



*SYRACUSE  
LANDMARK  
PRESERVATION  
BOARD*

**Landmark Preservation Board  
Thursday, November 4, 2010**

Meeting Minutes

8:30 am Common Council Chambers

**CALL TO ORDER**

Vice Chairman Bob Haley called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Members Present: Louise Birkhead, Tim Bonaparte, Bob Haley, Julia Marshall, Jeff Romano

Excused: Kelly Colabello, Fouad Dietz, Dan Leary, Don Radke

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

J. Marshall made a motion to accept the minutes, which was seconded by L. Birkhead. The minutes were approved unanimously as submitted.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**CA-10-18: 1666 James Street.** K. Auwaerter noted that Crawford & Stearns continues research on the repair/replacement options for steel windows. The application was held open.

**Project Site Review: 401 S. Clinton Street.** K. Auwaerter noted that the applicant had submitted revised drawings through the Zoning office. The only change noted was that the glass block in the tower windows would be replaced with aluminum frame windows, rather than the glass curtain wall as originally proposed. K. Auwaerter had spoken to the project architect who had clarified that the translucent panel above the entrance to the garage would not be back lit and hides mechanical equipment. The board reviewed the drawings and noted that the applicant had addressed none of the board's concerns. The board therefore recommended by consensus vote that the plans not be accepted as submitted. The board noted that the plans were incomplete and provided insufficient information regarding the proposed signage, canopy details, proposed storefront repairs and paint color selection. It made the following recommendations: that the existing sign be refurbished and maintained; that the existing tower be repaired and that the new EIFS cornice should be omitted as incompatible with the historic district. The board did recommend approval of the proposed tower window treatment.

CA-10-19: 130 Circle Road. Joseph Lee and Mijung Lee presented the application. It was noted that the applicants had started work prior to receiving a Certificate of Appropriateness and that the Division of Code Enforcement had issued a Stop Work Order. K. Auwaerter and J. Romano reported on their site visit to review the installed windows. The eleven new windows are located on the first and second stories of the house on the north and west elevations. The replacement windows are all full frame double-hung sash white vinyl windows. The original windows were wood double-hung sash on the first story and wood casements on the upper stories. The west façade features a large projecting sun porch with leaded glass, diamond pane casement windows. The windows located on the side walls of the sun porch have been replaced with vinyl windows. J. Romano noted that the new frames are larger than the original openings and as a result there is a large gap between the frames and the steeply angled wooden sills. The applicants said that they did not know that a Certificate of Appropriateness was necessary for the replacement windows.

B. Haley explained that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation recommend repair of historic materials over replacement and that repair is usually possible, unless a feature is totally

deteriorated. He noted the importance of maintaining the features of the windows including material, size of openings, and finally that the storm windows could have been reinstalled to retain energy efficiency. Upon the question by the applicant, it was noted that the replacement windows were visible from the street and that their size and color created a marked contrast with the original windows in the house.

T. Bonaparte made a motion to deny the application as submitted, which was seconded by L. Birkhead. The motion to deny was approved unanimously. K. Auwaerter explained that the applicants had the right to appeal the denial and described the process for appealing to the decision. It was also explained to the applicant that they could reapply to the board with a new window that would be in conformance with the Standards and the board could assist them with this, if the applicant so desired.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

**CA-10-20: 204 Sedgwick Drive.** Tom Cantwell, Bill Fitcher, Parker Sharon from the Episcopal Diocese presented the application consisting of a full window replacement for the house, the installation of gutters and, as an amendment, the replacement in-kind of the lower wood panels in the front façade bay windows. The applicants noted that the house originally had gutters, but they had been damaged and removed as a result of ice damming. The house has been without gutters for some time resulting in damage to the masonry and to the bay windows. The proposed gutters are K-type gutters and new downspouts.

The applicant also requested a full window replacement that includes aluminum clad windows on the front façade and vinyl windows on the side and rear facades. The applicant had selected these windows because of cost. They noted that they had considered repair but found replacement would be less expensive. The current windows are c. 1950 or 1960 double-hung sash windows with spring mechanisms that are no longer operable. The windows also tested positive for lead, which they want to remediate for the tenant.

The board discussed the window replacement project, noting that because of the location of the property within a preservation district, projects are held to a high standard. K. Auwaerter noted that the board's precedent in preservation districts was to deny clad and vinyl windows. The applicant agreed to separate this request from the other two items while it determined how to move forward with the window issue. The board discussed various window repair and replacement options with the applicant including wood sash replacements that would preserve the frame and would be a cost effective solution. J. Romano noted that with sash replacements, the new jam liner prevents the new sash from rubbing against the frame of the window that may have lead-based paint. J. Marshall also noted that the applicant could get the windows dipped to remove all the lead -based paint and then the windows could be reglazed and the hardware repaired.

J. Marshall made a motion to approve the installation of the new gutters with the condition that the color of the gutters and downspouts will match the color of the material that they are adjacent to, and to approve the in-kind replacement of the wood panels below the bay windows. The motion was seconded by T. Bonaparte and approved unanimously by the board.

**CA-10-21: 223 Dewitt Street.** Mary Anne Theiss presented the application for a roof replacement. The house is a Ward Wellington Ward that originally had a slate roof. The current roof is a brown colored architectural shingle that is in a deteriorated condition and leaking. M. Theiss noted that they plan to install a roof vent and a full ice barrier as well as insulation to prevent any future ice and water damage. K. Auwaerter noted that the application originally proposed a faux slate product. The applicant amended her application, substituting GrandManor CertainTeed asphalt shingle for the faux slate.

The board discussed briefly with M. Theiss the leaded windows in the house and the use of interior storm windows to protect the windows from heat build-up and as well as to provide improved energy efficiency for the house. It was also noted that the applicant was taking advantage of NYS's Residential Rehabilitation Tax Credits for Homeowners, which is available for National Register-listed properties within certain census tracts.

B. Haley noted that the proposed asphalt shingle has a heavy shadow line, color variation and texture that are meant to imitate slate. He noted that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation do not recommend the use of materials that imitate other materials. Appropriate materials for the roof would either be a slate roof or a plain asphalt roof. It was also noted that the board was consistent in its denial of architectural roofs with heavy shadow lines and color variation. B. Haley recommended that the applicant determine if the roof manufacturer made a product with less pronounced color variation and contrast. The applicant stated that she preferred the proposed roof material because of its slate-like appearance which in her opinion was closer to the original look of the house. She also preferred the product because of its 50 year extended.

T. Bonaparte made a motion to deny the application, which was seconded by J. Marshall. The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **DISCUSSION**

LPS Nomination: 309 Van Rensselaer. Patricia Prince, the owner and applicant, was present at the meeting. The application is for an interior and exterior designation. The interior and exterior are in excellent condition. P. Prince noted that the house was constructed in 1912 and her family bought the house from the original owners in 1926 for \$9600. She noted that her family had taken a lot of pride in the house and she would now like to protect it into the future. She noted that it is currently vacant and on the market.

The board discussed the interior designation. K. Auwaerter recommended that the preservation staff develop recommendations regarding the designation and review process for the interior of the house in order to give guidance to current and future owners. The board agreed that it had sufficient information to move the property forward for a public hearing for the designation. J. Romano made a motion to move the property forward for designation. The motion was seconded by T. Bonaparte and approved unanimously.

#### **ADJOURN**

J. Marshall made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by T. Bonaparte. The meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.