Approved as revised



Landmark Preservation Board Thursday, September 3, 2020 **Meeting Minutes**

WebEx.com Meeting

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Don Radke called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Cynthia Carter, Bob Haley, Dan Leary, Julia Marshall, Don Radke, Jeff Romano, Lisa Tonzi Absent: Tom Cantwell Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

J. Romano made a motion to approve the minutes of August 20, 2020, which was seconded by L. Tonzi. The minutes were approved unanimously as submitted.

OLD BUSINESS

CA-20-14 115 Hampshire Road. Steve Abshere (Great Day Improvements) was present. The Board reviewed the revised drawing provided by the contractor. Board members again expressed concern that the connection between the garage and the sunroom was poorly designed and would become a maintenance issue for the owner. B. Haley stated and J. Marshall concurred that the proposed sunroom addition was not compatible with the historic character of the original house. Other board members stated that the impact would be minimal because of the size of the new addition and that it would not be attached to the original house but to a prior addition. J. Romano made a motion to approve the application as submitted, which was seconded by L. Tonzi. The motion passed on a majority vote; B. Haley and J. Marshall voted to deny the motion.

NEW BUSINESS

Certificates of Appropriateness

CA-20-17 400 Sedgwick Drive. The owner/applicant Kelly Fallon presented the project to replace a cement/asbestos shingle roof with a new, architectural shingle roof (CertainTeed Grand Manor "Gatehouse Slate"). The applicant confirmed that the copper flashing and open, copper-lined valleys would be repaired or replaced in kind. B. Haley recommended strongly that the applicant review a large sample of the new shingle against the roof to confirm that it was an appropriate color and pattern selection. J. Marshall made a motion to approve the application as submitted, which was seconded by B. Haley. The motion passed unanimously.

Zoning Referrals

Site Plan Review (SR-20-02): 151-99 Solar Street. Steve McKnight (McKnight Architects) presented the proposal for new construction in Franklin Square. The proposed development is for a 3-story brick building with ground-floor commercial use and two floors of apartments (34 units total). S. McKnight noted that the brick is a red-orange brick common throughout Franklin Square and that the raised foundation will be rough-cut limestone, also typical of the district. The building has two sections connected by a 3-story, glass breezeway. The windows on the larger southern section will be large, multipane windows reminiscent of the surrounding historic factory buildings; the windows on the northern section will be double-hung metal sash. The site will include covered carports, a select number of which

will have roof-top solar panels. In discussion, B. Haley recommended that the solar panels on the car ports have black frames, edge trim and substructure in order to reduce glare and any potential negative visual impacts. J. Marshall recommended that they install plantings along the eastern edge of the development site across from the USPS parking lot. The board was in full support of the project and recommended that the application be approved.

Project Site Review (PR-17-34M1): 476-80 S Salina Street. Randy Crawford (Crawford & Stearns Architects), representing the applicant, provided a point-by-point summary of the discrepancies between the approved and as-built designs of the building. He explained that on the east façade, the contractors discovered structural issues that prevented them from building out the approved design. It was noted that the applicant did not seek City comment when these structural issues were first identified. After discussion, the board determined that it could not recommend approval of the as-built design of the S. Salina Street (east) facade. Of particular concern is the fenestration pattern on the second and third floors, which features windows of different sizes on each floor and a loss of the overall window pattern and symmetry of the approved design. The board compared the new storefront design to the approved design, noting that the transom band above the storefront windows had been eliminated and the new storefront openings disrupted the symmetry between the storefront and the openings on the upper floors. In addition, it was noted that there appears to be a large square of bricks above the second floor that are of a different color than the surrounding brick. On the S. Clinton Street (west) façade, the board noted that the as-built design resulted in incongruous window-head heights between the 2-story section and recessed, 1-story section. In addition, the color of the 1-story section is incompatible with the historic district. In conclusion, the board noted that it was unfortunate that the developer had not sought City comment prior to making the changes to the design of the facades and that it could not recommend approval of the design of the east and west facades as currently built. The board also recommended strongly that the design of the south elevation should be coordinated with the adjacent project (City Market). The board requested that the applicant develop mitigation solutions for the east and west facades and it also requested final elevations of the south facade with an explanation of how it is being coordinated with the adjacent City Market project.

Project Site Review (PR-20-18): 214 W. Water Street. James Trasher (CHA) presented the application for the west addition to the Amos Block. This application represents a redesign of the project that was approved in the spring of 2019. The revised design is for an 8-story building with a single level of parking on the ground floor and 7 floors of apartments above. The false store-fronts on the ground floor have been replaced by screening and the proposed balconies and windows on the east façade have been removed because of fire code restrictions. The new proposal also features a material change; specifically, the lightcolored Alucobond panels on the upper stories have been replaced by a light colored brick. In discussion, the board had the following comments: L. Tonsi stated that the ground floor parking presents a very poor pedestrian experience especially contrasted with the high quality of the ground floor of the Amos Block. B. Haley agreed and recommended that the designers consider how to mitigate the ground floor appearance through the design of the proposed screens. D. Leary suggested that landscaping should be incorporated into the ground floor. J. Marshall noted that the revised design had eliminated the strong visual datum line between the first and second floors of the Amos Building and the new addition. The board also considered the building materials. L. Tonzi questioned the pattern of light and dark brick on the facade and D. Radke suggested that the light color brick on the east and west facades could possibly be eliminated. J. Marshall suggested that the decorative brick arches on the east and west facades are unnecessary. In summary, the board was generally in support of the redesign. The reduction of the building's height from 11 to 8 stories was well received; however, it was noted that reducing the height by an additional story (to 7 stories), would be more appropriate and compatible with the Amos Block. It requested the developer provide detailed drawings of the treatment of the ground floor parking area including potential landscaping that might help improve the pedestrian experience. It asked the developer to reintroduce the strong horizontal datum lines between the first and second floors of the Jacob and the Amos, which was lost in the redesign.

It also asked the developer to consider alternatives to the proposed brick color pattern and consider the elimination of the decorative arch motifs on the east and west facades.

Project Site Review (PR-20-19): 217 Montgomery Street. Joe Piraino (In Architects) presented the application to install a fire escape stair on the east façade of the Hills Building. The stair would be simple metal stair that will lead to the ground from a single-story, enclosed deck on back of the building. D. Leary suggested that they consider installing a single, unbroken handrail on the stair. The board recommended approval of the application.

DISCUSSION

Predevelopment Discussion: 910 Madison Street. James Trasher (CHA) stated that the purpose of the discussion was to present a preliminary design of the new development in order to get initial board comments while the Board of Zoning appeals begins its consideration of a variance application for this project. Aaron Strange (Landmark Properties) noted that his company is seeking to create a "seamless" integration between the new construction and the former temple sanctuary building. John Harding (CUBE 3 Architects) presented the preliminary design and explained some of their considerations regarding the connection between the apartment complex and the sanctuary building. He said a primary objective is to preserve the views of the former temple sanctuary from the surrounding streets, in particular from the corner of University Avenue and Madison Street. The intention is to retain the front steps and west entrance into the sanctuary, as well as to retain the overall volume of the interior sanctuary space once inside the building. He noted that they are planning to level the sloping floor of the sanctuary so that it can be used as assembly space. On the exterior, he noted that the large, 2-story, amenity space to the south of the sanctuary building has been pulled back considerably so that it now projects out only 3 feet beyond the temple's build line. J. Marshall indicated that it would be helpful to see renderings of the building looking north along University.

Given the size and scope of the project, D. Radke asked the board to take time to consider the drawings and submit comments to K. Auwaerter, who will compile them and provide them to the design team.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 10:28 AM.