

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Monday November 1, 2010 at 7:00 PM**

**PRESENT:**

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

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

**Paul Schenkel, Port of Pittsford Park ~ Pavilion**

**Present:** Paul Schenkel

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 9/24/10.

**Discussion:** Mr. Schenkel stated that the Town of Pittsford is proposing to replace the temporary band shelter at the Port of Pittsford Park with a permanent one, similar to the Village's shelter across the canal. At the last meeting, he submitted preliminary plans for the pavilion and for replacement of the existing dock, installation of dock bollards with electric and water, replacement of all concrete walks, and installation of lights along the Port. Board members made several suggestions for modifications to the proposed plan. Mr. Schenkel stated that he is submitting revised plans that incorporate the suggested changes.

***Findings of Fact:***

The applicant presented revised plans with the following modifications:

- Orientation of the pavilion to the canal;
- Consistent overhang of the eaves;
- Exposed soffits;
- Profile of brackets; and
- Pavers under the structure.

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

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Lanahan – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on November 1, 2010.

\*\*\*\*\*

**John Caselli, 9 East Jefferson Road ~ Addition**

**Present:** John Caselli

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 10/19/10.

**Discussion:** Mr. Caselli presented proposed plans for side and rear additions for the house located at 9 East Jefferson Road. Chairperson Zachman noted that the original windows have been removed from the house. He stated that removal of the original windows disrupts the original window fenestration, and was an unnecessary demolition step. He stated that the application is incomplete as submitted, and the Board will need additional information on the project prior to making a determination.

Board Members expressed concerns with a number of the design elements of the plan:

- Side entrance: Typically, one of the distinctive features of a Foursquare-style house is a split level single door facing the driveway with a one story bay extension above it.
- The bay is a character-defining feature of a Foursquare-style house that should not be altered. The three-story stairwell addition proposed as a replacement to the above-mentioned feature is not an appropriate alteration to the house.
- Preservation and renovation of the second-floor cedar shake siding present under the vinyl siding to be removed.
- The siding should not extend down to grade over new foundation block.
- The proposed material and plan details for the block walls flanking the new proposed front steps should be added to the plan.
- The railing and porch skirt style should be maintained.
- The same openings for the windows and doors should be maintained.
- Cutsheets with the specific details of the windows and doors should be provided.
- A set of full-size plans and a plan view should be provided.
- The roof style and general configuration of the rear addition did not look appropriate for this style house and needs modification.

The application will remain open and the applicant will return to the Board with complete plans.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Debbie Davis, 30 South Street ~ Windows**

**Present:** Debbie Davis

**Application:** Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 10/19/10.

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that she is proposing to replace the windows in the house with full-frame replacement windows. The windows were replaced in the 1950's with spring-balanced sash windows.

Chairperson Zachman stated that replacement of the window sash only is a preferred alternative, if the functionality of the existing window sash cannot be restored. He further noted that the process of putting a fully-framed replacement window “within” the existing window frame reduces the overall window opening, and is not typically appropriate as a replacement solution for historic homes.

***Findings of Fact:***

- The applicant is proposing to replace most of the windows in the house.
- The windows are not original to the house, but are accurately-sized windows that were replaced with spring-balanced sash windows.
- The large bay/picture window in the house that is not appropriate to the era of the home is not being replaced.
- The window openings and locations are considered a significant architectural feature of a house.
- The applicant is proposing removing the sash and installing a framed replacement window inside of a framed window, which will reduce the size of the window and double the sill, thereby creating a smaller window area than would be historically accurate.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to *deny* the application for installation of replacement windows, as submitted.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Lanahan – yes; Zachman –yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on November 1, 2010.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

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

**Discussion:** Mr. DiMarzo began the presentation by reviewing the modifications that have been made to the original plan and the current status of the project. He presented a fully featured 3D virtual model of the project and nearby surroundings, to assist Board members in evaluating the mass and scale, as there was a concern that there has not been enough information provided to make a well-informed recommendation. The Board requested full front and rear elevations for the length of the project and a cross-section elevation of the development from the canal and Sutherland High School.

Board members will hold a special workshop meeting in the next couple of weeks to further discuss and evaluate the project.

**Member Items:**

- **Minutes:** October 4, 2010

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Daniele, to approve the October 4, 2010 minutes, as drafted.

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

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business, Chairperson Zachman adjourned the meeting at 10:00 pm.

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary