



APPROVED: January 7, 2009

**CITY OF ALBANY  
LANDMARKS ADVISORY COMMISSION  
City Hall Municipal Court Chambers, 333 Broadalbin Street  
Wednesday, December 3, 2008**

**MINUTES**

Landmarks Commissioners Present: Linda Herd, Oscar Hult, Roz Keeney, Heidi Overman, Dave Pinyerd and Robyn van Rossmann

Landmarks Commissioners Absent: Derryl James

Staff present: Planner II Anne Catlin, Administrative Assistant I Diana Eilers

Others present: Rebecca Bond and Skip Throop

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Oscar Hult called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**PUBLIC HEARING (HI-11-08 and DC-03-08)**

Hult called the public hearing on Planning File HI-11-08 and DC-03-08, Monteith National Register District Boundary Expansion, to order.

Declarations

Hult asked if any of the Commissioners wished to declare a conflict of interest, report a site visit, or an ex parte contact. Hult said that he can safely say everyone has been through the district.

Staff Report

Planner II Catlin summarized the staff report. She said that the project has been in progress for a long time. The purpose of the hearing tonight is to add the expansion area properties onto the local historic inventory and replace the map in the Development Code with a new version. Catlin gave a brief history of the Monteith District and how it was established. It was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in February 1980, it is 54 blocks, and has a nice block grid pattern, but the boundaries were irregular from the beginning.

The time period of significance for the District was expanded from 1915 to 1945 to include many different architectural styles to the District. Catlin showed pictures of the types of homes in the District. Survey work was done around the boundaries of the Monteith District and Hackleman District. A consultant was hired to see if there was potential for new historic districts. The Commission looked at the Monteith District first for an expansion because that is where there was more community support.

In April 2006, a meeting was held with property owners in the initial boundary area and there was good attendance. In the end, there was very good support and few objections. The consultants worked with the Commission and eventually came up with a boundary that reflected development patterns. Another public meeting was held and the City Councilors were invited to the meeting; no objections were made to the proposal. It went through two reviews at the state level (State Advisory Committee on Historic Preservation).

The final nomination was submitted to the Register in September 2008 and it was listed in the National Register November 13, 2008. Catlin said that the proposal meets the criteria to be added to the local historic inventory and meets the Comprehensive Plan goals, Development Code criteria, as well as the statewide planning goals.

Hult asked if there were any comments either opposing or in favor of this application. No comments were made.

The public hearing was closed at 6:44 p.m.

**MOTION:** Herd made a motion to approve the proposed Development Code amendment, Overman seconded the motion; **approved** 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARING (HI-10-08): 208-210 First Avenue SW

Hult called the public hearing on Planning File HI-10-08, 208-210 First Avenue SW, to order.

#### Declarations

Commissioners Herd, van Rossmann, and Overman said they have done site visits. Hult said he has been by the property.

#### Staff Report

Catlin summarized the staff report. She said that the applicant's (Skip Throop) original restoration plans were approved by the Commission a few months ago. The applicant is now working on the back of the building and some issues have come up. Catlin said that Throop is here to ask for approval for additional exterior alterations and a substitute materials request. The requests are to remove a brick chimney, to install a metal fire safety door at the back of the restaurant space, to convert a doorway that now goes to "nowhere" into a window, to replace two back windows with double-hung fiberglass or aluminum clad windows with a wood-clad interior, and to rebuild the bay windows to match what is there.

Catlin said that there are two sets of review criteria; the exterior alteration review criteria and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Catlin discussed the bay window bump outs first. She said that if the applicant rebuilds everything back and uses salvage materials as much as possible that this will not change the appearance and is a maintenance issue only. She said that one bay window has double-hung windows and one has casement windows. Throop said that his intention is to build everything back to match what is there. Catlin said that because the applicant is proposing to put everything back the way it is, the changes he is making will help the structural integrity and safety, so that meets the review criteria.

Catlin asked Throop if the conversion from a door to the window was on his preservation plan submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). Throop said it was. Catlin said that Rob Dortignacq recommended removal of the chimney. Throop said that he took the chimney down already because it was leaning. The bricks weren't mortared into the main wall. He doesn't know when it was put in, maybe in the 1930s or so for the bakery. Catlin feels that the chimney removal request seems to be necessary for safety.

Catlin said that the new fire safety egress door opening will be cut into the brick at the back of the retail/restaurant space. It will be a standard metal back door. Bricks will be reused on the building. Herd

suggested painting it to look like a wood panel door. Throop said that he could do that or he could purchase a door that is already painted that way.

Throop said that he would like to replace the entire window units with new ones. He would prefer to use fiberglass on the exterior, with wood on the interior. Catlin went over the substitute materials review criteria. The only time substituting materials can be used is if the original product would be cost prohibitive. Catlin said that in this case, she believes that fiberglass windows are comparable in price to wood windows. She then directed attention to an e-mail from Joy Sears at the SHPO (Exhibit A). The e-mail stated that it is likely that the federal tax credit application would not be approved if fiberglass is used. Catlin said that the windows are in bad shape and need to be replaced, but wood should be chosen to receive approval.

Hult asked if there were any comments on the application. No comments were made.

The public hearing was closed at 7:07 p.m.

Hult said that the new fire egress door has already been approved and is on the original plans. Hult doesn't know if there was a condition on what the door should look like.

Regarding converting the doorway to a window, Overman asked Throop if he would fill the rest of the opening with brick. Skip said that he would make it the same size as the other window and would fill it in with brick. Pinyerd asked if the metal shutters would stay where the door was going to be converted. Skip said that they are all severely rotten and rusted except for a couple of them. Hult said that the plan submitted before showed a balcony. Hult said that sometimes an element isn't usable, but is left to add an element to the building. Throop said that he can leave the door; he will just seal it up so it can't be accessed. Hult suggested using wood hardener inside the shutters in order to save the shutters. Herd concurred regarding trying to keep the shutters. Throop said that the shutters are not fixable and are dangerous. van Rossmann agrees with Herd, but she has looked at them and they are scary and nearly falling out. Throop said he would consider putting new ones on if he had to. Hult suggested deferring to the state on this item as it is not part of the request.

Hult discussed the bay windows issue. Overman said that she supports this request as long as all of the details are duplicated and similar products are used. Keeney said that because the bay windows are so characteristic of the building, she would like them to be wood.

Hult discussed the request for two new windows (the back windows above the old "Boccherini's" space). Hult asked if Throop plans to replace the whole window unit, or just the sashes. Hult said that modern windows are spring loaded don't have the lead weights. Throop said that the only thing you see from the outside is the brick. Overman felt replacing the window units with matching windows with rail extensions would be compatible. Keeney said that she prefers the lead weights but the most important thing is matching the materials and style.

**MOTION:** Keeney motioned to grant approval with conditions to:

- remove the chimney,
- the second floor door will stay and be sealed up so it is inaccessible,
- the windows be replaced with wood windows in-kind (rail extension and frame), and
- the bay windows will be rebuilt with materials in-kind (in a historic manner);

van Rossmann seconded, **approved** 6-0.

PUBLIC HEARING (HI-12-08): 120 Ellsworth Street/202 1st Avenue SW

Hult called the public hearing for Planning File HI-12-08, 120 Ellsworth Street, to order.

### Declarations

Van Rossman did a site visit. Herd reported ex parte contact saying she saw the project underway and talked to the applicant about it needing historic review. Hult said he went by.

### Staff Report

Catlin summarized the staff report. She said that the project was close to complete and that somehow the building permit was signed off on without her being notified. The applicant would like to add a window for light into an office space and was trying to make it compatible with the ones next door. Catlin noted that the vinyl windows he was trying to duplicate are not historically appropriate and is not sure when they were installed. Catlin said that the proposed window does not meet the compatible materials criteria. Keeney said that the best we can do is have the applicant match the other windows. Pinyerd suggested looking at the window for a date stamp to get an idea of when the window was installed. Catlin said that the LAC could suggest ways that the applicant could improve the compatibility of the proposed window. Hult said that the windows on the side are already there and at least they are being matched. van Rossmann said that she would be okay with leaving the window if the trim is taken off if the applicant would match the windows next to it. She noted that the trim around the adjacent windows was narrower. Hult would like to table this until next month so they can talk to the applicant.

**MOTION:** Herd made a motion to continue the public hearing at next month's meeting, Overman seconded, **approved** 6-0.

### OTHER BUSINESS

Herd had a question about the Cuisick building and if the low-e glass was approved by the LAC. Herd thought they had talked about having it be clear glass, but is certain that the glass put in is not clear.

Catlin noted the December open houses list and an invitation to the Albany Visitor's Association open house in their folders.

### NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting of the Landmarks Advisory Board is scheduled for Wednesday, January 7, 2009, at 6:30 p.m.

### ADJOURNMENT

Chair Hult adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:00 p.m.

Submitted by

Reviewed by

*Signature on file*

*Signature on file*

Diana Eilers  
Administrative Assistant I

Anne Catlin  
Planner II