



Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, January 7, 2021

Meeting Minutes

WebEx.com Meeting

CALL TO ORDER

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

ROLL CALL

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

Excused: Julia Marshall

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

J. Romano made a motion to approve the minutes of December 17, 2020, which was seconded by C. Carter. The minutes were approved unanimously as submitted.

OLD BUSINESS

No Old Business

NEW BUSINESS

Certificates of Appropriateness

CA-17-13 (Modification 1) 711 Fayette Street. Beth Crawford (Crawford & Stearns) presented roof and gutter modifications to the scope of work for 711 E. Fayette Street. The original proposal was for metal half-round gutters; the revised scope calls for a larger, K-style gutter with a crown molding that matches the existing molding along the cornice line. The second modification involves shortening the tower louvers on the east side of the tower in order to install a new valley and flashing where the roof meets the tower. The current configuration allows water to enter the tower through the louvers, which has caused significant interior damage. E. Crawford noted that the modifications have been approved by the State Historic Preservation Office. In discussion, B. Haley encouraged B. Crawford to move the coping infill at the tower/roof juncture on the east side of the tower as far back as possible from the edge of the building. B. Haley made a motion to approve the application as submitted, which was seconded by J. Romano. The motion passed unanimously.

Zoning Referrals

Sign Waiver (AS-20-08) 484 S. Salina Street. Greg Fischel (Allied Signs) presented the application to install two large, circular signs on the S. Salina Street and S. Clinton Street sides of the new Salt City Market. The signs will 15' in diameter with black aluminum faces and routed out lettering that will be internally lit. The signs will be applied to the face of the building. In discussion, B. Haley said that the design of the signs appeared appropriate but expressed concern about the size of the signs, especially on the S. Salina Street side of the building. L. Tonzi was concerned about the brightness of the illumination and asked for renderings that would better depict how the signs will appear in context. The applicant confirmed that this signage is the only exterior signage planned for the building; no additional exterior tenant signs will be installed. The board agreed to hold its comments until the applicant could provide renderings.

Project Site Review (PR-17-22M1) 751 N Salina Street. James Shattell (owner) and Michael Geraghty (MG Architects) presented the application to construct a small penthouse on the roof of 751 N. Salina Street. The

penthouse will be sheathed in siding to match the type and color of the Hardiplank siding on the north face of the building. A 5'-tall, black, metal, picket-style fence will be placed around the rear perimeter of the roof and roof deck as a safety requirement and to restrict access to the front roof area.

The board recommended approval of the project as submitted and commended the owner and architect on the project to rehabilitate and revitalize this property. The rehabilitation of this property, which had been slated for emergency demolition under a previous owner, is significant to the preservation of the character, architectural and historical continuity of the N. Salina Street Historic District. The board recognized the efforts of the owner to salvage and rehabilitate this important building.

DISCUSSION

Predevelopment Discussion: 910 Madison Street. Mark Riley and Aaron Stange (Landmark Properties), John Harding (CUBE3 Architects) and James Trasher (CHA Companies) were present at the meeting. D. Radke noted that a subcommittee of board members had met with the developer on 12/22/20 to go over the board design concerns prior to the meeting. The comments from SHPO (dated 11/25/20) were also discussed at this subcommittee meeting. The drawings (dated 12/31/20) now before the board reflected in part the subcommittee discussion. B. Haley noted that the developers had responded to board comment in part by reducing the above-ground height of the building by one story. He also noted that the top floor setback helped to reduce the massing of the building. Finally, he noted that the renderings showing the new development blocked out in grey volumes helped to illustrate how the temple should guide the design in color and scale. D. Leary and L. Tonzi both noted that the renderings did not address the board's and SHPO's comments regarding the size of the south wing of the building. J. Harding indicated that he was unaware of the SHPO comments; however, he said that in response to design discussions with the board, they had moved the wing back from University Avenue and had introduced the glass "box" on the ground floor to allow for views toward the temple from the south. He continued that the reduction in height, the upper floor setback, the reduction of above-ground parking were all in response to the board's comments. A. Stange stated further that the SHPO's request to move the southern wing back by 7-bays was not feasible for the project. J. Romano noted that he believed that the latest design iteration was an improvement and noted that because of the sloping site, the new construction would not appear as large as depicted to a pedestrian standing at the corner of Madison Street and University Avenue. C. Carter requested confirmation that the low connection between the temple and the new construction had been retained in the latest iteration, which was confirmed by J. Harding. T. Cantwell commented on the differing priorities of the developer and the board. He said that the board had been consistent with its concern about the height and massing of the new development and would continue to comment on the size of the southern wing.

In summary, D. Radke stated that the project remained in a discussion phase while the BZA considers the waiver application. The board comment would be that the board recognizes the designer's effort to address board concerns regarding the height and massing of the new development. The reduction in the building height, top story setback and the design of the connection to the temple sanctuary are all positive steps. Outstanding are the board's concerns about the size and extent of the south wing of the building. He also noted that the impact to the surrounding historic neighborhood assets had not been discussed as thoroughly as the impact on the temple sanctuary. He reiterated that at this point the board could only provide comment on the project and would not state approval or disapproval of the project until a formal application has been submitted.

D. Radke then allowed Susan Edmonds, a resident of Madison Court Condominiums to comment. She stated that so far the conversation had been focused on a transient pedestrian's perception of the development in relation to the temple without taking into account the impact to the people who live long-term in the neighborhood, specifically those with residences across the street. B. Haley reiterated that the impacts to the site context are critical considerations and that the discussion was still in its early stages.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 AM.