

**Village of Pittsford
Architectural and Preservation Review Board
Wednesday September 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.

Arthur Alves, 5 Monroe Avenue ~ Sign

Present: Arthur Alves, Business owner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/8/13.

Discussion: The applicant stated that he is proposing replacing the existing sign on the building located at 5 Monroe Avenue with a new sign. He submitted documentation with the dimensions, materials, and location for the proposed sign.

Findings of Fact:

- ◆ The proposed sign will be installed in the same location as the previous sign.
- ◆ The installation of the sign will not cover or damage any architectural features of the building.
- ◆ The proposed sign conforms to the Village Zoning Code.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for installation of the 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 September 4, 2013.

Michael Bonzo, 10 Schoen Place ~ Door

Present: Michael Bonzo, Business owner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 7/23/13.

Discussion: This is a continuation of an application for installation of a door on the building located at 10 Schoen Place. The applicant stated that he has revised his previous proposal to request replacement of the existing barn-style door on the building, instead of installation of a new door on the canal side of the building. He stated that the proposed door is a full glass door that matches the other entry doors on the building.

Findings of Fact:

- ◆ The existing door is a conventional swing door with rough-sawn material that matches the siding affixed to the outside of it.
- ◆ The existing door appears to be a utility side entrance to the building.
- ◆ The proposed door is in lieu of cutting a new door into the canal frontage side of the building and will not require an additional set of stairs and landing, which would have been required for a new door.
- ◆ The proposed door is a full glass door that matches the other entry doors on the building.
- ◆ A glass door is appropriate to increase the visibility of this retail space.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for replacement of the door, as submitted, with the condition that the exterior trim be either re-created as is or saved on re-installation, and the door to be painted to match the other doors on the building.

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 September 4, 2013.

St. Louis Church, 21 Rand Place ~ Fence and lighting

Present: Sally Schrecker, Operations Manager; Kayanne Gsellmeier, LaBella Associates

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 7/10/13.

Discussion: This is a continuation of an application for replacement and installation of three lighting fixtures and poles at the Rand Place driveway and new walkway. At the August APRB meeting, Board members expressed concern with the height of the proposed lamppost, stating that it is not appropriate for the residential setting. The applicant was proposing lights where the bottom of the fixture is 13' high, and it was the consensus of those at the meeting that 13' was not a good scale for the residential setting. Members suggested that lights in the 8' – 10' range would be more appropriate for this setting. It was also mentioned that the end of the school building also had floodlights, adding significant lighting to the area.

The applicants submitted a proposal with three options for installation of luminaries, which would be set at a height of 10.5 feet from the ground. They stated that they are also proposing replacing the spotlight-type fixture on the end of the Elementary Building with a shielded fixture that will spill light downward rather than outward. The applicants stated that the Planning Board approved the lighting plan at the August 26th PZBA meeting.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the installation of the carriage-style light with the side-mounted arm (Option #2), the height of the light at the bottom of the lip of the hood to be 10.5 feet, painted black, and the replacement of the double floodlight mounted on the school building to downcast light style, 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 September 4, 2013.

Charles Corby, 44 North Main Street ~ Demolition, fence, stone posts
Present: Charles Corby, owner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 7/31/13.

Discussion: The applicants stated that they are seeking (1) reaffirmation of the prior approval to demolish the milk house; (2) approval of the style, size, and type of the proposed fence; and (3) review of a proposal to replace the stone columns that previously existed at the Dairy entrance.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to renew the demolition approval for the Dairy building, based on the findings of fact entered in the minutes of the original approval at the 09/08/08 APRB meeting; there is no new information to reverse the findings from the original approval.

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 September 4, 2013

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member Huot, to renew the approval of the stone columns proposed for either side of the drive entrance and one to the north to terminate the fence, as originally submitted, and with the same findings of fact, the columns to be natural stone and grouting and reveal on the stone to be similar to the existing stone wall.

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 September 4, 2013

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the installation of a six-foot stockade fence, 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 September 4, 2013

Findings of Fact:

- ◆ With the removal of the Dairy building, there is a void between the primary residence and the barn in the rear and a lack of privacy to the rear of the main residence.
- ◆ The fence will be installed in the same location that was approved in the original site plan.
- ◆ The fence is an appropriate style for the agricultural setting.

Jay Whitbourne, 25 State Street ~ Roof
Present: Jay Whitbourne

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/19/13.

Discussion: The applicant is proposing to remove the existing deteriorated cedar shingle roofing on the house located at 25 State Street, and to replace it with an asphalt architectural shingle. Chairperson Zachman stated that the cedar shake roof is a significant architectural

feature of the house, which is located in a prominent area of the Village. He also noted that there are other cedar shingle roofs in the surrounding area of the house, and that pressure-treated shingle is available.

Findings of Fact:

- ◆ The roof on 25 State Street is one of the few cedar shingle roofs in the Village.
- ◆ The house is located in the main business district of the Village.
- ◆ The brick building across the street from the house also has a cedar shingle roof, which represents unique craftsmanship and materials.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to deny the replacement of the existing cedar shake roof with an asphalt architectural-style shingle, based on the findings of fact.

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 September 4, 2013

Bruce Steele, 19 Golf Avenue ~ Siding

Present: Bruce Steele

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/20/13.

Discussion: The applicant stated that they are proposing re-siding the house with vinyl cedar shake siding on the upper portion, and cultured stone façade on the lower portion of the house, and installation of a natural wood pergola. Board members suggested that three brackets be added to the cantilever of the center portion of the house to match the bracketed cantilever on the left side of the garage.

Findings of Fact:

- ◆ The house is a postwar split-level house, built in 1957.
- ◆ Since the original construction, a large two-car garage with an addition was constructed on the left side, the front dormer of which is incompatible with the house.
- ◆ Removal of the existing vinyl siding will not constitute loss of character or unique materials or workmanship.
- ◆ The siding design and arrangement, and material selection were illustrated with architectural drawings prepared by Bero Architecture.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the re-siding of the house, as proposed, with vinyl cedar shake siding on the upper portion and cultured stone façade on the lower portion of the house, and a natural wood pergola, with the condition that three brackets be added to the cantilever of the center portion of the house to match the bracketed cantilever on the left side of the garage.

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 September 4, 2013

Gene Cardamone, 73 South Main Street ~ Fence

Present: Gene Cardamone, owner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/20/13.

Discussion: The applicant stated that the proposal is for installation of a 6-foot stockade fence along the property line, starting at the 70-foot setback line. He is also proposing installing a three-foot fence on the south side property line of the house inside of the 70' setback line. Chairperson Zachman stated that a three-foot stockade fence, with the unfinished side of the fence visible from the street, would not be appropriate for the setting of the house. He further stated that a decorative fence from the rear of the house forward would be more appropriate.

Board members also discussed the appropriateness of installing a non-wood fence, in excess of three feet in height, located closer to the street line than is allowed in the R-1 Zoning District. The front setback requirement is a pre-existing, non-conforming, situation, as the front plane of the house is only several feet from the Village sidewalk. The wrought-iron fence sections between the stone columns are approximately 44 inches in height and are mounted approximately 6 inches off the ground.

Chairperson Zachman heard comments from the following people regarding these issues:

- ◆ Elizabeth Dodge stated that she is a neighbor of the residence on South Main Street, and that she approves of the renovations. She further stated that she supports screening of the property, but questioned the structural integrity of the fencing. She stated that she wants to assure that the applicant follows the appropriate Village procedures.
- ◆ Alexandra Mosman stated that she is also a neighbor of the residence on South Main Street and is pleased with the improvements of the property, but questioned whether the applicant had received the appropriate approvals from the Village.

The Board will hold a special meeting on site on Monday September 9th at 4:30 pm to further review these issues.

Kevin Morgan, 7 Austin Park ~ Addition

Present: Kevin Morgan, Homeowner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/20/13.

Discussion: The applicant presented plans for construction of an addition for the house located at 7 Austin Park. Chairperson Zachman noted that the addition will be minimally visible from the public way. At a previous meeting, Board members expressed concerns that the gable roof proposed for the addition intersected the existing roof and soffits at a higher elevation and the soffits of the addition overlay the existing roof.

Findings of Fact:

- ◆ The house is a minimal traditional, colonial revival style of house, built in the 1970's.
- ◆ The addition is in the rear of the house and will be minimally visible from the public way.
- ◆ The addition will be vinyl-sided to match the existing siding on the house.
- ◆ Two new windows will be installed.

- ◆ The replacement of the garage door is an alteration to a postwar home, and not a significant architectural feature of the house.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for construction of an addition, 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 September 4, 2013

Susan Brown, 6 East Jefferson Road ~ Porch

Present: Susan Brown, Homeowner

Application: Submitted, date-stamped, and Building Inspector reviewed on 8/20/13.

Discussion: The applicant presented plans for renovations to the windows and doors of the enclosed porch on the house, located at 6 East Jefferson Road. Chairperson Zachman stated that the removal of the windows and door is appropriate, because they are not significant or original architectural features of the house.

Findings of Fact:

- ◆ The existing porch has been retrofitted with awning-style windows and jealousy door, and the windows and door don't match the era of the house.
- ◆ It is appropriate to allow removal of the windows and door because they are not significant architectural features of the house.
- ◆ The porch is a pre-existing enclosed porch.
- ◆ The columns, cedar kneewall, silplate, radius of trim at heads of column and header are all features that are replicated on the existing porch on the rear of the house and features on the new porch will match those of the rear porch except for arch tops can have a slight notch where fixed glass will cap off the gliding window below.

Motion: Chairperson Zachman made a motion, seconded by Member McBride, to approve the application for the front porch renovations, noting that as referenced in the findings, all of the detailing and materials will match those of the existing second floor rear porch.

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 September 4, 2013

Member Items:

Minutes:

Motion: Member Daniele made a motion, seconded by Member McBride to approve the August 5, 2013 minutes as drafted.

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

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, Chairperson Zachman adjourned the meeting at 10:30 pm.

Linda Habeeb, Recording Secretary