

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Regular Meeting June 7, 2010 at 7:00 PM**

**PRESENT:**

Chairperson:	Paul Zachman
Members:	Maria Huot Cristina Lanahan William McBride Erin Daniele
Building Inspector:	Skip Bailey
Village Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

Chairperson Zachman called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

**J. Michael Smith, 5 Stonegate Lane ~ Generator  
Present: Michael Smith**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and building inspector reviewed on 5/12/10.

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that he is proposing installing a generator and air-conditioning unit at his house, which is located at 5 Stonegate Lane. He submitted photographs showing the proposed location for the units, and stated that the units will be screened from view with a row of evergreens.

Chairperson Zachman noted that the units are minimally visible from the public way. The units are not visible from Stonegate Lane, and cannot be seen at all from Lincoln Avenue, and the landscaping will screen that view. A fence blocks the units from the north side.

***Findings of Fact:***

The Village of Pittsford Architectural and Preservation Review Board finds that:

1. The applicant is proposing to install generator and air-conditioning units.
2. The units will be screened from view by landscaping.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to approve the application, as submitted.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan – yes; Daniele - yes. ***Motion carried.***  
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 7, 2010.

**John & Sonia Boufford, 24 West Jefferson Road ~ Deck**  
**Present: John Noga, Graves Bros.**

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on May 17, 2010.

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that he is proposing installing a pressure-treated deck at the rear of the house, which is located at 24 West Jefferson Road. He stated that a window will be removed and a sliding glass patio door will be installed in its place. The proposed deck will be the same size as the existing deck. A three-foot fence will also be installed.

Chairperson Zachman stated that the area for the window/door is not visible from the public way, and therefore is not an issue for the Board. The only portion that is visible is the east elevation. He explained that decks on older homes are typically not appropriate, but if they are installed, they should resemble a porch, with a railing with some detail, such as a post with a cap, and framed lattice skirting. He made red-line modifications to the plans indicating these changes, which were submitted for the record.

***Findings of Fact:***

The Village of Pittsford Architectural and Preservation Review Board finds that:

- The proposed deck is of limited view from the public way.
- There is a private drive from which the east elevation view of the deck is visible.
- The rear of the house is not visible, so the door installation is not subject to APRB review.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Lanahan, to approve the submitted application, with the following conditions:

1. The deck will have a framed lattice skirting;
2. The deck will have a traditional porch-style railing with distinct railing posts and caps and 2 x 2 balusters that will run between the upper and lower railing;
3. The applicant will submit documentation showing the specific details of the deck;
4. The red-line modifications were submitted for the record.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan – yes; Daniele - yes. ***Motion carried.***  
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on June 7, 2010.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Pittsford Canalside Properties, LLC, 75 Monroe Avenue, Application for Special Permits for Multiple Dwelling Buildings and Restaurant**

**Present:** Paul Lytle, Facilitator; Frank Hagelberg, Attorney; Richard LaCroix, Barkstrom & LaCroix; Mark IV: Anthony and Chris DiMarzo, Donald Riley, Vice President Marketing & Development; Bryan Powers, Engineer

**Discussion:** Mr. Lytle reviewed the status of the current application. He stated that the Board of Trustees has determined that the Special Use Permit application is complete, and referred the application to the PZBA and APRB for comment. The APRB will review the application and develop comments/recommendations to submit to the Board of Trustees. The Trustees will utilize the

recommendations to determine whether to issue the Special Permits for the project. If the Special Permits are granted, the review/project development process can proceed. The Development Review Committee (DRC) will serve as overall communication and schedule coordinator for the project.

Mr. Hagelberg introduced the members of the applicant's development team. He provided some history of the site and reviewed the status of the application and the steps needed to move forward with the project. He stated that the property was formerly occupied by a heating and fuel oil distribution facility, and was the site of a significant oil spill in 1999. Since acquiring the property, the applicant has been involved in a Brownfield remediation program authorized by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

He further stated that Pittsford Canalside Properties has extensive experience with waterfront development and is sensitive to historic preservation issues. The applicants stated that the proposal will reduce contamination at the site, provide rental housing opportunities for new and current residents, and increase the tax base. Mr. Hagelberg noted that Pittsford Canalside Properties not only develops properties, but manages them after they have been developed.

Mr. LaCroix stated that the property consists of a 7.4-acre site located on the west side of Monroe Avenue, bordered on the north by the Erie Canal and on the south by a railway line operated by CSX transportation. The grade of the land will be lowered to provide access to the canal. He stated that the proposal is for construction of 182 rental apartment units in two buildings, together with a freestanding clubhouse building and restaurant that will accommodate 150 diners. Both surface and underground parking will be provided, and residents and visitors will be able to take advantage of a number of amenities along the canal frontage. He provided documentation indicating that the proposal is consistent with the R-5 Zoning District.

Mr. LaCroix stated that he has reviewed the types of architecture that currently exist in the village and has proposed compatible styles for this project, primarily Greek Revival-style buildings. He stressed that the plan is in the conceptual stage, and he is open to suggestions from Board members as to modifications to the plan.

Board members expressed concerns with the height and scale of the proposed buildings. Chairperson Zachman questioned whether the proposed styles of architecture accurately reflect those existing on Village homes. Member Huot stated that the proposal is lacking the relationship between the residents of the buildings and people walking on the street that currently exists in the Village. She stated that the complex that is proposed does not reflect the character of the village.

Mr. Hagelberg explained that the applicants have added roadways and a sidewalk system for pedestrian use, which will increase the relationship between the inhabitants of the apartments and pedestrians on the street.

Member Lanahan pointed out that the buildings are the maximum size that is allowed by the R-5 district code. She questioned whether it was necessary to propose such large buildings. Chairperson Zachman stated that the project has a "campus-like" appearance, with a row of solid, monolithic structures. He explained that the style of village buildings is simple, modest, and not ornamental.

The Boards will have a special meeting to view the site on Wednesday June 16<sup>th</sup>, and there will be a meeting for comments from the public on Tuesday June 22<sup>nd</sup>.

**St Louis Church, 46 South Main Street**  
**Present: Chris Davis, Ontario Exteriors; Sally Shrecker**

**Discussion:** Mr. Davis stated that they are proposing tearing off the existing damaged shakes that are a 5½” exposure siding and replacing them with a 7” exposure Hardie Plank Shake product. Some trim will also have to be replaced. They are also proposing re-siding the barn with Hardie Plank sheet goods, which is a product that has the appearance of T-111 siding in the rear of the Ministry center.

Chairperson Zachman explained that the Board’s ultimate goal is not to create maintenance-free exteriors on Village buildings. He stated that there is a risk of losing important features and altering the character of the house. He said that the house is a shake-style house, and the shakes are a character-defining feature of the house. He noted that the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards state that “deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where 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.” He stated that damaged cedar should be replaced with cedar.

**Member Items:**

- The Board discussed nominations for the Irving Gaskin Historic Preservation Award.

**Minutes:**

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the May 3, 2010 minutes, as drafted.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Lanahan – yes; Daniele - yes. *Motion carried.*

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business, Chairperson Zachman adjourned the meeting at 11:00 pm.

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary