

MINUTES
June 22, 2020
Historic Preservation Commission – Remote Meeting
City of Batavia

Please **NOTE:** These minutes are not a word-for-word transcription of the statements made at the meeting, nor intended to be a comprehensive review of all discussions. They are intended to make an official record of the actions taken by the Committee/City Council, and to include some description of discussion points as understood by the minute-taker. They may not reference some of the individual attendee's comments, nor the complete comments if referenced.

1. Meeting Called to Order

Chair Hohmann called the virtual meeting to order at 5:30pm. The meeting was held via GoToWebinar. Residents were welcomed to register to attend the meeting or dial into the meeting.

2. Roll Call

Members Present: Chair Hohmann; Vice-Chair Hagemann; Commissioners Faivre, Krawczyk, Sherer, and Saam

Members Absent: Commissioner Bus

Also Present: Scott Buening, Director of Community Development; Jeff Albertson, Building Commissioner; Howard Chason, Director of Information Systems; and Jennifer Austin-Smith, Recording Secretary

3. Approval of Minutes: April 13, 2020

Motion: To approve the minutes from April 13, 2020

Maker: Hohmann

Second: Sherer

Roll Call Vote: **Aye:** Hohmann, Sherer, Saam, Faivre, Krawczyk, Hagemann

Nay: None

6-0 Vote, 1 Absent, All in favor. Motion carried.

4. Items to be Removed, Added or Changed

There were no items to be removed, added or changed.

5. Matters From the Public (for items not on the agenda)

There were no matters from the public.

6. COA Review: 901 North Batavia Avenue – Glass Block Replacement (Frank Mares, applicant)

A PowerPoint presentation was presented to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) that included the following information:

- Campana's Glass Block System
 - Chronic breakage due to changes in temperature and pressure
- Routine Glass Block Replacements are Unavoidable

- East Elevation
 - Replacement of 25 8” glass blocks
- West Elevation
 - Replacement of 25 8” glass blocks
- Tower North Elevation
 - Planning on replacing 12 glass blocks
- Tower South Elevation
 - 10-15 glass blocks that need to be replaced
- Tower East Elevation
 - Least amount of glass blocks that need to be replaced
- Existing Block cannot be Matched with New Products
 - Original block production process is obsolete
 - Clear glass block is the only block that was available when the building was built and is still available today. Trying to match with anything else would create a noticeable difference and checkerboard pattern.
- Clear Glass Block Standard Replacement Approved in 2010
- There are not enough Original Glass Block for Replacements
- Alternative Solution
 - Windows on the northwest corner are not original to the building. They have vinyl surfaces so they must have been replaced at some point. If we cut out small sections of glass block in a symmetrical pattern we can then introduce windows into the openings to help with the ventilation of the building. The smaller sections of block could be taken into the warehouse where someone could restore them.

The HPC discussed the COA for glass block repairs. Albertson noted that the alternative solution window installment and reclaiming of the original glass block would have to come back to the HPC for consideration. Krawczyk asked if there was any alternative material that would look like glass block that could age better. Frank Mares, applicant, answered that there is an acrylic glass block that is available but he is uncertain if it would match completely. Mares stated that a redevelopment of the building would make replacing all of the glass blocks with a modular glass block replacement more feasible. That is an estimated two million dollar solution. This is not likely to happen as part of the continuing operation of the building. He stated that he would look to see if Pella has a solution as well to make a product that looks like glass block from the distance. As part of a redevelopment, there are alternatives available. Currently, he is trying to maintain the building and keep it safe. Albertson noted that any solution would also have to be brought to the National Park Service because the Campana building is a nationally registered building. Chair Hohmann stated that if it makes sense to reclaim the glass block and do the windows we would need to see it come back to the HPC with details on the proposed windows. We do not want to lose the historical character of the building but if there is cost effective way to maintain the building while keeping the correct historical nature we would all like to see what you could bring to the table. Mares stated that he would come back to discuss the alternative solution further. He is also open to talking about larger scale solutions but they would require a larger redevelopment.

Sherer asked if the National Park Service approved the alternative solution windows. Mares stated that those windows have been in the building for a long time. There is a window on the third floor

that is made of wood and is deteriorating in place. There are several spots where it appears a window has been replaced with replacement glass blocks. Albertson commented that it appears that the east façade is the most important to preserve for the National Park Service.

Sherer asked about the letter “C” in the Campana sign and if that would be fixed. Mares stated that it is more likely to happen before the repairs to the entire east glass façade. He has been talking about fixing the “C” but it would require a big crane. Mares stated that they would accept any grant funding for this project because he estimates it would cost at least ten to twenty thousand dollars. Mares stated that he would like to have the “C” repaired and light the sign up again. He believes the original color of the lettering was purple. He cannot promise to do anything now. He explained that due to the pandemic there are tenants that are having trouble paying the rent. This is probably not the year.

Faivre asked the applicant if he has researched glass fabricators and the ability to mimic glass blocks. Mares responded that in the minutes from March 2010 it was discussed. They could not find a replacement block or a fabricator that could make a suitable replacement. The plan b was to speak to an artist. While it is possible to produce them one at a time it would be very expensive and cost prohibitive at one hundred dollars per block. It would be more like artwork than a glass block. He wanted to purchase one glass block from the artist to show the Commission and the artist declined making it stating they could not do it. He is still hopeful that someone could do it if we were willing to pay enough. Faivre stated that having the correct historic glass blocks in place, at least on the east facing side of the building, would be really important. Faivre stated that since it was ten years ago, perhaps it would be worth another look for a potential fabricator. Mares stated that he would be happy to take a look and make some calls. He noted that it would be cost prohibitive but he is willing to look into it. Mares shared that some corner blocks were found in the back of a warehouse and he bought them all sight unseen. If there is ever a time he could find this original block in the back of a warehouse we just buy them. They don’t really exist anymore and the technique used to make them no longer exists.

Motion: To approve the COA as presented

Maker: Hagemann

Second: Saam

Roll Call Vote: **Aye:** Hagemann, Hohmann, Sherer, Saam, Faivre, Krawczyk

Nay: None

6-0 Vote, 0 Absent. Motion carried.

7. COA Review: 1 North Washington Avenue – Façade Revisions (1N Washington, LLC, applicant)

Albertson reported that COAs have to be acted on and a building permit has to be applied for a COA within one year. The project, because of some of the delays, has to be brought back and be reapproved since it has been more than a year since the previous COA was approved. Also, since that time there have been some changes to the elements of the building and some of the façade work, which is another reason it is back in front of the HPC tonight.

Chair Hohmann stated that the HPC’s purview is that we are looking at this from the materials standpoint, the design standpoint, and it is in the Historic District. Our purview has nothing to do

with the planning, the zoning or whether or not this is something that should be built in Batavia. Those discussions are under the purview of other Commissions.

Dave Patzelt, Shodeen, stated that there are three different items that are causing these changes. The first is the use that is on Wilson Street. The first plan that was approved by the HPC was a retail use on the first floor. During the process, it was changed to residential use and now we are going back to commercial use along Wilson Street. That is one of the significant changes. The other significant change along Wilson Street is that the elevation used to run parallel to the center line of Wilson Street. When the façade was parallel to Wilson Street, it made for a non rectangular parking garage within the structure. We have pulled the elevation back when we went to residential use. There are some relatively minor changes that have to do with a window location or a door location. Patzelt introduced the project architect, Don McKay, to present the PowerPoint presentation to the Commission. The presentation included the following:

- Design Revision Exhibit May 4, 2020
- Site/Residential Plan
- Lower Garage Plan
- Upper Garage Plan
- Residential Plan
- North Street Elevation
- South Elevation Wilson Street
- West Elevation River Street
- East Elevation Washington Ave
- Proposed Elevations
 - Wilson and State
 - River and Washington

The Commission discussed the façade. Chair Hohmann stated that he likes the use of windows and feels that the updated look will fit very well in the downtown. Faivre stated that she likes the changes as well. The Commission discussed the materials used on the elevation, scale, retail, the luxury apartments and amenities.

Motion: To approve the COA as presented

Maker: Hagemann

Second: Krawczyk

Roll Call Vote: **Aye:** Hagemann, Hohmann, Sherer, Saam, Faivre, Krawczyk

Nay: None

6-0 Vote, 1 Absent, All in favor. Motion carried.

8. Updates:

1. 7 East Wilson Street – Historic Inspection
2. Anderson Block Building – Masonry Maintenance
3. Significant Historic Building Inspection Program
4. 10/12 North River Street – Historic Inspection
5. 227 West Wilson Street – Historic Inspection
6. 16 East Wilson Street – Historic Inspection

7. Certified Local Government

Albertson reported the Certified Local Government application has been submitted to the State. Buening stated that he is unsure of the State's timeframe to review the application.

Albertson stated that there are no updates on the other items.

9. Other Business

There was no other business to address at this time.

10. Adjournment

There being no other business to discuss, Chair Hohmann asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 6:38pm; Made by Vice-Chair Hagemann; Seconded by Krawczyk. Motion carried.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Jennifer Austin-Smith, Recording Secretary, on June 29, 2020.