

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Wednesday August 24, 2010 at 7:00 PM**

PRESENT:

Chairperson:	Paul Zachman
Members:	Cristina Lanahan
	William McBride
	Erin Daniele
	Maria Huot
Preservation Consultant:	Ted Bartlett
Village Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

Chairperson Zachman called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm.

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

Present: Richard LaCroix, Barkstrom & LaCroix; Mark IV: Anthony and Chris DiMarzo, Bryan Powers, Engineer

Discussion: Chairperson Zachman stated that this is a continuation of a discussion regarding Pittsford Canalside Properties' application to the Board of Trustees for special permits for multiple dwelling buildings and a restaurant.

The Board reviewed the sections of the R-5 Zoning Code that are part of the standards for special permit review:

Standard #2: The proposed development will be compatible, in terms of scale, massing, orientation, and architectural design, with the visual character of the village and will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood nor be detrimental to the residents thereof.

Standard #7: Proposed buildings shall be unique and varied in design with a residential scale and architectural articulation that relates to the Village of Pittsford's building traditions: a) Varied roof heights, projecting bays, gables, recesses, and porches shall be used to visually divide larger buildings to produce a scale that is visually compatible with the Village's distinctive aesthetic character. b) Uniform building designs are to be avoided, and individual buildings within groups of buildings will be designed to create unique and distinct identities.

Mr. LeCroix stated that in response to comments from APRB members at a previous meeting, the applicants have modified the original development plans. He presented drawings of the revised plans, and noted the following changes:

1. The total overall volume of the buildings has been reduced.
2. The larger buildings have been separated into smaller buildings.
3. Additional features, such as dormers, varied sloped roofs, porches, and covered decks, have been incorporated into the revised plans.
4. 1820's architectural detail has been introduced, increasing verticality and segmentation.
5. The buildings have been straightened and a more linear site plan has been created, similar to Village blocks.
6. The buildings have been modified to locate two- and three-story buildings at the Monroe Avenue gateway.
7. The turrets and archways have been eliminated.
8. Additional green space has been created between buildings.
9. Some of the underground parking has been eliminated, and surface parking added
10. The fountain has been omitted.

Member McBride stated that the revisions are positive steps that address the large scale of the project, but he questioned whether the applicants had adequately addressed the issue of massing. He suggested that the applicants present a model of the project, so that Board members can visualize it in relation to the Village setting.

Mr. Hagelberg pointed out that the density is within the parameters of the R-5 ordinance. He stated that the definition of "compatible" is not "the same as," but is "able to exist with something else." He further stated that the property is near the railroad, the canal, and other businesses, and will not be located in the center of the residential areas of the Village. Chairperson Zachman stated that the Board will consider all areas of the Village in relation to the proposed project.

Mayor Corby stated that the word "compatible" in this situation is defined as "a balance of new and similar architecture or design that blends a new project in with the existing characteristics of the setting," which, in this case, is the Village. The historic district includes the entire Village. Mr. Bartlett stated that the project will be a new use of the property introduced in the Village, and will, as a result, be different and unique from other areas of the Village.

Board members questioned the rationale for proposing to locate most of the larger buildings in the middle of the project. The applicants explained that this was in response to the Board's request to reduce the height of the buildings at the Monroe Avenue entrance. They also noted that the area in the rear of the property is too narrow for the larger buildings, and the grade of the property increases. Member Lanahan stated that while the modified proposal is an improvement over the original plan, she has concerns with the height of the buildings located in the middle of the development. She suggested that the buildings be further reduced in height. Board members expressed concerns with the proposed location of the swimming pool, and suggested that it be changed to a more private area of the property. Chairperson Zachman stated that

this revised proposal has more of a residential feel than the original proposal. He questioned the applicant regarding the gable ends of the larger building, suggesting that they continue the architectural articulation found on the other building facades.

Chairperson Zachman summarized the Board's concerns:

- Scale and mass of the larger buildings;
- Peak mounding of larger buildings in the middle; more variability in size of buildings;
- Location of the swimming pool;
- Treatment of the ends of the buildings; and
- Development of streetscape: trees, sidewalks, etc.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, Chairperson Zachman adjourned the meeting at 6:30 pm.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary