



**Landmark Preservation Board**  
**Thursday, June 2, 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: Louise Birkhead, Fouad Dietz, Bob Haley, Don Radke, and Jeff Romano

Excused: Dan Leary, Tim Bonaparte, Julia Marshall

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

L. Birkhead made a motion to accept the minutes of May 19, 2011, which was seconded by J. Romano. The minutes were approved with the following corrections:

**Project Site Review: 525-27 N. Salina Street.** In addition, the board recommended that the proposed half-light metal door be replaced with ~~a half light, three-quarter light~~ wood paneled door *to line up with the sills of the storefront windows in order to be more compatible with the open appearance and materials of the storefront.* Finally, the board discussed the proposed sign. B. Haley noted that it was important that the sign not cover over any significant historic element of the original façade. Although it appears that ~~no little~~ original materials of the historic façade remains, the board recommended that if during construction they find hidden details of the original storefront that the sign be located in such a way that it does not obscure any significant features.

**South Presbyterian Church Windows.** The exterior *fiberglass* protective panels do not need any repair.

**OLD BUSINESS**

*No old business*

**NEW BUSINESS**

CA-11-11 223 Dewitt Street. Mary Anne Theiss presented the proposal to reconstruct her c. 1970 garage for discussion. She stated that she was aware that she did not have sufficient information for the board to be able to make a decision at the time of the meeting. The garage is built into a hill with no footings and is deteriorating. The contractor is proposing to lift the garage up, build a new foundation approximately 6' back from its current location, repair, and reset the garage. M. Theiss noted that she wished to move the garage back to create more distance between the rear of the house and garage which are currently separated by only 9'. The new foundation would be either split-faced block or a parged block. K. Auwaerter encouraged the applicant to discuss her preliminary plans with the Codes department to ensure that she was within the legal setback limits. B. Haley recommended that she paint the garage dark like the body of the house so that it recedes and does not compete visually with the house.

The board discussed materials and design with the applicant including the new wooden overhead door to the garage. F. Dietz noted that the drawing provided of the proposed reconstructed garage was inaccurate and did not provide sufficient detail for the board to formulate its decision. He discussed with the applicant some of the deficiencies in the drawing. D. Radke summarized

by saying that the applicant needed to provide the board with an accurate drawing of the garage, a survey, and list of materials and manufacturers catalogue cuts of the proposed materials and of the new garage door. The board concurred that it found the overall concept acceptable.

M. Theiss also discussed with the board the plan to redesign the driveway introducing a pattern of poured concrete slabs and pavers. The board noted that the pavers should be made of real brick (clay) rather than concrete. She also noted that they wished to reintroduce the walk that went from the sidewalk next to the driveway to the house. K. Auwaerter noted that Codes had informed her that they would require a lip between the sidewalk and driveway to insure that no cars could be parked on the sidewalk. F. Dietz questioned that policy in preservation districts. D. Radke recommended again that the applicant stay in contact with the Codes department. The board concurred that the concept for the new driveway and sidewalk were acceptable, but it would need a drawing illustrating the proposed design, a materials list, manufacturer's cut sheet for the paver and, if possible, a sample paver.

### **DISCUSSION**

Summer Intern: K. Auwaerter noted that an intern would be working this summer on a potential boundary extension to the Hawley Green NR Historic District, as well as a potential NR nomination for the Scottholm neighborhood.

Request for information: K. Auwaerter also noted that she and D. Radke had been contacted by Assemblyman Bill Magnarelli to discuss a window replacement project for his house in Sedgwick. D. Radke stated that it was his understanding that energy efficiency was his chief concern and that B. Magnarelli had been told by various contractors that no company made an energy efficient wood window. K. Auwaerter noted that she would send a letter to him with information about the type of wood windows that had been approved in the past by the board (namely wood sash replacements) along with the window survey paperwork and Certificate of Appropriateness.

Lead Program: K. Auwaerter reported that she was seeing a number of Section 106 review applications (not seen by the board) for people wishing to use the Lead Hazard Abatement program to replace their windows in houses in historic districts. The SHPO determines these applications to have an "adverse effect" on the historic resources leading to complaints from homeowners that they were being forced to live in "unsafe" homes.

### **ADJOURN**

J. Romano made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by B. Haley. The meeting adjourned at 9:07 a.m.