to flooding in the basement. He also noted the water damage to the wooden framework and particularly to the base panels of the breezeway. The proposal is to remove the lattice panels and replace them with glass panels with an interior grid pattern. An exterior wood door would lead into the newly enclosed breezeway.

D. Radke recommended that the two projects be separated, noting that there was not enough information for the board to recommend approval of the breezeway project. The board requested drawings, a materials list and a description of the proposed glass panels to be installed. D. Leary questioned how the applicant proposed to repair the damaged base of the breezeway. B. Haley suggested that the lattice might be retained as removable panels over fixed glass panes. J. Marshall noted that she was not sure that the proposed work would solve the applicant's issues with water infiltration.

J. Marshall made a motion to approve the retaining wall installation as proposed, which was seconded by J. Saya. The motion carried by a majority vote; D. Leary opposed the motion.

J. Viglioti asked about a driveway realignment that was approved for the house in 2001, but was never built. Staff has not been able to find records of what had been approved. B. Haley recommended contacting the architect involved in the project, Bob Levy, who might have records of the proposed work.

CA-11-36 300 Stratford Street. The applicant was not present. The project is to replace the existing metal posts holding up the side porch with wooden columns to match the columns on the front porch. It was noted that the step railing would remain metal. B. Haley made a motion to approve the application as submitted with the recommendation that if the applicant decides at a later date to install new step railing that it should be in wood and that it would require a new Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by J. Romano and approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION

New Kasson and Leavenworth Apartment Buildings: Update from Randy Crawford

Randy Crawford presented in advance of a formal Project Site Review modification application the changes to the plans for the New Kasson and Leavenworth rehabilitation projects. He reported that the original plans had been approved by SHPO and the National Park Service for the rehabilitation tax credits. However, when cost estimates came in they were higher than the developer anticipated and so they had made a number of major as well as minor modifications. The most significant modification is that instead of repairing the existing windows in both buildings, the developer is proposing to install new aluminum clad windows on the front elevation and vinyl windows on the side and rear elevations. He noted that the proposed window replacements were smaller than the existing windows and that the muntins were 1" thick, which would create a considerable visual change especially for the multi-pane windows in the New Kasson, some of which have a 20-over-1 pattern. R. Crawford noted that he had rarely seen a window that could not be repaired and that he was not privy to the difference in cost between repair and the proposed replacements.

Other modifications include the central mechanical systems originally proposed for both buildings were changed to individual units, which will require exterior vents and condensing units for each apartment. He said that the vents would have less of a visual impact on the Leavenworth than on the New Kasson because they could be hidden in the recessed bays. Condensing units will be located on the back porches at the New Kasson and on the non-usable side balconies at the Leavenworth.

In addition, at the Leavenworth, the developers propose to face the new recessed stairwell as well as the small addition in the rear with EIFS. Finally, he presented a potential design for the front entrance at Leavenworth which is currently a c. 1970 brick box. Originally, the front steps of the building were

forward of the mass of the building so the canopy was high. The new proposal is to replace the box with a canopy that will be lower than the original and will have a simple storefront system applied below the canopy. He also noted some minor modification to the roofing on the Leavenworth.

The board noted that it was opposed to the window replacement plans as presented and asked to see the details of the proposed window replacements and a cost difference between replacement and repair. For the other modifications, the board requested final drawings so that it could evaluate the changes in the context of the historic resources.

128 Circle Road. K. Wright reported that she had been approached by the owners of 128 Circle Road about a project in their back yard. In 1998 the Labor Day storm had blown down the garage on the property. All that remains is an asphalt pad on top of the concrete foundation of the garage. The property owners want to remove the asphalt and install lawn. In addition, there is a grade change at the garage foundation wall that tapers from the north to the south. They propose to remove the garage foundation wall and install a retaining wall of boulders. Parking for the house is located on the driveway. The board agreed that it had no issue with the proposed changes and did not require a Certificate of Appropriateness. The owners had told staff that they would submit at a later date if they decided to install a patio.

223 Dewitt Street. D. Radke reported that Mary Anne Theiss had contacted staff regarding a modification to the Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new garage at 223 Dewitt Street. The modification involved moving the garage back an additional two feet from the house. A note will be added to the file, but it was agreed that no further action was needed from the board.

ADJOURN

B. Haley made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by J. Romano. The meeting adjourned at 9:25 a.m.