ITHACA LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION (ILPC)

NOTICE OF MEETING & AGENDA

The regular monthly meeting of the ITHACA LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION will be held at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 21, 2023. This meeting is open to the public and will be held in Common Council Chambers, Third Floor, City Hall, 108 E. Green Street, Ithaca, NY, and also conducted remotely using videoconferencing technology. In-person attendance at City Hall may be limited and will be permitted on a first-come, first-served basis. Members of the public are strongly encouraged to participate remotely. Virtual participation in public meetings is authorized by Part WW of Chapter 56 of the Laws of 2022 of New York State and Local Law 2022-05. More information, including the written procedures governing the use of videoconferencing technology, is available at http://www.cityofithaca.org/339/Boards-Committees.

For remote viewing/attendance: A live stream of the proceedings is available at https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC7RtJN1P_RFaFW2IWCnTrDg; a recording will made available through the same link following the conclusion of the proceedings. If you are a member of the public wanting to observe the meeting, please simply watch the live stream. If you are an applicant or member of the public wishing to comment during the proceedings, you should both follow the meeting via the live stream and join the meeting via Zoom. (You will be placed in a waiting room until your allotted time to speak.) Members of the public wishing to be heard are strongly encouraged to register by 3:00 PM on the day of the meeting. To register, please send your name and physical address to bmccracken@cityofithaca.org, subject line: “ILPC Speaker Registration – February 2023”. Written comments may be submitted to the aforementioned email address no later than 3:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting. Use the subject line: “ILPC Comments – February 2023,” and include your legal name and physical address along with your comments in the body of the email. Each comment is limited to three minutes and will be read aloud at the meeting.

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Sage Hall, 114 Feeney Way (Central Avenue), Individual Local Landmark – Proposal to Replace a Set of Monolithic Brownstone Steps and a Landing with Monolithic Red Granite Steps and a Landing.

B. 123 Roberts Place, Cornel Heights Historic District – Proposal to Install a Fence Enclosing the Front, Side and Rear Yards.
   https://www.cityofithaca.org/DocumentCenter/View/14857/Certificate-of-Appropriateness---123- Roberts-Place-

C. 702 East Buffalo Street, East Hill Historic District – Retroactive Request for Approval for the Removal of Railroad Tie Retaining Walls and Landscape Stairs as well as Non-historic Flagstone Walkways in the Front Yard, Regrading the Front Yard, and the Installation of a Concrete Walkway
   [Materials previously distributed with the December 20, 2022, ILPC Meeting Agenda]

II. PUBLIC COMMENT ON MATTERS OF INTEREST

If you have a disability and would like specific accommodation in order to participate, please contact the City Clerk’s Office at 274-6570 by 12:00 p.m., no later than 2 days (not including weekends and holidays) before the meeting.
III. OLD BUSINESS
   A. Sibley Hall, 921 University Avenue, Cornell Arts Quad Historic District – Proposal to Replace the Cornice on the Dome, Replace the Windows in the Dome’s Lantern and Those in the Second and Third Stories Below, Infill Two Window Openings in the Second Story on the North Elevation, and Install a Large, Contemporary Window in the Second Story of the North Elevation

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

V. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS
   A. Update: Stewart Park National Register of Historic Places Nomination – State Review Board on March 9, 2023

VI. ADJOURNMENT

ACCESSING ONLINE MEETING MATERIALS:
Online meeting materials, like applications for a Certificate of Appropriateness and supporting materials, are available electronically via the “Document Center” on the City web site (www.cityofithaca.org/DocumentCenter), under "Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission" > "Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness" and in the relevant address folder. Please do not hesitate to contact our office if you have any questions or you need any assistance accessing the meeting materials.
RESOLUTION: Moved by XXX, seconded by XXX.

WHEREAS, Sage Hall, 114 East Avenue (Feeney Way) is an individual local landmark, as designated under Section 228-3 of the City of Ithaca Municipal Code in 1990, and

WHEREAS, as set forth in Section 228-4 of the Municipal Code, an Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, dated February 3, 2023, was submitted for review to the Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission (ILPC) by J Shermeta, Associate University Architect on behalf of property owner Cornell University, including the following: (1) two narratives respectively titled Description of Proposed Change(s) and Reasons for Changes(s); (2) a document prepared by MCWB Architects titled Sage Hall: Building Foundation Waterproofing and Drainage and dated January 31, 2023, and

WHEREAS, the ILPC has reviewed the New York State Building-Structure Inventory Form for Sage Hall, and

WHEREAS, as stated in the narrative Description of Proposed Change(s), the project involves the replacement of a set of monolithic brownstone steps and a landing at the secondary south entrance with monolithic red granite steps and a landing, and

WHEREAS, other aspects of the project, including waterproofing the building’s foundation and constructing a new foundation for the stone steps, meet criteria for a staff-level review and have been approved by the Secretary of the Commission per the provisions of the Landmarks Ordinance and the City of Ithaca Historic District and Landmark Design Guidelines, and

WHEREAS, the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness is a Type II Action under the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act and the City Environmental Quality Review Ordinance for which no further environmental review is required, and

WHEREAS, the applicant (has/has not) provided sufficient documentation and information to evaluate impacts of the proposal on the subject property and surrounding properties, and

WHEREAS, a public hearing for the purpose of considering approval of the Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conducted at the regularly scheduled ILPC meeting on February 21, 2023, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the ILPC has made the following findings of fact concerning the property and the proposal:
As indicated in the New York State Building Structure Inventory Form, Sage Hall was constructed in 1875 as Cornell University’s women’s dormitory. Designed by Cornell’s first professor of architecture, Charles Babcock, Sage Hall is an outstanding example of the High Victorian Gothic style. It is the third of the three buildings that comprise the informal Red Brick Group.

In consideration of this and all approvals of proposals for alterations, new construction, or demolition in historic districts, the ILPC must determine that the proposed exterior work will not have a substantial adverse effect on the aesthetic, historical, or architectural significance and value of either the landmark or, if the improvement is within a district, of the neighboring improvements in such district. In considering architectural and cultural value, the Commission shall consider whether the proposed change is consistent with the historic value and the spirit of the architectural style of the landmark or district in accordance with Section 228-6 of the Municipal Code. In making this determination, the Commission is guided by the principles set forth in Section 228-6B of the Municipal Code, as further elaborated in Section 228-6C, and by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, and in this case specifically the following principles and Standards:

Principle #1 The historic features of an individual landmark shall be altered as little as possible and any alterations made shall be compatible with the historic character of the landmark.

Standard #2 The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard #6 Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. When the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Standard #9 New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard #10 New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
With respect to Principle #1, Standard #2, and Standard #9, the replacement of the steps and landing (will/will not) remove distinctive materials (and will/and will not) alter features and spaces that characterize the property. [If “will” describe feature or space and how it will be inappropriately altered]

With respect to Principle #1 and Standard #6, as [shown or documented how] the severity of the deterioration [of what feature] requires its replacement. The proposed new work (will/will not) match the old in design, color, texture, [material] and other visual qualities. [if material will not match, explain why not and why that’s acceptable].  Proposed justification if replacement is appropriate: The ILPC notes that the in-kind replacement of the brownstone is not possible because this once readily available building material is no longer quarried. While the retention of the original historic material is preferred, the use of an alternate material is required in this case. The ILPC finds that the proposed red granite adequately replicates the historic characteristics of the brownstone, including color, texture and tooling, as evidenced by the physical sample presented at the Public Hearing. The ILPC also considered the location of the stairs, which are on a secondary elevation and not used as a primary entrance to the building.

Also with respect to Principle #1 and Standard #9, the proposed replacement steps and landing (are/are not) compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment. [if “not”, describe qualities of the project that are not compatible and in what ways they are not ]

With respect to Standard #10, the steps and landing (can/cannot) be removed in the future without impairment of the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment. [if “cannot”, describe why it cannot]

RESOLVED, that, based on the findings set forth above, the proposal (will/will not) have a substantial adverse effect on the aesthetic, historical, or architectural significance of Sage Hall, as set forth in Section 228-6, and be it further,

RESOLVED, that the Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission determines that the proposal (meets/does not meet) criteria for approval under Section 228-6 of the Municipal Code, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the ILPC (approves/denies) the Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness.
ILPC Meeting – date
Resolution –

RECORD OF VOTE:
Moved by: 0
Seconded by: 0
In Favor: 0
Against: 0
Abstain: 0
Absent: 0
Vacancies: 0

Notice: Failure on the part of the owner or the owner’s representative to bring to the attention of the ILPC staff any deviation from the approved plans, including but not limited to changes required by other involved agencies or that result from unforeseen circumstances as construction progresses, may result in the issuance by the Building Department of a stop work order or revocation of the building permit.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS

Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission (ILPC)
Planning & Economic Development Division
City of Ithaca, 108 E. Green St., 3rd Floor, Ithaca, NY  14850
Bryan McCracken  |  Ph: 607-274-6555  |  bmccracken@cityofithaca.org
www.cityofithaca.org/boardscommittees/ilpc/index.cfm

Date:  2/3/2023  Building Permit Application # (REQUIRED):  #43920

Applicant’s Name:  J Shermeta, Assoc. Univ. Architect  Phone:  607-255-6870
Applicant’s E-Mail address (REQUIRED):  j.shermeta@cornell.edu

Property Address:  114 Feeney Way, Ithaca, NY 14853

Owner’s Name (if different from Applicant):  Cornell University
Owner’s Mailing Address:  144 Feeney Way, Ithaca, NY 14853

Proposed Work Includes (check all that apply):

☐ New Construction  ☐ Site Changes (paving, fencing, patios, etc.)
☐ Addition  ☐ Signage
☐ Accessory Structure  ☐ Demolition
☐ ALTERATION: Primary Structure  ☐ ALTERATION: Accessory Structure

Submittal Requirements
All documents are to be sent to the attention of Bryan McCracken at the above address.

STAFF-LEVEL REVIEW:
Submit one (1) hardcopy and one (1) electronic copy of application and attachments. See City of Ithaca Historic District & Landmark Design Guidelines for a description of work that is eligible for this expedited review process.

ILPC REVIEW:
Submit eleven (11) hardcopies and (1) one electronic copy of application form and all attachments. Complete applications must be received by 4:00 p.m. on the last Tuesday of the month, 21 days prior to the regular ILPC meeting at which the application will be reviewed. ILPC meetings are held the third Tuesday of each month.

Applications must be accompanied by thorough documentation of existing conditions and proposed changes, including (as applicable): photographs of existing conditions; site plans showing location and dimensions of proposed change; drawings or sketches showing proposed changes on each affected elevation; description of design details and materials to be used (manufacturer’s data sheets may be used); samples of proposed materials; scale drawings of any proposed signs including colors, typeface, and illumination details; historic photographs, if the intention of the project is to return a property to a documented prior condition; and a statement from a qualified contractor or design professional attesting to the physical condition of any element that is proposed for replacement due to deterioration.
Description of Proposed Changes (use additional sheets if necessary):

Sage hall was built in 1875 and is a locally designated landmark. Originally built as a women's residence, it now houses the Johnson Graduate School of Management. Cornell is undertaking a critical waterproofing and drainage project to address ongoing water infiltration in the basement. The scope of work includes excavating at the existing west and south foundation walls and installing a new waterproofing and drainage system. Most of this work involves repair and replacement in kind and does not require a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Committee to proceed.

Only one aspect of the project requires review by this Committee and the issuance of a COA. At the secondary south entrance, existing original brownstone treads and landing will be replaced with red granite, as the original materials are in poor condition and cannot be reused.

Relevant scope of work includes:
- Remove and reinstall original iron handrail for reuse
- Remove and reinstall stone cheek wall for reuse
- Remove deteriorated, cracked brownstone treads and landing
- Provide new foundation to support landing and steps
- Install new red granite treads and landing
- Backfill, finish grading and seeding

Reasons for Proposed Changes (use additional sheets if necessary):

At the secondary south entry stair, severe water damage to the existing brownstone treads and landing has led to structural cracking which has allowed for water infiltration into the building. Snow and salts have caused pitting and deterioration to the brownstone surfaces resulting in ponding. The risers are not at a regular height interval and this lack of uniformity presents a tripping hazard.

The proposed replacement material (Coldstone Radiant Red Granite in Diamond #100 finish) is compatible with the original red sandstone decorative elements on the building. The granite will also be far more durable than the existing brownstone.
Upon application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, a public notice of the proposal must be posted by the owner or owner’s representative on the property for a minimum of 10 days. This notice must remain in place until a decision to approve or deny the Certificate of Appropriateness has been made. The notice must be placed at or near the property line in the front yard, so it is be plainly visible from the street, and, in cases where a property has frontage on more than one street, an additional sign must be placed at or near the property line on any additional street frontage.

Standard signs for this purpose are available for purchase from the City of Ithaca, Division of Planning and Economic Development, at a cost of $15.00 each. Alternatively, an applicant may create their own signs, as long as the following required content is included and the signs have dimensions of at least 18”x23”:

PROPOSED EXTERIOR OR SITE ALTERATIONS TO THIS PROPERTY WILL BE REVIEWED BY THE ITHACA LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION ON [INSERT DATE], BEGINNING AT 5:30 p.m. IN [INSERT LOCATION OF MEETING]. PUBLIC COMMENT MAY BE SUBMITTED IN ADVANCE OF, OR DURING, THE ABOVE-REFERENCED PUBLIC HEARING. FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: BMcCRACKEN@CITYOFITHACA.ORG, 607-274-6555.

Applicant’s Statement:

I understand incomplete applications cannot be processed and will result in delay. This application is complete to the best of my knowledge and includes the following attachments (check all that apply):

☑ photographs of existing conditions
☑ site plans showing location and dimensions of proposed change
☑ drawings or sketches showing proposed changes on each affected elevation
☑ description of design details and materials to be used
☑ samples of proposed materials
☑ scale drawings of any proposed signs, including colors, typeface, and illumination details
☑ historic photographs, if the intention of the project is to return a property to a documented prior condition
☑ statement from a qualified contractor or design professional attesting to the physical condition of any element proposed for replacement due to deterioration
☑ other (specify): ______________________________________________________________________________

Applicant’s Signature (REQUIRED): ________________________________ Date: ____________

STAFF USE ONLY:

Date Received: ________________________________
Staff Review: ☐ yes ☐ no  Approved: ☐ yes ☐ no  Referred to ILPC: ☐ yes ☐ no
ILPC Review: ☐ yes ☐ no
Date of Public Hearing: ________________
Secondary Entrance Steps (South Elevation):
- Remove and salvage original iron handrail for reuse
- Remove deteriorated stone steps and landing
- Excavate to expose building foundation stonework
- Clean building foundation wall and parging existing stonework
- Install new membrane waterproofing and drainage board
- Provide new foundation to support stone steps and landing
- Install new foundation drain piping
- Install new stone steps and landing
- Repair, re-install, and paint original iron handrails
- Backfill, finish grading, and seeding
- Patch and repair existing asphalt sidewalk

Justifications for stone step and landing replacement:
1. Significant deterioration of stonework has resulted in uneven walking surfaces.
2. Significant deterioration of stonework has resulted in uneven riser heights.
3. Cracked and missing stonework has weakened railing post supports.
4. Cracked and missing stonework has allowed moisture to infiltrate the basement of building.

Stone replacement Material recommendation:
1. The use of Coldspring Radiant Red Granite in Diamond No. 100 finish would be consistent with the replacement stone used for the west main entrance and compatible with the original red sandstone decorative elements on the building.
SALVAGE HANDRAILS AND POSTS - PREPARE, PAINT, AND REINSTALL

REPLACE CAST-IN-PLACE CONCRETE LANDING AND STEPS WITH RADIANT RED GRANITE

SALVAGE CHEEK WALL STONE AND REINSTALL

RADIANT RED GRANITE
CRACKED STONWORK

DELAMINATED TREAD SURFACE
ERODED STONE, UNEVEN STONE RISER HEIGHT

DELAMINATED TREAD SURFACES
ERODED TREAD SURFACE, UNEVEN WALKING SURFACE

OPEN CRACK IN STONEWORK ALLOWING WATER INFILTRATION

UNSECURE RAILING SUPPORT
MISSING STONEWORK

ERODED TREAD SURFACE, UNEVEN WALKING SURFACE
BUILDING-STRUCTURE INVENTORY FORM

DIVISION FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION
NEW YORK STATE PARKS AND RECREATION
ALBANY, NEW YORK (518) 474-0479

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

UNIQUE SITE NO. __________________________
QUAD: ____________________________________
SERIES: __________________________________
NEG. NO. _________________________________

Your NAME: Mary Donohue __________________ DATE: 9/20/78

Your ADDRESS: 111 Cascadilla Avenue TELEPHONE: 277-0486

ORGANIZATION (if any): Cornell University ________________________________

IDENTIFICATION
1. BUILDING NAME(S): Sage College ________________________________
2. COUNTY: Tompkins TOWN/CITY: Ithaca VILLAGE: ____________
3. STREET LOCATION: Corner of Campus Road and East Avenue, Cornell University
4. OWNERSHIP: a. public [ ] b. private [ ]
5. PRESENT OWNER: Cornell University ADDRESS: Ithaca, NY
6. USE: Original Women's College Present: Graduate Center and Residences
7. ACCESSIBILITY TO PUBLIC: Exterior visible from public road. Yes [X] No [ ] University road
   Interior accessible: Yes [X] No [ ] Open during school term

DESCRIPTION
8. BUILDING MATERIAL: a. clapboard [ ] b. stone [X] c. brick [X] d. board and batten [ ]
   e. cobblestone [ ] f. shingles [ ] g. stucco [ ] other __________________
   slate __________________
9. STRUCTURAL SYSTEM: a. wood frame with interlocking joints [ ]
   b. wood frame with light members [ ]
   (if known) c. masonry load bearing walls [ ]
   d. metal (explain) __________________
   e. other __________________
10. CONDITION: a. excellent [X] b. good [ ] c. fair [ ] d. deteriorated [ ]
11. INTEGRITY: a. original site [X] b. moved [ ] if so, when? __________________
   c. list major alterations and dates (if known):
   C. 1955 Steeple of front facade's central tower (west) removed
   1977-78 Replacement of multi-colored, banded slate roof with grey slate

12. PHOTO: [Image of building]
14. THREATS TO BUILDING:  a. none known ☑  b. zoning ☐  c. roads ☐
d. developers ☐  e. deterioration ☐
f. other: __________________________

15. RELATED OUTBUILDINGS AND PROPERTY:
   a. barn ☐  b. carriage house ☐  c. garage ☐
d. privy ☐  e. shed ☐  f. greenhouse ☐
g. shop ☐  h. gardens ☐
i. landscape features: Informal arrangement
j. other: __________________________

16. SURROUNDINGS OF THE BUILDING (check more than one if necessary):
   a. open land ☐  b. woodland ☐
c. scattered buildings ☑
d. densely built-up ☐  e. commercial ☐
f. industrial ☐  g. residential ☐
h. other: Parking lot on the west and south sides

17. INTERRELATIONSHIP OF BUILDING AND SURROUNDINGS:
   (Indicate if building or structure is in an historic district)

   Sage College is located on the corner of East Avenue, Campus Road, and Sage
   Avenue. It faces west and originally had a lovely sloping terrace down to
   Central Avenue. This terrace has been filled in by Olin Hall and now the front
   facade of Sage College is wedged in at the back of Olin Hall.

18. OTHER NOTABLE FEATURES OF BUILDING AND SITE (including interior features if known):

   As already noted, the building originally had a large terrace on the west
   side of the building. The facade design is outstanding. Parsons states "Sage
   College is a fine building of the times and an all too rare example of tasteful
   design within the general framework of Ruskin's poetical but structurally naive
   notions of good architecture....Ruskinian elements of Sage College are also (con't)

SIGNIFICANCE
19. DATE OF INITIAL CONSTRUCTION: BEGUN 1872, COMPLETED 1874
   Charles Babcock, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY
   ARCHITECT:__________________________
   Builder-Thomas Stonecarver-Robert Richardson

20. HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL IMPORTANCE:

   Sage College for Women is the first brick building erected south of the Arts
   Quad in what was planned as an informal grouping. This group now includes Barnes
   Hall, Sage Chapel, and Sage College. It also reflects the taste of Cornell's
   first president, A.D.White, for Ruskinian Gothic and this informal red brick
   group contrasts greatly with the predominantly grey stone buildings of the upper
   quadrangle. Sage College is named for Mr. and Mrs. Henry Sage. Henry Sage served
   on the University's Board of Trustees and donated the money for the erection of
   Sage College and Chapel. Sage College marks the introduction of women in larger
   numbers into the University thus making Cornell one of the first of the eastern
   universities to allow women scholars. Charles Babcock was the architect for Sage
   College and Cornell's first professor of architecture. He was also an Episcopalian

21. SOURCES: minister and admirer of Ruskin's theories of architectural design.

   Cornell University Archives, Babcock Drawings, Microfilm.

22. THEME:
SAGE COLLEGE, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, TOMPKINS COUNTY, NEW YORK

18. OTHER NOTABLE FEATURES OF BUILDING AND SITE

striking. For example, the color alternation in the bricks of the arches is meant to emphasize the quality of an arch, that is made up of individual bricks. These bricks were also meant to symbolize, according to Ruskin, the radiation lines of power of the arch. In Sage College, however, architectural statement is subtle: there are not too many pieces. Ruskin thought horizontal bands of contrasting color were the only correct decoration for a flat wall surface. He believed that such color bands, in suggesting the horizontal spaces of the building on the wall surface itself, would establish in the eye of the viewer an understanding of the total organization of the building. Babcock's use of these bands in Sage College is restrained and tasteful. The proportions of wall divisions created by these bands and the window openings are pleasant and varied. This interplay of horizontal and vertical rhythms adds considerable interest.

The Sage College tower and the entry porch are composed in a fine Ruskinian statement of architectural power." (Parsons, p.71-72) He states that the central tower is "a distillation of Ruskinian symbolism: overbearing power, layering of horizontal space, rhythmic movement, and the radiation energy of pointed arch segments." (Parsons, p.73) The capitals, carved by Robert Richardson and others, illustrate examples of local flora. These stonecarvers also worked on Llenroc, Barnes Hall, Sage Chapel and many local homes.
CENTRAL TOWER OF ENTRANCEWAY
WEST ELEVATION (FAÇADE)

DETAIL OF TOWER
NORTH ENTRANCEWAY

DETAIL OF CAPITOL
Continuation Sheet: 1
Address: Corner of Campus Road and East Avenue, Cornell University
Local Landmark: Sage Hall

View: West Facade

View: South Facade

Documentation: John Auwaerter
Date: 2/92
Alterations: None apparent
Continuation Sheet: 2
Address: Corner of Campus Road and East Avenue, Cornell University
Local Landmark: Sage Hall

View: North Facade

View: East Facade, addition

Documentation: John Auwaerter
Date: 2/92
Alterations: None apparent
RESOLUTION: Moved by XXX, seconded by XXX.

WHEREAS, 123 Roberts Place is located within the Cornell Heights Historic District, as designated under Section 228-3 of the City of Ithaca Municipal Code in 1989, and as listed on the New York State and National Registers of Historic Places in 1989, and

WHEREAS, as set forth in Section 228-4 of the Municipal Code, an Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, dated February 13, 2023, was submitted for review to the Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission (ILPC) by property owners Erin and David Cuddihy, including the following: (1) two narratives respectively titled Description of Proposed Change(s) and Reasons for Changes(s); and (2) a seven (7) page presentation documenting the proposed project layout, design details, and materials, and

WHEREAS, the ILPC has reviewed the New York State Building Structure Inventory Form for 123 Roberts Place, and the City of Ithaca’s Cornell Heights Historic District Summary Statement, and

WHEREAS, as stated in the narrative Description of Proposed Change(s), the project involves the installation of a 4’ 6” fence with five wood gates around the perimeter of the front and side yards; the west and north sections will be constructed of wood, and the east and south sections will be wood and metal, and

WHEREAS, the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness is a Type II Action under the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act and the City Environmental Quality Review Ordinance for which no further environmental review is required, and

WHEREAS, the applicant (has/has not) provided sufficient documentation and information to evaluate impacts of the proposal on the subject property and surrounding properties, and

WHEREAS, a Public Hearing for the purpose of considering approval of the Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conducted at the regularly scheduled ILPC meeting on February 21, 2023, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the ILPC has made the following findings of fact concerning the property and the proposal:

As identified in the City of Ithaca’s Cornell Heights Historic District Summary Statement, the period of significance for the area now known as the Cornell Heights Historic District is 1898-1937.
As indicated in the New York State Building-Structure Inventory Form, the Tudor-Revival Style residence at 123 Roberts Place was designed by Clarence Martin, Dean of the School of Architecture at Cornell University, and constructed in 1902 for Cornell University librarian Mary Fowler. It was most notably the home of John Henry and Anna Botsford Comstock, professors of entomology and natural sciences respectively at Cornell University. Anna Comstock was the first female professor at Cornell University.

Constructed within the period of significance of the Cornell Heights Historic District and possessing a high level of integrity, the property is a contributing element of the Cornell Heights Historic District.

In consideration of this and all approvals of proposals for alterations, new construction, or demolition in historic districts, the ILPC must determine that the proposed exterior work will not have a substantial adverse effect on the aesthetic, historical, or architectural significance and value of either the landmark or, if the improvement is within a district, on the neighboring improvements in such district. In considering architectural and cultural value, the Commission shall consider whether the proposed change is consistent with the historic value and the spirit of the architectural style of the landmark or district in accordance with Section 228-6 of the Municipal Code. In making this determination, the Commission is guided by the principles set forth in Section 228-6B of the Municipal Code, as further elaborated in Section 228-6C, and by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, and in this case specifically the following principles and Standards:

Principle #2 The historic features of a property located within, and contributing to the significance of, an historic district shall be altered as little as possible and any alterations made shall be compatible with both the historic character of the individual property and the character of the district as a whole.

Principle #3 New construction located within an historic district shall be compatible with the historic character of the district within which it is located.

Standard #2 The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard #9 New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.
Standard #10  New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

With respect to Principle #2, Standard #2, and Standard #9, the installation of a fence (will/will not) remove distinctive materials (but will/and will not) alter features and spaces that characterize the property. [If “will” describe feature or space and how it will be inappropriately altered]

Also with respect to Principle #2, Principle #3, and Standard #9, the proposed fence (is/is not) compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment. [if “not”, describe qualities of the project that are not compatible and in what ways they are not ]

With respect to Standard #10, the proposed fence (can/cannot) be removed in the future without impairment of the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment. [if “cannot”, describe why it cannot]

RESOLVED, that, based on the findings set forth above, the proposal (will/will not) have a substantial adverse effect on the aesthetic, historical, or architectural significance of the Cornell Heights Historic District, as set forth in Section 228-6, and be it further,

RESOLVED, that the Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission determines that the proposal (meets/does not meet) criteria for approval under Section 228-6 of the Municipal Code, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the ILPC (approves/denies) the Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

RECORD OF VOTE:
Moved by: 0
Seconded by: 0
In Favor: 0
Against: 0
Abstain: 0
Absent: 0
Vacancies: 0

Notice: Failure on the part of the owner or the owner’s representative to bring to the attention of the ILPC staff any deviation from the approved plans, including but not limited to changes required by other involved agencies or that result from unforeseen circumstances as construction progresses, may result in the issuance by the Building Department of a stop work order or revocation of the building permit.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission (ILPC)
Planning & Economic Development Division
City of Ithaca, 108 E. Green St., 3rd Floor, Ithaca, NY 14850
Bryan McCracken | Ph: 607-274-6555 | bmccracken@cityofithaca.org
www.cityofithaca.org/boardscommittees/ilpc/index.cfm

Date: 2/13/2023  Building Permit Application # (REQUIRED): In progress
Applicant’s Name: Erin and David Cuddihy  Phone: 646-409-2717
Applicant’s E-Mail address (REQUIRED): erin.cuddihy@gmail.com
Property Address: 123 Roberts Place, Ithaca, NY 14850
Owner’s Name (if different from Applicant): (as above)
Owner’s Mailing Address: (as above)

Proposed Work Includes (check all that apply):
☐ New Construction
☐ Addition
☐ Accessory Structure
☐ ALTERATION: Primary Structure
☐ Site Changes (paving, fencing, patios, etc.)
☐ Signage
☐ Demolition
☐ ALTERATION: Accessory Structure

Submittal Requirements
All documents are to be sent to the attention of Bryan McCracken at the above address.

STAFF-LEVEL REVIEW:
Submit one (1) hardcopy and one (1) electronic copy of application and attachments. See City of Ithaca Historic District & Landmark Design Guidelines for a description of work that is eligible for this expedited review process.

ILPC REVIEW:
Submit eleven (11) hardcopies and (1) one electronic copy of application form and all attachments. Complete applications must be received by 4:00 p.m. on the last Tuesday of the month, 21 days prior to the regular ILPC meeting at which the application will be reviewed. ILPC meetings are held the third Tuesday of each month.

Applications must be accompanied by thorough documentation of existing conditions and proposed changes, including (as applicable): photographs of existing conditions; site plans showing location and dimensions of proposed change; drawings or sketches showing proposed changes on each affected elevation; description of design details and materials to be used (manufacturer’s data sheets may be used); samples of proposed materials; scale drawings of any proposed signs including colors, typeface, and illumination details; historic photographs, if the intention of the project is to return a property to a documented prior condition; and a statement from a qualified contractor or design professional attesting to the physical condition of any element that is proposed for replacement due to deterioration.
**ELECTRONIC SUBMISSIONS:** You must provide electronic versions of ALL submitted documents. LARGE FILES: Incoming e-mails to the City must be under 50 MB in size. If your files are too large to email, please provide a flash/thumb drive, use a free file-sharing web site, like: www.hightail.com, www.dropbox.com, www.google.com/drive, etc., or split documents into smaller parts and send multiple e-mails/files. Please email both aharris@cityofithaca.org and bmccracken@cityofithaca.org.

**Description of Proposed Changes** (use additional sheets if necessary):

We propose to install a fence in the locations and materials shown in the enclosed presentation. The fence will be made from two materials -- round-top wood pickets similar to the fences already on Roberts Place along the front of the house/yard and along the west side of the front yard; transparent wire fence along the south and east sides of the side yard.

**Reasons for Proposed Changes** (use additional sheets if necessary):

**MAKE THE YARD MORE FUNCTIONAL AND PLEASANT**
Currently, both the side and front yards feel completely exposed and are unsettling to sit in. Both yards face driveways, and the side yard sits below the concrete driveway across the street.

**PRIVACY AND SECURITY**
Our yard is used as a cut-through for people between Roberts Place and Fall Creek Drive. Students have hung out in the yard at night and they leave garbage including beer cans and dixie cups. Especially being located across the street (diagonally) from a fraternity, the exposed yard is not a comfortable nor safe space for children.

**SAFETY FOR OUR DOG**
We cannot safely play with our dog in the yard – we routinely try but she has run away numerous times. She may be hit by a car and killed.

**HISTORICAL PRECEDENT**
The Comstocks created comfortable, private spaces in their 123 Roberts Place yard through landscaping, fencing, and gates, and we would like to do the same. Historic fencing (dark green rounded picket fences and gates) already exist on the street.
Upon application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, a public notice of the proposal must be posted by the owner or owner’s representative on the property for a **minimum of 10 days**. This notice must remain in place until a decision to approve or deny the Certificate of Appropriateness has been made. The notice must be placed at or near the property line in the front yard, so it is be **plainly visible** from the street, and, in cases where a property has frontage on more than one street, an additional sign must be placed at or near the property line on any additional street frontage.

Standard signs for this purpose are available for purchase from the City of Ithaca, Division of Planning and Economic Development, at a cost of $15.00 each. Alternatively, an applicant may create their own signs, as long as the following required content is included and the signs have dimensions of at least 18”x23”:

PROPOSED EXTERIOR OR SITE ALTERATIONS TO THIS PROPERTY WILL BE REVIEWED BY THE ITHACA LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION ON [INSERT DATE], BEGINNING AT 5:30 p.m. IN [INSERT LOCATION OF MEETING]. PUBLIC COMMENT MAY BE SUBMITTED IN ADVANCE OF, OR DURING, THE ABOVE-REFERENCED PUBLIC HEARING. FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: BMcCRACKEN@CITYOFITHACA.ORG, 607-274-6555.

**Applicant’s Statement:**

I understand incomplete applications cannot be processed and will result in delay. This application is complete to the best of my knowledge and includes the following attachments (check all that apply):

- photographs of existing conditions
- site plans showing location and dimensions of proposed change
- drawings or sketches showing proposed changes on each affected elevation
- description of design details and materials to be used
- samples of proposed materials
- scale drawings of any proposed signs, including colors, typeface, and illumination details
- historic photographs, if the intention of the project is to return a property to a documented prior condition
- statement from a qualified contractor or design professional attesting to the physical condition of any element proposed for replacement due to deterioration
- other (specify): __________________________________________________________________________

**Applicant’s Signature (REQUIRED):** ___________ **Date:** 2/13/2023

---

**STAFF USE ONLY:**

Date Received: ___________

Staff Review:  □ yes □ no  Approved:  □ yes □ no  Referred to ILPC:  □ yes □ no

ILPC Review:  □ yes □ no

Date of Public Hearing: ___________
The Cuddihy Family Fence Proposal

See following page for larger plan.

The red lines along the north and east side will be wood picket fence with rounded pickets to match the historic fence at 124 Roberts Place.
The three gates shown along the north side and east side will be wood picket gates to match the fence.

The blue lines along the west and south sides will be a transparent fence with minimally visible posts, for a similar appearance to the fence that the Comstocks built at 124 Roberts Place, the Chalet.

The two gates on the south side will enclose the porch/deck. They will be constructed and painted to match the existing deck railings.

The fences and gates will be 4’-6” tall.

The back side of the property (south side) which is sloped woodland will not be within the fenced area. It is animal habitat (possums, groundhogs, skunks, deer, squirrels, bats, etc.).
The Cuddihy Family Fence Proposal

Location of west side gate

Proposed dark green picket fence, similar to 124 Roberts Place, rounded pickets, 4’-6” tall

Location of front door gate

For reference, sidewalk is 5’ wide

Location of side path gate (by sundial)
The Cuddihy Family Fence Proposal

West side gate, at path to driveway

Gate to front door. We will install a path to the front door in the future.

Gate at sundial, where Anna Comstock’s gate is shown in earlier photos.

Fence and gate details: 124 Roberts Place fence and round-top pickets
The fences proposed on this page, along the south and west, should be as transparent as possible, to allow views of the wooded backyard from within the yard and views between our house and Gen’s house (316 Fall Creek Dr., the brown house shown). The more transparent fence will also be invisible from Fall Creek Drive, especially in Spring through Fall. (These photos were taken in winter.)

Example fence material: 2”x4” opening black-coated welded hot dip galvanized steel. Could also be 2”x2” square grid. Fence posts could be black steel, or either unpainted or painted wood. Top and bottom fence rails may not be necessary if using steel posts.

Above product from https://www.critterfence.com/
The Cuddihy Family Fence Proposal

Photo of fence incorporating the black steel grid mesh.

Photo of fence with black steel grid mesh and black steel posts.
https://bennerdeerfence.com/posts/5-ft-line-post-kit-foot
The Cuddihy Family Fence Proposal

The steel mesh fence along the back of the side yard (to the left of the retaining wall) will be invisible from Fall Creek Drive.

Two gates will be installed to enclose the porch/deck areas. They will be constructed and painted to match the deck railings. Both will be perpendicular to Fall Creek Drive and will blend in with the existing deck.

Small empty space to be filled with freestanding planter or continuation of existing hedgerow.
BUILDING-STRUCTURE INVENTORY FORM

DIVISION FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION
NEW YORK STATE PARKS AND RECREATION
ALBANY, NEW YORK (518) 474-0479

YOUR NAME: Judith Dulberger
YOUR ADDRESS: 108 E. Green St., Ithaca, N.Y. TELEPHONE: (607) 272-1713
ORGANIZATION (if any): Ithaca Dept. of Planning & Development

IDENTIFICATION

1. BUILDING NAME(S):
2. COUNTY: Tompkins
3. STREET LOCATION: 123 Roberts Place
4. OWNERSHIP: a. public[ ] b. private[X]
5. PRESENT OWNER: Cornell University
6. USE: Original: residential Present: residential
7. ACCESSIBILITY TO PUBLIC: Exterior visible from public road: Yes[X] No[ ]
   Interior accessible: Explain

DESCRIPTION

8. BUILDING MATERIAL:
   a. clapboard[ ] b. stone[ ] c. brick[ ] d. board and batten[ ]
   e. cobblestone[ ] f. shingles[X] g. stucco[X] other:
9. STRUCTURAL SYSTEM:
   (if known) a. wood frame with interlocking joints[ ]
   b. wood frame with light members[X]
   c. masonry load bearing walls[ ]
   d. metal (explain)
   e. other
10. CONDITION: a. excellent[ ] b. good[X] c. fair[ ] d. deteriorated[ ]
11. INTEGRITY: a. original site[X] b. moved[ ] if so, when?
    c. list major alterations and dates (if known):
       See Continuation Sheet

MAP:

---

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

UNIQUE SITE NO. 10440, 04/1623
QUAD
SERIES
NEG. NO.
14. THREATS TO BUILDING: a. none known[X] b. zoning[ ] c. roads[ ]
    d. developers[ ] e. deterioration[ ]
    f. other:

15. RELATED OUT BUILDINGS AND PROPERTY:
    a. barn[ ] b. carriage house[ ] c. garage[ ]
    d. privy[ ] e. shed[X] f. greenhouse[ ]
    g. shop[ ] h. gardens[ ]
    i. landscape features: See Continuation Sheet
    j. other: See Continuation Sheet

16. SURROUNDINGS OF THE BUILDING (check more than one if necessary):
    a. open land[ ] b. woodland[X]
    c. scattered buildings[X]
    d. densely built-up[ ] e. commercial[ ]
    f. industrial[ ] g. residential[X]
    h. other: See Continuation Sheet

17. INTERRELATIONSHIP OF BUILDING AND SURROUNDINGS:
    (Indicate if building or structure is in an historic district)
    See Continuation Sheet

18. OTHER NOTABLE FEATURES OF BUILDING AND SITE
    (including interior features if known):
    See Continuation Sheet

SIGNIFICANCE

19. DATE OF INITIAL CONSTRUCTION: 1902

    ARCHITECT: Clarence Martin
    BUILDER: unknown

20. HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL IMPORTANCE:
    See Continuation Sheet

21. SOURCES:
    See Continuation Sheet

22. THEME:
    See Continuation Sheet
11.

15i. The grounds are not formally landscaped but take advantage of the area's natural foliage which includes tall conifers and leaf-bearing trees.

15j.

16h. The house overlooks Fall Creek Gorge to south.

17. This building is situated along a narrow loop drive below (south) Thurston Avenue. The rear (south end) of the property slopes sharply downward and the house overlooks Fall Creek Drive and Fall Creek gorge to the south. There are only two other period buildings on Roberts Place but several others to the north along Thurston Avenue. This house is one of approximately 150 buildings in the proposed Cornell Heights Historic District, an early-twentieth century residence park and suburban development in the northeast section of the city of Ithaca.

18. This two and one-half story residence is reminiscent of continental (Germanic) Tudor Revival styles with its jerkin-headed gables and Tudor false half-timbering on the first floor. The mass of the building is contained within smooth shingled wall surfaces except for a small, two-story rear wing and porch (south elevation). A diminutive shed dormer projects from the north facade. Windows on all facades are generally small with a combination of single and banded, 9/1 double-hung sash and multi-pane casements. Entrance from Roberts Place is either through a simple wood vestibule on the north-facing facade or a small screened entry porch along the east facade. The roof of the north-facing dormer is penetrated by a large stone chimney. The house rests on an uncoursed rubble foundation.

20. This house was built for Mary Fowler, librarian at Cornell University. Fowler lived here only through 1909. The house was subsequently occupied by John Henry Comstock from about 1910 to his death in 1931. Comstock was a professor of entomology and zoology at Cornell and operated the Comstock Publishing Company (now Cornell University Press) from 124 and 126 Roberts Place. Comstock and Simon H. Gage (professor of microscopy) formed the Comstock Publishing Company in 1893 to market their Introduction to Entomology and The Microscope. The Comstock Publishing
Company, bequeathed to the University in 1931, became a precious component of the Cornell University Press. Following Comstock's death the home at 123 Roberts Place was occupied by English professor Lane Cooper through the 1950's.


22.
RESOLUTION: Moved by XXX, seconded by XXX.

WHEREAS, 702 East Buffalo Street is located in the East Hill Historic District, as designated under Section 228-3 of the City of Ithaca Municipal Code in 1988, and as listed on the New York State and National Registers of Historic Places in 1986, and

WHEREAS, as set forth in Section 228-4 of the Municipal Code, an Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, dated November 28, 2022, was submitted for review to the Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission (ILPC) by property owner Mark W. Haag, II, including the following: (1) two narratives respectively titled Description of Proposed Change(s) and Reasons for Changes(s); (2) three sheets of photographs document original and existing conditions; and (3) a letter dated November 2, 2022 from the applicant to Bryan McCracken, City of Ithaca Historic Preservation and Neighborhood Planner and Secretary, Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission, regarding the application, and

WHEREAS, the ILPC has also reviewed the New York State Building-Structure Inventory Form for 702 East Buffalo Street, and the City of Ithaca’s East Hill Historic District Summary Statement, and

WHEREAS, as stated in the narrative Description of Proposed Change(s), the project involves a retroactive request for approval for the removal of railroad tie razing walls and landscape stairs, the removal of non-historic flagstone walkways, regrading the property’s front yard, and the installation of a concrete walkway, and

WHEREAS, the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness is a Type II Action under the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act and the City Environmental Quality Review Ordinance for which no further environmental review is required, and

WHEREAS, the applicant (has/has not) provided sufficient documentation and information to evaluate impacts of the proposal on the subject property and surrounding properties, and

WHEREAS, a Public Hearing for the purpose of considering approval of the Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conducted at the regularly scheduled ILPC meeting on February 21, 2023, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the ILPC has made the following findings of fact concerning the property and the proposal:

As identified in the City of Ithaca’s East Hill Historic District Summary Statement, the period of significance for the area now known as the East Hill Historic District is 1830-1932.
As indicated in the New York State Building-Structure Inventory Form, the Queen Anne style residence was constructed between 1898 and 1903.

Constructed within the period of significance of the East Hill Historic District and possessing a high level of integrity, the property is a contributing element of the East Hill Historic District.

In consideration of this and all approvals of proposals for alterations, new construction, or demolition in historic districts, the ILPC must determine that the proposed exterior work will not have a substantial adverse effect on the aesthetic, historical, or architectural significance and value of either the landmark or, if the improvement is within a district, of the neighboring improvements in such district. In considering architectural and cultural value, the Commission shall consider whether the proposed change is consistent with the historic value and the spirit of the architectural style of the landmark or district in accordance with Section 228-6 of the Municipal Code. In making this determination, the Commission is guided by the principles set forth in Section 228-6B of the Municipal Code, as further elaborated in Section 228-6C, and by the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, and in this case specifically the following principles and Standards:

Principle #2 The historic features of a property located within, and contributing to the significance of, an historic district shall be altered as little as possible and any alterations made shall be compatible with both the historic character of the individual property and the character of the district as a whole.

Standard #2 The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard #9 New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

With respect to Principle #2, Standard #2, and Standard #9, the hardscape improvements and concrete walkway (did/did not) remove distinctive materials (but did/and did not) alter features and spaces that characterize the property.

[Proposed language: Although the material used to construct the original walkway was non-historic, its orientation toward to the public sidewalk reflects historic pedestrian circulation patterns in the historic district and was a character defining hardscape feature of the property and historic district. With the reorientation of the front walkway toward driveway, the residence no longer directly engages the street. The ILPC finds the]
reorientation of the front walkway significantly changed the character of the property's historic hardscape.

Also with respect to Principle #2, and Standard #9, the regraded yard and concrete walkway (are/are not) compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment. [If “not”, describe qualities of the project that are not compatible and in what ways they are not]

RESOLVED, that, based on the findings set forth above, the proposal (will/will not) have a substantial adverse effect on the aesthetic, historical, or architectural significance of the 702 East Buffalo Street and the East Hill Historic District, as set forth in Section 228-6, and be it further,

RESOLVED, that the Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission determines that the proposal (meets/does not meet) criteria for approval under Section 228-6 of the Municipal Code, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the ILPC (approves/denies) the Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions:
  • A walkway from the porch steps to the public sidewalk shall be installed, reestablishing the significant historic hardscape feature. The walkways shall be at least as wide as the porch steps and constructed of concrete to match the existing walkway.

RECORD OF VOTE:
Moved by: 0
Seconded by: 0
In Favor: 0
Against: 0
Abstain: 0
Recuse: 0
Absent: 0
Vacancies: 0

Notice: Failure on the part of the owner or the owner's representative to bring to the attention of the ILPC staff any deviation from the approved plans, including but not limited to changes required by other involved agencies or that result from unforeseen circumstances as construction progresses, may result in the issuance by the Building Department of a stop work order or revocation of the building permit.
ILPC Meeting – February 21, 2023
Resolution – RB

RESOLUTION: Moved by XXX, seconded by XXX.

WHEREAS, Sibley Hall, 921 University Avenue, is located within the Cornell Arts Quad Historic District, as designated under Section 228-3 of the City of Ithaca Municipal Code in 1990, and

WHEREAS, as set forth in Section 228-4 of the Municipal Code, an Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, dated November 18, 2022, was submitted for review to the Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission (ILPC) by J. Shermeta, AIA LEED AP, Associate University Architect, on behalf of property owner Cornell University, including the following: (1) two narratives respectively titled Description of Proposed Change(s) and Reasons for Changes(s); (2) an aerial photographs documenting existing conditions; (3) five sheets of the photographs documenting the historic development of Sibley Hall and the surrounding area; (4) nine sheets of photographs and drawings documenting existing conditions and the proposed scope of the restoration of the Sibley Dome; (5) fourteen sheets of drawings and rendering illustrating proposed changes to the central three-story block beneath the dome; and (6) an appendix with additional information on the project, including specific information on the proposed window replacements, and

WHEREAS, the ILPC has reviewed the New York State Building-Structure Inventory Form for Sibley Hall, 921 University Avenue, and the City of Ithaca’s Cornell Arts Quad Historic District Summary Statement, and

WHEREAS, as stated in the narrative Description of Proposed Change(s), the project involves the renovation of the Sibley Dome and the central building block beneath it, including the following:
• in-kind replacement of the dome cornice, in-kind repairs to the metal dome cladding, and recoating all metal roof elements;
• replacement of forty wood sash windows in the dome and the two stories beneath;
• replacement of a ventilation louver in the lantern with a window;
• installation of two rooftop exhaust vents behind the parapet on the south elevation; and
• removal of two windows on the north elevation and the insertion of a large window in the second story of the north elevation, and

WHEREAS, consideration of this application was tabled at the December 20, 2022, meeting, as the Commission required additional information to make a determination on the proposal, including a site visit to assess the condition of windows scheduled for replacement, and
ILPC Meeting – February 21, 2023
Resolution – RB

WHEREAS, site visits were conducted on January 10, 2023 and February 7, 2023, and additional information for consideration by the Commission was submitted by the applicant on February 14, 2023, including a fifteen (15) page presentation summarizing the project’s scope of work, a conditions assessment of the windows scheduled for replacement, and a revised design for the new north elevation windows, and

WHEREAS, the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness is a Type II Action under the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act and the City Environmental Quality Review Ordinance for which no further environmental review is required, and

WHEREAS, the applicant (has/has not) provided sufficient documentation and information to evaluate impacts of the proposal on the subject property and surrounding properties, and

WHEREAS, a Public Hearing for the purpose of considering approval of the Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness was conducted at the regularly scheduled ILPC meeting on December 20, 2022, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the ILPC has made the following findings of fact concerning the property and the proposal:

The period of significance for the area now known as the Cornell Arts Quad is identified in the City of Ithaca’s Cornell Arts Quad Historic District Summary Significance Statement as 1868-1919.

As indicated in the New York State Building Structure Inventory Form, the Second Empire-style Sibley Hall was designed by multiple architects, including Archimedes Russell, Charles F. Osborne, and Arthur N. Gibb, and built in phases between 1870 and 1902.

Constructed within the period of significance of the Cornell Arts Quad Historic District and possessing a high level of integrity, the property is a contributing element of the Cornell Arts Quad Historic District.

In consideration of this and all approvals of proposals for alterations, new construction, or demolition in historic districts, the ILPC must determine that the proposed exterior work will not have a substantial adverse effect on the aesthetic, historical, or architectural significance and value of either the landmark or, if the improvement is within a district, of the neighboring improvements in such district. In considering architectural and cultural value, the Commission shall consider whether the proposed change is consistent with the historic value and the spirit of the architectural style of the landmark or district in accordance with Section 228-6 of the Municipal Code. In making this determination, the Commission is guided by the principles set forth in Section 228-6B of the Municipal Code, as further elaborated in Section 228-6C, and by the
Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and in this case specifically the following principles and Standards:

Principle #2 The historic features of a property located within, and contributing to the significance of, an historic district shall be altered as little as possible and any alterations made shall be compatible with both the historic character of the individual property and the character of the district as a whole.

Standard #2 The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard #6 Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. When the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Standard #9 New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

Cornice, Louvers, and Vents

With respect to Principle #2, Standard #2, and Standard #9, the replacement of the cornice, replacement of a louver with a window, installing new vents, and recoating the exterior (will/will not) remove distinctive materials (but will/and will not) alter features and spaces that characterize the property. [If “will” describe feature or space and how it will be inappropriately altered]

Also with respect to Principle #2, and Standard #9, the proposed cornice, window, and vents (are/are not) compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment. [if “not”, describe qualities of the project that are not compatible and in what ways they are not ]

Window Replacements

With respect to Principle #2, Standard #2, and Standard #9, the replacement of forty wood sash windows (will/will not) remove distinctive materials (but will/and will not) alter features and spaces that characterize the property. [If “will” describe feature or space and how it will be inappropriately altered]

With respect to Principle #2 and Standard #6, as shown in the submitted photographs, the severity of the deterioration of the roofing requires its
replacement. The proposed new work (will/will not) match the old in design, color, texture, material, and other visual qualities.

Also with respect to Principle #2, and Standard #9, the proposed replacement windows (are/are not) compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment. [if “not”, describe qualities of the project that are not compatible and in what ways they are not]

New Window
With respect to Principle #2, Standard #2, and Standard #9, the infill of two windows and installation of a new one (will/will not) remove distinctive materials (but will/and will not) alter features and spaces that characterize the property. [If “will” describe feature or space and how it will be inappropriately altered]

Also with respect to Principle #2, and Standard #9, the proposed window (is/is not) compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features of the property and its environment. [If “not”, describe qualities of the project that are not compatible and in what ways they are not]

RESOLVED, that, based on the findings set forth above, the proposal (will/will not) have a substantial adverse effect on the aesthetic, historical, or architectural significance of the Cornell Arts Quad Historic District, as set forth in Section 228-6, and be it further,

RESOLVED, that the Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission determines that the proposal (meets/does not meet) criteria for approval under Section 228-6 of the Municipal Code, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the ILPC (approves/denies) the Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness.

RECORD OF VOTE:
Moved by: 0
Seconded: 0
In Favor: 0
Opposed: 0
Abstain: 0
Absent: 0
Recuse: 0
Vacancy: 0

Notice: Failure on the part of the owner or the owner’s representative to bring to the attention of the ILPC staff any deviation from the approved plans, including but not limited to changes required by other involved agencies or that result from unforeseen circumstances as construction progresses, may result in the issuance by the Building Department of a stop work order or revocation of the building permit.
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission (ILPC)
Planning & Economic Development Division
City of Ithaca, 108 E. Green St., 3rd Floor, Ithaca, NY 14850
Bryan McCracken | Ph: 607-274-6555 | bmccracken@cityofithaca.org
www.cityofithaca.org/boardscommittees/ilpc/index.cfm

Date: 02/14/2023  Building Permit Application # (REQUIRED): __________________________

J. Shermeta, Assoc Univ Architect  607 255 6870

Applicant’s Name: ____________________________________________________________________________

Applicant’s E-Mail address (REQUIRED): ____________________________________________________________________________

Property Address: 921 University Ave, Ithaca, NY 14853 (Sibley Dome)

Owner’s Name (if different from Applicant): Cornell University

Owner’s Mailing Address: Humphreys Service Bldg, 639 Dryden Road, Ithaca NY 14850

Proposed Work Includes (check all that apply):

☐ New Construction  ☐ Site Changes (paving, fencing, patios, etc.)
☐ Addition  ☐ Signage
☐ Accessory Structure  ☐ Demolition
☐ ALTERATION: Primary Structure  ☐ ALTERATION: Accessory Structure

Submittal Requirements
All documents are to be sent to the attention of Bryan McCracken at the above address.

STAFF-LEVEL REVIEW:
Submit one (1) hardcopy and one (1) electronic copy of application and attachments. See City of Ithaca Historic District & Landmark Design Guidelines for a description of work that is eligible for this expedited review process.

ILPC REVIEW:
Submit eleven (11) hardcopies and (1) one electronic copy of application form and all attachments. Complete applications must be received by 4:00 p.m. on the last Tuesday of the month 21 days prior to the regular ILPC meeting at which the application will be reviewed. ILPC meetings are held the third Tuesday of each month.

Applications must be accompanied by thorough documentation of existing conditions and proposed changes, including (as applicable): photographs of existing conditions; site plans showing location and dimensions of proposed change; drawings or sketches showing proposed changes on each affected elevation; description of design details and materials to be used (manufacturer's data sheets may be used); samples of proposed materials; scale drawings of any proposed signs including colors, typeface, and illumination details; historic photographs, if the intention of the project is to return a property to a documented prior condition; and a statement from a qualified contractor or design professional attesting to the physical condition of any element that is proposed for replacement due to deterioration.
**Description of Proposed Changes** (use additional sheets if necessary):

1. Repair and Restoration of the Dome:
The proposed changes include the removal and replacement of the dome’s cornice section, repairing any deterioration detected on the exterior shell and interior steel structure, removing dysfunctional items, re-insulating the third-floor ceiling as well as re-painting the entire dome with a high-performance coating. A study will be conducted on-site to investigate the original color of the dome with the intention of repainting it to match its historical condition. The current exhaust fan visible on the exterior of the dome lantern will be replaced with a window to restore it back to the historical condition.

2. Replacement of Existing Windows:
The proposed work includes replacing the existing windows of the second and third floor, as well as the lantern windows in the dome. There are three (3) different window types included in the scope and a total of forty (40) windows affected. Windows will be replaced to match the detail of the current condition taking into consideration historical accuracy, material integrity, aesthetic continuity, long-term functionality, and thermal performance.

3. New second floor window on the North Facade
The proposed work includes removing the existing windows on the second floor on the north facade, infilling to match the existing brick and installing 3 new insulated glass windows. Lintels of the current windows will be reused above the two outer windows and a new lintel to span the larger central window will be created. The central new window will include fritted vertical glass to align with the masonry below.

**Reasons for Proposed Changes** (use additional sheets if necessary):

1. Repair and Restoration of the Dome:
This work is necessary because the current dome is leaking and many of the finishes are at end of life which will require repairs for continued use. A detailed report of the dome shows evidence of corrosion and deformities on the exterior, most severely at the cornice section. There are dysfunctional items that are affecting the historical exterior of the building such as an exhaust fan in the dome lantern that is visible. The dome’s thermal system is not adequate and needs to be repaired to function as a cold attic.

2. Replacement of Existing Windows:
This work is necessary to address the long term historical, functional and energy issues of the building. The current windows are over 100 years old and have varying degrees of deterioration and are not insulated. This is affecting the thermal comfort of the interior space that will sustain greater use with the new program.

3. New second floor window on the North Facade
This work is necessary to address the functionality issues of the second-floor windows on the north facade with the building’s new interior program.
— REQUIRED PUBLIC NOTIFICATION —

Upon application for a Certificate of Appropriateness, a public notice of the proposal must be posted by the owner or owner’s representative on the property for a minimum of 10 days. This notice must remain in place until a decision to approve or deny the Certificate of Appropriateness has been made. The notice must be placed at or near the property line in the front yard, so it is be plainly visible from the street, and, in cases where a property has frontage on more than one street, an additional sign must be placed at or near the property line on any additional street frontage.

Standard signs for this purpose are available for purchase from the City of Ithaca, Division of Planning and Economic Development, at a cost of $15.00 each. Alternatively, an applicant may create their own signs, as long as the following required content is included and the signs have dimensions of at least 18”x23”:

PROPOSED EXTERIOR OR SITE ALTERATIONS TO THIS PROPERTY WILL BE REVIEWED BY THE ITHACA LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION ON [INSERT DATE], BEGINNING AT 5:30 p.m. IN [INSERT LOCATION OF MEETING]. PUBLIC COMMENT MAY BE SUBMITTED IN ADVANCE OF, OR DURING, THE ABOVE-REFERENCED PUBLIC HEARING. FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT: BMcCRACKEN@CITYOFITHACA.ORG, 607-274-6555.

Applicant’s Statement:

I understand incomplete applications cannot be processed and will result in delay. This application is complete to the best of my knowledge and includes the following attachments (check all that apply):

☒ photographs of existing conditions
☒ site plans showing location and dimensions of proposed change
☒ drawings or sketches showing proposed changes on each affected elevation
☒ description of design details and materials to be used
☒ samples of proposed materials
☒ scale drawings of any proposed signs, including colors, typeface, and illumination details
☒ historic photographs, if the intention of the project is to return a property to a documented prior condition
☒ statement from a qualified contractor or design professional attesting to the physical condition of any element proposed for replacement due to deterioration
☒ other (specify): ______________________________________________________________________________

Applicant’s Signature (REQUIRED): ______________________________________________________________________ Date: 02/14/2023

STAFF USE ONLY:

Date Received: ________________
Staff Review: ☐ yes ☐ no Approved: ☐ yes ☐ no Referred to ILPC: ☐ yes ☐ no
ILPC Review: ☐ yes ☐ no
Date of Public Hearing: ________________
Sibley Hall Dome Restoration

Introduction:

• The University has engaged Work AC as the lead architect and Argus Architecture as the historic preservation firm for the project.

• Sibley Dome was designed by Arthur Gibb and completed in 1902, connecting east and west Sibley Hall, designed by Charles Osborne and Archimedes Russell, and thereby completing Cornell Arts Quad's north edge.

• The building is a contributing structure to the locally-designated Arts Quad Historic District.
Sibley Hall Dome Restoration

Request for Certificate of Appropriateness:

• 20 south facing windows that replicate the East Sibley Window Replacement project that was approved by ILPC in the January 2013 application by LevenBetts and Walter Melvin Associates

• Proposed design for new North facing windows
Sibley Hall Dome Restoration

Scope of Work:

• The critical maintenance project work includes the following exterior renovation scope:
  
  o Repair and restoration of the exterior dome roof in kind, repainting to match original color
  
  o Replacement of existing south façade windows
  
  o Add new second floor windows on the north façade to increase daylight
Sibley Hall Dome Restoration

Proposed Changes to Dome:

• Work involves less than 50% of dome, no material changes, administrative review
• Repair, restore, and repaint the Dome
• Remove the current exhaust fan visible on the exterior of the dome lantern and replace with a window—restoring it back to the historical condition
Replacement of Existing South Façade Windows:

- Replacing windows in kind that will be historically accurate and will match the style and dimensions of the existing double hung wood windows and round wood windows
- Replacement windows will be fully operable and have a higher thermal performance
South Window Conditions Assessment of 9 arched and 11 round windows:

- Poor insulation value in the single pane glass results in energy loss and discomfort to students
- Broken weight and pulley balance systems presents operational challenges
- Metal infill panels on 2 windows were installed for mechanical ductwork that will be removed and windows will be restored to full glazed windows
- Proposed new windows will match the dimensional thicknesses of the existing wood trim and sashes and be constructed from a hardwood such as mahogany.
- Wood trim to be mechanically fastened and include weatherstripping to improve thermal performance
Sibley Hall Dome Restoration

**New Second floor North Façade windows:**

- Proposed new windows on second floor to improve functionality in support of interior renovation
- The north facade is generally deemed less historically relevant than the south façade
Sibley Hall Dome Restoration

EXISTING
NORTH ELEVATION
Sibley Hall Dome Restoration

PROPOSED DESIGN
NORTH ELEVATION

1. WINDOW HEIGHT MATCHES EXISTING WINDOWS.
2. WIDTH AND DEPTH OF WINDOW ALIGNS WITH EXISTING WINDOWS AND MATCHES THE RHYTHM OF THE CURRENT FACADE.
3. LINTELS OF EXISTING WINDOWS TO BE REUSED FOR HISTORICAL REMEMBRANCE.
4. REMOVED BRICK TO BE REUSED TO PATCH DEMOLISHED WINDOWS.
5. WINDOW FRAMES TO BE RE-PAINTED TO MATCH NEW WINDOW.
6. FRITTERED GLASS TO MATCH BRICK COLOR TONE.
7. NEW ROUGHLY TEXTURED PRE-CAST CONCRETE SILL AND LINTEL TO MATCH THE ORIGINAL DEVONIAN SILTSTONE SILLS AND LINTELS IN COLOR AND TEXTURE.
8. PROPOSED WINDOW FRAMES AND SIDEWALLS TO BE PAINTED ALUMINUM.
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PROPOSED
EXTERIOR VIEW - PARKING LOT
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PROPOSED
EXTERIOR CLOSE UP VIEW
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Project Schedule:

• Construction documents to be completed in June 2023

• Construction period is expected to begin in November 2023 with a target completion date of late fall of 2024
Questions?

Sibley Hall Dome Restoration
Ithaca Landmarks Preservation Commission
February 21, 2023