



**Landmark Preservation Board**  
**Thursday, April 16, 2020**  
**Meeting Minutes**

WebEx.com Meeting

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman 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, Don Radke, Jeff Romano

Absent: Lisa Tonzi (due to technical difficulties)

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

J. Romano made a motion to approve the minutes of April 2, 2020, which was seconded by J. Marshall. The minutes were approved with the following revisions:

Project Site Review (PR-20-09) 437 N. Salina Street.... J. Marshall noted that there were several ~~errors in the drawings and in the dimensions on the drawings, which impacts~~ *dimensional differences in the windows that could impact* the symmetry of the facade.

In summary, the Board recommended approval of the application with the recommendations that the ground-floor entrance be narrowed ~~along its northern edge~~ to align with the upper-story window opening...

Special Permit (SP-06-18M1): 700 N. Salina Street....The Board reviewed the signage and agreed that it appeared to ~~be excessive~~ *exceed the amount allowed by the sign ordinance*....In addition, B. Haley suggested that the owner consider removing the awnings along both sides of the building, which would reveal the architectural detail and character of the *original* building. J. Marshall agreed that removal of the awnings would be preferable; however, she noted that the removal of the awnings would also require ~~extensive~~ repair of the brick façade.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

Special Permit (SP-06-18M1): 700 N. Salina Street. (*Note: this review took place after the review of CA-20-08.*) Edward Withers (applicant) and Andrea Wandersee (NEHDA) were present for the meeting. D. Radke stated that, as recommended by the Board, the applicant had removed the signage on the N. Salina Street and E. Division Street sides of the building and that any further comment that the Board wished to provide to the applicant would be advisory only. B. Haley noted that over time, elements had been added to the main facades of the building that detract from the historic character of property. In particular, the long, continuous awnings on both street facades horizontally bisect the facades and hide decorative brickwork underneath. He suggested that the Board could help the property owner and/or applicant to develop a holistic approach to bringing the building back closer to its original historic appearance. D. Radke reiterated that these were suggestions, not requirements.

In regard to new signage, D. Radke recommended that K. Auwaerter work with E. Withers to determine what additional signage might be required for the business, what is allowed by the sign ordinance, and where it could be sited on the building.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

CA-20-08 1204 James Street. Basim AlQuraishi (applicant) presented the application, which includes rebuilding the back steps to the house and extensive site work to the rear half of the property. The existing

steps are wood with a metal handrail. The new stair will be brick (risers and sidewalls) with limestone treads and will have 5 steps with 6" risers. The application depicted a single handrail, but C. Carter recommended that the applicant consider installing two handrails to either side of the steps. J. Marshall noted that the handrails will need to have extenders at both the top and bottom in order to meet code. D. Leary asked for more information about the foundation to the steps.

Regarding the sitework, the existing driveway is asphalt up to the rear line of the house and the remaining driveway and parking area behind the house are gravel. The applicant seeks to lay new asphalt along the entire driveway and over the gravel parking area at the rear of the property. In addition, the plan indicates that an arborvitae screen will be installed along the side property line along with fruit trees between the grassy lawn/garden area and the rear driveway that continues to a curb cut on Sedgwick Drive. Finally, the applicant proposes to install new fill in the garden area in order to level out uneven areas.

The Board reviewed the information and determined that it needed a more definitive site plan that depicts the dimensions of the driveway and parking area and indicates how the parking area will accommodate the 6 cars belonging to the applicant and his family members. J. Romano also asked for clarification regarding the type of material located at the base of the rear steps next to the parking area.

### **DISCUSSION**

LPS 20-01 910 Madison Street (Temple Concord): D. Radke and K. Auwaerter reported to the Board that the Planning Commission had approved the Board's petition to designate the full Temple complex. However, it appears that Common Council may only designate the sanctuary portion of the building. K. Auwaerter is in discussion with the Council members, the administration and Corporation Counsel regarding the designation. The Council may vote on the designation as early as April 27, 2020.

### **ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 AM.