



**Landmark Preservation Board**  
**Thursday, July 1, 2010**

**Landmark Preservation Board**

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, Kelly Colabello, Fouad Dietz, Bob Haley, Dan Leary, Julia Marshall, Don Radke, Jeff Romano

Excused: Tim Bonaparte

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

F. Dietz moved to accept the minutes of the June 16, 2009 meeting as submitted, which was seconded by J. Romano. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**CA-10-10 203 Berkeley Drive.** Mary Ann Laubacher, the applicant, described her proposal to build a wooden deck at the back of her house. (Note: The applicant had built a deck without a Certificate of Appropriateness. The deck was constructed within 1' of the property line which would require a variance. Rather than seek a variance, the applicant had decided to rebuild the deck within the required 4' set back and was seeking approval by the LPB for the new design. A letter of complaint regarding the illegal deck had been submitted by the applicant's neighbors.) The proposed new deck is a stained cedar deck that is 10' x 14' with an open railing that would extend from the back porch and would have diagonally oriented stairway leading to the driveway. The applicant noted that the steps needed to be diagonal in order to avoid obstructing the driveway. The board reviewed the information provided and determined that it needed additional information in order to make a decision. In particular, it was noted that because of the circumstances surrounding the construction of the first, non-conforming deck, the board needed to be clear about what was being proposed. Specifically it requested a site plan with dimensions of the deck and indicating where it would intersect with the house. B. Haley recommended that that the deteriorated concrete steps leading from the back porch be removed prior to the completion of the new deck, while they were still accessible.

**Project Site Review: 707-09 N. State Street.** The applicant was not present. K. Auwaerter noted that the board had requested a corner sample of the proposed replacement windows. K. Auwaerter will call the applicant to find out the status of the request.

**Project Site Review: 325 S. Salina Street (Syracuse Trust Building).** The applicant was not present. K. Auwaerter noted that the applicants were waiting a response from the SHPO regarding the proposed façade work and window replacements.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**CA-10-15 714 N. McBride Street.** Rocky and Jennifer DeCaro presented the application for exterior work related to the renovation of Louis Will Mansion into a bed and breakfast. They noted that the majority of the work to the exterior of the house will be repair and restoration, in particular of the brick and stone masonry. R. DeCaro noted that they had retained Crawford & Stearns architects to assist with the project. The only exterior modifications were to a rear, 2-story, c. 1970 addition. The applicants propose to enclose the bottom story of the addition and convert it into living space. The upper portion would be converted into a kitchen. Off the second floor kitchen would be a

door leading to a small wooden deck and stairs. The applicants were seeking conceptual approval of the proposed rear deck and will bring the finished plans to the next LPB meeting.

The applicants also noted that they wanted to install a small wooden gazebo in the rear of the property that was similar to a gazebo that they have seen in an historic photo of the property. They will bring an image of the former gazebo to the next LPB meeting.

The applicants presented landscape plans for the property. The board cautioned against using concrete pavers and emphasized the use of compatible materials and material finishes. The board requested a materials list and samples of the pavers and other materials proposed for paving and walls, etc. Finally the board also requested more information regarding the proposed signage, in particular the free-standing sign in the front of the property.

**Project Site Review: 101 Green Street.** Martha Maywald, Office of Neighborhood & Business Planning, presented the application for the owner of 101 Green Street, Michael DeSalvo. She noted that this property, though it had lost significant architectural integrity due to a fire in the 1980s, was nonetheless a contributing structure in the Hawley Green National Register Historic District. The proposal called for the resizing of the third story windows and the installation of new vinyl windows, painting the building and installing new awnings. It was noted that the existing vinyl windows were too small and the proposed larger openings were in better alignment and proportion to the lower stories. It was noted that the board does not usually approve vinyl, but given the poor integrity of the structure, the board was willing to consider vinyl replacements. The board agreed to approve the proposed application with the comment that the applicant consider installing paired 1-over-1 sash windows in the resized window openings on the front of the building, rather than the large, single sash windows proposed. An example of this pairing is found in the middle window on the 3<sup>rd</sup> story of Catherine Street side of the building.

## **DISCUSSION**

**CA-10-14 213 Scottholm Terrace.** The owners were not present for the discussion. K. Auwaerter noted that she was in receipt of a revised design for the patio and fire pit area next to the approved new pool. She reminded the board that these revisions were not a requirement of the Certificate of Appropriateness, but a request to the owners to consider introducing more wooden features into the area surrounding the fire pit and that they consider extending the checker-board effect of grass and pavers to soften the edge of the patio.

In addition, K. Auwaerter noted that she had received an email requesting that the owners substitute a black vinyl chain link fence for the approved metal fence in an area of the back yard where the slope was too great for the metal fence. The email had explained that the proposed chain link fence would not be visible. The board determined that it did not have sufficient information to make the decision regarding the fence. In particular, members were concerned about the treatment of the area between the shed and the house – the request was not clear as to what was proposed. K. Auwaerter would try to set up a site visit to go over these questions.

## **Administrative/Staff Review**

The board discussed the types of situations when LPB staff could review and approve applications. The board agreed to the following policy and procedures regarding administrative review:

At the discretion of the SLPB, staff may review and approve the following types of work:

- 1) In-kind and conforming replacement or repair projects that involve no material change, including:
  - a) roof repair or replacement (same color, material, no change in form)
  - b) exterior painting (same color palette)
  - c) window repair (Note: window replacement, even if in-kind, will require a Certificate of Appropriateness.)
  - d) window shutter repair (no change in color, material or placement)
  - e) repair of front/back/sidewalks and front steps (involving no change in material, location, layout)
  - f) repaving driveways (no change in material, location or layout)
- 2) The installation of replacement fencing if:
  - a) the new fencing is in-kind, conforming and involves no change in location
  - b) involves the removal of non-conforming fencing (such as chain link) and the replacement of that fencing with wooden, board-on-board flat topped fence or wooden picket fence. (Note: any fence installation involving change in location or a substantial grade change will require a Certificate of Appropriateness)
- 3) Special Permit applications involving signs that meet the provisions of the sign ordinance.

Procedures:

Draft

- 1) Staff will request a detailed written description of the proposed work along with appropriate images of the property.
- 2) Staff will write a letter to the property owner including a description of the approved scope of work along with a statement, such as: "this administrative approval is valid only for the specific work cited and that it is unlawful to deviate from the plans unless an additional approval or a Certificate of Appropriateness has been approved." This letter will be copied to the permit desk and code enforcement.
- 3) Staff will provide a report to the board at every meeting with a description of all the administrative approvals.

L. Birkhead moved to approve the proposed procedural changes, which was seconded by J. Marshall. In discussion, it was agreed that the change in procedures should be appended to the LPB established procedures and a copy should be provided to Corporation Council. In addition, it was agreed there will be a statement added to the new procedures indicating that they are subject to review with any change in staff. The board approved the motion as amended unanimously.

**ADJOURN**

B. Haley made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by J. Marshall. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 a.m.