



*SYRACUSE
LANDMARK
PRESERVATION
BOARD*

**Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, December 16, 2010**

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: Louise Birkhead, Tim Bonaparte, Fouad Dietz, Bob Haley, Julia Marshall, Don Radke, Jeff Romano

Excused: Kelly Colabello, Dan Leary

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

F. Dietz made a motion to accept the minutes, which was seconded by J. Romano. The minutes were approved unanimously as submitted.

OLD BUSINESS

CA-10-18: 1666 James Street. The application was held open in anticipation of the discussion regarding steel windows with Randy Crawford.

CA-10-20: 409 Sedgwick Drive. The applicants were not present at the meeting and the application was held open.

NEW BUSINESS

Sign Waiver: 301-19 N. State Street (The Nettleton). The board discussed the application for the installation of an additional set of signs on the Nettleton Building. D. Radke noted that the existing signs had not come before the LPB and requested that staff determine from Zoning if the existing signs had gone through the application process. He commented that the board usually recommends that sign waivers not be granted and that applicants work within the existing allowable signage limits. J. Marshall observed that the existing signs were not appropriate for the building and that the addition of a new similar sign only adds to the problem. F. Dietz suggested that an inventory of all the signs on the building be conducted. The board agreed that it would recommend against the sign waiver with the note that it was inappropriate to allow a proliferation of non-conforming signage on the building.

2010 Meeting Schedule. D. Radke called the board's attention to the 2011 LPB schedule, noting that the meetings would continue to be held on the first and third Thursday of every month at 8:30 a.m.

DISCUSSION

Steel window repair and replacement options. Randy Crawford came to discuss steel window replacement options. He had provided the specs for a "typical" steel casement window from 408 Sedgwick Drive to various window manufacturers and asked them to provide him with their closest match. He presented scaled drawings of the "typical" window and drawings of the manufacturer's responses for a range of window types including fiberglass, vinyl, and steel. He noted that the intention was for comparison purposes and that none of the alternatives exactly matched the proportions of the sample window. The board discussed the interpretation of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for

Rehabilitation and the point at which cost should be considered a qualifier. It also discussed the precedent that could be set by allowing alternative or modern materials. It was noted that in most cases repair was an option, however, the downside of a project that includes both repair and replacement is that it could lead to an irregular appearance with a mixture of modern and original windows. F. Dietz commented that the cost of repair may be comparable to replacement, but in the end the applicant was left with an inefficient steel window. He continued that most applicants come to the board with the desire not only to improve the actual function of the windows but to improve the thermal performance of their houses. The board's response should be to assist the homeowner to meet these goals. B. Haley recommended that the board consider replacement windows with materials that were available at the time of construction, in this case of Sedgwick Drive this would include wood and aluminum. He noted that steel windows were designed to read as voids with minimal sight lines and so were recessed and painted black or in dark colors. The board discussed the use of modern materials such as fiberglass. R. Crawford noted that if aesthetics are paramount that fiberglass would probably be able to provide the closest profile match. F. Dietz commented that the newer vinyl windows also could meet those requirements and again it would set a new precedent. D. Radke noted that the board always recommended repair to applicants, but also gave the applicant the option of replacement in-kind. F. Dietz also observed that the value of city housing stock limits the amount that homeowners can and are willing to invest in their houses. The board requested that R. Crawford provide design and pricing information on all-wood and aluminum-clad wood casements. This would provide the board with enough information to be able to develop its policy toward steel window replacement.

Landmark Theater (NPS denial of certification): K. Auwaerter reported that the Landmark Theater had been denied its certification for the federal rehabilitation tax credits. The development team will appeal the decision and has requested a letter of support for the project. The board discussed the National Park Service's concerns regarding the proposed stage-house expansion including the appearance of the third story addition and the loss of the storefronts along W. Jefferson and S. Clinton streets. It agreed to send a letter in support that included language regarding the LPB's limited jurisdiction over the approval of the proposed work, the importance of the project to the city, and its importance of maintaining the viability of the theater. J. Romano also noted that PACNY would be providing a letter as well.

ADJOURN

L. Birkhead made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by F. Dietz. The meeting adjourned at 9:20 a.m.