



Landmark Preservation Board
Thursday, September 6, 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: Tom Cantwell, Cynthia Carter, Bob Haley, Dan Leary, Julia Marshall, Don Radke, Jeff Romano, Lisa Tonzi

Excused: Joe Saya

Staff: Kate Auwaerter

APPROVAL OF MINUTES C. Carter made a motion to approve the minutes of August 16, 2018 as submitted, which was seconded by J. Romano. The motion was approved unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

Certificate of Appropriateness Applications

CA-18-11 301 Sedgwick Drive. John Gazda (owner) and Richard Krenzer (architect) presented the application for 301 Sedgwick Drive, which is a non-conforming structure within the preservation district, constructed in 1953. D. Radke reminded the Board that as a non-conforming structure, the Board's responsibility is to consider the effect of the proposed project on the character of the surrounding district. The house has a "V"-shaped plan, with the tip of the "V" facing the intersection of Sedgwick Dr. and Farmer St. The project includes the replacement of the casements in the large, circular bay window that faces the intersection with new, aluminum-clad casements with exterior applied muntins that will be custom built to fit into the existing opening. The project also includes the replacement of the main entrance, which is located on the northside of the property. The existing entrance is an aluminum, storefront system. The replacement entrance will include a residential door with sidelights and new gable-end portico on square wood posts. The new door will be a fiberglass, $\frac{3}{4}$ -light door above a single panel. The sidelights also feature $\frac{3}{4}$ lights with panels to match the door. Further along the north façade is a secondary entrance. The proposal includes the installation of a shed roof over the entrance and windows to either side of the entrance. The shed roof will be supported by three, square columns to match the columns on the new front portico. Under the shed roof, the secondary entrance door will be replaced with a fiberglass door. A casement window immediately east of the door will also be replaced with a new aluminum-clad casement window with exterior applied muntins. Finally, the project includes the removal of a rear screened-in porch with an all-season enclosure that will include large casement windows with transoms in dimensions similar to the screened porch. The Board reviewed the application. B. Haley and D. Leary noted that the house was designed by Charles Umbrecht, a prominent local architect. After discussion of the rear porch enclosure, the Board agreed that the focus of the review should be those items that are visible to the street. The Board discussed the angle of the new portico roof. J. Marshall made a motion to approve the application with the following condition: the portico roof angle shall match the angle of the roof that it intersects. C. Carter seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

CA-18-12 104 Hampshire Road. Shawn and Charlene Patane (owners) presented the application for the demolition of their garage and the construction of a new, larger garage. The existing, period, 2-car garage has a square plan with a pyramidal roof and is stucco sided. S. Patane explained that they have worked hard to

maintain the garage over the years; however, they believe that it is no longer repairable. Among the problems is the unused chimney at the rear of the garage, which is pulling away from the wall and causing damage to the garage wall. He noted that due to poor site drainage, the garage is perpetually damp, and prone to mildew and rot. He also mentioned that the attic is unusable because of animal infestations from years past. In addition to the problems with the structure itself, the owners stated that they need a larger garage in order to accommodate their lifestyle. He mentioned that he collects cars and that they also need room for bikes, kayaks, etc., all of which the current garage cannot accommodate. The proposed new garage would be slightly wider, taller and deeper than the existing garage. He explained that there was sufficient depth to the lot, which would allow the garage footprint to extend back without impacting the neighbor's view.

D. Radke reported to the Board that J. Marshall, D. Leary, and he had made a site visit to review the condition of the garage. The consensus from the site visit was that the garage is in need of repair, but is repairable. He noted that the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation recommend repair first over replacement. D. Leary recommended that the applicants consider an addition to the garage. S. Patane explained that their architect had considered an addition, but had determined that the only feasible way to accommodate a car lift was to build a new garage. He also noted that many of the problems with the garage were hidden from view, because of their efforts to keep up the appearance of the structure. He noted that they were open to any recommendations, but did not see an alternative to demolition. L. Tonzi commended the applicants for their work on their property and expressed her hope that a compromise could be reached. After discussion, the applicants agreed to withdraw their application. The Board recommended that the applicants have their architect provide an assessment of the condition of the garage for the Board's review. The Board also provided a copy of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation to the applicants that they could share with their architect.

DISCUSSION

Amos Block Addition: subcommittee report back. D. Radke reported that at the request of the property owner, a subcommittee of Board members had met to discuss a draft design for the western addition to the Amos Block, called "The Jacob". The subcommittee included D. Radke, D. Leary and J. Marshall. K. Auwaerter and Owen Kerney (City Planning) were also present at the meeting with the owner/developer, Mark Congel. D. Radke reported to the Board that the proposed abandonment of city property on the Water Street side of the building had been taken off the table. As a result, the new construction will be pulled back to the property line and will be narrower and taller (10 stories). He also noted that parking is still proposed for the first two stories. However, a portion of the ground floor on the Water Street side will feature some type of use other than parking (such as a gym for the tenants). Finally, he noted that the parking garage entrance had been relocated to the Erie Boulevard side of the property.

D. Radke stated that he believed good progress had been made over the earlier versions of the design. He stated that the subcommittee's discussion with M. Congel focused in large part on how to address the articulation of the hyphen between the new construction and the Amos Block. J. Marshall noted that they had discussed widening the hyphen and making it narrower than the Amos Block on both sides (Erie Blvd and Water Street) so that there is visual relief between the Amos Block and the new construction. D. Leary suggested that perhaps the hyphen itself could be shorter than the new construction.

The Board discussed how it should review the new construction, either as an addition to the Amos Building (which it is functionally), or as a new building connected to the Amos Block. T. Cantwell stated that he still had significant concerns regarding the height and scale of the new construction in the context of the Amos Block. B. Haley agreed that scale is a difficult issue and that the new building even at 10 stories could fit within the existing context through appropriate articulation of the new construction. J. Marshall stated that one problem is that the surrounding context is not provided in any of the drawings. The Board discussed the value of a simple mass model that would depict the height, volume and massing of the new construction in relation to the Amos Block and the surrounding blocks. It was noted that this could be done through renderings or a 3D model. In conclusion, D. Radke stated that the comments to the development team should include the Board's concern about the scale of the building as currently proposed in relation to the Amos Block and the suggestion that a

mass model may help show how the new construction will fit into the context of the Amos Block and surrounding area.

Preservation Ordinance review and comment. Due to time constraints it was agreed that the Ordinance review would take place at the next regular Board meeting.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 AM.