



Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, December 19, 2019
Meeting Minutes

Room 215 City Hall

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Don Radke called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Tom Cantwell, Cynthia Carter, Bob Haley, Julia Marshall, Don Radke, Jeff Romano, Lisa Tonzi

Absent: Dan Leary, Joe Saya

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

C. Carter made a motion to approve the minutes of November 21, 2019, which was seconded by J. Romano. The minutes were approved unanimously as revised (below):

CA-19-21 108 Circle Road....After discussion, J. Marshall made a motion to approve the application with the following conditions: The window will be a single, wide, double-hung-sash window matching the dimensions (width) *and muntin pattern* of the original windows as seen on the second and third floors of the rear façade of the house.

Predevelopment discussion: Temple Society of Concord (910 Madison Street). ...J. Harding presented preliminary drawings including a site plan and elevations of the proposed 7-8-story, student housing development includes a total of 202 beds.... Finally, the Board requested renderings of the proposed development from all directions in order to understand the impact of *the scale and height of the project* on the surrounding context and historic resources.

OLD BUSINESS

No Old Business

NEW BUSINESS

Verizon Small Cell Installations: (Note: Because no other applicants were present, D. Radke rearranged the agenda to discuss the small cell installations first.) Greg Hanley (Verizon) attended the meeting with two colleagues to present plans for the installation of 5G small cell antennas in the vicinity of historic areas within the city. They presented plans for 15 sites in close proximity to the North Salina Street Historic District, Sedgwick-Highland-James Preservation District, and the Hawley Green Historic District. These installations were all on existing wooden utility poles and on the periphery of the historic areas. The Board had no issue with the proposed installations given their locations on the periphery of the districts and the fact that the equipment would be installed on existing wooden poles. Moving forward, the Board gave staff the authority to approve similar future applications. However, G. Hanley noted that eventually, the 5G antennas will be installed in neighborhoods that have special lighting districts. The Board requested that the team return with representative examples of 5G antenna installations in neighborhoods with ornamental lighting, such as in the Sedgwick, Berkeley Park, Allen Street, Scottholm and Strathmore neighborhoods. K. Auwaerter will send G. Hanley a map of the various historic districts in the city.

CA-19-22 902 Rugby Road: The applicant was unable to attend the meeting. K. Auwaerter described the proposal to install a 4-ft tall, wire fence with plain metal posts on the inside edge of the bushes surrounding the front lawn. She noted that the applicant told her that the fencing would be temporary until the owner of the property gets approval for the installation of fencing in the rear yard. The Board discussed the application and noted that the Sedgwick-Highland-James Preservation District *Guidelines & Standards* do not recommend front-yard fencing because it negatively impacts the planned open character of the district. It was also noted that there was no guarantee of how long the fencing would remain. B. Haley made a motion to deny the application, which was seconded by C. Carter. The motion to deny was approved unanimously.

Sign Permit (AS-19-14 A) 300 S State St: K. Auwaerter explained that the application is to install four, internally lit signs on One Park Place - one sign at parapet height on each side of the building. She noted that this application was an appeal: the Zoning Administrator had denied the application because of the size and number of the signs. The Board reviewed the application and agreed to recommend that the application be denied. The Board determined that the four proposed signs are out of scale with the building and inappropriately located (for example, the east elevation sign is located over a glass curtain wall, which is a primary architectural feature of the façade). In addition, the size and scale of the signage on the east elevation is in conflict with the historic character of the locally protected Fayette Park and its surroundings. K. Auwaerter noted that the Zoning Administrator had approved an earlier application from the previous owner to install two signs (east and west facades). The Board noted that the previously approved signs were of an appropriate size, scale and location for the building and did not impact the historic character of the surrounding neighborhood. It also noted that the desired building branding could be accomplished with the two appropriately located and scaled signs.

Sign Permit (AS-19-19): 201 West Street: The Board reviewed the application for new signage on the east and west facades of the building. It agreed to recommend approval of the proposed signage. However, the Board noticed that dimensions given for the window decal signs on the building's west façade (already installed) are 80"x 36". These dimensions are in error and should be corrected. In addition, it noted that there is additional signage currently in place on the north façade, which was not included in the application. The signage is located in the four display boxes attached to the north wall of the property. The Board noted that the display boxes were installed by the former theater. Now that the theater is no longer in the building, it recommended that the boxes along with the signage in the boxes be removed.

DISCUSSION

Potential Local Protected Site: Temple Society of Concord (910 Madison Street): K. Auwaerter reported that she had not received a request from the building owner of Temple Concord to the Board to initiate the Protected Site evaluation process. As a result, the Board could not authorize a public hearing. She anticipated receiving the request prior to the next Board meeting in January.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 AM.