



**Landmark Preservation Board  
Thursday, September 15, 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, Bob Haley, Julia Marshall, Don Radke, Jeff Romano, Joe Saya

Excused: Tim Bonaparte, Dan Leary

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

B. Haley made a motion to accept the minutes of September 1, 2011, which was seconded by J. Marshall. The minutes were approved unanimously as submitted.

**OLD BUSINESS**

CA-11-27 233 Dewitt Street (modification). K. Auwaerter reported that she had been contacted by Gary Radke, the applicant, who requested the following modifications in his original application: replace the proposed Flexi-pave on the driveway with natural brick in a herringbone pattern and use bluestone flagstones for the rear patio rather than natural brick. J. Romano made a motion to approve the modifications which was seconded by L. Birkhead. The motion passed unanimously.

**NEW BUSINESS**

CA-11-29 530 Oak Street. Applicant Richard Caruso presented an application to install a wooden overhead door on the south façade of the carriage house facing his property. He shares the carriage barn with two other properties on Highland Avenue. Currently, the only access his tenants have to the carriage house, which they use for storage, is along the right-of-way located up the neighbor's driveway/property. He provided a catalogue cut of the wooden garage door along with drawings depicting simple wood trim around the door. J. Marshall made a motion to approve the application as submitted, which was seconded by L. Birkhead. The motion carried unanimously.

CA-11-30 213 Scottholm Terrace. Applicant Brian Haynes presented an application to stain the siding of his house. He noted that the cedar siding had not been maintained or treated for many years and as a result was fading and uneven in appearance. The owners of Purcell's Paints came to the house and provided four stain samples on a piece of the siding, which he had brought for the board members to review. The board reviewed the sample and agreed that the exterior-grade, oil-based, clear stain was the best choice. B. Haynes noted that Purcell's had recommended that the siding be brushed clean of obvious dirt prior to application of the stain, but otherwise no preparation was needed. B. Haley made the motion to approve the application subject to the

submittal of the stain's product details. The motions was seconded by Jeff Romano and approved unanimously.

Project Site Review: 701 N. State St. The owner and applicant Ron Ciricillo and Steve DePalma, contractor, represented the application to rebuild the north facing wall of the building in concrete block. The brick wall is bowing out and three engineers have recommended that it should be rebuilt. The proposal calls for maintaining an 11-foot wide strip of brick at the corner, which is in good shape. But starting 11 feet back from the corner, the wall will be completely rebuilt with concrete block. The application indicated that the entire wall including the old brick section would be parged. J. Romano asked and it was confirmed that the color of the parging would match the current red brick color of the building. B. Haley suggested that the historic brick not be parged even though it would result in an uneven appearance. He noted the value in the original materials and that a commercial district of this age consists of a rich, visual mosaic of materials. The board agreed to recommend approval of the project as submitted with the recommendation that the new wall match the color of the brick walls surrounding it [not specified in the application]. The board also agreed to make the suggestion that the applicant consider repointing and not parging the original brick at the northwest corner of the building. Finally, the board also suggested that the applicant retain the window openings where they exist on the north wall. But if the applicant decides to brick over the openings, the infill brick should be set back to retain the shadow of the original openings along the wall.

Screening Device Waiver: 206 Sabine Street/105 + 107 Davis Street. K. Auwaerter reminded the board members that they had reviewed this property before for a resubdivision application. The board had recommended against the resubdivision because the creation of a single lot fronting both Sabine and Davis Streets would be out of character with the historic development pattern of the neighborhood. The resubdivision had been approved by the Planning Commission. The application now before the board was a screening device waiver to install a 6', solid, picket-style, privacy fence around the perimeter of the entire lot. The waiver was required because of a 16' setback requirement on the Davis Street side of the property. The board members had a lengthy discussion regarding the fence. The board agreed to recommend denial of the application because of the intrusive physical and visual barrier that it would present on the Davis Street side of the property. The board recommended strongly that the 16-foot setback be enforced. In addition, to avoid the fortress-like appearance of the blank wall on Davis Street, the board recommended that the fence be no taller than 4-feet high and should be 50% opaque. Finally, J. Romano noted that the application included a 12-foot and a 4-foot gate on the Davis Street side, which would seem to indicate that the applicants are seeking automobile access from Davis Street. The board agreed that this should also be noted in the memo to the Zoning Department.

## **DISCUSSION**

Clarks Ale House proposal. Chad Clark, partner in the Clark's Ale House restaurant, presented the proposal for the relocation of the restaurant to 321-25 S. Clinton Street. The discussion focused on the wall sign proposed for the southwest corner of the building. The sign will wrap around the clipped corner of the building and will consist of vertical, back-lit letters spelling out "Clarks" and a smaller front-lit sign with the words "Ale House" below. C. Clark explained that the sign was designed to be seen from the corner of Jefferson and S. Clinton and from down

Walton Street. He was not so concerned that up close the letters might be distorted. B. Haley strongly recommended that they have the sign company create a 3D model of the sign so that they could see what would happen to the font as it was split around the clipped corner of the building. He recommended that they consider mounting the letters on a curved panel. The board said that it was not opposed to the sign in concept. C. Clark noted that he had to determine if the new projecting sign on the former Shoppers Garage will obscure the Clark's sign. If it does, the applicants would have consider a different approach.

Planning Commission decision: CA-11-19 501 Sedgwick Drive appeal. D. Radke reported that the City Planning Commission had approved Laura Hand Wright's appeal for a front yard fence at 501 Sedgwick Drive. B. Haley, who had spoken in opposition to the appeal on behalf of the board, reported that L. Wright had used crime statistics as her primary argument for the fence installation. He had spoken in opposition to the appeal, referring to the Sedgwick design guidelines and the need for maintaining the open character of the designed landscape. K. Auwaerter said that she had spoken with Nancy Larson, of the Corporation Counsel's office, who confirmed that the Planning Commission's decision, as a de novo review, does not set a precedent in regard to fences nor does it nullify the design guidelines. However, D. Radke noted that this action suggests a pathway to undermine the guidelines. He requested that staff work on a letter to be sent to the Planning Commission and copied to the Mayor expressing the board's strong disagreement with the Planning Commission's decision. He noted that this decision weakens the board's ability to adopt design guidelines for local districts and sites. He also noted that the Preservation Ordinance is not strong enough, lacking an appeal process that outlines reasonable grounds for appeal, such as hardship.

#### **ADJOURN**

L. Birkhead made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by J. Saya. The meeting adjourned at 9:45 a.m.