



**Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, October 18, 2018
Meeting Minutes**

Common Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Don Radke called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

ROLL CALL

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES J. Romano made a motion to approve the minutes of October 4, 2018 as submitted, which was seconded by B. Haley. The motion was approved unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

CA-18-14 224 Brattle Road. D. Radke reported that L. Tonzi, J. Romano, K. Auwaerter and he had met with the owner of 224 Brattle Road to review the condition of the patio at the rear of the house. Approximately 20% of the brick appears to be damaged and possibly another 40% of the brick is beginning to deteriorate. The patio has a large sunken area and appears to pitch toward the house. The subcommittee agreed that the patio needs significant repair and at a minimum the brick would need to be taken up and reset after the site was properly graded. The applicant has asked the Board to hold the application open while he considers other possible options other than brick. The Board agreed to hold the application open and encouraged the applicant to use the Board as a resource.

Project Site Review: 214 W. Water Street (Amos Block addition/the Jacob). James Trasher (CHA) and Aaron LaSala (Hueber Breuer) were present at the meeting. J. Trasher provided a brief introduction and noted that this submission included color elevations and specifications. He also noted some of the revisions to the design of the new construction, including to the "hyphen" connector between the two buildings, which now reads as the same width on both the Water St and Erie Blvd sides.

In discussion, C. Carter noted that the extensive sections of blank brick wall at the street level on the east and west ends of the Water Street facade were pedestrian unfriendly and uncharacteristic of the setting. J. Trasher and A. LaSala agreed that the "storefronts" located in the center of the ground-floor facade could be extended further along the facade and into these sections of the facade. J. Trasher indicated that the storefronts would only be approximately 3' deep and would function as display areas rather than commercial spaces. Board members noted that in previous iterations, this ground floor "storefront" area was designed to be 12' deep and was to serve as tenant space (i.e. a work-out/exercise area). J. Trasher said that the display/storefront areas were analogous to the Landmark Theatre's false storefronts along Clinton and Jefferson streets and the plan was to make the spaces available to community groups or to the commercial tenants for advertisements. Upon a question, J. Trasher indicated that they had not yet determined how the display case/storefronts would be accessed.

J. Romano asked about the material selections. A. LaSala confirmed that the first two floors will be brick-faced and the upper stories will feature 2'x6' metal panels. The brick will be a blue-black and the upper story panels will be two shades of grey.

B. Haley commented on the size of the decks on the west end of the new building. J. Trasher indicated that they were attached to large units and were one of the variety of apartment sizes and amenities that the developer

wished to offer to potential tenants. B. Haley also asked about the color choice for the metal panels and established that the lighter grey was a middle value grey.

D. Leary stated that he continued to find the design of the connection troubling. He noted that “hyphens” are usually smaller than what they are attached to. In this case, the hyphen connector is actually larger than the Amos Block. He asked again if the elevators could be moved out of the hyphen and placed at the western end of the building. This would eliminate the balconies, but would allow for a more appropriate scaling of the connection between the buildings.

D. Radke summarized that the Board was not against building on this site and noted some of the positive revisions to earlier iterations of the design, including pulling the new construction back to the property line in order to avoid encroaching into the City right-of-way, and moving the parking entrance from the south side of the new building to the north side of the building. He also noted that the Board had agreed to review the new construction as if it was a separate building connected to the Amos Block, rather than as an addition to the Amos Block, which would allow greater flexibility in the design. However, he stated that there were still major design issues to address, including the design of the connecting “hyphen”. He stated that the project would benefit from the input of an architect with preservation experience. He noted that it was not the Board’s job to design the building for the developer. B. Haley agreed and echoed D. Leary’s earlier statement that once the hyphen rises above the Amos Block it no longer functions as a secondary feature that defines two visually separate buildings. J. Marshall stated that the design team needs to look at the scale of the entire block. She said that she had no issue with 10-story height, but the scale of the new façade and its relationship to the rest of the street doesn’t work from a preservation point of view. She stated it made little sense for the Board to comment on the individual design features of the new construction when the scale issues had not been resolved. K. Auwaerter confirmed that the Board’s recommendation was that the current design should be denied.

NEW BUSINESS

Certificate of Appropriateness

CA-18-16 244 Brattle Road. Scott McCormican (owner) presented the application for improvements at 244 Brattle Road, including the installation of a hot tub behind the garage. The hot tub area will include a platform made of Azek decking and walkways of natural stone. The hot tub area is enclosed to the west by the rear wall of the garage, and to the north and east by an existing, wood privacy fence. A new section of fence with a gate will be installed to fully enclose the space. In addition, a portion of the fence next to the hot tub area on the north side of the property will be relocated approximately 3’ north to the edge of the property line. The application also calls for repainting the front door black and shutters dark green. Finally, the application calls for dismantling three sides of the garage and incorporating them into a new garage that would be slightly wider than the existing structure and would have a new roof and new garage doors.

In discussion, the applicant indicated that he wished to hold off on discussion of the partial demolition and reconstruction of the garage. D. Radke noted that a subcommittee would need to review the condition of the garage before voting on the partial demolition. The Board agreed to remove the garage demolition/reconstruction from this application. In regard to the hot tub, the applicant indicated that the hot tub and platform could be installed regardless of the demolition/reconstruction plans for the garage. It was noted that the hot tub area would be completely invisible from the neighbors due to the privacy fencing. The applicant noted that it would also be invisible from the house because of its location behind the garage. For this reason, a majority of the Board felt that the introduction of the Azek material was acceptable in this application. C. Carter made a motion to approve the site alterations, including the hot tub, platform, paths and new fencing and gate. J. Marshall seconded the motion, which was passed on a majority vote, B. Haley voting no. B. Haley made a motion to approve the paint colors for the front door and shutters as submitted, which was seconded by J. Romano. The motion was passed unanimously.

K. Auwaerter stated that she would organize a site visit to review the condition of the garage.

CA-18-17 333 Berkeley Drive. The applicant was not present. K. Auwaerter stated that she had made a site visit to the house to inspect the two trees that the applicant wishes to remove from the property. They are both

mature silver maples – one in the side yard and one in the front yard. The City/County arborist, Steve Harris, had also looked at the trees and agreed that they should be removed because of their condition and the danger they posed to the property. J. Marshall made a motion to approve the application as submitted, which was seconded by C. Carter. In discussion, the Board noted that it would recommend that the applicant replant the front yard tree with a tree recommended by the city/county arborist. The motion was approved unanimously.

Zoning Referrals

Special Permit (SP-03-28M1): 239-245 W. Fayette St. Jim Knittel and Dan Angiolillo (Dalpos Architects) presented the application for the conversion of two floors of the Seneca Building in Armory Square from office space to apartments. They noted that the owners are applying for rehabilitation tax credits. Part of the conversion requires repairing and replacing windows on the second and third stories. The Board discussed the window schedule and determined that it appeared to be appropriate. The application also includes the installation of a privacy gate on the Walton Street side of the building leading to a narrow alleyway along the side of the building. B. Haley questioned whether it was needed or appropriate to the setting. J. Knittel stated that the design of the gate was not finalized. The Board agreed to recommend approval of the application as submitted with the understanding that the gate design would be resubmitted for review after further design consideration by the applicant.

DISCUSSION

National Register Nomination: St. Anthony of Padua Church Complex. The Board briefly discussed the nomination and the importance of the property as a neighborhood anchor. It was noted that the Board had recently reviewed a Project Site Review application for the conversion of the former convent and school into senior housing. The Board unanimously indicated its approval of the nomination. K. Auwaerter will submit a letter on behalf of the Board to the State Historic Preservation Office.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 AM.