

**Village of Pittsford  
Architectural and Preservation Review Board  
Monday March 4, 2013 at 7:00 PM**

**PRESENT:**

Chairperson:	Paul Zachman
Members:	Cristina Lanahan William McBride Maria Huot Erin Daniele

Village Attorney:	Jeff Turner
Building Inspector:	John Limbeck
Recording Secretary:	Linda Habeeb

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

**Linda Brisbane/Marty Martina, 30 Locust Street ~ Addition**

**Present:** Linda Brisbane, homeowner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 12/18/12.**

**Discussion:** Chairperson Zachman explained that the original version of this application for an addition was reviewed at the January 7<sup>th</sup> APRB meeting, and a modified plan was reviewed at the February 4<sup>th</sup> and February 11<sup>th</sup> meetings. The applicants have requested a vote of the full Board on the original proposal.

***Findings of Fact:***

Style: Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century Four Square

Form:

While the roof form (gable) of the proposed addition is the same as the other primary existing roof forms, the slope of the proposed roof (5/12 & 6/12) is significantly flatter than the 8/12 existing roof slope. The proposed addition is a two-story shallow wing extension to the west of the main house. The width of the proposed wing addition is as wide or slightly less than the width of the front of the house, and the corresponding gable roof above the addition constitutes another similar sized major gable peak that is clearly visible from the street in relationship to the front main gable peak. The amount of disparity in the pitch between the main gable peak and the proposed "wing" gable peak is enough that the architectural style of the home is negatively impacted as the proportion of the prominent proposed wing gable is too dissimilar to the front gable. There are many proper examples in the village of *Four Square (1)* style homes with significant side wing extensions, as well as similar *Folk Victorian Gable Front and Wing (2)* style homes, where the two primary opposing gables are always of the same roof pitch.

Visibility:

Village homes are typically close spaced, thus affording somewhat reduced visibility for the side elevation views as compared with the main front façade. In this particular setting, the property directly adjacent to the west side of the subject property is a double-wide lot. This wide lot setting creates a large open space gap between the homes, exposing the proposed wing addition to a broad view exposure from the street. At present, there is a line of large arborvitae that obscure a significant lower portion of the house; however, the arborvitae are on the neighboring property. The distance between the proposed addition and the lot line of the property is between three and five feet, not enough space to plant any kind of significant, tall landscape plantings to help mitigate the view of the two-story addition.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to *deny* the application for construction of an addition, as submitted on 12/18/12.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – abstain; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 4, 2013.

Chairperson Zachman stated that the Board approved a version of an addition that was submitted by the applicant. The applicant is requesting the ability to shift the addition to center it between the first floor shed roof wings and retain the ability to build the addition in the approved form.

***Finding of Fact:***

- ◆ Shifting of the wing addition forward approximately two feet to center it does not change the character of the addition.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve both versions of the proposal for an addition.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – abstain; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 4, 2013.

Ms. Brisbane requested clarification as to the reason that the findings of fact cite examples of other appropriate additions located in the Village, but the applicants' examples of inconsistent additions were not applicable.

Chairperson Zachman explained that the APRB is charged with reviewing applications and making determinations as to what is appropriate, given the available options and limitations of each property. He further noted that there are many examples in the Village of nonconforming and ill-advised additions, and the Board will not use the examples to set a precedent to follow.

Ms. Brisbane asked for an explanation of the reason that Board members changed their opinions from one meeting to the next.

Chairperson Zachman stated that through the course of discussions, members' opinions can evolve. It was also pointed out that the Board did not vote on the proposal at the February 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

\*\*\*\*\*

**John Stadt, 18 South Main Street ~ Sign**

**Present:** John Stadt, business owner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector approved on 2/7/13.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that he is proposing installing a sign for the new business located at 5 South Main Street. He stated that the sign will be stud-mounted letters installed over the front entryway in the same location as the previous sign. The applicant inquired about adding signage to the storefront windows. The board instructed the applicant to confer with the Building Inspector as to what was allowable under the Village Code and then return with proposed signage for approval. The current application will be held open to hear the additional signage proposal.

***Findings of Fact:***

- ◆ The proposal is for installation of individual lettering indicating the name of the business to be mounted on the building over the front entryway.
- ◆ The method of installation of the sign will not cover or damage any significant architectural features of the building.

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

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 4, 2013.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Clayton Forsyth, 28 Boughton Avenue ~ Fence**

**Present:** Clayton Forsyth, contractor

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector approved on 1/24/13.**

**Discussion:** This is an open application for installation of a picket fence in the front yard of the house located at 28 Boughton Avenue. At the February APRB meeting, Board members expressed concern with the lack of space between the pickets of the fence. Member Lanahan explained that the preferred style of fence in the Village has more space between the pickets, so that the fence appears more open. The applicant presented a modified application with more space between the pickets and narrower pickets.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Daniele, to approve the application for installation of a fence, the configuration, general scale and style of the fence will conform to the submitted proposal; the pickets will be 2¾ inches, the space between the pickets will be 1¾ inches, and the fence posts will range from 5½ to 6 inches. All other aspects of the proposed fence design will remain the same.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 4, 2013.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mary Wilmot, 21 South Street ~ Fence**

**Present:** Tim Curtin

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector approved on 2/15/13.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that the homeowners are proposing installing a 6-foot-high fence to enclose the side yard of the house located at 21 South Street. Mr. Limbeck pointed out that the house is located on a corner lot, and the Village Code does not permit installation of a 6-foot fence in the front yard. The applicant stated that he will amend his application to propose installation of a 3-foot-high picket fence for the portion of the fence that is located in the front yard.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the amended application for installation of the submitted privacy fence on all borders except for the South Street portion, where a 3-foot wood picket fence will be installed, with pickets measuring 2¾ inches, the space between the pickets measuring 1¾ inches, and 4 x 4 support posts behind crossrails topped off at the level of the top crossrail.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 4, 2013.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Greg Dillingham, 18 South Main Street ~ Vent Installation**

**Present:** Greg Dillingham

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector approved on 1/22/13.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that he is proposing installing a larger exhaust fan vent cover on the side of the building, because the existing louver vent cover is insufficient for ventilation. Board members stated that it would not be appropriate to create a larger opening on the side of this historic building without considering existing architectural features. It was suggested that he consider installing the louver within an existing archway opening that has been brick in-filled in the building, rather than enlarging the louver opening as originally proposed.

**Findings of Fact:**

- ◆ There is an existing penetration in the side of the building that corresponds to the bricked-in former window opening on the Church Street side of the building.
- ◆ The vent is being mounted over the top of the flat roof entryway.
- ◆ The penetration opening will be increased but will be within the constraints of the existing window opening.
- ◆ A repair will be made to restore the former edge on the right side of the window opening.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the grille installation allowing flange overlay of not more than two inches on the brick perimeter, and the grille will be painted to match the brick façade.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 4, 2013.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mona Alongi, 23 Boughton Avenue ~ Garage Door**

**Present:** Mona Alongi

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector approved on 2/19/13.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that she is proposing replacing the existing front door on the house with a mahogany door, and replacing the existing garage door with a new wooden garage door. Chairperson Zachman noted that the existing garage door is in disrepair, and the proposed garage door is almost identical in style and material to the existing garage door.

Garage Door:

**Findings of Fact:**

- ◆ The existing wood, flat-panel garage door is in a state of disrepair.
- ◆ The proposed replacement door is the same style and material as the existing door.

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

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 4, 2013.

Front Door:

Chairperson Zachman explained that, according to the Village Code, the original front door of a historic house is a significant architectural feature that should be preserved instead of replaced. Replacement of non-distinguishing and non-contributing exterior architectural features will be considered an alteration. Alterations of non-distinguishing and non-contributing exterior architectural features of existing buildings shall be made with materials that are of equal or better quality than the original materials, and shall be made consistent with the spirit of their architectural style or shall alter the structure to an appearance consistent with the architectural styles of historic value existing in the district.

Board members questioned the applicant as to whether the existing front door is original to the house. She did not know if the door is original, and requested that the Board leave the application open, so that she could gather more information about the door. Member Daniele stated that, in her opinion, the door proposed by the applicant is not appropriate for the house.

The application will be held open.

\*\*\*\*\*

**John Caselli, 10 East Jefferson Road ~ Garage Door**

**Present:** John Caselli, homeowner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector approved on 1/29/13.**

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that he is proposing replacing the existing barn-style garage doors that are in disrepair with steel garage doors. Chairperson Zachman stated that the existing garage doors are a character-providing architectural feature of the garage.

**Findings of Fact:**

- ◆ The existing barn-style doors have a unique track system.
- ◆ The existing door panel components will be reconfigured to mount in an out-swing style that will preserve the character and appearance of the existing doors.
- ◆ This will be an adaptive re-use of the structure to increase functionality.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the adaptation of the two wider panel sections of existing doors to be rehung in the same height configuration with the appropriate hardware. The two existing smaller panels will be fixed mounted flanking the functional swing doors.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 4, 2013.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Larry Weis, 19 South Main Street ~ Garage**

**Present:** Larry Weis, Owner

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing (1) installation of a metal roof over the existing flat roof on the south side of the building; (2) re-siding the second story of the building with hardieboard siding; and (3) extending the Architrave façade detail currently over the “Breathe” space across the entire front of the building.

Siding:

**Findings of Fact:**

- ◆ The building was built in 1815.
- ◆ The building is located on South Main Street.
- ◆ The building has been changed and repurposed and the current state of the outside of the building is a mixture of different siding materials, including aluminum, cedar and composite clapboard, and vinyl.
- ◆ The front, and eventually the entire building, will be restored to the clapboard appearance with hardieboard material, including trim and soffits, in historic proportions. Any existing historic trim/soffit/siding details will be exactly replicated.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the removal of the existing aluminum siding and soffit trim cladding and restore with historically appropriate dimensioned revealed hardie clapboard. The Hardie cementitious material will be smooth faced. The front façade re-siding as proposed is subject to removal of some aluminum siding to determine original reveal of the original clapboard if it exists.

Chairperson Zachman amended the motion to approve extending the siding renovation to include other sides of the building subject to appropriate completion of the front façade renovation. Each successive phase of the exterior renovation will conform to existing or historically accurate architectural detailing. Any proposed deviation is subject to approval from the APRB.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.**  
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 4, 2013.

Extension of facade:

**Findings of Fact:**

- ◆ The proposal is for extension of the storefront architrave above the front windows across the same dimension and proportion as the architrave above the “Breathe” store front
- ◆ The extension will match the trim and style of the “Breathe” portion.
- ◆ The building has been changed and repurposed and the current state of the outside of the building is a mixture of different siding materials.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the extension of the architrave subject to the applicant’s submitting a detailed front elevation design of the building and proposed architrave extension.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.**  
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 4, 2013.

Roof:

**Findings of Fact:**

- ◆ The proposal is for installation of a metal roof over the existing flat roof on the south side of the building.
- ◆ The area for the roof is shielded from Main Street by a parapet wall that rises above it and is minimally visible from the public way.
- ◆ A standing seam metal roof is appropriate for this flat roofing application and the era of the building.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the installation of a standing seam roof, subject to submittal of documentation, the color to be either black or bronze, and with a conventional gutter along the south drip edge of the roof.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.**  
This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 4, 2013.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Cathie Gartland, 55 Rand Place ~ Windows**

**Present:** Cathie Gartland, Homeowner

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 3/1/13.**

**Discussion:** The applicant is proposing replacing the twelve existing windows on the house with Lincoln double-hung tilt pack windows. Chairperson Zachman explained that since this house was built in 1957, it is considered a postwar house, for which there is more flexibility in materials. Substitute materials are allowed for alterations as long as the quality of the materials

is equal to or better than the original component, and the style is compatible with the original component or others in the neighborhood.

***Findings of Fact:***

- ◆ The house is a postwar minimal traditional-style, one-story house, built in 1957.
- ◆ The existing window sash does not possess a high level of craftsmanship or architectural styling.
- ◆ Replacement of non-distinguishing and non-contributing exterior architectural features will be considered an alteration.
- ◆ Alterations of non-distinguishing and non-contributing exterior architectural features of existing buildings shall be made with materials that are of equal or better quality than the original materials, and shall be made consistent with the spirit of their architectural style or shall alter the structure to an appearance consistent with the architectural styles of historic value existing in the district.
- ◆ The replacement windows are double-hung sash with a horizontal window divider, which will be maintained.

**Motion:** Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the replacement of the window sashes, as submitted, with replication of the existing two over two, horizontal muntin design.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Zachman – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. ***Motion carried.*** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 4, 2013.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Paul Zachman, 43A Rand Place ~ Deck**

**Present:** Paul Zachman, Boardwalk Design

**Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector approved on 2/18/13.**

**Discussion:** Mr. Zachman presented a proposal for construction of a deck structure to be installed in the rear of the house located at 43A Rand Place. He presented samples of the materials to be used for the deck. He submitted a survey map, photographs, and documentation indicating the materials for the proposed deck addition. Board members stated that the proposed design and materials are appropriate for this contemporary house.

***Findings of Fact:***

Proposed Deck Addition:

- Walk out basement elevation – Deck off of 1<sup>st</sup> floor level
- Existing sliding glass door installed for future deck
- Deck will extend over exposed blank wall foundation area
- Wood Framing
- Steps with landing down to grade
- Proposed decking and step treads: Trex Transcend – Lava Rock
- Proposed Railings: Trex Transcend – Classic White – Matte finish
- Proposed fascia & step riser trim: Trex Classic White Trim – Cellular PVC

Specific Proposed Findings:

- 2009 Neo-Traditional, Hardie Siding & Trim
- Non-traditional setting within a postwar private street extension neighborhood
- Rear elevation visible at a distance through the properties along East Jefferson Road
- Original siding and foundation configuration set up for future deck installation
- Deck flooring material is discernable from public view
- Railing style and profile imitative of historic styles
- Proposed materials are consistent with this style and age/era of home

**Motion:** Member Lanahan made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of a deck, as submitted, with the supporting posts clad in the same material as the railing.

**Vote:** McBride – yes; Lanahan – yes; Huot – yes; Daniele - yes. **Motion carried.** This decision was filed in the Office of the Village Clerk on March 4, 2013.

**ADJOURNMENT:** There being no further business, Member Lanahan adjourned the meeting at 10:30 pm.

---

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary