



**Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, February 4, 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, Julia Marshall, Jeff Romano, Don Radke, Lisa Tonzi

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

B. Haley made a motion to approve the minutes of January 7, 2021, with the following revisions:

NEW BUSINESS

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 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 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 now before the board (dated 12/31/20) reflected in part the subcommittee discussion.* B. Haley stated that the developers had responded to board comment in part by reducing the above-ground height of the building by one story....

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....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.*

C. Carter seconded the motion to approve the minutes as revised, which was passed by a majority of the board; J. Marshall abstained because she was not present at the January 7, 2021 meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

Sign Waiver (AS-20-08) 484 S. Salina Street. K. Auwaerter reported that the applicant had provided renderings of the new signage for the Salt City Market. She shared the renderings with B. Haley and L. Tonzi who had expressed concerns about the proposal at the January 7, 2021 meeting. Because Central Permitting had requested an expedited review due to the timing of the opening of the market, she completed the

preservation review of the project signage based on B. Haley and L. Tonzi's comments. She noted that the renderings were included in the board packets.

NEW BUSINESS

CA-21-01: 506 W. Onondaga Street. Edward Barry (VIP Structures) and Terry Horst (Maxain+Horst) presented the application including site plan and building elevations for the conversion of the former Dr. Gorman House into a branch of Pathfinder Bank. The site plan includes the redesign of the rear parking lot; introduction of a drive-thru teller and remote ATM at the rear of the property; new signage (a pole sign on W. Onondaga Street and signage on the drive-thru teller canopy); and landscaping at the front of the former house, along the driveway and western property line, and the edge of the driveway to the ATM along the rear property line. E. Barry confirmed that there was no fencing proposed for the project. Lighting is planned for the exterior of the building, at the drive-thru teller and along the driveway leading to the ATM and the ATM itself. However, there were no specifications provided for the fixture types. B. Haley and J. Marshall emphasized the importance of the design of the lighting and the containment of the lighting within property lines. E. Barry noted that he would provide the photometric plan and specifications. In regard to the signage, J. Romano asked if they had considered possibly orienting the proposed pole sign at the front of the building vertically to be less obtrusive. B. Haley asked how this sign related to the other signage including on the drive-thru teller. The applicants indicated that they would provide a signage package to the board also.

In regard to the former house, E. Barry noted that this is a rehabilitation tax credit project. SHPO has provided preliminary approval of the restoration of the exterior, which includes opening up the rear and side porches, both of which had been enclosed. All the windows will be restored with internal storms and the masonry will be cleaned and repaired including the stone foundation. The house requires a new asphalt shingle roof, but they intend to restore the Yankee gutters on the building, which are connected to downspouts located on the east and west facades of the former house. The main entrance to the building is located at the side porch on the east side of the former house. A concrete ramp will lead from the back parking lot to the porch. The front steps to the porch will be restored. Inserted into the entrance porch is a glass vestibule, which has been approved by SHPO. D. Leary and J. Marshall both noted that there are code requirements which may preclude the use of large single panels of glass for the vestibule as proposed. For visibility, they may need to divide the glass panels into two and/or install decals to the glass. C. Carter noted that the proposed glass box vestibule was a good preservation solution.

After further discussion, C. Carter made a motion to approve the application for the rehabilitation of the building and the primary features of the new site plan, omitting the signage and lighting plans. Both of these plans will be provided later as a modification to the Certificate of Appropriateness. In discussion, D. Leary stated that the requirements for the glass panels should be determined before approval. The motion carried with a majority of the board voting in support; D. Leary and J. Marshall voted to deny the motion.

DISCUSSION

Predevelopment: 413 S. Warren Street. Luke Esposito (R. F Esposito, Inc.) and the owners Stephen Schmitt and Melanie Goodwin were present for the discussion. L. Esposito presented a revised concept for the front facade of the building. Instead of projecting bay windows, they proposed to install recessed balconies for the second story tenants. S. Schmitt explained that his family had owned this building since 1941. Under their ownership, the building had first housed a salon, later Raymour & Flanigan, and more recently a bagel store and now the present Chinese restaurant. As the work progressed on the façade rehabilitation, they recognized the potential for providing "outdoor" space for the second floor tenants, which they believe would add value to the units. L. Esposito showed the board a 1940s version of the facade which indicated there were flat ribbon windows as a replacement to the earlier bay windows on the second floor.

In discussion, B. Haley stated that he recognized the benefit to the tenants of having the balcony space, but that the balconies had no architectural precedent along S. Warren Street. The board noted that it had based its earlier approval of the façade rehabilitation on the early 20th century image of the building which depicted the projecting bays. B. Haley suggested that they consider installing the bay forms, but keep them open (no glass),

which would create more floor space for the tenants and retain the historic character of the block. L. Tonzi agreed, but added that operable windows in the bays would be preferable. The owners and L. Esposito said they would consider the suggestions. K. Auwaerter noted that if they decide to revise the plans for the facade that they would submit the revisions to the Zoning office.

515 W. Onondaga Street (Gillett House): Follow-up from site tour. B. Haley, L. Tonzi, J. Romano and T. Cantwell had gone on a site tour of the Gillett House and neighboring Trinity Church and parish house on 1/21/21. Of the Gillett House, B. Haley said that the primary block of the house -- the walls, roofline, etc. - appears true. The rear addition has collapsed and should be removed. He noted the craftsmanship of the materials including the polychrome slate roof and woodwork. He and the other board members on the tour noted the importance of saving and rehabbing the building. Referring to the developers' presentation on 12/20/20, D. Leary said that the developers' comment that their project should be considered an extension of the larger Strathmore neighborhood is in error. Rather, the project should be considered as part of the historic W. Onondaga Street corridor, of which the Gillett House is a significant component. J. Romano agreed, noting the importance of the collection of buildings (house, church and parish house/chapel) and the unique design of the house in particular. He suggested that the developers would gain from more preservation and architectural professional expertise and assistance.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 AM.